

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 June 2003

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the following bills:

Gaming Machines (Roosters Club Incorporated Licence) Amendment,

Statutes Amendment and Repeal (National Competition Policy).

### SCHOOLS, KINGSCOTE AREA

A petition signed by 377 residents of South Australia, requesting that the house will support the redevelopment of the Kingscote Area School and retention of all educational facilities on Kangaroo Island, with no reduction or elimination of services, was presented by Ms Thompson.

Petition received.

### QUESTION ON NOTICE

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answer to question No. 147 on the *Notice Paper* be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### RADIOACTIVE WASTE

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: Today on radio the federal science minister, Peter McGauran, threatened to cut South Australia's science budget in order to mount a court challenge against South Australians who do not want a nuclear waste dump located in our state.

*Members interjecting:*

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: I agree, he sounded totally unhinged and I understand that wiser heads may now have prevailed, but I find the threat vindictive and small-minded. Quite simply, it is blackmail. If Mr McGauran's threat is serious, he must immediately tell us from whose budget this money will be cut. I am sure the universities would be most keen to learn of his intentions. I am told that, in 2002, South Australia received a total of \$96 million in federal science funding. I am reliably informed by our own science minister that South Australian scientists received \$22 million from the Australian Research Council, \$30 million from the National Health and Medical Research Council, \$40 million in Cooperative Research Centre funding, and also a one-off grant of \$4 million to a research facility at Thebarton.

It is a disgrace that Mr McGauran, the federal science minister, is now threatening the important research work of many facilities and scientists throughout our state. I am further advised—

*Members interjecting:*

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has a different opinion about nuclear waste dumps from me, but we on this side of the house do not want our state to be known as the nuclear waste dump state. I am

further advised that removing any funds from South Australia in such a move would be unconstitutional, and I advise the Leader of the Opposition to look at section 99 of the Constitution Act, and also be aware of the independence of a number of research funding authorities.

South Australia has been unfairly targeted by Mr McGauran and the federal government as the site for a nuclear waste dump and I understand that, for the very first time in this nation's history, according to the advice I am given, the federal government is moving to compulsorily acquire land from a state government in direct defiance of that government's wishes. This government made a pledge to South Australians that we would do everything within our power to stop this nuclear waste dump being built, and we are keeping to our word.

Yesterday in this place the Minister for Environment and Conservation announced that the government will seek to make the preferred site for the waste dump a public park. The government is taking this action as a means of forcing the federal government to take legislation to compulsorily acquire this land, land owned by the taxpayers of South Australia, into the federal parliament. So, if they are fair dinkum about overriding our laws and our ban against the nuclear waste dump, let them pass legislation through both houses of the federal parliament. Let them see if they can get it through the Senate. If this creates a problem for—

**Mr BRINDAL**: I rise on a point of order. The Minister for Environment and Conservation has Notice of Motion No. 2 on the *Notice Paper*, which is the introduction of a public park bill. I ask whether this is canvassing debate on a matter that will come before the parliament.

The **SPEAKER**: I was listening very carefully to the Premier and, in the earlier part of the ministerial statement, the remarks being made were relevant to the statements made by the federal science minister, Senator Peter McGauran. I think the Premier has now strayed into an area, as the member for Unley indicates by taking this point of order, which pre-empted debate on the measure of which notice has already been given, but I am not absolutely sure of that. I assure the member for Unley, and all other members, that I am listening carefully. I would also make the point that ministerial statements were never intended to be a free kick in debate.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: I appeal once again to those opposite to put state before party and to join with us in fighting against the construction of this radioactive waste dump in our back yard. I appeal to them to support the law passed by this parliament.

Let me get one fact straight. The Environment Protection Authority has just informed the environment minister that, by its calculations, South Australia has produced, and now has in storage, about 4 cubic metres of low level radioactive waste. I am told that this is, in total, about enough to fill a single 44-gallon drum. On 10 February this year, Mr McGauran told federal parliament that, in order to clear a 40-year backlog of radioactive waste nationally, it would be necessary to transport 170 truckloads of waste by road to the planned dump site in our Outback. I have been told that about 130 trucks—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: No, let's listen to this. This is what you want, but not what South Australians want. I have been told that about—

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I have been told that about 130 trucks would be loaded with waste coming directly from the Lucas Heights reactor in Sydney. We do not want Lucas Heights' nuclear reactor waste in our state, brought across our borders, taken through our communities or driven along our roads. It is believed that this waste is highly likely to contain short lived intermediate level waste that contains serious hazardous waste such as strontium 90, caesium 137 and tritium, which is potentially hazardous for hundreds of years.

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition, who interjects—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition wants nuclear waste from Lucas Heights to come to our state. I do not, and that is the difference, and that is why we are in government and they remain in opposition. Why would we not be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —fighting against that waste coming to our state? Mr McGauran has already decided not to override South Australian laws that ban a medium level waste dump in South Australia. Apparently, we were told that the Liberals supported that legislation—

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Morphet!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —because they said it was their legislation. So, why do they want to run up the white flag on South Australia's future now?

*The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Newland!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Put your state before your party.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leave is withdrawn.

## EDUCATION DISTRICTS

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Yesterday in this house, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the state government's new Futures Connect program 'will not be funded until 2004'. That claim is incorrect. That program is funded in 2002-03 and into the future, and the program has commenced.

## RIVER RED GUMS

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I rise to inform the house of a report into the health of red gums along the River Murray.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I rise on a point of order, sir. Is the minister going to seek leave to make a statement or is he just going to stand up and inform the house?

**The SPEAKER:** If the minister wishes to make a statement, he will need leave. Is leave sought?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, I thought that I had.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I appreciate the chance of a rehearsal; I will get into the main game now! I rise to inform the house of a report into the health of red gums along the

River Murray. The report confirms our worst fears. Our iconic red gums that help define the distinctive character of the Lower Murray are sick and in some cases nearly dead. The report, funded by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and coordinated by the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, involved a range of experts within government and includes scientists, river operators and land managers.

These experts have concluded that up to 80 per cent of red gums in the River Murray flood plain are stressed. Between 20 and 30 per cent of the trees are severely stressed. It appears that this severe decline has occurred in the last 12 months. The decline in the health of the trees is a serious threat to native fauna species. Normally, river red gums are uniquely suited to the harsh conditions of the River Murray flood plain. However, it has been too long between floods. For example, a flood of 85 000 megalitres a day used to occur, on average, one year in every 3.3 years under natural conditions. However, under current regulated river flows these floods now occur just one year in every 10.8 years. Also, the duration of the floods is now much shorter.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for MacKillop will come to order.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The situation is worsened by the current drought. The report warns that there is very limited opportunity to improve the health of the trees under the current flow conditions. It calls for urgent action to better understand the way red gums respond to local environmental factors, such as flooding and their capacity to recover from prolonged drying. The government has recently committed funding to the completion of a Ph.D. thesis on red gum response to flooding. The recipient of this funding is a young woman from Adelaide University who led the survey team for the red gum report.

Her thesis is due for completion later this year and will add to our understanding of the critical relationship between flooding and red gum health. Also among the report's findings is the need for better monitoring of the health of the gums. The dying red gums are the latest symptom of a river in decline. They are a tragic symbol of the damage done over generations to our river system. They are a clear indicator of landscape change due to river regulation and over-extraction of water. The government is working with the Murray-Darling Basin Commission to find a solution to restoring the health of the River Murray red gums—more water and better environmental management.

## QUESTION TIME

### REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier assure the house that he will require the Minister for Transport to uphold his instructions and his government's commitment to ensure that no decision impacting on regional South Australia will occur without a regional impact statement being undertaken and released for public consultation? During the past 18 months, the Premier has talked about the government's commitment to regional impact statements, how they will be undertaken and how they will be released to the public.

Last night this was reconfirmed in an interview given by the regional development minister, who said that every

cabinet document that has a significant impact on regional and rural areas must have an impact statement with it before the event and be publishable. However, yesterday in the house, when I asked the Minister for Transport whether a regional impact statement and consultation had been undertaken prior to the introduction of the new tax on fishermen, he said, 'The answer to your question is no.'

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** The leader asked a similar question yesterday and I made the point that this decision is about cost recovery. I say to the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** If the honourable member wants an explanation of how it will operate, I will see the honourable member privately. I say to the Leader of the Opposition that cabinet took due regard of the regional impact in making budget decisions, and I suspect that it would not have been too much different—he may not remember—when the opposition was in government. Of course, cabinet takes due regard of the regional impact in making budget decisions.

### EDUCATION EXPENDITURE

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** My question is directed to the Minister for Education. Does she have any further information in relation to the question asked by the member for Bragg yesterday about the percentage of education expenditure in relation to the total budget?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** Yesterday, in her question without notice to me, the member for Bragg asked—and you, sir, took great interest in the detail of the response—why the government had reduced the percentage spent on the education portfolio in the government's first two budgets, and claimed that this expenditure was a decrease compared to the last Liberal budget, which she claimed to be 25.2 per cent of total government expenditure. I can now provide—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** The member for Bragg says she cannot read the budget papers, and I think perhaps that is right. I can now provide the house with the figures for which the honourable member asked yesterday.

The 2001-02 Budget Paper 3, appendix A at page 15 shows that the education portfolio attracted \$1 945 million out of a total expenditure of \$8 179 million (that is, 23.52 per cent in the 2001-02 budget, the last Liberal budget). The 2002-03 Budget Paper 3, appendix A at page 15 shows that education attracted \$2 154 million out of a total expenditure of \$8 714 million (that is, 23.86 per cent). In the 2003-04 budget papers, page 15 of appendix A shows that education attracted \$2 209 million out of a total expenditure of \$9 103 million (that is, 24.27 per cent).

Even on those figures, it is clear that the Labor government has increased the percentage of expenditure for education over the Liberal government's last budget. However, and of course, that is not the whole picture, because the Liberals' last budget included, in that figure, employment and youth, as well as education, and I will be interested to see the face of the opposition leader who repeated the claims given to him by the member for Bragg. Adjusting to remove funding for employment and youth from the 2001-02 figures shows that the last Liberal government budget devoted only 22.99 per cent of expenditure to education.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Some of the information provided by the minister in answer to the question—which, itself, was bordering on being out of order in that it sought information relevant to an answer given by the minister yesterday, and in further explanation of it to a question from the member for Bragg—should have been provided to the house by way of a statement. More particularly, the information that was provided in the answer by the minister in quoting a paper, I think—and I was distracted for the moment—from the current budget papers before the house is disorderly. It is not appropriate for members to engage in questions and answers that pre-empt debate on the budget, or any other measure—whether it is a River Murray bill or any other measure at any other time—that is on the *Notice Paper*.

Question time is not theatre for the benefit of members to get themselves in front of the media—electronic or print media—in any way coincidentally differently to what would be the case in any other debate which the media have as much obligation to the public interest to report as is so for question time. I will be listening very carefully to any further questions that seek information about any matter relevant to the budget. Honourable members must realise that standing orders are made and accepted by them and for good reason. They are not made by the chair and they are not enforced by the chair at whim.

### GREENING AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the mean Treasurer. Will the Treasurer advise the house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Government Enterprises will not engage in repartee with the Leader of the Opposition the moment he stands to ask a question.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** My question is directed to the Treasurer. Will he advise the house why, eight weeks after he informed the house that he would, he still has not held discussions with Greening Australia regarding options for payment of its payroll tax? Greening Australia first wrote to the Treasurer regarding this matter in November 2002. In response to questions raised by the opposition in April 2003, the Treasurer assured the house that 'talks would be held in the very near future'. That was eight weeks ago, yet I am advised that no meetings have taken place, no discussions have been held and, apart from a note acknowledging its arrival, Greening Australia still has not received a response to a letter it wrote to the Treasurer's office on 11 March.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I am gobsmacked that this is the second question in nearly two sitting days of parliament. I have been a little preoccupied for the past eight weeks, if it had escaped the knowledge or understanding of the Leader of the Opposition, but as with everything that relates to my portfolio as Treasurer I require my staff and officers to look at every matter diligently and carefully and to consider our position. I will be happy to deal with this matter as soon as we are able to. I have been somewhat preoccupied for the past eight weeks. I know the Leader of the Opposition has little to do other than worry about the impending leadership challenge of the member for Davenport, but if this is the best he can offer his backbench and how he intends to inspire his backbench, the member for Davenport will be installed as leader before the end of the year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Again the Leader of the Opposition did not seek assistance in making a book on the prospects of his survival, but merely sought information about whether or not the Treasurer had, as I recall it, had a meeting with Greening Australia or when such meeting might be held, if I am not mistaken. It is not appropriate to speculate about the standing of other honourable members: it is highly disorderly and insulting to the dignity with which we treat each other in the course of conducting business here.

#### VICTIM IMPACT STATEMENTS

**Mr SNELLING (Playford):** My question is directed to the Attorney-General. How effective has the legislative requirement been for victim impact statements to be read in court?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** Members will recall that in the previous parliament I proposed a private member's bill to introduce an oral victim impact statement to be read in the presence of the judge and the offender in the dock. This proposal was opposed by the then Attorney-General and by the parliamentary Liberal Party, but it prevailed eventually, became law and indeed was used by the parents of a young man murdered at an all-night service station within minutes of the legislation being proclaimed by the Governor.

I was surprised to read in a judgment of the Court of Criminal Appeal that a trial judge in the District Court had recently refused, initially, to allow a victim of a child sex offence to have his victim impact statement read out in court. I understand that the trial judge in the case of *Queen v Leach* also refused initially to permit the boy's mother to have her statement read out. The victim and his mother live in the north of the state and were unable to make another trip to Adelaide for the sentencing part of the trial. Nevertheless, they wanted their victim impact statements to be put orally to the judge and to the offender before he was sentenced. The trial judge said:

I take grave exception to this, where victims simply want it read to the court without being present. It is just a waste of my time.

To her credit, the lawyer from the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (Louise Kleinig) insisted that the statements of the victims be read to the court. In the face of her insistence, the trial judge said that he would read out the victim impact statement but 'at breakneck speed'. I am pleased to report that, on appeal, the full bench of the Supreme Court sitting as the Court of Criminal Appeal criticised the attitude of the trial judge, which was described by Mr Justice Perry as 'both misconceived and regrettable'. I agree.

A victim impact statement is not just about putting the information in front of the trial judge, important as that is. The parliament has decided that a victim impact statement will be read out to the court. The parliament has insisted that the perpetrators of these serious crimes must be present in court to hear the statement. Members will recall when prisoner Liddy refused to come to court to hear the statements of his victims read out. The Liberal government very properly, although they had initially opposed the oral victim impact statement, moved swiftly to ensure that prisoner Liddy would be required to come to court to hear the victims' impact statements read out. This may be uncomfortable and unsettling for the convicted criminal, and all the better if it is—it may be doing some good. As Mr Justice Bleby of the Supreme Court said on appeal:

Reading out the victim impact statement—

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to standing order 107, regarding ministerial statements. The Attorney-General is reading from a prepared text a ministerial statement, which is wasting time for questions without notice. The Attorney could have made this statement as a ministerial statement prior to question time.

**The SPEAKER:** Notwithstanding the sincerity with which the member for Waite raises the point of order and, in some measure, the probable validity of his suspicions, nonetheless, it is not possible for the chair to second guess what motivated the member for Playford to ask the question. Obviously, in the member for Playford's mind, the information was important, and he wanted it. The Attorney-General is giving it to him. I do not uphold the point of order, but I intone ministers to use ministerial statements rather than question time where they have information of a substantive matter which will assist the house in its contemplation of the true welfare of the people of South Australia.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The member for Playford was present in the house, and a supporter of my private member's bill on the oral victim impact statement. I understand that the member for Waite was not. Nevertheless, it became law, and the member for Waite asks why this information is interesting to the house. It is interesting because it was a proposal which originated in this house, and I think there is an interest not only of parliament but also of the public in how the oral victim impact statement is working. Moreover, the Court of Criminal Appeal has pronounced on the matter. I think it is one of those matters that it is right for me to share with the house upon being asked by a member.

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The Leader of the Opposition asks whether I will overrule the court. I am not sure why he is interjecting that I should overrule the court. I am sharing with the house a judgment of the Court of Criminal Appeal, and I respectfully agree with it.

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** It's wasting our time.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The member for Waite says that I am wasting the house's time talking about the oral victim impact statement. He opposed it (he probably still does), but I think it is supported overwhelmingly by the public. Justice Bleby—

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** I rise on a point of order. The Attorney-General is not answering the substance of the question but is debating it.

**The SPEAKER:** I assure the member for Mawson that I will listen carefully. I did not detect that misdemeanour in the substance of the remarks that the Attorney was making.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Sir, that would be a felony, and I would never do that. Justice Bleby said:

Reading out the victim impact statement may, in some cases, have a beneficial impact on the convict. It is the personal confrontation that is important and which the act requires.

I have discussed the matter with the Chief Judge of the District Court, who reported that, despite initial misgivings by a few of the older judges, the requirement is now supported and the new law is being properly applied. I am pleased to report that the requirement for victim impact statements to be read out in court is working well and has widespread support from the victims, the public, and the legal profession, although not, it seems, the opposition.

## INSURANCE, PUBLIC LIABILITY

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation explain why the volunteer group Landcare will not be covered by the government for public liability as from 1 July this year, whilst the volunteer group Friends of the Parks will be? The government has written to Landcare groups saying that they will not be covered by the government for public liability as from 1 July this year. The opposition supports and understands that Friends of the Parks will remain covered by the government for public liability after 1 July this year. They are both volunteer environment groups. Why is there a difference?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I thank the member for Davenport for this important question. For SAICORP to provide insurance for groups, their volunteers have to be attached to a state government department or agency. Most Landcare group volunteers are not; therefore, groups fall outside of the Commissioner for Public Employment PSM Act Determination 27, section 2(ii).

The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation informed groups of this in a letter dated 29 May 2003, to which the member for Davenport has just referred. This letter informed groups that they will need to arrange their own insurance via the commercial market from 1 July 2003. This is the situation in all other states.

The South Australian government sees the need to assist with the transitional period, so the Treasurer (not the mean Treasurer but the kind, thoughtful and caring Treasurer) has written to the manager—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Nobody has any doubt about the Treasurer and the appropriateness of the epithets. We all understand.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** We all understand. I agree with you, sir. The Treasurer has written to the Manager of SAICORP today suggesting this approach and, as a result, the government will continue to cover community Landcare groups until 30 June 2004. This has been done under regulation 12(g) of the Public Corporations (Treasurer) Regulations 1994, in which the Treasurer conferred on SAICORP the function of insuring registered SA Landcare groups. SAICORP and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation—

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

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Landcare groups. There is more than one Landcare group. SAICORP and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation will jointly administer the continuing insurance cover. Groups will have 12 months to look for alternative insurance from the commercial market. The government is currently liaising with the other states and territories on a national approach to community Landcare insurance. A letter is being prepared for distribution today advising Landcare groups of the insurance extension being provided. This letter will come from the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation but has been prepared in consultation with Treasury and SAICORP.

## FAMILY AND YOUTH SERVICES

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Social Justice confirm that staff numbers in FAYS are not being increased and that

funding for FAYS this coming year has been cut in real terms? Today the Chief Executive of the Department of Human Services said:

So, we are not cutting FAYS staff but we are not actually increasing them.

He went on to say:

I mean, the budget papers certainly show that there is less funding for FAYS this year.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question is probably more appropriate for the estimates committee. It is out of order here, anyway.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. I was not referring to the budget papers at all, and that is the only grounds on which your ruling could be made, sir. I was referring to statements made outside this parliament by the Chief Executive of the Department of Human Services. I was asking the minister to comment on those statements by the Chief Executive Officer.

**The SPEAKER:** My recollection of the honourable member's question was that it sought to determine the accuracy of current budget allocations as compared with previous budget allocations and the effect it would have on staff numbers. That being so, it is clearly about this budget. Regardless of what anyone else may have said anywhere else, the honourable member has the prospect before him of being able to ask such a question when debate on that matter resumes in the appropriate form. That form, as I have already said, is the estimates committees. It is equally out of order to ask a minister to comment on the veracity of a remark that has been made in the media or wherever else, and the deputy leader knows that.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** I didn't do that.

**The SPEAKER:** Without wanting to engage the deputy leader in debate, I simply point out to him that I do not know how he discovered what it was that the senior bureaucrat to whom he referred was saying.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I was not asking the minister to confirm what was actually said by the Chief Executive Officer. I was asking the minister to confirm whether staff numbers in FAYS were not going to be increased this year—just increased: I did not put a time on it. I also asked whether funding for FAYS this coming year would be increased or cut in real terms.

**The SPEAKER:** That is the very simple explanation of why it is out of order. Whether funds are going to be increased or cut or whatever in this coming year is the very bill before the house now: it is called the budget bill. The honourable member for Newland.

## SURF LIFE SAVING

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism, in her capacity as minister responsible for major events. Will the minister advise the house why, on 13 May 2003, in answer to a question that I asked, the minister gave this house an incorrect answer, when she informed the house that the government had placed a bid for the 2007 to 2009 Australian surf life saving titles? At that time, the minister was unable to release details of the bid, due to confidentiality requirements, but she did confirm that the government had made one. I have since been advised that Western Australia has won the bid for the games. However, I am also advised that the unsuccessful South Australian bid did not comply with

the national body's guidelines, and the bid was not for the 2007 to 2009 years.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** I am very happy to explain to the member for Newland how the bidding process proceeds. I recognise that the member is not familiar with the AME bidding cycle, and she may not understand all the issues involved in making a bid for a major event. I am quite happy to explain the series of events surrounding the surf life saving bid for the national championships.

The bidding cycle now comprises three-year pitches for three consecutive years. The three-year cycle that we originally decided to bid for was somewhat unusual, because it included the same year that we have the police and firemen's games. That being the situation, whilst the surf lifesaving championships are an extraordinarily effective way of generating tourism dollars, visitation and bed nights, it would be quite inappropriate for us to bid for all three years of the cycle because, in fact, with the police and firemen's games on in the same period, our occupancy capacity could not cope with that bid.

I am now able to explain how we circumnavigated this extraordinary turn of events and were prepared to make a bid. Because we understand that it is better sometimes to collaborate than to compete with other states, we decided to make the unprecedented bid, whereby we shared a bid with Victoria. The previous government would never, perhaps, have worked with another state. But we worked out that, if we bid for a three-year cycle jointly with another state, we could be in the running and have our cake and eat it.

*The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Newland!

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** I say that because we were intent on filling the three-year bid cycle, but doing it jointly with another state.

**The Hon. D.C. Kotz:** You set it up to fail.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland will not interject again.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** In the course of making the bid, we formed a strong relationship with Victoria and put together bid documents for a three-year cycle. We knew that we could not host the games for one of those years, so we formed a joint bid with another state. I have to inform the house that we were not successful but, in the course of the bidding process, it was put to us that perhaps, as a state, we would be better to bid for the next three-year cycle. And this is quite normal. I know that, when previous ministers failed in one bid, they would turn around immediately and bid for another cycle or date. It was regularly done. So, having been told that our initial bid for a three-year cycle—including an unprecedented historic alliance with another state—was unsuccessful, we turned to another ploy whereby we could win the bid, and we moved our bidding cycle on to the next three-year cycle.

At that point, we did not win. Now, if the member for Newland or the member for Waite would rather we did not negotiate to win events, if they would rather we gave up at the first whiff of a problem, that is their idea of how to operate a ministry. As far as I am concerned, even if we could not host a three-year cycle, it was certainly worth trying to negotiate a win for the state. It was certainly worth putting money, effort and energy into getting some part of the cycle. We put in a very good bid, a professional bid, using our staff and a bid team. We formed an alliance with the City of Onkaparinga. We worked with the Surf Life Saving Associa-

tion. We made a commitment to fund the event and, regrettably, we did not win it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** But, frankly, you have to be in it to win it. We were creative and we did the best that was possible.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Will the Minister for Tourism, within her responsibility for major events, advise the house of the costs relating to the government's failed non-complying bid for the Australian Surf Life Saving Titles as confidentiality requirements are no longer relevant?

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Davenport is not the Minister for Tourism.

*Ms Rankine interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright may aspire to be but neither is she.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop will come to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** I would be very happy to bring back to the house details of the cost of the preparation of the bid, the staff hours, the travel involved and the lobbying efforts involved, as well as the costs to the Onkaparinga council. As members will understand, every bid is not successful, but one has to be in it to win it.

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite will come to order.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader of the house will come to order. The member for Unley.

## SA WATER

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** My question is directed to the Minister for Administrative Services. What is SA Water doing to improve the efficiency of the water delivery system in South Australia? All South Australians are asked to make water savings of between 10 and 20 per cent this year. SA Water, between its intakes and our taps, loses more than 10 per cent of all water through leakages because of faulty joints, old infrastructure and the like. Such water wastage by a public authority cannot be justified in the driest state on the driest continent, yet we are aware that SA Water staff responsible for the maintenance of this infrastructure in country areas is being reduced.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services):** I thank the honourable member for his question, and it is an important question although, I must say, the explanation does not bear a lot of relationship to the central issues at stake. The amount of staffing that may exist in a country area in relation to the maintenance of the SA Water network has very little to do with issues that relate to infrastructure which, in some cases, has been in place for 40, 50 or 60 years. They are very substantial issues involving capital works and the way in which one plans them. We are talking about capital works projects which cost of the order of \$60 million, \$70 million, up to \$100 million in relation to the upgrading of those networks.

Decisions that are made about those networks obviously need to weigh up some fairly crucial choices—choices about

the sorts of money that should be spent on public infrastructure in that sense, or whether there might be other purposes to which those resources could be better applied. The previous government under the previous minister—I think, indeed, it was the member for Unley for a period—had a degree of wheel spin on this issue. It talked a lot about better ways of managing our water resource but never got around to putting in place a serious strategy to deal with the long-term water resource needs of this state.

This state government has put in place a Waterproofing Adelaide study, and SA Water has devoted \$1 million to that study. It is the first and most serious attempt to look at the long-term water needs of this state that has occurred in decades.

The previous minister (the member for Unley) is aware of this because he was puddling around in this area for some time. He knows that there were discussions about getting a study of this sophistication off the ground but he could not persuade SA Water or his colleagues to put sufficient money into a decent study of this sort. We know that in this state as much water hits Adelaide and runs down our drains as we take out of the River Murray and the reservoirs in a given year. So, there is a massive opportunity to harvest stormwater and apply that scarce resource to our future water needs.

We also know that we are at the end of this great river, and we know the uses to which the river is put—by our own irrigators, but, I must say that, in the scheme of things, they tend to be much better and more efficient users of water from the River Murray than many users upstream. So, there remain additional options for our state to engage in a serious debate about the process of trading water rights as they exist across the basin.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister, in answering the question, must address the substance of the question. My question was clearly about leaky infrastructure, not water plans for the future of the world.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The question was: what is SA Water doing to improve the efficiency of its water delivery system? It seems to be a very broad question. I am seeking to make the point that, if we are able to persuade our federal colleagues to implement a decent system of tradeability of water rights, the capacity exists to apply resources in a way which will ensure that we have a much more efficient system of obtaining water from the River Murray.

It is crucial to make this point because, when there is the choice between public infrastructure projects that cost in the order of \$100 million and when one compares those choices with the choices that may be able to be made to purchase water rights from perhaps less efficient irrigators up the river, it may be that the equation tilts itself in favour of those decisions. So, it is a question of making sensible economic decisions using the scarce taxpayers' funds that we have to choose between various options about how one maximises the efficiency of the take from the River Murray.

Those are decisions that will be taken once we have completed this sophisticated study into Waterproofing Adelaide and, once we have those answers, those opposite will have an opportunity to consider the solutions we will put before them. But we will end up with the most efficient water delivery system in this country. We will end up with an SA Water corporation that we are proud to say is the deliverer of one of the most sustainable water resources in this country.

## MURRAY RIVER

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** My question is directed to the Minister for the River Murray. Given that the government has repeatedly expressed public support for the needs of the River Murray system, why did it underspend by \$2.6 million the amount to be spent through the national action plan? The previous Liberal Government reserved the money, some \$100 million, realised from the sale of the PortsCorp to address salinity problems in the River Murray. The amount was to be spent over some seven years. Papers show that the amount that was allocated for expenditure during the past financial year has been underspent by \$2.6 million—why?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the River Murray):** As the member says, there is an allocation under the national action plan on salinity and water quality, matching funds by the commonwealth and the state, and it is a seven-year program. The funds are applied to high priority areas to improve water quality and reduce salinity. In South Australia the focus has been on the River Murray. I will get an answer for the member in relation to the underspending of the sum he has mentioned, but I put to him in general terms that the problems we have had is getting approval through the system. I think he will find that in its recent budget the commonwealth reduced the amount of money in the next year in relation to that funding because there had not been a sufficient rate of approvals. This problem is affecting all the states, and it has been a matter of some discussion and controversy at ministerial council meetings. I will get some particular details for the honourable member.

**Mr Brindal:** They blame you.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Of course they blame me—I'm the minister and that's what I'm here for, but it doesn't mean it's true. It is often difficult to get the acquittal processes, plans, and so on in place, but I assure the honourable member that the commitment is there to have this NAP funding spent as quickly as possible for the purposes for which it has been allocated.

## ROAD TRAFFIC SIGNALS

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** My question is directed to the Minister for Transport. What is the new initiative to replace traffic signal lanterns?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I thank the member for West Torrens for his very good question—he always asks good questions. In line with government initiatives to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gases, there is now an initiative for the upgrading of traffic signals on Transport SA roads with light emitting diode (LED) lanterns.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** You had your chance—you don't get the chance to give answers anymore. The upgrade will involve replacing approximately 6 800 lanterns currently in use—

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** On a point of order, sir, from my recollection this is part of the budget papers with respect to the funding that the honourable member is talking about here in answer to the member for West Torrens.

**The SPEAKER:** As far as I am aware, the minister was giving technical details and not providing information about sums of money. I thought the nature of the question was more about the change in technology than the amount of money to be spent. I will listen with care, as always.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Existing traffic signal lanterns are at various stages of obsolescence, with some being over 30 years old. The new LED lanterns will reduce energy consumption by 80 per cent and reduce greenhouse gases by 8 per cent. In addition to energy savings, there will be reduced maintenance costs because LED lanterns do not need to be replaced as regularly as do the existing lamps. The LED lights are also brighter, making them more visible and thereby safer for road users. The initiative is consistent with the targets in the draft transport plan and with the Rann Labor government's election commitments by contributing to a transport system that is more environmentally sustainable and by investing in existing public infrastructure assets.

#### METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Given the need for increased capital works spending in emergency services and the government's anti-privatisation policy, will the minister advise the house why the provision of cleaning services for the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service has been put out to public tender, and what is the expected cost? In yesterday's *Advertiser* there was an invitation to tender for the provision of cleaning services for the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. I am advised that previously fire officers themselves have always undertaken cleaning so as to utilise part of their 85 per cent of down time at the fire stations.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services):** I am very happy to answer the question, but I am struggling a little to understand the relationship between the question and the capital budget for fire services. Since coming to government, we have made significant increases in the funding of our vital emergency services to allow them to restore the capital program which was destroyed by the earlier three years of mismanagement; that is, the three years of spending capital expenditure on the recurrent budget to which I have referred in this house on numerous occasions. We are proud of our record in that regard.

I am struggling a little to understand what the cleaning of the Metropolitan Fire Service head station has to do with that program. I do not know how the shadow minister went when he was minister, but I do know that he had some obsession about what those firefighters were doing with their down time. I can honestly say that, while I manage in fine detail the important metropolitan services of this state, I do not actually check with the chief officer of any of the services about how they procure their cleaning services.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

*Mr Caica interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! No-one is questioning the cleanliness of the member for Colton, and there is no necessity for the member to defend himself in that respect. I can vouch for that. The member for Hartley.

#### CONSCIENCE VOTE

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Premier responded to correspondence and representation by family organisations and mainstream churches advocating a conscience vote on the same sex superannuation bill and the domestic co-dependents superannuation bill? If so, will the Premier outline the government's position on this matter?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I understand that my learned colleague the Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Consumer Affairs, and Minister for Multicultural Affairs has responded to that question.

**Mr SCALZI:** What is the government's position on this matter?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I think that we have made the government's position patently clear.

#### GREENING AUSTRALIA

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Can the Treasurer advise the house on what action the government has taken concerning payroll tax for Cleaning Australia?

**An honourable member:** Greening Australia?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I apologise, but the member for Mawson has got me in quite a flutter about cleaning.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members will come to order. I did not hear the question.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** I did.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, the chair needs to determine whether it is in order. I respectfully invite the member for Torrens to repeat her question.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Thank you, sir. Can the Treasurer advise the house on what action the government has taken concerning payroll tax for Greening Australia?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I can assure the house that, whilst I have some elements of generosity, I do not want it to be broadened out to give payroll relief to anyone who cleans in South Australia. In response to an earlier question from the opposition, where I was accused of not getting back to the house within an eight week period, as I have said, I have been somewhat preoccupied for the past eight weeks. I should have recalled this earlier and pointed out that on most weekends I sign a number of documents relating in specific terms to the many requests we get for ex gratia relief for reconsideration of decisions and determinations in relation to emergency services levies involving the first home owner's grant, and this one did not immediately come to mind. However, I can advise the house that on the weekend I indeed signed a document approving ex gratia relief for Greening Australia for back taxes—so, mean and green!

**An honourable member:** You haven't been reading your dockets!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I probably should have recalled it, but I am happy to advise the house that that approval has been provided, and a letter to that effect will be available for my signature during the course of this week. We have provided ex gratia relief for a 12-month period. However, Greening Australia will be required to meet future payroll tax obligations. Ex gratia relief has been provided for its accrued tax liability. The basis for that exemption was one that I used earlier for the amusement machine organisation, with which I think the member for Davenport will be familiar. I think a member of the opposition raised that matter with me.

I am advised that Greening Australia is a charitable organisation, not a public benevolent society; therefore, under state law, it is required to make payroll tax payments. I assure the house that, whilst I have been preoccupied for the past few weeks, we have ensured that Greening Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I am happy for the member for Mawson to take credit. I say to the member for Schubert that I am happy to be called the first, but not necessarily the latter.

#### SCHOOLS, STURT STREET COMMUNITY

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the house what will comprise the first stage of the Sturt Street Community School, which is due to commence for the start of 2004 school year?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** Stage 1 is those works which are being completed for the start of the new school year and which will enable students in reception to year 3 classes to commence.

#### REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development supply copies of the 150 regional impact statements mentioned on ABC radio by the Minister for Tourism and advise the house whether they are all the decisions made in relation to the regions in the last year, as the minister stated on ABC radio? On 1 March 2003, on ABC radio the Minister for Tourism stated:

We have the opportunity to put in regional impact statements. We've had over 150 of those in the last year.

A number of decisions have been made by cabinet which I believe have not had regional impact statement assessments, such as the removal of the regional health inspectors, the regional ambulance communication centres, the Coffin Bay ponies and the Outback road workers. Many more decisions have become apparent only recently.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development):** Mr Speaker, you will be delighted to know that, since I have had the privilege to join cabinet, I have been robust in demanding that the views of rural and regional South Australian are taken into consideration in every cabinet decision. In fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader will come to order.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** The member for Flinders will be delighted that I take a robust stance on all issues involving rural and regional South Australia and that every cabinet decision must consider the impact on that area, whether the service can be directly applied to all regional South Australia or not. Does the member wish me to make public 160-odd cabinet documents?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** Before we need to call a doctor for the leader, can I reassure him that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson and the Attorney-General will come to order.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** Mr Speaker, I know that you and I at least are aware how important it is that a rural and regional perspective be brought to every cabinet decision. So, I have gone beyond the original promise made at the last election and have now introduced, for significant cabinet decisions, a second tier of input—a regional impact assessment statement. We have gone beyond the original commitment and, in terms of the second tier, for significant cabinet decisions—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** I know that you at least, Mr Speaker, want to know the answer, because you wish to

represent your community, as do I; others, of course, wish to interject, because they do not want to hear what is going on. However, their communities do. The commitment this government will give to those communities is that, in terms of significant cabinet decisions, the second tier (the regional impact assessment statements) will be made public and will be available to the community as part of the decision-making process. Communities will be engaged. If the opposition is genuine—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley will come to order. For the third and final time, the member for Wright will come to order.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** The key to regional impact assessment statements will be engaging the stakeholders in the process. That is the challenge that we will put to the communities by identifying the key agencies that wish to respond, and that can include local government and our partnerships with regional development boards. Equally, it can include any local member identifying key agencies that wish to contribute ahead of the decision-making process, so that, when we get around to making a decision, it is a quality decision that has engaged the whole community ahead of the event. Equally—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** The opposition does not want to be consulted, nor does it like to be consulted. Unfortunately, if you are part of the process, you have to respect the outcome and the decision. It is much easier to sit back and carp and not be responsible for the outcome of the decision.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

---

#### SCHOOLS, STURT STREET COMMUNITY

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** The member for Bragg asked what comprised stage 1 of the Sturt Street Community School development. The answer that the first three years is included in that stage is correct, but I gave the wrong three years: it should be kindergarten, reception and year 1.

#### BUDGET QUESTIONS

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to review your ruling today that questions about the budget cannot be asked in this house. In previous years (I have gone back over at least three years' of *Hansard*, and I could go back over many more), I have found numerous questions asked by both sides of the house about the budget papers before the house between the introduction of the budget and before the Estimates Committee and, in fact, whilst the bills were still being debated before this house. I would ask you to consider whether previous practice of this house should be taken into account when considering any ruling on standing orders because it would appear, and my recollection is, that over many, many years that has been the practice of this house. Therefore, I find today's ruling unusual

in terms of the precedent established in this house by former speakers on previous occasions.

**The SPEAKER:** I take the point made by the deputy leader but, by analogy, without wanting to be too rural, I refer him to an experience of a much earlier time in my life when the first time after shearing that the sheep found it necessary to respond to the call of nature, it did not cause much accumulation, but as time went by it became evident that the sheep needed to be crutched. In this case, I think the time has arrived where the house has standing orders which it chooses to ignore. It either amends those standing orders or accepts the fact that I am not going to let it continue in its unhygienic state to bring bad odour upon itself in the eyes of the public.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Let me say to the deputy leader that it was not me who used the term 'daggy', but I think that all members in this state would understand that that is about the way the public have seen us in the way in which we have disregarded our standing orders, increasingly, over the last several years, to the point where, at the time of the last election, it was on my radar screen, to use the vernacular, and it was one of the most common complaints being made to me by members of the general public, that is, the way in which honourable members failed to live up to what the standing orders said they were required to in the way they conducted themselves here. That caused me a great deal of embarrassment and pain. It resulted in my deciding, should the opportunity present itself, to do something about it.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** My point of order was a specific request that you review your ruling—

**The SPEAKER:** I will.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —and I would like to have the opportunity to discuss with you previous practice of this house, and I am willing to show you where in *Hansard* that has occurred. Members of this house, on so many occasions, have not taken any point of order. They had the opportunity to take a point of order that the standing orders were being breached. No-one has taken that point of order, to my knowledge, and that is why—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** We were all wrong. Let's admit that we were wrong.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out that it has gone on for many, many years and I have heard many speakers say that previous custom of this house must be taken into account when considering standing orders.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the deputy leader had bothered to listen—the first thing I said was that I would. However, it is not only the members in this place who have an interest in the manner in which it conducts itself. Indeed, there are over a million other South Australians who have an interest in this place. That is the public interest. That is what I am upholding because that is what I was asked to uphold, repeatedly, during the months leading up to and especially during the last state election campaign.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Notwithstanding that, I do not need encouragement or support from the government benches in this matter.

#### WHEAT STREAK MOSAIC VIRUS

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** I table a ministerial statement made in the other house

relating to the lifting of quarantine in this state for the wheat streak mosaic virus.

#### ABORIGINAL DEATH IN CUSTODY

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I table a statement relating to an Aboriginal death in custody made by my colleague the Hon. Terry Roberts in another place.

#### MEMBERS' REMARKS

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yesterday in question time, in a disorderly fashion, I responded to interjections from those opposite. While I considered my remarks at the time to be pertinent, they were ill advised and intemperate, and I apologise to those who took objection to them.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

#### CENTENARY MEDAL AWARDS

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** Members would be aware that the commonwealth government instituted the Centenary Medal to celebrate Australia's centenary of Federation. The purpose of the medal is to commemorate the centenary of Federation in Australia and the contribution made to the Federation of Australia and to Australian society and government by its citizens and other persons. In recent weeks, recipients of the Centenary Medal have been announced and many of those recipients have received their awards at public ceremonies across the state.

I take this opportunity to thank the commonwealth government for enabling members of our communities to be honoured for their contribution to our society in such a significant manner. It was also pleasing that members of parliament, as elected members representing 47 communities across South Australia, were invited to nominate members of their communities to be recognised for their achievements. The criterion for individuals to be nominated was that they should have made a contribution to our society. The contribution may be recognised as an achievement or service to the nation, a region, community, profession, vocation or activity.

I am very pleased to be able to congratulate and acknowledge the truly wonderful members of my community who give so unselfishly of their time and effort to add immense, incalculable value to our society. I would like to list some of the nominees in my electorate, and others who have an association with my electorate, who received a Centenary Medal at a ceremony held at the Tea Tree Gully city council chambers recently, presided over by Senator Grant Chapman and the member for Makin, Trish Draper, and hosted through the auspices of the council by Mayor Lesley Purdom. When mentioning the people concerned, I will also mention the service to community that the medal was awarded for:

- Mrs Lillian Garrett, fundraising for Modbury Hospital and the Red Cross;

- Mrs Pamela Karran-Thomas, establishment of an international students program at Banksia Park International High School;
- Mrs Mary Lane, service to community, particularly through the Friends of Anstey Hill Recreation Park;
- Mrs Doreen Mason, service to community in raising funds to upgrade equipment at Modbury Hospital;
- Mrs Lois Ramage, service to the aged community, in particular the welfare of veterans;
- Mr Jim Selth, service to Modbury Hospital as chair and member of the board of directors for some considerable years;
- Mr David Southern, service to the community, in particular again through the Modbury Hospital; and
- Mr Alan Zwar, service to local conservation and as member of the Tea Tree Gully National Trust branch.

Some of the other people I would like to congratulate are: David and Ros Phillips, for service to family policy and community education through the Festival of Light; and Mrs Lesley Purdom, for service to the community, particularly as Mayor of the City of Tea Tree Gully.

I was very pleased to see Mr David Rathman (who was chief executive officer of the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs for the 4¼ years that I was minister for Aboriginal affairs) receive another award, the Centenary Medal for service to the welfare of Aboriginal people in South Australia, an award that is well deserved. Mr William Rob received the medal for service to the community, particularly through gaming regulations. Rachael Sporn was another of those who received this medal for service to sport and the community and as a role model for young women. Mr Patrick Walden received the medal for service to the community, particularly through sporting and youth clubs.

Mr Klynton Wanganeen, who is a commissioner of ATSIC, received the medal for his service to community, particularly the indigenous community, through employment and training. Ms Phoebe Wanganeen received the medal for service to the community, particularly through the welfare of indigenous people. I think most people who have had anything to do with the affairs of Aboriginal people would know that Ms Phoebe Wanganeen has been a long serving representative for all indigenous people across the state. I would also like to acknowledge Mr Tony Zappia, the Mayor of Salisbury, who received his medal for community service, as Mayor of the City of Salisbury. Congratulations to them all.

Time expired.

## DEREGULATION

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** Today I would like, if I might be indulged a little, to continue on the theme that I was exploring yesterday about the problems of deregulation and matters associated with it. In doing so today, I would like to quote from a person who I do not believe is a well known Leftie, Mr Alan Wood, who is the economics editor of the *Australian* newspaper. In an article that appeared in that journal on 22 October last year, he started to comment on the writings of a US economist called Paul Krugman. Mr Krugman apparently has addressed himself to the problem of what has been happening in the United States (of which we are, of course, a pale, insipid copy, I suppose, in many respects) since the 1970s. In his article, Mr Wood said:

Since the '70s income gaps have been widening and, says Krugman, the US is now back to the days of *The Great Gatsby*. . .

That is, of course, back in the Roaring 20s, just before the wheels completely fell off the cart in 1929. Mr Wood continued:

After 30 years in which the income shares of the top 10 per cent of taxpayers, the top 1 per cent and so on, were far below their levels in the '20s, all are very nearly back to where they were.

So, from the period between, really, the Roosevelt years in the late 1930s through to the 1940s, up to the last few years, when there was, in fact, a middle class in the United States, they are getting back to the point where they have this underclass and a group of super rich people, with extravagant consumption and unrestrained capitalism. Alan Wood then said that the figures show that, over the 29 years from 1970 to 1999, the average real annual compensation of US chief executives went from 39 times the pay of the average worker to 1 000 times. That is something that should make anyone who thinks about it absolutely horrified.

Of course, in Australia, we have seen the same sickening payments being made to chief executives, which are out of any possible proportion to their relevance to the community. Mr Krugman also has a theory about how that occurs. Mr Wood said:

The key reason executives are paid so much now, Krugman thinks, is that they appoint the members of the corporate board that determines their compensation and control many of the perks board members count on.

So, it is not the invisible hand of the market that leads to those monumental executive incomes: it is the invisible handshake in the boardroom.

In looking at what has happened in this country over the last few years, we can take, for example, the demutualisation of the AMP society, which apparently had to happen. What a disgrace! An institution that had been built up over many years, which was something held by a number of Australians as a mutual holding of investments, is handed over to spivs, and we have the whole show ruined and these same spivs walking away with huge payouts, which are a disgrace. Telstra spent the best part of a century building up a great public enterprise, which did great service to Australians, not least of which were rural Australians, who received communication services that they never would have received had it been left to private concerns to do it.

In a few short years, we have seen massive amounts of Telstra's equity squandered on the tech wrecks that seem to appeal to the current chief executive officer. Billions of Australian dollars have just been wasted. And I come back to the National Competition Council. It is busily opening all the doors, removing all the regulations and letting the wolves in. What will happen at the end of this process is that there will be only the wolves out there. There will be the people who are very well off, there will be the people who are very poorly off and there will be an increasingly small number of people in the middle carrying the burden of taxation.

It is about time that we in this chamber did our small part. I realise that many of these things are national issues, but we do have the opportunity from time to time to put our foot down and say, 'This deregulation for its own sake is not getting us anywhere.' By all means, deregulate if there is a merit in it, but do not do it just because it is deregulating, just because someone will pat you on the back and say, 'Well, you are increasing competition.' That is not an end in itself. We should be about improving and maintaining the position for members of our community.

Time expired.

### CLASSIC HOLDEN PROGRAM

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light):** I rise today to talk about a program that has commenced in the northern suburbs called the Classic Holden Program. The people who are running this program are to really be congratulated. Paul Vansetten is the person who is in charge of this program. He receives funding from the Department of Human Services, which funds two full-time youth workers and three volunteers who work with him. This is a program that is available to young men, and there are 12 young men participating in the program. To be accepted into the program, one has to be a youth offender. These young people, under the guise of Classic Holden, are restoring cars that have been involved in accidents. They are being supported by SGIC, which has donated one car to the group, and they are basically stripping that car, restoring it completely, reconditioning the motor and learning skills that go with that while they restore it. These young people are then donating the car that they have restored to someone who has lost their car through theft.

It is an exceptional program, because these are young people who have been offenders. It is available to those in the 'at risk' age of 14 to 17 who are having a great deal of trouble getting a job because they have been a youth offender, and also because the majority of them have left school without any great qualifications, or dropped out of school along the way. This program is doing a great job in giving them some skills.

What is more, most of the restoration that is undertaken in the program is accredited training. So, not only are they picking up those skills as they are restoring the cars but they also receive a certificate of accredited training for undertaking this program, and their hope is that it will lead them into employment within the car industry—and particularly, with these young people being in the northern suburbs, that that employment will be with Holden's at Elizabeth.

We would certainly like employers in the Elizabeth and northern suburbs area to undertake to get behind this program. Two Holden Kingswoods are being restored at the moment. As I said, one was donated by SGIC and the other one was purchased by the Classic Holden group. I believe this is a program that really should be supported by industry in the northern suburbs, because it is providing skills to these young fellows who have obviously dropped out of the school system.

It is giving them accredited training and, as a result, their chances of obtaining a job in the motor industry, once they have completed this program, is much enhanced. Young people attend two days per week. As I said, 12 young men are involved in this program. Currently, a 12 seater bus transports people to the various programs, and currently they are even making their own utility; so, they are picking up all good skills. There is one slight hitch in the program, that is, that the Department of Human Services, as I said, is presently funding them to the tune of \$36 000 per three months, but it is doing so on only a three-monthly basis.

These young men would love to be more secure in terms of even 12 months guaranteed funding so that they could then go to private industry and say, 'We are definitely in operation for the next 12 months. You can support us with confidence. We will be here.' I call on the Minister for Human Services to support this group because it is identifying a particularly vulnerable group of young people and giving them skills in an area in which they are interested. They are a group of young offenders who probably are unlikely to get a job or a

chance elsewhere, and this project is changing their lives. I commend Paul Vansetten and his workers for their involvement in the project.

Time expired.

### ABB GRAIN LIMITED

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** Members might recall that last Tuesday was described by my learned colleague as the day we travelled from Sydney to Los Angeles. Since that time I think it has been a little like a slow rowboat back. However, I digress. Last Tuesday I was fortunate to attend a briefing by the ABB Grain Limited. I congratulate the member for Enfield and the member for Stuart for organising that briefing. It is safe to say that I did not know too much about what was once the Australian Barley Board (which, since 1999, has been known as the ABB Grain Limited) save and except for the fact that I have tried many of the products made from barley.

This was a very interesting and entertaining afternoon, and it demonstrated the vast organisational skills of ABB Grain Limited with respect to meeting the needs not only of barley growers but also of other grain growers in this state to maximise the return that is made from that product for rural South Australia. ABB's business uses the growers' supply base across South Australia, Victoria and southern New South Wales. Principally, it offers marketing services through its single desk pools (which I will talk a little about), trading options and finance and risk management. It would seem strange to a few members in the house that such a briefing would be organised by the member for Enfield and the member for Stuart because, to some members, they might seem to be strange bedfellows.

However, it has become clear in my time here that the member for Stuart has been a very good advocate not only for the people he represents but also for Australian farmers in terms of the circumstances that might impact on their ability to do their job and maximising the price they can get for their product for the benefit of all South Australians. Over the last few days, and even before that, the member for Enfield has made his position perfectly clear with respect to the impact that deregulation and, indeed, any potential signing of agreements between the Australian and United States governments on free trade might have, not just on our rural economy but on our economy in general.

I think that there is a little fear on the part of that organisation with respect to matters that are somewhat out of its control at this point, namely, the fact that the NCC is reviewing ABB Grain's single desk. I am certainly hopeful that, in its review (and not wishing to pre-empt the outcomes of that review), the NCC takes into account the guarantees of export income to rural South Australia that the ABB Grain export provides for rural South Australia. It is not just the money that comes back to those people who grow grain: it is also the value-added effect that occurs through employment and, in fact, the wealth that it provides for those communities, which is a very important aspect of South Australia's economy.

Also, of course, are the potential effects if we do sign an agreement with the United States with respect to free trade. I come from the school of thought which certainly believes that if America thinks we are doing something wrong that is all the more reason for us to believe that we are doing it right. From my observations last week, ABB Grain Limited is a

very well-organised machine, which maximises profit through its organisation and collective, and that is realised for the growers of grain in this state, and that can be only a good thing.

It would seem to me that there would be no rhyme or reason to dismantle the single desk option when it delivers such benefits to South Australia and, hence, Australia. I would be very mindful of what outcomes might occur from both the federal government's discussions with the United States government on the free trade agreement and also the NCC's contemplation of what effect it believes the single desk has on competition—because, it seems to me, it is putting us in a better position to compete on the international level with respect to barley and the sale of other grains. This is really maximising our ability to compete, and I do not see any reason to dismantle such a situation that would make us less competitive at the international level.

Time expired.

### STATE ECONOMY

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I thank the honourable member for his comments in relation to the limited role I had in organising the Australian Barley Board's presentation of factual information to the members concerned. I hope it now puts them in a position to better understand the benefits of organisations such as Australian Barley Board Grain Limited. May I say from the outset that I am one of those people who believe that we should have an economic system that looks after our own first. I can see no point in removing procedures and processes which have served the state and the nation well and which have given income and employment to large numbers of people.

I do not mind whether it is the Australian Barley Board or whether it is having a sensible tariff regime in place to protect people building motor cars. Because we have a good system, we make the best motor cars in the world today and, for the life of me, I cannot understand why we would want to say, 'Look, we will create a situation that will make us less competitive and we will bring more in from overseas.' I cannot see the sense, rhyme or reason of it because, at the end of the day, those people who are building motor cars, growing barley or doing something else need to be gainfully employed.

If they are gainfully employed they do not get into trouble. It is the best social welfare program you can have. These economic theorists who, unfortunately, seem to be coming out of Canberra in even greater numbers in recent times, do not seem to have ever been in the real world. I would say to them: the first thing that ought to be compulsory reading for them is that interesting book that was written by the late Jack McEwen soon after he left politics. Read it. Hopefully they can understand, it and then they will have a better understanding of how to look after Australians.

I know that some of them will say, 'It is old hat; it is no longer relevant.' I do not share that view. Let me say that I do not care what Mr Samuel or any of his ilk have to say. I think they have lived too long in the lofty towers of Melbourne and have never been out in real Australia.

There is some controversy in my electorate in relation to a decision of the Federal Immigration Department to bring family members of illegal immigrants housed at Baxter into the community—into some houses. Well, that may be well and good, but there is a great deal of concern that the commonwealth department may set out to override the

planning laws which apply in the Corporation of the City of Port Augusta. In this respect, I received a letter from a constituent which explains the situation very well. The letter states:

Re: Residential Housing Project, Slade Road, Port Augusta West.

As property owners in the vicinity of one of the site. . . which is being considered for a residential housing project for women and children currently detained at the Baxter Detention Centre, we would like to express our objection to the proposal.

The area of land abutting Slade Road (and including our property) is zoned as a 'rural living zone' under the Port Augusta City Council's Development Plan. The objective of this zone is:-

A zone primarily accommodating detached dwellings on large allotments set in a semi-rural environment, with limited opportunities for agricultural activities.

The Principles of Development Control include the following:-

1. Development undertaken in the rural living zone should be, primarily, detached dwellings on large allotments set in a semi-rural environment with limited opportunities for agricultural activities.

2. New dwellings within the zone should only be established if appropriate infrastructure and services are already provided.

The following kinds of development are listed as non-complying in the rural living zone:-

- Boarding house
- Group dwelling
- Multiple dwelling
- Residential flat building
- Row dwelling
- Semi-detached dwelling

It is our understanding that the proposed development contravenes all of the abovementioned objectives and principles, whilst meeting the provisions of a non-complying development.

In addition to expressing our views as they relate to the Port Augusta City Council's Development Plan, we would also like to indicate our extreme disappointment as land owners within [100 metres] of section 143, hundred of Copley (Slade Road, Port Augusta West), that we have not received from your department, the 'consultation survey', which appears to have been selectively issued. We find this situation intolerable, particularly in view of the . . . public reaction to the undertaking of such a development.

This information has been sent to the federal minister and it is my intention to make this letter available to the state minister. You cannot have two sets of rules, one for the federal department of environment—

Time expired.

### VOLUNTEERS

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** It is my pleasure today to speak about three important areas in which volunteers are helping some of our struggling young people to gain a grasp of education. The first area I want to speak about briefly is the many volunteers in each of our schools who undertake learning assistance programs and many other tasks. I was very pleased when the Premier gave members the opportunity to recognise some volunteers in our electorates by attendance at the IYV function, and I was able to take volunteers from schools in my electorate. But I will talk about that in another context at a later date.

The second area I want to talk about is a wonderful education program conducted by Coolock House, a body in my electorate that provides both financial and caring support for young mothers and their children in times of great need. I think we all know the benefits of early intervention, and Coolock House provides support for these young women, and sometimes their partners, in many different ways. However, recently, I became aware of an education program conducted by a volunteer, Jenny Flood, at Coolock House. Miss Flood is a previous principal of the school who could see how difficult it was for both young women who left school

because of early pregnancy and also children who were coming to school without much family educational background. So, Miss Flood set about working with some of the clients of Coolock House, trying to identify their particular educational needs and working with them in a supportive way to access whatever program was required—in some cases, it was basic literacy and in some cases it was to enrol in a course at TAFE.

I was very pleased to present Coolock House with a cheque for \$10 500 from the Premier's Community Initiative Fund which will enable enrolment fees to be paid for some of these young women, and also the provision of educational resources. In talking to a couple of these young women, one of the most exciting things to learn is how, through their experiences, they have learned the benefits of reading to their young children. One young mother told me how she could see a great difference in her second child, to whom she had been reading since she was only a few weeks old, compared with her first child, and that she has come to recognise that even very tiny babies love to be read to and love books.

The other initiative I would like to comment on is the Smith Family. The Smith Family has been in the southern suburbs only since September last year, and a few weeks ago the Minister for the Southern Suburbs, the member for Kingston and I were pleased to attend a fundraising ball for the Smith Family which was hosted by the very abstemious Mayoress of the City of Onkaparinga, Mrs Edith Gilbert, supported of course by her husband Ray Gilbert. Already, at Christies Beach, Learning for Life is providing support to 433 young people—258 primary school children, 131 junior secondary children and 44 senior secondary school children. These people not only receive some financial support, which is given to the family to be spent in a way that the family determines on the education of these young people, but they also receive mentoring support, which is extraordinarily important for young people who do not have a wealth of educational experience in their family background.

Members probably know, and you certainly would, sir, that the Smith Family also undertakes some excellent and rigorous research in relation to the role of education in improving the lives of people who are struggling. They have recently identified that young people who leave school at 15 years without post-secondary education are 14 times more likely to end up in poverty than somebody who completes post-secondary education, even though they have left school at 15 years. So, the wisdom of the current government in extending the school attendance age has been vindicated by this measure, and I thank and congratulate the Smith Family.

Time expired.

## STATUTES AMENDMENT (NUCLEAR WASTE) BILL

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Dangerous Substances Act 1979 and the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Honourable Members will be aware that during debate in the other place leading to passage of the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Amendment Act 2003*, undertakings were given to consider suggested amendments to the principal Act to strengthen it and improve the State's position in resisting the Commonwealth's proposal to establish a radioactive waste repository here. As a result of those discussions, the Act will, in the absence of further legislation, expire on 19 July 2003.

Further consideration has now been given to the matters raised at that time and this Bill seeks to meet the commitment given by the Government.

This Bill will have three principal effects. First, the Bill seeks to amend the *Dangerous Substances Act 1979* to allow the application of the major development provisions of the *Development Act 1993* to the conveyance of nuclear waste in South Australia. A number of supporting definitions are inserted into the *Dangerous Substances Act 1979*. The definition of 'nuclear waste' is substantially the same as the definition of that term in the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000* but does not include nuclear waste lawfully stored in South Australia prior to the commencement of that Act or waste from radioactive material used or handled in accordance with the *Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982* if the storage or disposal of the waste has been authorised by that Act.

Secondly, the Bill seeks to amend the *Dangerous Substances Act 1979* so that nuclear waste is included in the definition of 'prescribed dangerous substance'. This will mean that persons keeping or conveying nuclear waste will be subject the licensing requirements for keeping and conveying dangerous substances.

Thirdly, the Bill seeks to amend the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000* by replacing section 9, which prohibits the importation or transportation of nuclear waste for delivery to a nuclear waste storage facility, with a new provision that prohibits both the transport of nuclear waste into the State and the supply of nuclear waste to another person for the purpose of transportation into the State. It is also an offence under this section to supply nuclear waste to another person in the knowledge or expectation that it will be delivered to South Australia. These provisions will have extra-territorial application and breach of them carries substantial penalties.

It is expected that these measures will substantially limit the supply of material to the Commonwealth for transfer to any proposed repository.

Section 14 of the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000* is repealed. This section, which requires the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament to inquire into, consider and report on the likely impact of a proposed Commonwealth nuclear waste storage facility, is not considered necessary as the Act prohibits the establishment of such a facility. The Bill also repeals section 15, which provides that the Act will expire on 19 July 2003.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

*Part 1—Preliminary*

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Amendment provisions*

These clauses are formal.

*Part 2—Amendment of Dangerous Substances Act 1979*

*Clause 3: Amendment of section 2—Interpretation*

This clause amends the definition of 'dangerous goods' so that nuclear waste is included within that definition. The clause also inserts a number of new definitions. The definition of 'nuclear waste' is substantially the same as the definition of this term in the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000*. The definition of nuclear waste does not include nuclear waste lawfully stored in South Australia prior to the commencement of that Act or waste from radioactive material used or handled in accordance with the *Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982* if the storage or disposal of the waste has been authorised by that Act.

*Clause 4: Substitution of section 13*

*13. 'Prescribed dangerous substance' for the purposes of this Division*

Section 13 is repealed and a new section substituted. The new section 13 provides a definition of 'prescribed dangerous substance' that includes nuclear waste. This means that the provisions of Part 3 Division 2 of the Act, dealing with licences to keep dangerous substances, apply in relation to nuclear waste.

*Clause 5: Substitution of section 17*

*17. 'Prescribed dangerous substance' for the purposes of this Division*

Section 17 is repealed and a new section substituted. The new section 17 provides a definition of 'prescribed dangerous substance' that includes nuclear waste. This means that the provisions of Part 3 Division 2 of the Act, dealing with licences to convey dangerous substances, apply in relation to nuclear waste.

*Clause 6: Insertion of Part 3 Division 5*

This clause inserts a new Division into Part 3 of the Act.

*Division 5—Special provision for nuclear waste*

*22A. Conveyance of nuclear waste declared project under Development Act*

Part 3 Division 5 includes a new section that relates to nuclear waste only. Section 22A provides that the provisions of Part 4 Division 2 Subdivision 1 of the *Development Act 1993* apply in relation to the conveyance of nuclear waste as if a declaration has been made by the Minister under section 46 of that Act that the conveyance of nuclear waste is a project to which the section applies. Those provisions also apply as if the conveyance of nuclear waste is a project for which an Environmental Impact Statement is required.

*Part 3—Amendment of Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000*

*Clause 7: Substitution of section 9*

*9. Prohibition against supply of nuclear waste to controlled person*

This clause repeals section 9 of the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000*, which prohibits the transport of nuclear waste within South Australia for delivery to a nuclear waste storage facility, and substitutes a new section that prohibits the transport of nuclear waste into the State. Under subsection (1), a person who transports nuclear waste into the State is guilty of an offence. Under subsection (2), a person who supplies nuclear waste to another person is guilty of an offence if the waste is later transported into South Australia by the other person and was supplied by the person for the purpose of transport to a nuclear waste storage facility located within the State or the person believed at the time of the supply that there was a reasonable likelihood the other person would transport the waste into the State. By virtue of section 6, the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000* does not apply to nuclear waste lawfully stored in South Australia prior to the commencement of the Act or waste from radioactive material used or handled in accordance with the *Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982* if the storage or disposal of the waste has been authorised by that Act.

Section 9 applies both within and outside the State and outside the State to the full extent of the extra-territorial legislative power of the State.

The Governor may, by regulation, exempt a person from the application of subsection (1) or (2), conditionally or unconditionally.

*Clause 8: Repeal of sections 14 and 15*

Sections 14 and 15 of the Act are repealed.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PUBLIC PARK BILL

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to reserve land as a public park for the use, enjoyment and recreation of inhabitants of, and visitors to, the state. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Honourable members will be aware that this Government has given a commitment to the South Australian public to do everything possible to prevent the Commonwealth Government from establishing a low level and short-lived intermediate level radioactive waste repository in this State.

This Bill is a means of honouring this commitment and we believe the Bill will enable the State to prevent the Commonwealth from establishing this repository in South Australia.

On 9 May 2003 the Commonwealth confirmed its intention to establish, operate and decommission a national near-surface repository for the disposal of low level and short-lived intermediate level radioactive waste at site 40a in the State's central north.

Site 40a is located on Crown Land currently subject to a pastoral lease. To establish the repository, the Commonwealth must acquire an interest in that land. Mere acquisition of the leasehold would not, in itself, enable the Commonwealth to construct the repository. It is understood that the Commonwealth will seek to acquire the land using processes under its Lands Acquisition Act 1989.

The Commonwealth Lands Acquisition Act 1989 does not allow compulsory acquisition of 'an interest in land that consists of, or is in, a public park unless the Government of the State or Territory in which the land is situated has consented to the acquisition of the interest' (Part IV, s.42).

Public park is defined as land that, under a law of a State or Territory, is dedicated or reserved, or is vested in trustees, as a public park or national park or otherwise for the purposes of public recreation (section 6).

This Bill seeks to establish a new public park in South Australia that encompasses the land that is now commonly known as sites 40a and 45a. This new park will allow current pastoral and mining activities to continue. Any existing native title interests will not be altered in any way.

The principles that underlie the Bill are similar to those within the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

The park will have two parts: one on the Arcoona pastoral lease and one mostly on the Andamooka pastoral lease but crossing into the Arcoona lease.

This region of the State is part of the Stony Plains Bioregion and has significant biodiversity values. The Biological Survey for the Bioregion described a significant and highly adapted flora and fauna with a number of species occurring nowhere else in the world.

The Bill provides the Government with the capacity to instigate conservation programs in the park. It also provides the government with the capacity to establish facilities to allow for the public enjoyment and recreation in the park.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

### Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Commencement*

This clause provides that the measure will be taken to have come into operation on 3 June 2003.

*Clause 3: Interpretation*

Clause 3 sets out the definitions required for the purposes of the measure.

*Clause 4: Effect of Act*

This clause provides that the Act has effect despite any other Act or law.

*Clause 5: Reservation of Park*

This clause creates the Northern Public Park by reserving the area described in the Schedule for this purpose.

*Clause 6: Variation of Park*

The Governor is able to alter the boundaries of the Park, or the name of the Park, by proclamation. A proclamation that has the effect of reducing the area of the Park can only be made following a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

*Clause 7: Reservation of Park subject to native title*

The reservation of the land as a public park, and the addition of land to the Park by proclamation, are subject to native title existing at the time of the reservation or proclamation.

*Clause 8: Rights of prospecting and mining*

The reservation of the Park does not prevent the acquisition or exercise of rights of entry, prospecting, exploration or mining pursuant to the *Mining Act 1971*, the *Opal Mining Act 1995*, the *Petroleum Act 2000* or the *Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1982*.

*Clause 9: Public right of access to Park*

Members of the public and visitors to the State are entitled to have access to the Park and to use the park for recreational purposes.

Section 48 of the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*, which describes the right of persons to travel across and camp on pastoral land, does not apply to the Park. However, under clause 9(3), a person may enter and travel across pastoral land, or may camp temporarily on pastoral land, that comprises, or forms part

of, the Park. The right to camp on pastoral land is subject to restrictions described in subclause (4).

*Clause 10: Minister may arrange for provision of facilities*

The Minister may arrange for the installation of facilities and amenities in the Park for the use of members of the public. However, the installation and use of facilities in the Park must not limit or interfere with the rights of any lessee under the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*.

*Clause 11: Access to Park*

This clause provides that for the purpose of entering or leaving the Park, it is permissible for a person to travel across pastoral land between a public access route (within the meaning of the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*) and the Park. This is subject to the proviso that a person travelling across pastoral land for the purpose of entering the Park must make use of the public access route located nearest to the portion of the Park the person wishes to enter or leave and must use the most direct route between the public access route and the Park.

*Clause 12: Regulations*

The Governor will be able to make regulations for the purposes of this Act. Subclause (2) lists a number of matters in relation to which the Governor may make regulations. The Governor may, for example, make regulations providing for the protection of natural features of the Park and animals in the Park.

*Schedule—Northern Public Park*

The Schedule contains a description of the boundaries of the land reserved as a public park under clause 5.

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

### APPROPRIATION BILL 2003

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 2 June. Page 3315.)

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I rise today to join the debate on the budget as presented by the Treasurer last week and to lament the missed opportunity for South Australia. Upon coming to government a little over 12 months ago, the government was, as one can understand, a little confused about its role and what it needed to do to keep the economy of South Australia going, and a little confused about what to do in such a short time. We have seen the government institute a number of reviews—well over 150, in fact. For everything it looked at it instituted review. This did two things: it gave it the opportunity to look at how current policies were progressing but, more importantly for the government, it gave it an opportunity to stall, sit back and not make decisions.

I guess coming to office after a period in opposition they could be excused for standing back and not wanting to make decisions. However, after spending 15 months in government, after inheriting an economy that could only be described as going along at a gang buster pace and where the unemployment rate in South Australia for the first time in many years was at about the national average or even lower, an economy that was returning huge windfall gains to the Treasury, you would think that this government might have just gone out and kept it going, kept the boiler stoked, kept the steam up and kept the state going. But that is not what happened.

This Treasurer, like his Premier and some of his front bench colleagues—and I do not know that the attitude is shared by all on the back bench (from some of the conversations I have had with them, they do not share some of the directions mapped out by the Premier and some of the leading lights on the front bench)—are only concerned with one thing. One has only to hark back to what the member for Mitchell said a few months ago when he left the Labor Party: they are concerned only about the headline, the headline, the headline. That will not help the average South Australian or

keep the jobs growth going in this state, keep the economy going or keep money flowing into the Treasury coffers. Even the things in the heartland of Labor philosophy will become unachievable because the economy is already starting to falter.

I touch on a couple of things that we need to understand in the first instance. With the budget cycle that we have been through in the past 12 months, we must remember that the government in its first budget created an artificial mountain of money by changing the date of a transfer of substantial funds from what is euphemistically known as the old bad bank, which assets were held, and, instead of their being transferred in the 2001-02 budget year, they were held over to the following year, thus giving an artificial gloss to the first Labor budget. Now we have this budget where the government inherited an economy that was going along very well. We have some hundreds of millions of dollars in windfall gains coming into the Treasury, principally from payroll tax, because of the heightened employment situation and from those stamp duties on property conveyances resulting from the heated property market.

Despite the Premier's protestations that we need to salt away this money because it is a one-off (the leader in his address to the house talked on this issue and I reinforce it), nobody expects the property market to go into a nose dive. We may see a levelling off of the trend and the levels of increase that we have seen over the past 12 months may slow, but nobody expects values to decrease. Nobody has tipped that, yet the Treasurer would have us believe that revenues from property taxes, which have grown because of the increase in values, will decrease in future. They will not decrease in future. Stamp duty on property conveyances will continue to give the government a windfall. Why is the Treasurer salting it away? He is doing it principally so that he can have a war chest in a couple of years time when he has to face the electorate.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The Attorney-General is mocking and confirms what I have expressed: that the government is asking the people of South Australia today to do it tough so that it can go and massage the electorate in the run-up to the next election. That is bad government, when industry and the average householder in South Australia are looking for a bit of a break. They have done it tough in the past 10 years since this government last had its hands on the levers in Treasury. We have got to the point where I think they deserve a little relief.

What does this government do? When we have the worst drought in living memory, what does this mealy-mouthed government do? It takes the opportunity to bang on another tax—the River Murray tax. It is unbelievable that it takes this opportunity to squeeze another \$20 million out of the people of South Australia. One might understand if the government had a plan on how it would spend the \$20 million, but the government does not even have a plan. The people of South Australia have been squeezed of another \$20 million per year and the government does not even know what it will do with it.

I will spend some time this afternoon talking about water and point out some of the issues that the government has failed to recognise. The Minister for Water Resources has been on the airwaves talking about what the government might do with this money. When he was asked whether they would buy water entitlements to increase flows in the river, the minister said that it was not the best way to go about it.

He said that the best way to proceed was to spend money in Victoria and New South Wales upgrading infrastructure to increase irrigation efficiency—noble sentiments.

In the minister's own River Murray summit, the experts that the minister brought into this very chamber to give us an insight into what is happening in the River Murray warned us that increasing irrigation efficiency upstream at the very best would have no effect on flows in the river and at worse would reduce flows. The minister does not even understand the hydrological dynamics of the Murray River system. I suggest that he go back to his department, to CSIRO Land and Water and get further briefings, because at this stage he does not understand it. He should take the Treasurer with him.

At some point this government has to understand that, if we are to get greater environmental flows into the river, there is only one way of doing it: going out in conjunction with those other states and buying the water, buying the extraction rights so that the water is not extracted from the river. It matters not how efficiently the water is used once it is extracted because with the inefficient delivery systems the water ends up back in the river. If you increase the efficiency of the delivery systems, a percentage will not end up back in the river and the flow will reduce. True, the water quality may be improved. However, it depends on how much the flows are decreased, and the minister has to get his mind around that and have an understanding of it.

In relation to that minister's budget area, I will go through some of the reduced programs to show the commitment of this government. The only additional money going into the River Murray and the problems therein is from the \$20 million new tax. This government has seen this as such a low priority that it came in under every other budget measure. Every other budget measure was funded and then they said, 'Whoops! What about the River Murray? We'll need another \$20 million, so that we look like we're doing something positive.'

The government has reduced by \$100 000 for the next four years funding for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation's program for animal and plant pest control on crown lands. That is a wonderful thing! We will have the rabbit problem, the fox problem and the weed problem exacerbated on crown lands. They are going to rationalise the level of operational sport for the catchment water management boards by \$1 million over the next four years. That is pretty positive for the environment, particularly with regard to water.

In relation to sustainable water management, they are going to limit the involvement in development of plans and technical projects by \$760 000 for each of the next four years. They are going to reduce the level of assessments, including hydrogeological assessments, by \$295 000 for each of the next four years. So, even though the minister, at this point, does not understand the hydrogeological factors that involve the River Murray system, he is going to reduce by virtually a further \$300 000 in each of the next four years the amount of money spent in that area. In water monitoring and resource assessment, monitoring of both ground and surface water monitoring networks is to be restricted to those areas where the resource is under stress. The restriction in dollar terms is \$800 000 per year for the next four years.

I would love the minister to tell me and this house what water resources in South Australia currently are not under stress. I believe that they are all under stress, and I think that the minister is well aware of that. It just highlights the

changing priorities of this government. It will endeavour to sell a new \$20 million tax. Every time a minister stands up in this house to explain why they are doing something, it is because it was an election promise. They have all forgotten their fundamental election promise: no new taxes and no increase in taxes. I would love the minister to explain why he is making all those cuts when he does not understand what is happening to the river, anyway.

I would also like the minister to explain why he expects all South Australians to contribute to the rehabilitation of the River Murray. I do not necessarily have a problem with that, but I would like him to say why he would do that for the River Murray, and yet he expects my constituents in the Upper South-East to contribute a further \$11 million on top of the \$6 million they have already contributed for environmental rehabilitation in the Upper South-East. I would like the minister to explain why there is one policy for the River Murray and another for other parts of the state and other environments in the state.

I will move onto some of the other issues that are impacting on my electors. I am sure that the house is well aware of the problems with health services being faced in the South-East, particularly in Mount Gambier. There are very serious problems at the Mount Gambier Hospital, where resident specialists are leaving literally in droves. The reality is that the delivery of medical services from that hospital could completely collapse, possibly by the end of the financial year. Once the specialists leave that hospital and that community, it will be very difficult for the local GPs to maintain the services they provide, because they will not have that specialist back-up. This is a very serious problem. How does the government address this problem? It reduces, in real terms, the expenditure in country health.

I would argue that, notwithstanding that they have increased the dollar amount going into health per se, in real terms, particularly if we use the health inflator rather than the CPI, we would find that the health spend has, in fact, fallen. In country health, it has definitely fallen. The increase in expenditure in country health is much lower than the CPI, and the minister and the member for Mount Gambier wonder why we have problems delivering health services in Mount Gambier!

In that city last Friday, the member for Mount Gambier said that it is not an issue of money. At that time, I telephoned the local ABC radio program and told him that, if it is not a matter of money, he might return the \$700 000 taken out of the hospitals in my electorate to help support the Mount Gambier Hospital, because for the hospitals in my electorate at Bordertown, Naracoorte, Millicent, Penola and Kingston it is indeed a matter of money. Those hospitals are doing it tough, and they are endeavouring to deliver a level of service that their communities not only expect but deserve.

While I am talking about health matters (and I am sure that the deputy leader will talk at length on this matter), it was very interesting listening to the debate on ABC radio being conducted by David Bevan and Matthew Abraham about the fall in funds in the FAYS budget. We know that there has been a critical shortage of funds in the family youth area. This government, which pretends that it is serious about this issue, has received the very lengthy Layton report, which has highlighted serious problems, yet we see that today the government is still putting less funding (by at least \$1 million) into that area than that allocated in the Liberal Party's last budget, some two budgets ago. There has been a significant turnaround, so no wonder families and youth in

this state are suffering. Overall, there has been a huge lost opportunity here.

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** There is nothing good in this budget that I can see. It is a lot of smoke and mirrors. The government has made sweetheart EB deals to appease a whole range of Public Service employees, such as teachers, nurses and the police, and yet it has failed on those essential needs of the state.

The major plank of the Economic Growth Summit held by the Premier recently was to try to deliver over the next 10 years an increase by a factor of three in the exports out of this state. If that is to come to pass, most of it will come out of regional South Australia, because I cannot see that sort of export growth coming out of metropolitan Adelaide. However, once again, this government, after many cuts to regional programs last year, has chosen to cut infrastructure spending in regional areas.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Did we increase spending on anything?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Only on wages.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling):** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The infrastructure spending on essentials to production in country areas, particularly transport, has been absolutely slashed under this government. The Attorney-General is well aware of that. We have a situation where the government is saying on the one hand that we need to increase exports out of South Australia, but on the other hand it has hamstrung the very industries needed to drive that export growth. I am talking about all those industries in regional South Australia that rely so heavily particularly on transport and energy. The government is doing very little to help out. In fact, it is not doing anything; it is slashing funding in those areas.

As pointed out by the shadow minister, in real terms, there has been no growth in education spending. If anything, there has been a reduction over the last couple of years. So, again, the reality belies the rhetoric of this government. There is an interesting impost on professional commercial fishermen, who will now be asked to pay a tax based on the length of their boat. It has nothing to do with user pays, because in a lot of the ports throughout the state, including Port Lincoln and Wallaroo, private facilities are used. Certainly along the South-East coast, particularly in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate at Carpenter Rocks, Blackfella Caves and Nene Valley, there are no jetties whatsoever, and yet those professional fishermen will be taxed.

So, this budget is all about tax, tax, tax, including a new impost on car owners, that mobile wallet that the Treasurer keeps his hand in, but the delivery of very little. It contains no breaks for struggling families, no support for industry and no support for infrastructure to help drive the economy of South Australia.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** So we're not spending enough!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It is not that you are not spending enough; it is your priorities that I am complaining about. These priorities will do nothing to help build the economy of South Australia. The Attorney knows very well that without a robust economy in South Australia the funds which flow into the Treasury and which allow us to provide social programs will dry up.

Time expired.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** This budget has to be viewed in context. Let me take the house back to 1994. The context in 1994 was one of chaos. The Labor Party had handed the state almost \$10 billion worth of debt. Unemployment levels and interest rates were at an all-time high, and we were about to enter into Paul Keating's recession that we had to have. Corporate officers were fleeing the state, and the state was virtually bankrupt, thanks to the Labor Party.

The context for the incoming Liberal Party was that things had to be done, and things had to be done quickly, and there was little money with which to do them. Tough decisions had to be made, such as to cut the size of government, to wind up the State Bank, to review most carefully all government outlays and to examine revenues. Compare that with the context in which this budget is set. The context today is one that the Labor Party has had handed to it after two terms of Liberal government, a budget in outstanding shape, despite the protestations of members opposite.

Thanks to the good governance of the federal Liberal government, unemployment levels are at all-time lows. In fact, after two terms of Liberal state governorship, the state arrived at a point where unemployment levels were below the national average. Interest rates are at 30-year lows, the economy is booming and house prices are rocketing. Compared with 1994, people in South Australia are well off and things are in good shape.

So, this government has inherited a set of books and an economy that is thriving. This government could not have hoped to take over in better circumstances. What sort of a budget has it delivered? It has delivered a mean budget that increases revenues by \$600 million—a \$600 million windfall in revenues—while requiring extra taxation of people, ripping money out of people's pockets at a flat-rate level and administering savage cuts across a range of portfolios for a second year in a row.

I am going to focus on the three portfolios for which I am responsible as Liberal Party spokesperson: the arts, tourism and innovation and information economy. Let me start with tourism and remind the house that last year the government savaged \$16 million from the tourism budget. The minister flicked off the Clipsal 500 to the Treasurer and, in addition, cut \$4.1 million from tourism business development, \$4.8 million from tourism infrastructure development, \$3.6 million from tourism marketing and over \$4 million from event development, whilst also savaging the Entertainment Centre and the Convention Centre.

What has the government done to follow on this year? It has been remarkably silent about tourism, and I wonder why that might be. Could it be because it has savaged tourism for a second year running? The answer is yes. Stakeholders need to look carefully at Budget Paper 3, page 2.31, to see that the Adelaide International Horse Trials are to be completely defunded, not only this year but in the out years, and to see that the Glenelg Jazz Festival is losing its funding. It is being sliced from the agenda.

On page 2.32, they will see a raft of supposed new operating initiatives that are nothing more than a rehash of annual budget entitlements: they are not new money at all. On that page, stakeholders will also see that funding for the Adelaide Convention Centre (that iconic construction of the former government that we were brave enough to build, which would never have been initiated had this government been in office at the time) has been cut by \$1.5 million for each of the next four years. Funding for the Adelaide Entertainment Centre (that vital piece of arts infrastructure)

is also to be cut by almost a quarter of a million dollars this year, and more than a quarter of a million dollars beyond that time.

However, the budget goes further. Stakeholders in the tourism industry need to draw their attention to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 12.4. What will they find? The amount of money spent last year is just over \$48.059 million, but the amount this minister and this government budgets to spend in the coming year is \$43.52 million. That is a cut of another \$4.5 million and is another whack at the tourism industry. In addition, this government underspent in the current year: having budgeted to spend \$49.79 million, it spent only \$48.059 million. The minister could not even spend the money which she had been allocated, which had already been cut by \$16 million.

What is going on? An underspend of \$1.7 million in a budget this size is barely a competent outcome. Compare that with the amount that the Liberal Party spent in its last budget in 2001-02: we spent \$55 million. In the coming year the Labor Party will spend \$43.5 million, so the budget has been sliced back by over \$11.4 million since our budget alone, based on your own accounts, which are very tricky and which smack of a little creative accounting.

I note that commission employees have been reduced by around 10 but entitlements are up. I notice that there have been some fairly savage cuts in regard to tourism development. In 2002-03, the budget was \$12.137 million, but in 2003-04 this government plans to spend a mere \$6.49 million, which is a cut of \$5.6 million. It is not surprising, because the government strangled it to death last year, and now it wants to bury it.

Last year's result was \$10.25 million with a budgeted \$6.4 million for the coming year, which is still a \$3.7 million reduction. Of course, most of that is coming from grants and subsidies that will drop to \$4.6 million in the coming year (having been over \$9 million in the last Liberal budget), which is a 50 per cent slice since we handed over government.

Page 12.9 of the budget papers, tourism infrastructure development, is the most telling page of all. Tourism infrastructure is to be disinvested in the coming year by almost 50 per cent. Last year, the result was \$8.112 million, budgeted to be \$10 million, but it was underspent again by \$1.8 million—a barely competent result. In the coming year, it will go down to \$4.46 million, so it is a 50 per cent slice out of tourism infrastructure. How dare the government stand there in its media releases and say it will continue with tourism infrastructure funding, when it has sliced it in the coming 12 months by 50 per cent, having already savaged it in the previous year. As my colleagues have pointed out, this is a slap in the face to people in rural areas and regional South Australia who depend on tourism, but it is a slice out of the tourism industry which employs so many South Australians and which is valued at well over \$3 billion to this state.

Tourism events have also been savaged. The Liberal government spent \$9.5 million in its last year, and in the coming year the government plans to spend \$7.8 million, a cut of \$1.6 million. Again in this area, grants and subsidies have been savaged. We spent \$7.8 million in our last year of office. In the coming year the government will spend \$2.5 million. It is almost a 300 per cent cut. It is easy to see why tourism stakeholders are ringing me up saying that they are very disappointed, most unhappy and most ashamed of what this government has done to South Australian tourism. It is a mess.

Interestingly, the Adelaide Rose Festival has been omitted from this year's budget papers, so I assume that is up for the cut, as well as funding for a range of other tourism major events. I urge tourism stakeholders to read the budget papers carefully, to be heard, to contact me or their local Liberal member of parliament, and to let us know how these cuts are affecting their business and their industry, because I can assure all South Australians that I have a lot of questions for the minister during budget estimates.

I turn now to the arts budget. What a tricky bit of accounting we have had from the Premier as Minister for the Arts in the arts budget. Members should recall that one of the first acts of this government was to fail to provide the \$7.2 million required for country theatres. What do we get? We get \$500 000. That will barely develop the disabled access at one of the theatres, let alone all four. A lot more investment is needed for the very basics in those four theatres.

What else have we had in the arts? There are some interesting savings initiatives. I see there is virtually no funding next year for board fees for arts organisations, and in the out years 3 and 4 there is no funding at all. I assume that we are going to see the back end of all arts boards. Corporate services are to be slashed—half a million dollars each year in years 2, 3 and 4, and \$200 000 in the coming year. Administrative savings—that mysterious administration—involve \$120 000 or more in each of the next four years. There is also a reduction in funding to grant programs—\$875 000 this year and almost \$1 million in years 2, 3 and 4. I am referring to pages 2.9 and 2.10 of Budget Paper 3, and I urge arts industry stakeholders to view those papers carefully and contact me.

Operating initiatives—what a joke! Most of the operating initiatives listed on page 2.10 have come straight out of the hide of cuts to grants. For the Adelaide Film Festival, the Adelaide Festival Centre, the funding for a curator for the Asian collection at the Art Gallery, a security and video surveillance upgrade at the Art Gallery, and the Live Music Fund—all good ideas, all great initiatives—at face value there does not appear to be any new money at all. They appear to be coming straight out of the hide of other sections of the arts budget.

I say that because, if stakeholders turn to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, and look at page 1.32, they will see that, in our last year in office, the Liberal Party spent in excess of \$105 million on the arts, but this year we will see only \$94 million spent. There is a big gap between \$94 million and \$105 million. When one looks at the actual results, and at arts industry development and access to artistic products, one sees that we Liberals budgeted \$47.4 million, yet this government has cut that in this coming year to \$40.8 million, which is almost a \$7 million cut in the space of two budgets. Bravo! Encore!

It gets worse because, when one looks in more detail on page 1.35 of the arts budget, one sees that grants and subsidies have been savaged. Last year, \$19 million was the estimated result. In the coming year, it will be \$17.3 million. That is a cut of \$1.7 million. I will be asking questions about that. For supplies and services, \$2.56 million is the estimated result for the financial year just ending, and \$2.113 million is the figure for the coming year. That is a cut of almost half a million dollars. I would like to ask some questions about that. When we look at artistic development and access to artistic product on page 1.37, similar facts come out. Expenses have been cut from the last year of the Liberal government in 2001-02, when we spent \$52.3 million, to the

coming year, in which we are going to see \$42.3 million spent. That is a reduction of over \$10 million in the amount that is to be spent. Grants and subsidies are down from \$47.2 million in 2001-02 to \$37.9 million in this coming year, which is a cut of over \$9 million.

When we look at the actual amount of money being spent, we see that it is astoundingly less, and it is that reality on which the arts industry needs to focus. Even when we turn over to page 1.39, we can see that state government appropriations are to be significantly reduced. There has been some serious damage to the arts in the last two years. I question whether the new propositions put forward by the Premier are really new money. Maybe I am wrong; maybe the Premier will come to budget estimates and be able to fully explain how it is new money—how he is spending more on the arts. We will see. At face value, the papers appear not to reveal so.

I move now to science and innovation, and there is further bad news. For the Playford Centre, there are reductions in overheads of almost \$100 000, and it is far more than that in years 2 and 3—\$128 000 next year and \$147 000 the year thereafter. Bio Innovation SA has been given a mere \$1 million with which to continue its outstanding work. That is hardly adequate.

The Premier's Research and Innovation Fund is to receive \$1 million in the coming year. What a huge announcement that is! We Liberals had a \$40.5 million innovation fund, which this government and this minister scrapped as one of their first initiatives. As a consequence, we are missing out on federal money which would be there if we matched it dollar for dollar. Just \$1 million for the Premier's Research and Innovation Fund! I am sure that will attract massive investment from the commonwealth to this state! I am sure that private investors in the commonwealth will be rushing us with ways to add value to that \$1 million! And this is a government that is supposed to support science and innovation.

We know the government tried to stop the Plant Functional Genomics Centre of Excellence at Waite, to which the Liberal government had committed over \$12 million from the innovation fund. The present government failed to cancel it and had to go ahead with it—thank God for the state—and now all it can come up with is \$1 million. The Science and Technology Innovation Division is to receive \$1.5 million. I will be interested to see how that is spent.

We have heard that the Minister for Science and Information Economy will be the lead minister for the Thebarton biosciences precinct, a Liberal government project which this government has decided not to cut. However, the present government cannot trust the minister with the money because it does not appear in her budget line, so it must belong to—guess who?—the Treasurer, Kevin Foley, because we know how he likes to nobble the Minister for Science and Information Economy. Why is it not in her budget where it is secured for bioinnovation?

This is a sad and miserable budget for the arts, tourism, science and innovation. At face value, all appear to have suffered, and to be suffering, and not to be receiving the investment they deserve. I look forward to asking questions during estimates. I urge stakeholders in all those three portfolio areas to examine the documents and to contact me or their nearest Liberal member of parliament and let us know what the government is doing to them. They should not be intimidated. They should examine the figures, stand up for their industry and have a say, because if they do not do so the government will run over them. This miserable budget is a

challenge to them, and I say to them: do not be fobbed off with joys and gifts in year four of this government's term of office. Do not let the government leave it to year four to then, miserably, give them some funds, only to cut them should it be re-elected. They need the money now. They should demand it and stand up for their industry. I look forward to hearing from them.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** I congratulate the member for Waite on his contribution. Obviously, the budget has certainly affected the areas for which he has portfolio responsibility. I want to touch on a few matters in regard to the budget, in relation to the lack of vision—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** 'In regard to', 'in relation to'—you talk like you write.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** —in relation to, or in regard to (as I would write), the government's lack of economic vision in this state budget. The budget, basically, sets out the economics of the state over the next 12 months and beyond. I just want to look at where we are and where we are going, because it is a sobering thought to think that we are now halfway through budget presentations. This is the second budget, and there are two more to go before the next state election, so it would be—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Can our poll results go any higher?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I think Simon Crean can get above 26 per cent: I do think that. The reality is that it sets out the government's economic vision and it talks about the government's growth plan. I want to look at where we are going and what message we are sending to interstate industry about South Australia. I want to go back to the period since the election of the Labor government and talk about where it has come in relation to its economic vision and what message it is sending interstate investors—or, indeed, South Australian investors. I guess we start off with the first act of the Labor government, when it broke a written commitment to an industry group about an increase in tax. That, of course, involved the tax on the hospitality industry—and the pokies, in particular. The record shows that letters were written, lunches were had and handshakes were given in relation to a commitment by this government not to increase the pokies tax.

The Treasurer stood up and said that he is breaking that promise because he can. That sent a message to interstate investors—and, indeed, to every industry group in the state—that this government was prepared to break written commitments. The problem with that is that, by breaking a written commitment to an industry association, the government sends a message to investors that it simply cannot be trusted and that, even when someone shakes hands with government members and has it in writing, if the Treasurer does not like it or if pressure comes to bear, the decision will be changed. The first message that the government has sent is that it cannot be trusted; that it is prepared to break written agreements.

The second message that the government has sent relates to the retrospective nature of its changes. This government introduced legislation to retrospectively change 15 000 leases, or contracts, relating to crown leases and imposed a new form of property tax upon those instruments. The message there is that the government is prepared to apply taxes retrospectively to agreements, introduce new property taxes and, indeed, go through the whole process of retrospectively changing contracts. The philosophy whereby a government is prepared

to retrospectively change contracts is a great concern to those businesses that wish to invest. While that issue itself—the crown lands issue—may not stop investment, the philosophy about not having a problem with retrospectively changing contracts will have an impact in some people's minds about whether they want to invest with a state government that retrospectively changes contracts and also breaks written agreements.

The third issue that I want to talk about regarding the government's lack of economic vision and the way in which economic development is being handled is the message sent by the Economic Development Board. Members of the Economic Development Board, if anything, surely should be the sales people for the state. They should be out there saying, 'This is the place to invest, for all these reasons. South Australia can offer you A, B and C in relation to advantages as to why your business and your dollars should come to South Australia for investment.' The Economic Development Board is running around Australia saying in the media that this is South Australia's last chance, and beating up the South Australian economy as if it is in some sort of doldrums. As the member for Waite said, thanks to eight years of hard work by the previous Liberal government, the economy is in pretty good shape, and the economy of the federal government is also in good shape, due to the work of the federal Liberal government.

I do not know whether it is in the state's best interests to have members of the Economic Development Board running around telling anyone who will listen that this is the state's last chance. I think it sends a negative and a desperate message, and to some degree it sends an uncertain message to investors who might be looking at South Australia versus Victoria, New South Wales or Queensland. One does not hear the Queenslanders coming out and saying, 'This is Queensland's last chance,' or the Victorians saying, 'This is Victoria's last chance.' The best that members of our Economic Development Board can do is say, 'This is South Australia's last chance. We are 15 months into our term as a government, but don't worry, we will now develop a strategic plan.'

The other issue I have with respect to the Economic Development Board is the fiasco that occurred this week, as reported in the *Financial Review*, when Mr Robert Champion de Crespigny, the head of the Economic Development Board, basically was reported as writing to federal and state ministers, in essence, not supporting the SAMAG project. I thought the Chair of the Economic Development Board was out there to promote South Australian investment, to promote South Australian projects and try to get investments across the line. But, in the very week that the state government brings down its second budget, the head of its Economic Development Board is telling the rest of Australia that it is his view that the SAMAG project should not go ahead. It seems to me to be a bizarre response to go out publicly, as has now occurred, and to have it reported in the media. I just cannot understand why the head of the Economic Development Board would go down that path. I think it sends the wrong message. That, combined with the 'South Australia's last chance' mentality sends the wrong message regarding investment and economic growth in South Australia.

The other issue that will cause South Australia some problems in the mind of some investors is the perception that the government is trying to create by saying that there will be no corporate welfare in South Australia, that is, no financial assistance, by way of tax offset or other measures, to

industries wishing to invest in this state. We all know that that is rubbish; we all know that the government will offer assistance packages to companies, whether that be through payroll tax offset, infrastructure grants or whatever the project may be. But it is trying to create the perception that that will not occur. Some businesses will believe that and, therefore, will not necessarily be as aggressive in their approach to South Australia as they will be to other states, and we will automatically miss out on projects that we may not even know exist because the companies simply will not approach us. I think there is a danger in running that line too hard, because we know (and I know, because I sit on the various committees) what is happening in relation to industry assistance. There is no doubt that that will create some issues regarding economic growth.

The other problem I think we have in the economic vision is the message that the government has sent out to the mining industry—and I know that the member for Bright made a very good contribution last night on the importance of the mining industry to South Australia and the reasons why the royalties in South Australia have been lower than those in other states. That has been a decision of previous governments because a lower tax regime helped attract industry to this state. If I heard him correctly, the member for Bright said that there is a higher cost generally in South Australia to start up a mine because of the crust that is on the surface. To get through that there is an initial higher expense in this state than necessarily occurs in other states; so, governments have proposed a lower mining royalty. This government, of course, has now put us on an equal footing with other states, but what it has not addressed is that our cost structure is different.

So, rather than design a horses for courses approach to mining (where we should design a South Australian model to our royalty structure), we have simply adopted an Australia-wide royalty structure, which will send a negative message to the mining industry. If one wants to see how important the mining industry could be to economies, one should look at Western Australia and some of the other states to see how they have built their economy on the back of the resources industry. Again, it is a negative message, and I am wondering whether we really needed to send it if one believes the Economic Development Board that the state is on its last chance.

Then, of course, we have the issue in regard to the tourism industry. I will not go through all the issues in regard to the tourism industry, but the member for Waite gave an excellent contribution in regard to the lack of tourism investment structure. I know that the member for Morialta and others had a very keen interest in investing in tourism infrastructure, because it provided economic growth and a reason for tourists to come and spend extra money. It generated economic growth from there and from jobs. I think that, as the member for Waite quite rightly points out, the Convention Centre, by way of example, is an excellent tool for economic growth and an attraction for this state of which we should all be proud.

The other message the government has sent industry and investors generally is that one of the areas in which it does have an interest is fining them at every opportunity. Virtually every bill introduced to the house seeks to double the penalties. In my particular area, the EPA bills seek virtually to double the penalties, and it doubled the penalties with respect to native vegetation bills. In relation to the retail industry, of course, it will increase the penalties tenfold just because people want to open their shops at 9.10. All those

things add up to disincentives, and it is another reason not to invest.

If one believes the rhetoric of the Economic Development Board that South Australia is on its last chance, why are we putting disincentives in place? One should have thought that, if it believes the rhetoric of the Economic Development Board, it would be going the other way and, maybe, providing some incentives—through the legislative measures—to industry to come to South Australia.

The other issue that I think sends the wrong message is the virtual lack of capital works projects in this state. The message is there to the building industry and all those industries that rely on it that the government is not investing in that area.

We know that the housing market will slow down, and indeed there are media reports to that effect. Couple that with the government's lack of investment in capital works, and that will create some economic issues as well. Underpinning all that is the government's total lack of a strategy in relation to industrial relations. We argued about industrial relations with respect to shop trading hours and we argued about industrial relations in respect of the economic development summit. We had a whole economic development summit without any indication of what this government is doing in regard to industrial relations.

It just seems to me that the reports are very anti-employer. They are very much about penalising the employer for daring to invest in a business to create a job. That all sends the wrong message, because it creates uncertainty. Because the government has not dealt with those bills, people do not know in what industrial relations climate they are investing. If there is a close call between investing here and investing in another state, and if they know there is certainty in the other state's system, they are more likely to invest in that other state because it has a clear and defined system.

Whereas in South Australia the government has released at least two or three reports (the Stanley report and the Stevens report in relation to industrial relations), there has been no great response in that regard. As far as I am concerned, the whole economic development issue lacks vision. I am not sure whether the state knows where it is going. We know that we have had a summit and we know that we are having this strategic plan but, after 15 months of Labor government, where are we going? We know that the government is aiming low at growth, and one must be careful about what message one is sending the investors. This government is aiming low.

Basically, it is saying that it is about a 2½, 2¾ per cent growth this year, and it is then a 1 per cent growth each year thereafter. I do not know how many businesses will be saying, 'Let's see whether we can grow the business by just 1 per cent.' If one looks at what is happening in regard to the federal economy, one sees we are now at the stage where we are aiming at lower growth figures state-wise than the federal economy. This means that the state government has confidence that it can wind the economy back from where it was two or three years ago—that is the confidence of the state government. I think there is a clear lack of vision in regard to where we are going with economic growth.

The government says that it wants to triple exports. Let us talk about tripling exports because, if you are going to triple exports, why does it not nominate a few industries in which it is going to triple the exports? We went out with a clear plan in regard to the defence industry, the wine industry, the Food for the Future program, the aquaculture programs and others.

We had a program to grow exports. The government has come into office and said, 'Gee whiz, that was a good idea. They grew exports and greater jobs. Tell you what we'll do: we'll match it. We'll just decide to triple exports over the next 10 years.' But if one looks there is very little in the budget papers that gives much indication at all about which industry sectors it will target in regard to its economic growth.

**Mr Meier:** They didn't realise how much hard work was involved.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am sure they did not realise. I think they are just starting to find out about some of those issues. One industry in which I have particular interest is the electronics industry, which has grown at 20 per cent per year for the last few years, and I just cannot see a mention of it anywhere in the budget papers. I have not got through every paper yet—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You haven't? I thought you read every document.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do read every document, unlike some of your ministers, might I remind the Attorney. Unlike some of your ministers, I do read a few documents. I am sure that by the time the Estimates Committee comes around the appropriate documents will have been read. If the government intends to triple exports it needs to have a very clear plan as to how it is going to do that. I do not see anything in the budget papers to indicate that it has a clue what it is doing in that respect. It also does not have a regional development plan at all. The leader made a good contribution in regard to the lack of a regional development plan with respect to simple things like housing, infrastructure and skills based—those areas that are growing in South Australia.

There are some very good growth opportunities in South Australia, but I am concerned that we are going to miss the boat. I am concerned that we will miss the window of opportunity to grow those regions because the economy is cyclic. Currently, there are opportunities to grow the regional economies. If we do not take the opportunity now we will miss it but, of course, that will not concern the Attorney because it is in the regions and he does not care about the regions. There is an opportunity to grow the regional economy if you invest in the right areas, and there is nothing in the budget papers that indicates to me that this government has any interest in the regional areas except, maybe, in regard to one minister.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member for Mawson is quite right: the only interest the government has in the regions is to tax them. With respect to the area of employment, the member for Unley made a very good contribution outlining all the various low targets and, in some cases, the halving of targets. The number of businesses eligible for development assistance is halved from 1 700 to 800. The number of government traineeships has decreased from 419 to 363—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Is there anything good at all?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There is one good thing in the budget: the government did not cut the funding to the Blackwood arts facility that was promised by the last Liberal government. It was halfway through being built so the government could not cut the budget for it; so—

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member for Florey says that it would have if it could have. Coromandel Valley Primary School has suffered the honourable member's party's cut. It was promised \$2 million and got a \$1.2 million program. Not

one cent of state money went into that project—a 125 year old school with not one solid classroom, and the member for Florey's government took away \$800 000. The only money going into that project is the federal government's money—not one project. The Attorney-General interjected previously asking whether there is anything good in the budget.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling):** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** So there are some early issues, as I say, in regard to the Labor vision. I reflect on this point: let us assume that Labor won the major political battles in policy debate over the last 20 years. We would have no Roxby Downs in this state, because that was going to be a mirage in the desert.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I always supported Roxby Downs.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** You might have, but a lot of your factional colleagues did not. That brings about \$25 million worth of revenue into the state. Labor would not have sold ETSA to reduce the debt, and that is saving the original interest payment of around \$700 million to \$900 million, which is now about \$250 million, so there are some issues there. Labor opposed the GST which, according to its own budget papers, will bring in \$30 million in 2006-07 and \$140 million in 2007-08. So, without those revenue measures, what was Labor's plan for the budget? If all those measures had not been undertaken, how would the Labor Party have managed the state budget? The reality is that they will play politics with anything, even if it is not in the best interests of the state.

Time expired.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I would like to commence by—

**Ms Breuer:** Same sex super! Same sex super!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I will not have scattergun interjections from members on my right.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** That was a machine gun interjection.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hartley has the call.

**Mr SCALZI:** I would like to contribute to this important debate—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No, you will speak. I don't know whether you will contribute.

**Mr SCALZI:** Well, empty vessels make the most sound. A budget is an opportunity for the government to outline to the state and the constituency how it plans its expenditure to meet its priorities and keep its promises, and to outline how it will get the revenue to meet those expenditures. We can talk about budget surpluses and budget deficits, we can talk about cash accrual, and we can use statistics in whichever way we like to support our arguments, but the bottom line is that we must look at the state's ability to raise funds and undertake expenditure in its proper context, and to see where we have been, where we are and where we want to head.

There is no question, if we look at the last eight years, that we have come a long way. It surprises me to hear the Treasurer talking in rhetoric about a responsible budget and trying to pay off debt as if this government had invented the word 'debt'.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** They did not invent it; they created it, and that is the difference. Now they invent the rhetoric to match it. I think it is always good to quote a third person. I read

from Greg Kelton's article in the *Advertiser* of Friday 30 May, which states:

No wonder the electorate is cynical. In capital works, what is happening to the much-vaunted public/private partnerships program? We get a few country police stations but where are the big-ticket items—the new prison, the aquatic centre?

And Leanne Craig writes that we each pay \$62 more to hand over an extra \$90 million. Her article states:

The state government's tax take will grow by \$90 million next financial year, with every South Australian paying \$1 678. The figure is \$62 more than the state taxes paid last year by each man, woman and child. The state government expects to raise \$2.46 billion in state taxes next year, up from \$2.37 billion. Property taxes, which delivered the government an unexpected \$130 million windfall last year due to the property boom, are expected to taper off this financial year, but will still raise \$784 million for the state's coffers.

The government will raise an extra \$22 million by increasing fees and charges—including bus fares, drivers' licences and car registrations—by 3.09 per cent. The rises will increase the cost of a 10-year driver's licence by \$9 to \$239 [for example]—

It is not the Liberal Party that said that, and it is not the opposition that said that. That is contained in an article in the *Advertiser*. There is no question that in those two articles—

**Ms Rankine:** What does it say about your party's leadership?

**Mr SCALZI:** The member for Wright can get it wrong and talk about other things except the budget. What these articles say is that the government's intake is healthy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SCALZI:** These articles are saying that the government has a cash flow and the ability to meet its commitments. It has the ability, if it wishes, to keep its election promises. This is where the government fails because, when the cruel Treasurer gets up and says that we have to look at our debt, it becomes farcical. We have a debt, and there is no question that we have to look at that debt, but the debt is around \$3 billion and manageable. When the previous Liberal government came to power in 1993 there was the equivalent, in today's figures—

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** I have a point of order. The government is laughing about the \$9.5 billion state debt—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** —that they created, and I am trying to listen to the member for Hartley.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is no point of order.

*Ms Rankine interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hartley has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SCALZI:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I am well aware that you cannot bank on the government, so I will continue, and there is very little interest from government members in my doing so. You have to compare the state of the economy in 1993-94 with the state of the economy now. A state budget is no different in principle from a household budget. Members opposite would know that when constituents come to them for assistance, for example, because they cannot meet their rental commitments to the Housing Trust, for example, we assist constituents whose rent is not more than 25 per cent of their income. If we look at the State Bank in perspective, the costs to the state were certainly more than 25 per cent of its income, and that is the comparison that you have to make. You cannot spend and meet the demands of the

community if you have a debt which is the equivalent of \$10 billion in today's figures.

To compare that is an insult to the memory of the people of South Australia. Whenever this Treasurer talks about debt he is insulting the memory of the people of South Australia who, in the past eight years, together with responsible government, have done their utmost in contributing to getting this state back on its feet. This was the time for this government, because it made the promise, to give people a little return for their hard work in trying to overcome one of South Australia's greatest financial disasters. The debt has been brought down to manageable levels, although we still have to deal with it.

Members opposite went to the election saying that health, education and law and order were a priority. You can do more with health, education, law and order and the environment, and I know the government has made a commitment to the environment and the River Murray, which I acknowledge, but with the revenue that is coming in, as outlined in the *Advertiser* article, this government had the ability to meet its promises and to try to keep South Australia on the road to growth. It has failed to do so. It has broken its own promises. Whenever commentators say that, the government says, 'But the former Liberal government broke its promises over ETSA.' The reality is that we were forced to take care of a debt and, unless changes took place and returns were gained from assets, we could not have dealt with that debt as we had to pay about \$800 million a year in interest. That is the reality that this government fails to be open about. When the government goes on about the debt it is insulting the memory of the people of South Australia and saying, 'You don't know,' when in reality they have made the contribution.

I refer now to taxes. I have no difficulty with governments making water a priority in this state. We are the driest state in the driest continent, but a \$20 million commitment by the people of South Australia is not the type of commitment that needs to be put into making it a priority. The tax is \$30 per year on households and \$135 per year on residential properties, including clubs, schools and businesses and includes a second house brought by some people who have worked very hard, who have no super and who may have a small rental property. They are slugged \$135 a year, regardless of the size of the business. It is indiscriminate—a flat tax, regardless. If we look at it on its own, you think it is only one, but this is on top of other charges, as outlined in the article I read out about car registrations and so on.

What will we levy next? I remember sitting opposite when the previous government introduced the emergency services levy and I remember the carryings on by the opposition. Why was that introduced? Because it had to meet the costs of having an updated communication system and supply the emergency services resources needed to meet the demands and make this state a safer place. Some things had not been dealt with since Ash Wednesday, which is why that was introduced. Taxpayers are now contributing \$22 million, without major contribution by the state government, to the River Murray, which is paying lip service to something that is very serious and which must be addressed. It must be addressed not only by the \$22 million but also by getting around the table with all the Labor governments of the other states. Labor members read from the same book and should come up with a solution.

*Ms Ciccarello interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** The member for Norwood laughs. I look forward to her contribution. She can tell the people in

Norwood and Hartley—the pensioners who have worked hard and may have a little flat, which is their only source of income for their retirement—that they will be slugged \$135 on top of the other charges. See if the member for Norwood laughs then.

**Ms Ciccarello:** Pensioners will not have to pay.

**Mr SCALZI:** Not on their homes, but they will on their rental property.

**Ms Ciccarello:** What are you talking about, Joe?

**Mr SCALZI:** You look it up. The additional revenue this government is taking on top of these new taxes means that Labor has had a major windfall gain in revenue—nearly \$200 million in the past 12 months. Instead of rewarding South Australians it has punished them. We do not suggest that you have to have a budget deficit blow-out, but within reason you can give a little incentive. We know the property market will not keep growing forever. There is no reason why you cannot increase and put a little money back into the economy because the inflation rate is not high and will not cause problems, but it will create the climate for further investment and further returns in the long run.

The Treasurer has gone to great lengths to assure us that the additional revenue streams currently being hoarded by the government are one-offs and saying that in future that will not be the case and that we have to plan for the future. He tells us about the great debt. It is not the \$9 billion or \$10 billion in today's figures that the previous government has to face. We know there is about \$150 million in additional revenue this year alone from bracket creep. That is the case with the federal government as well. One has to look at this in its proper context. With \$600 million extra going into government coffers this year the government has had an opportunity to give a little back and to fund those priority areas of health, education and law and order.

In relation to law and order, funding has been allocated for a new prison, and tougher sentences will be introduced. But what about crime prevention? Despite the success of the crime prevention strategies in Norwood, Payneham, St Peters and Campbelltown, they have been cut. That will not help us. Under the Liberals, 24.7 per cent of the budget was spent on health, but this has decreased to 24.1 per cent under Labor. So much for its priorities!

Education is another priority for this government. True, the government has taken some measures, but, if education is top of its list, it should have top priority. Under the Liberals, it was 25.2 per cent of the budget, and under Labor it is 24.3 per cent. This is not a government that is giving priority to health, education, and law and order.

Time expired.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling):** Order! The member for Wright.

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** If there is an extension of time, the member for Unley will be made to stay in the chamber to listen to it!

**Mr Brindal:** How can one listen to an extension of time?

**Ms RANKINE:** I meant that the member will be forced to listen to the address made during that extension of time, even if we have to chain him to his bench! When this government went to the people in the 2002 election, we made a commitment that education, health and community safety would be our priorities.

**Mr Brindal:** You failed to win that election, so why do you keep harping about it?

**Ms RANKINE:** Well, we are in government and you're not. Our commitment has been reinforced by the second Rann Labor budget. Yesterday and today, we have heard constant bleating from members opposite. It seems that they have not got what they wanted out of this budget. I have a small piece of news for them: their priorities were rejected by South Australians at the last state election, and they are no longer in government. They do not understand what it is to actually honour a commitment. We well remember the SA Water deal, and the commitment made by the Liberal Party to the electors of South Australia prior to the 1993 election.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The question before the chair is the budget debate on the application of moneys for the Rann Labor government and not the history of the world according to the previous Liberal government.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I have given a great deal of latitude this afternoon to members opposite. The member for Wright is only a minute into her speech, and I am sure that she will tie her comments into the matter being debated.

**Ms RANKINE:** Thank you, sir. You can be assured that I will.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a further point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I believe that there has been some blasphemy in the chamber. I said something about God, and the answer came back referring to 'she', which I do not think is a correct use.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order. I warn the member for Unley for frivolous points of order.

**Ms RANKINE:** That is how the opposition members treat this important debate about the state's finances and its impact on our community. They are frivolous: they were a frivolous government, they were frivolous with the finances, and they are a frivolous opposition. As I have said, I remember their commitment to South Australians before the 1993 election that SA Water would not be privatised, and I remember their commitment to South Australians before the 1997 election that they would not sell off our power utility. After the 1997 election, they came back to this place red faced and embarrassed. However, their embarrassment seems to have subsided.

They now come into this place and raise issues which are a direct result of their backflip in privatising our power utility. They have the temerity to come in here and criticise, and they now want the Labor government to clean up their mess. Nevertheless, we are the new government, and we have a different set of priorities, and it is not grand parties and privatisation. Our priorities are the wellbeing and advancement of the people of this state, and the future opportunities for all our children, including those from the northern suburbs, who have been long neglected and overlooked by the Liberal government. Our priorities are about ensuring the safety of our communities and actually delivering health services rather than just announcing them.

First, I want to address the issue of health, although I will restrict myself to those services impacting on my electorate in the northern suburbs generally. In this budget, the Lyell McEwin Health Service redevelopment stage A received an allocation of \$32 million to complete a new women's health centre, new wards, intensive care, theatre, and emergency and imaging facilities.

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

**Ms RANKINE:** It was on the plan for a long time under the Liberal government. It was announced and re-announced

continuously, but nothing was done. It is now due for completion in 2004. Stage B of the redevelopment will also commence under this budget and will provide a 60-bed mental health unit, upgrading of patient accommodation, and improvements to public access and car parking. These are much needed and deserved facilities for the people of the northern suburbs. Under the Liberals, the Lyell McEwin Hospital was long neglected, but it is now being upgraded under this government. Residents of my electorate—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** The member needs to realise that people living in the northern suburbs don't get to go to the Entertainment Centre. They are stuck out there with poor services that the Liberals neglected year after year. Those people are worried about adequate health services and not a good night out, which seems to be the focus of the former Liberal government. Residents of the northern suburbs in my electorate are also heavily reliant on the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms RANKINE:** In this budget, funds have also been allocated to those facilities. The Royal Adelaide Hospital stage 4 new works will provide patient accommodation, clinics, mental health, engineering infrastructure, car parking, and teaching facilities.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is on one warning.

**Ms RANKINE:** The Women's and Children's Hospital \$1.5 million redevelopment program is due for completion in 2006, and will provide a paediatric emergency department, a women's assessment service and day assessment unit, and the relocation of the patient information service.

My community is looking forward to the completion of a new public dental service in Salisbury which will be located out at the Hollywood Plaza. It will provide the most up-to-date equipment to replace the five very outdated and outmoded services, which are currently scattered in the community. Again, these services suffered eight years of neglect under the former Liberal government.

In relation to community safety, I am delighted that a new Metropolitan Fire Service station will be provided to service Golden Grove and the surrounding areas. This is a much needed facility, and has long been anticipated by fire officers themselves. Until April this year, there have been approximately 250 fires in Golden Grove, two of which were brush fence fires.

**Mr Brindal:** I suppose we were responsible for the lot!

**Ms RANKINE:** If you are willing to admit to that, I am happy for you to get that off your chest. However, we know that the fire service has been concerned for some time about response times to Golden Grove. We know that it is the most densely populated area of Tea Tree Gully and that it is sorely in need of this particular facility. So, the residents and I look forward to its completion.

Officers at Elizabeth are also delighted that they are getting a new station. Indeed, there has been a massive increase in the capital works program for the Metropolitan Fire Service. For example, the Liberal government provided \$2.55 million for new works in the 2001-02 budget; in the 2003-04 budget, under Labor it is \$4.462 million—an increase of nearly \$2 million. For works in progress, in 2001-02, under the Liberal government, the budget was \$2.395 million; under Labor in 2003-04 it is \$5.89 million—

an increase of nearly \$3.5 million. The Country Fire Service is in similar circumstances: in 2001-02, new works were allocated \$4.73 million; under the Labor government, in the 2003-04 budget it is \$12.1 million.

I have to say that the CFS did a fantastic job last year. It responded to over 7 500 fire and emergency situations: not one house or life in South Australia was lost. It deployed over 750 volunteer firefighters and management personnel to New South Wales and Victoria and, very recently, it coordinated the very successful Premier's bushfire summit, which was held in this place. I greatly appreciated the opportunity to participate in that summit and to raise issues involving the threat that exists in metropolitan Adelaide (such as my electorate) and the impact that planning and development decisions have in increasing that threat.

**Mr Brindal:** You didn't have to say it, but you did.

**Ms RANKINE:** And I am pleased that you were here to listen to it. Our education budget has also been a major focus in this year's budget.

**Mr Brindal:** If you took the women out of this chamber, the government would be a bit thin on.

**Ms RANKINE:** If we took the women out of the opposition, it would still be thick! Under this budget, the Torrens Valley Institute, which services the northern suburbs, is having its very substandard and underutilised facilities completed for veterinary and applied sciences. I was delighted to see that the Modbury Special School is to be upgraded, too. I had the opportunity to visit that school some time ago, and I was greatly impressed with the wonderful work being done there with our very deserving children with special needs, such as autism. It is a wonderful facility, and I recommend anyone in this house to visit the school and see the work that is done.

The Mawson Lakes School is due for completion this year, and I know that the community will be pleased. As the minister told the house yesterday, Keithcot Farm Primary School was advised that it will be funded for a new gymnasium. I have raised the issue of recreation and sporting facilities in Golden Grove a number of times in this house. Those facilities were very thin on the ground, and I know that the gymnasium will be a much utilised and very welcome facility in the school and in the community. The school has a very heavy emphasis on physical activity and healthy activities for its students, and I know that the school community was delighted at the minister's announcement that it would get its gymnasium. I was also delighted to speak to the Chairperson of the Madison Park Primary School Council the other day.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms RANKINE:** I told the house a little about my visit there. Lyn Newton has been a great council Chairperson and, as I told the house, a very strong advocate for her school, pushing very strongly for the provision of primary school counsellors, which has been part of the 'Hands up for primary counsellors' campaign run by the Australian Primary Principals Association. Indeed, Madison Park Primary School was a focus for that association in getting a school counsellor. This budget has provided 29 new primary school counsellors who will supply those services for approximately 76 schools.

In this house, we have heard much talk about early intervention, which makes a difference, particularly to our young people. The years from birth through to the early primary school years really do determine the life outcome of our young people, and those years have to be taken seriously.

This government is committed to early intervention for our children and our families in a number of ways.

Yesterday, I paid another visit to the Salisbury East High School. I am there so regularly that they are thinking of enrolling me! I visited the home economics centre, which will be part of the wonderful \$1.7 million upgrade of the home economics and technical studies facilities. Those facilities were exactly the same as those available to me when I was at high school.

**Mr Brindal:** How long ago was that?

**Ms RANKINE:** That was 1967.

**Mr Brindal:** Labor government time!

**Ms RANKINE:** Those facilities were new then. I was at the assembly, and they had been there through eight years of neglect of the Liberal government. We have heard members opposite bleating about not getting things for their schools. Salisbury High School has waited 37 years—37 years of being ignored by Liberal governments.

**Mr Brindal:** Excuse me, but 29 of those were Labor government years!

**Ms RANKINE:** But the facilities were not that old then. They are 37 years old!

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** And you were a baby, too!

**Ms RANKINE:** I was a baby as well. I was at the assembly when the minister announced those facilities. The shock around—

**Mr Brindal:** Who was the minister?

**Ms RANKINE:** The Minister for Education and Children's Services.

**Mr Brindal:** What was his name?

**Ms RANKINE:** The member for Taylor, the Minister for Education and Children's Services. The member should know who the ministers are by now.

**Mr Brindal:** I thought you meant when those facilities were opened in 1952, or whenever it was.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms RANKINE:** It was wonderful to be at the assembly, with a community which has been neglected for so long and which has had only patch-up work done at its school, to see the reaction of the students and the joy on the teachers' faces, and to sit next to the Principal who could not talk because he was so shocked. I thought that the school council Chairperson, who was sitting on the other side of me, was having a heart attack, because he was making the strangest of noises seemingly in shock.

The school is still in a state of absolute jubilation that it finally has a government that cares about it and that values students and young people from the northern suburbs.

**Mr Brindal:** Who's the Principal?

**Ms RANKINE:** The Principal is Peter Maeder—the member is out of order asking me questions. Peter Maeder is an excellent Principal, who is committed to his students and to his community.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms RANKINE:** The Principal, the school council, the parents, the students and the electorate of Wright are all delighted with the second Labor budget.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** It is nice to participate in this debate. Having listened intently to the member for Wright's contribution, I wonder where she has been. She has a selective memory. Where was she during the Bannon years? Where was she when—

**Ms Rankine:** I'm not as old as the member for Stuart!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** The member looks a lot older. Her contribution tonight has shown that she has a selective memory.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** On a point of order, sir, I think it is unacceptable for the member for Stuart to reflect on the personal attributes of the member for Wright, and I ask you, sir, to ask him to withdraw that comment.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling):** If the member for Wright takes objection, I am happy to ask the member for Stuart to withdraw.

**Ms RANKINE:** We all know that the member for Stuart is not only older than me but also looks older than me—and he is a whole lot hairier than I am!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It has proved one thing, not only that the honourable member has selective memory but also that she can make caustic remarks and, when a few are handed back, she cannot take it. Let me just take the honourable member through one or two of the issues that she mentioned today in this budget debate, because it is very important. The member had a lot to say about the excellent work that the Country Fire Service does in protecting the people of South Australia. One of the first things the Liberal government did when it came to power was relieve the CFS of the \$13 million debt that the Bannon government refused to accept. The Bannon government let the CFS borrow the money but would not pay it back, so out of its budget each year it had to fund that debt of \$13 million, an amount that the CFS had to spend after Ash Wednesday.

**Ms Rankine:** When was the government in power?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** For far too long, and it was unfortunate for the people of South Australia because that government ran down the state. The honourable member has, to this day, failed to understand, appreciate or accept that, when we came into government, we put into effect a series of strategies to rebuild the economy, to get the government finances back in order, and that is why this government today has the ability to bring in a budget with a surplus. We did not leave the government with a massive overdraft, with the economy in decline.

Thanks to the efforts of the federal government, we have had stable interest rates for the last 12 months. There has not been an adjustment in 12 months. Those unheralded low interest rates have assisted the housing industry to develop, and it is a major employer. There has been large capital investment in various areas, which has helped the state and the government greatly, and there has been confidence in the economy. Thanks to the good management of the commonwealth government, people are investing in real estate, and this Treasurer is getting millions of dollars in stamp duty. He has had a windfall in stamp duty, which has enabled him to have a surplus budget.

I am pleased that the government is putting some of that money into dealing with the unfunded superannuation liabilities and reducing debt, but we must remember that we brought the debt down by thousands of millions of dollars. One of the hallmarks of a good government is that it makes decisions that are in the long-term interests of the people of South Australia, not popular decisions, but the right decisions, and decisions that are going to create long-term opportunities. That is why this Treasurer is having an easy time. That is why we have this budget, and that is why the member for Wright is getting money spent in her electorate: because her government inherited a sound financial situation.

It is all very well for the member for Wright to carry on like she did, but I can tell her a few things that the govern-

ment has done in my electorate. One of the first things the government did was delay the upgrading of the Orroroo school. It also delayed work at Booleroo Centre, and it was only the involvement of Brendan Nelson, the federal minister, that brought the government into line, but it slowed down the whole process. The government stopped the sealing of the road to Lyndhurst and it has stopped the funding of other roads. My constituents who are not hooked up to the River Murray water system, people who live in places such as Hawker, who have the worst water in Australia, will have to pay the levy. Their hot water systems collapse because of the sort of water they have, so they are now looking at putting in a desalination plant, but they have to make a substantial capital contribution themselves and pay the River Murray levy.

**Ms Rankine:** How long have you represented them? You haven't done much in 30 years, have you?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I'll tell you what I have done for them. They have got their school upgraded, they have got an airport, they have got the road sealed and, for the first time since 1924, which was the last time something was done in the ward, we upgraded the hospital. Thanks to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, there was a complete upgrade worth \$600 000 of the Hawker Hospital. So do not talk to me about not looking after my electorate. The honourable member and her colleagues made all sorts of promises. What they have done, and what they are continuing to do, is dip their hands in the pocket of the long-suffering taxpayer. One of the first things the government did this time last year was tear up all convention and try to slug every perpetual leaseholder \$300. That has been nipped in the bud. That was a great effort.

**Ms Rankine:** You didn't fix the water for the people in Orroroo in 30 years, did you?

**Mr BRINDAL:** I take a point of order. Generally in the Westminster tradition, it is at least a custom that senior members in this house, in this case the most senior member in the house and a former speaker, are heard in silence because they are known as the father of the house. I ask if that tradition should be observed in this chamber.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling):** It is a little rich for the member for Unley to be objecting to interjections, and I know for a fact that the member for Stuart is more than able to handle himself and does not require the protection of the member for Unley.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If the member for Wright would like to go through each area of my electorate, I am happy to give her a history of the difficulties that have been experienced and what I have done to assist them. I am happy to give her chapter and verse. However, I want to point out to her very clearly what this budget has done to my constituents. I have been well briefed, and I understand that the Department of Transport has determined to spend \$29 million to purchase construction equipment. That will mean that operators who have previously been supplying that equipment to the Department of Transport, and others, will have to shut up operations. It is most likely that there will be the loss of 14 jobs in Port Augusta. That plant hire company has already lost eight jobs, so that is over 20 jobs that have gone.

The government is going to slug my people who are not connected to a reticulated water scheme with a tax, which they never expected, and people at Melrose and Wilmington

will have to pay, even though they are not connected and they get no benefits from the Murray River system. Those people do not get a lot from the government. I presume that the people at Marree and Oodnadatta will have to pay. People at Leigh Creek will escape it because they are connected to a different system. It is all very well for the member for Wright to be loud in her praise of the government, but this government has selectively targeted people, in many cases those who are least able to pay the impost.

This budget backs up the comments that I was making earlier that, this year, the government has access to some \$8 600 million in taxation revenue and grants from the commonwealth. That compares to some \$8 027 million last year. On the expenditure side, last year the government spent \$7 700 million, and this year it is anticipating spending \$7 845 million, which allows it a surplus of about \$300 million. I pointed out earlier to the member for Wright that it is only as a result of the good housekeeping and financial management of the previous government that it has access to these funds.

The other thing I would say to the member for Wright is that the only way to successfully ensure that one has adequate revenue is to encourage business and commerce to continue to develop and produce. In that way, one is creating opportunities and revenue. If the government continues (as appears to be the wont of certain ministers) to pass legislation in this house and impose restrictions and empower bureaucracy to interfere and prevent business going forward, it will kill the goose that lays the golden egg. If one looks at this budget, it is interesting to see the allocations, when one considers that the health department, in general, will receive 24 per cent of the total revenue allocated. I wonder how much of that 24 per cent will go into my electorate. I wonder what new capital investments—

*Mrs Hall interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Some of it is funding the Labor candidate's office at Port Augusta. Then there is 24 per cent allocated to education. Is there any money in this budget to help train governesses or supervisors on these isolated stations, where the parents have to organise their children's education? They are supported by the excellent work of the people who work for the School of the Air at Port Augusta. However, it is very important that these governesses are given some training. I just wonder how much money will be allocated. Very little, I would think. One will see that the agriculture and fisheries department receives 1 per cent of over \$8 billion. Housing and community amenities receive 8 per cent. If one goes through the documents, one can see that the overwhelming amount of revenue that this government has at its disposal has been spent on service areas. Those service areas obviously have not been fairly allocated.

In my constituency, there is an urgent need to continue with an effective, reasonable sealing of country roads. Yesterday, on the way to Adelaide, I drove on the unsealed section between Booleroo Centre and Jamestown. It is a pity that a few government members do not occasionally drive on that section of the road, because we have yet to be told whether there is any money for that project. It is absolutely deplorable.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I beg your pardon?

**Mrs Geraghty:** You were there for nine years.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** We had a program to seal all rural arterial roads by 2004. When we came into government, there was virtually no money for rural arterial roads. We

made a very substantial advance on those neglected and unsealed roads. These roads, and those in the Far North, are essential if we are to continue to support the tourist industry. Many of the local communities in my electorate are very dependent upon the revenue that is generated from tourists travelling through those places. There are people who want to visit these areas, but if the road conditions deteriorate people will not go there.

I note that in these budget documents there is a line that talks about providing money for the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. I want to refer to that, because this government has now been in power for well over 12 months, and we have had a great deal of discussion about honesty and integrity in government, and all those sorts of things. At the last state election, they engaged in the most disgraceful, inaccurate, misleading and scurrilous campaign, yet they make out that they are lily white. I have complained on two occasions about the activities of the Parliamentary Librarian—

**Ms Rankine:** Why was it scurrilous?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Because it was untrue, misleading and inaccurate. I have complained about it, and I do so for the last time because, if I do not get some undertaking about future involvement, a motion will be moved in this house. I make no apology for saying it. When a document is put out which purports to be accurate, and when it uses its source as the Parliamentary Library of South Australia, I, as a member, am entitled—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart is straying too far from the matter at hand. I ask him to return to the budget.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If you look—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I will not be argued with. The member has the opportunity for a 10-minute grievance, during which he can canvass any issue he wishes. I think that, on this occasion, referring to what may or may not have happened at the last state election is straying too far from the budget. I ask him to return to that.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Mr Acting Speaker, the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee is a line; if members turn to the budget statement in Budget Paper 3, they will see 'Joint Parliamentary Service Committee'. That is the organisation that receives funds from the government of South Australia to run the parliament, to run the Parliamentary Library, and the Parliamentary Librarian answers to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. The conduct of those people is obviously the subject of matters that can be debated in this parliament. When that conduct is inappropriate, or when it sets out to give inaccurate information about a member of parliament, it is the role of this parliament to question; it is the role of a member of parliament to engage in proper debate and discussion on that matter.

I do this with no pleasure. However, I wish to bring to the attention of this house what I believe to be a grave injustice that has taken place to damage me in the public eye, to impute improper actions on my behalf and to bring into question my reputation and my good name. I have a right to stand in this parliament, as a duly elected member, and question the role of those responsible. It was a member of parliament who went there in the first place: we know that. This government sets itself up as one that will uphold the best traditions of the Westminster system and all those principles that are good about a democracy. But, when comments are made on its behalf that are misleading and downright scurrilous, we are entitled to object. The Parliamentary

Librarian authorised work to be carried out and calculations to be made which not only were inaccurate but which also set out to impute improper actions on my behalf, suggesting to the people of South Australia that I was engaged in inappropriate behaviour and that I was to be paid money by the taxpayers to which I was not entitled.

I do not mind what anyone says about me if it is true or if it is criticism of what I stand for. But I take very strong exception to being labelled and maligned in a grossly misleading, inaccurate and downright disgraceful manner. As I said to that gentleman concerned on the telephone, I will see him in hell unless they come clean. I believe that the Parliamentary Librarian and others should not be engaged in political activity. They are there to provide accurate information. They do not have skills in calculating people's superannuation, and when a document is put out that states that I was entitled to a payment of \$1 337 000 I would like to know the basis of it. When I asked what was the basis of the calculation, I was denied that information. He refused point-blank to give me the information. I am annoyed, and I have every right to defend myself against this sort of behaviour. And where else should I do it but on the floor of the parliament? Unless I receive an apology and a clear undertaking that this will never happen again, a motion will be moved in the house, and that is unfortunate.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 8.15 p.m.]*

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAS AND ELECTRICITY) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL 2003

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** The regional areas of this state have, I believe, been shafted in this budget with the spear going right through the heart of the Eyre Peninsula. My words seem inadequate to put to the house the grief I feel as I see the potential of this region and the hopes and aspirations of the people that have been raised under eight years of Liberal government slashed into tatters after only one year of the so-called bipartisan Labor government. The Premier said today, 'Put your state before your party.' I wish that he and his party would.

There has been no mention that I can find in the budget of the \$32 million desalination plant previously announced by the Minister for Energy at the September cabinet meeting last year and reaffirmed in the house on 14 May this year. Developments worth multimillions are currently constrained by lack of available water. Private enterprise is waiting for the tender, which was expected this month, to provide this desperately needed commodity. Is this yet another of the government's loud proclamations where actions contradict what is said by a minister? The desalination plant, supposedly a private/public partnership project, is glaringly omitted from the PPP short list, with police stations the only PPP flagged by the government in its budget papers. Another proposed PPP, the Glenelg trams, is now to be provided for with public funds, presumably after the government bowed to union pressure.

To add insult to injury we are now being expected to pay the Murray River levy of \$30 on every household in the state and \$135 on non-residential entities, such as farms, commercial businesses and schools and, presumably, all the country halls, clubs and churches. The pipeline stops at Whyalla. We on the rest of Eyre Peninsula do not use River Murray water. The Minister for the Environment said on radio yesterday that we must think about the issue on a broader scale than just those who immediately use the river water and then, in the same interview, said that he cannot comment about desalination plants: it is not his portfolio responsibility. You cannot have it both ways.

Surely the government should be looking at a holistic approach to water and not just slugging the taxpayer whenever it can. Even the Chairman of the Economic Development Board, Mr Robert Champion de Crespigny, highlighted the need for government departments to work together and break down the silos between departments, yet here we have ministers who obviously do not communicate with each other on related issues. Is this minister perhaps then unaware of the \$28.60 levy that residents and businesses on Eyre Peninsula already pay per year to the Eyre Peninsula Catchment Water Management Board, an initiative to address water conservation in our region—a levy that is going up again this year.

A spokesperson for the Conservation Council said that the money has to come from somewhere—where better than the users of the water. Where better, indeed! However, I am doubtful whether the Conservation Council is any better informed about the State of South Australia than the government is. If it was it would be pointing out the injustice of a levy on a region that is not connected to the River Murray and on top of an existing levy. The River Murray levy is a further impost on a region that has addressed its water resources shortages and, for years, sought practical ways to conserve water.

Many towns on Eyre Peninsula have water reuse programs in operation. The federal government contributed significantly to the grey water program in Port Lincoln, where effluent water is now being used to water ovals and bowling greens. The excellent work that has been done by the Port Lincoln City Council has been severely set back by this government's withdrawal of support for stage 2 of the Clean Seas and Water Reuse Program. Today, I have been advised that funding for the catchment management subsidy scheme will not be forthcoming. This program has the potential to save 200 000 kilolitres of water in an area where water restrictions have been in place since last summer.

Again, we have injustices heaped upon us and upon our productivity. Our region produces 65 per cent of the state's seafood and is home to about 85 per cent of the world's temperate sea species. It should and could be the world's centre for marine research, education and training, for which we are already a magnet through the wonderful work of the Marine Science Centre, yet there is no sign in this budget of the Marine Innovation South Australia project that would put us where we should be—at centre stage with a magnificent campus that would include SARDI research from West Beach, the Marine Science Centre, and possibly TAFE and high school campuses on land that is already owned freehold by the Port Lincoln City Council.

I had hoped that the former Liberal government would announce this wonderful project but decided that I would have to put up with a Labor government taking credit. I did not dream that it did not have the vision or the courage to take it on and put us and the state on the world map where we

belong. Indeed, rather than highlighting and promoting our fishing and aquaculture industries—industries that are major contributors to this state's coffers and a major employer in the regional areas—this government instead, without consultation, inflicts another cost on the commercial fishers by imposing a jetty levy. The minister said today that this is all about cost recovery, but it is actually just another tax on regional areas, as most commercial fishers use private facilities not jetty infrastructure.

We are acknowledged to have one of the very best wind power sites in the world on the west coast of Eyre Peninsula. More than \$1 billion in wind power projects are ready to go ahead when the line into the grid has been built. The accounting firm Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu has written a report, 'Wind Generation Developments on the Eyre Peninsula—Economic Impact Analysis', which outlines, in scenario five, that the benefits of this project to the state were estimated to be \$4.72 billion.

When I asked the Minister for Energy on budget day whether he had read or been briefed on this report, I believe that he did not know what I was talking about. There was nothing in this budget even to provide a scoping study to investigate the upgrading of the old 132 kilowatt powerline from Whyalla which services the needs of Eyre Peninsula and which would enable two wind farms that lie close to this line to be built. If the way was led by the government, I believe that private enterprise would provide the funding to enable all the wind farms to be developed, but facilitation must be provided by the government.

How devastating to the state is the new 40 per cent increase in mining royalties. The exploration of the Gawler Craton that underlies the Eyre Peninsula and the expected jobs will now be curtailed. The message being sent is that this government does not want mining and is unlikely to facilitate new enterprises. Perhaps this is a means of ensuring that Yumbarra is not mined. What a blow to the Adelaide Resources and Newmont Australia joint venture announced only last week, which is expecting to spend \$5 million within the next five years in exploration alone on tenements on Eyre Peninsula. Newmont is the world's largest gold producer. The diamonds, coal and iron ore companies, one of which I spoke with last week, will all be assessing their viability in the light of this new impost and apparent lack of support.

Victimisation of Eyre Peninsula is nowhere more pronounced than in the roads program. The sealing of all rural arterial roads in the state which, under the Liberals, was to be completed next year has been gutted. The allocated funding of \$2.798 million for the whole state is only 3.5 per cent of what is required, and only a little more than what is needed to complete the Lock-Elliston Road alone. Labor has already backflipped on the Elliston-Lock Road. The Minister for Transport gave a written undertaking in August last year to complete the 19 kilometres remaining to be sealed by doing 10 kilometres in this financial year and 9.5 kilometres in the 2003-04 financial year. That has been cut, without notice or advice, to 4.5 kilometres, with no indication when, or even if, under Labor, the rest will be sealed.

It appears from evidence such as this that Labor's written word is as worthless as its spoken word. Only \$1.9 million of the estimated \$7.8 million required has been allocated for ongoing work on the shoulders of the Lincoln Highway between Cowell and Tumby Bay, where the narrowness of the road is a constant danger. This major highway carries a larger volume of heavy transport than many other highways in the state. All this is from a government which consistently

states that ensuring road safety is one of its major commitments.

But it seems that the Labor government has enough in the coffers to spend \$16.3 million on airconditioned buses in the city and a further \$56 million on the trams to Glenelg, on top of a subsidisation of \$160 million provided for buses in the metropolitan area.

I hear that the Department of Transport is buying back equipment so that unionised labour can undertake the little work that is left in the regions—work currently done by local contractors. Meanwhile, jobs in regional areas will be lost and families forced to relocate away from family and friends, while money that could have been used to build safer roads, save lives and encourage economic development is spent on city luxuries.

Just \$50 million is needed to upgrade the railway on Eyre Peninsula, or parts of it will be closed, throwing tonnes of freight and hundreds more trucks onto our already inadequate roads. Surely, that is a much better use for limited funds than trams in the city.

Blatant Labor self-promotion is just as pronounced in the two rural development offices opened in Port Augusta and Murray Bridge in the marginal seats of Stuart and Hammond. Both these offices, I believe, are manned by failed ALP candidates—presumably, in preparation for the next election. They are unlikely to deviate from the official Labor line of crucifying rural and regional South Australia. These offices are in addition to the Office of the Southern Suburbs operating under a very talented director, Ms Fij Miller, who was shifted from the efficient and effective Office of the Small Business Advocate, an office that I guess will soon be found to be no longer required. One question is the need for providing millions of dollars to develop these offices when there are already effective offices belonging to local members of parliament, regional development boards and local councils operating in these areas that could well use the additional resources for actual programs. The crime prevention program scrapped by the Labor government would be regarded as a high priority for these funds by most people in those areas.

The Premier and the Labor Party people have spoken and written many fine words about education and health—again, actions contradict the fine words. Ceduna has been dealt a body blow with the removal of state funding for the redevelopment of the area school. The Liberals allocated \$5 million for the first stage of this project in the 2001-02 financial year, \$1 million of which was from the commonwealth government's 2002 capital funding program. The \$5 million was cut by Labor to \$3.9 million, with the completion date also extended from September 2003 to September 2005. Now, the funding has been cut to \$1 million this year—questionably, the federal contribution to the project. There is no evidence that the \$500 000 allocated to be spent in last year's budget has yet been spent.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services was quick to defend the cut in last year's budget when I queried it. Her patronising media reply included the information that \$500 000 was to be spent in 2002. *Hansard* also records the minister's statement, as follows:

Ceduna Area School, a \$3.9 million project, of which \$500 000 is allocated in this budget. That was due to commence in June 2002 and be completed in September 2003. That will now be commence in December this year (that is 2002).

Once again, the words mean nothing. I visited Ceduna Area School just one month ago and, surprise, surprise, not a thing could be seen to be done. Where is the Labor government

spending the money that it claims in the budget has been allocated to specific projects—projects that never eventuate? The commonwealth Minister for Education, Dr Brendan Nelson, in October-November last year took the unprecedented step of eventually withholding payments to South Australia under the federal government's capital funding program until the state government provided adequate explanations for the delays in school projects for which it had accepted funding. His action followed an investigation by his department which revealed that the South Australian government had accepted commonwealth funding for up to 26 capital projects in state government schools which had not been completed and, in some cases, such as Ceduna, not even started.

On Eyre Peninsula we have 10 hospitals. In the budget last year metropolitan hospitals received a 7.1 per cent increase. Our hospitals received a 2.4 per cent increase, which is less than inflation. This year, I understand the budget is 1.7 per cent extra for our hospitals. I do not know how they are expected to cope. These hospitals are already under stress to provide quality health care. The staff and members of the community already voluntarily man ambulances and raise funds for equipment. These are the same people who volunteer throughout our communities for emergency services and the like.

Is this what the Premier and his colleagues call open, honest and accountable government for all the people of the state, and a government for all South Australians? Is this a budget that supports a forward-moving state? I think not. What hope is there for young people with apprentices and trainees being dealt a blow in the form of a 50 per cent increase in training fees? Tradespeople are the backbone of development in the regions and, without a work force coming through apprenticeship training, who will provide these trades for our state?

Right across Eyre Peninsula, much like the rest of regional South Australia, we are in need of houses. Four transportable houses were delivered to Wudinna over the last few months, and we have three new families coming from Zimbabwe to live in Wudinna soon. Where will they live, and how will this help the new immigration policy?

Our Liberal leader put out a press release some weeks ago which said, 'Be afraid. Be very afraid. If you have had a Labor cabinet meeting in your area, the cuts soon follow.' There have been two cabinet meetings on Eyre Peninsula that my office tried hard to facilitate on the basis that they would help the new ministers have a picture of this huge region and its potential, and the wonderful people who live there. And how wrong we were! What I really would like to do now is secede from this miserable government and not return until we are once more valued and respected. Perhaps it is a vendetta against Eyre Peninsula because we have so many millionaires living in Port Lincoln. However, the government should recognise that we have our fair share of low income earners, with more than our fair share of unemployed people. They are spread over Eyre Peninsula, remote from many of the services that are taken for granted in the city of Adelaide. Does this government want to see the regions once again have one of the highest suicide levels in Australia?

There is a saying that actions speak louder than words. The Premier has been very ready with words in the media. His actions, however, are at odds with his pronouncements. His actions shriek of injustice, victimisation, self-interest and callous cynicism, all delivered with expert media spin. As usual, a Liberal government, after years of a Labor govern-

ment, pulled South Australia out of a massive debt and got its economic engine going again, with regions pulling more than their weight. A Labor government is once again stopping that economic engine and pushing the state right back into the bog.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel has the call.

*Ms Rankine interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Wright is wrong. She is out of her place and out of order.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I have a very strong feeling of *deja vu*. I have heard it said before in this house that some days we feel that we are experiencing *Groundhog Day*. It is almost—it is not almost; it is—*Back to the Future*, because that is an extremely accurate description of this budget. Twelve months ago we were here in this place berating the government for its lack of vision and the raft of broken promises that was being developed and delivered in its first budget. We are experiencing exactly the same today, and this week, as we did last year.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Enfield raises a very good point. I will quote from a statement that the then leader of the opposition, now Premier, made in the election campaign, I understand from a policy costing document dated 7 February 2002, as follows:

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

Well, we have all seen a drastic change from empty rhetoric. It is important to support an argument with fact, and we pride ourselves on this side of the house in doing that. We have seen a massive tax slug on South Australian families and a massive breach of promises made by this government. We have the new water tax of \$30 per year per household and \$135 per business. We have the Labor government's car slug: in the past 12 months we have had increases of about \$85 per car in the city for a six cylinder vehicle and there is a further \$37 rise in this budget. We also have an increase in the training tax whereby, for example, an apprentice hairdresser will pay an extra \$160 per year. We have a 40 per cent increase in mining royalties and gas hikes up by 5.6 per cent—

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** I will not worry about responding to those interjections as I know they are out of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, they are out of order, but members are a bit testy tonight. I do not know what they have been consuming, but they should settle down.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** All government charges are up by 3.9 per cent, including train, tram and bus fares, and fines. Stamp duty on mortgages is up from 35¢ per \$100 to 45¢ per \$100. We also see a new levy on commercial fishing vessels, which is based on the length of the vessel—fairly basic stuff! This government obviously cannot be trusted: it made promises and now has broken them. Contrary to Labor's claims, this budget gives education, which includes TAFE spending, and health a lower priority in government spending than did the last Liberal budget in 2001-02. The member for West Torrens can put that in her pipe and smoke it.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** I mean 'Torrens'. I am used to the member for West Torrens interjecting, but I am getting used to the member for Torrens interjecting as well. I will

give some figures. It is important to back up an argument with facts and figures. The actual percentage of the total budget spent on health in the previous Liberal government was 24.7 per cent. This compares with Labor's 24.1 per cent last year and 24.1 per cent again for the 2003-04 year. If we look at education, which includes funding for TAFE, we see that it was 25.2 per cent under a Liberal Government, 23.9 per cent for Labor last year and 24.3 per cent this year—a very modest increase of .4 per cent. Not even half a measly per cent can they wring out of this budget—shabby dealings when it comes to education.

We have also seen a shock blow-out in unfunded superannuation liabilities from \$3.3 billion to an expected \$4.9 billion—a huge \$1.6 billion. We could use the old adage that if you say it quickly it does not sound a lot, but \$1.6 billion is a huge amount of money. In January 2002 the Liberal Government released a Treasury estimation of unfunded superannuation liabilities for June 2003 of \$3.3 billion and after just 16 months we have seen this Treasurer reporting that in four years' time unfunded superannuation will blow out to a huge \$4.9 billion, which shows an astonishing lack of control. While we understand the challenges of the international investment market, at the moment this government needs to explain what has happened in its first year and what is being done to stop the blow-out.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Torrens has had ample time to reflect on her behaviour and I will have to warn her soon, which is most unusual for the Whip.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** We have not heard much of how the Treasurer or this government is looking to turn it around. Will we see an unfunded superannuation liability levy introduced, because that seems to be the only initiative this government knows? When correcting a problem that needs money spent on it, the government is not prepared to draw it out of its bank account or out of the budget generally: it looks at increasing taxation on the community. Labor has under-spent its capital works budget this year by about 23 per cent, or \$104 million. That is another example of extreme mismanagement. Human services is underspent by \$11 million, and the education portfolio area is underspent by \$5 million. Schools and hospitals have missed out on critical capital works spending this year because Labor ministers did not ensure that their agencies spent their budgets. Shame!

The actual accrual of \$312 million, reported by Labor in 2002-03, is the result of an accounting fiddle, as identified by Tony Harris, the former New South Wales Auditor-General, in the *Financial Review*. The Liberal Government had budgeted for about \$3 million from SAFA and SAAMC to be put into the budget in 2001-02, but this government decided to fiddle the accounts by reversing the decision to try to create the fictitious black hole for the last Liberal budget and put it into its first budget, thereby creating a big surplus of \$312 million. One does not have to be a genius to work it out. I used to be a bank manager.

It is the same as a customer having a \$50 000 overdraft limit, having their cheque account overdrawn by \$50 000. They may have had \$100 000 in an investment account, and they say they are overdrawn by \$50 000 but, in fact, they may have \$100 000 in a separate investment account. There is nothing stopping them from moving \$50 000 or \$60 000 into the operating account, putting it back into the black. It is no different from the way the state's finances are being run, and that is what the Treasurer tried to do last year.

After two or three years of impressive performance in the South Australian economy, the Treasurer, under his policies, is forecasting a major slow-down in our economy relative to the national economy. Employment growth in South Australia in the last two years was 1 per cent and 2.75 per cent, compared with national growth of 1.1 per cent and 2.5 per cent respectively. They are some of the facts. I could go on about the broken promises, but I will turn my attention over the next few minutes to the River Murray. We all agree that significant work needs to be done in connection with the River Murray. It also needs the states upstream to come to the party and show some commitment to the issue.

Despite the rhetoric, the government has not committed millions of extra dollars to the River Murray. It is clear evidence of its lack of commitment to solve the problem. The government is not willing to put in one extra Treasury dollar into the River Murray. It is an absolute disgrace that a government would introduce a tax for an issue like this. The government is introducing a new tax and is not willing to commit one extra cent, and it sends the wrong message upstream. The government anticipates raising \$20 million from this tax, with every household paying a \$30 levy. That is an attack on families and middle Australia.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Standing order 128 states:

If a Member indulges in tedious repetition of substance already presented in a debate. . .

By your yawning, sir, and mine, I think that tedious repetition is obvious, and I ask that you request the member to move on.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. If we took that to its extreme, we would close the parliament down in about 10 minutes.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, sir. Every family in this state has to pay the \$30 levy. I wonder what they will think in March 2006 in the electorates of Wright, West Torrens, Torrens, Reynell, and Florey? They are all electorates that do not need much of a move in margins to see the sitting members completely swept from their electorates. I wonder what voters will think about that levy in a couple of years, because we will certainly be reminding them.

The levy for businesses is \$135. However, what happens when a business operates on two separate titles with two water meters? Will they be pay double the levy, or if they have three water meters will the levy be trebled? I am sure that businesses will be happy to cough up that additional tax for this government.

The additional revenue is not a one-off. Labor has had a major windfall in revenue of about \$200 million during the past 12 months, and it is now punishing South Australia with extra taxes and charges. The Treasurer has gone to great lengths to assure us that the additional revenue streams currently being hoarded by the government, are one-offs and cannot be relied on. He has said this is why he had to break his promise not to introduce new taxes.

A minimum of \$150 million additional revenue has been collected this year because of bracket creep alone. With almost \$600 million additional funds in the government coffers, the government had an opportunity to give some of it back. However, instead it introduced a whole new regime of taxation.

Self-funded retirees on the lowest incomes will be hit the hardest by this budget. We have seen the government's car slug. As I have said, the cost of running a vehicle has

increased by about \$85 per year, which is \$170 per year for a two car family.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for West Torrens talks about repetition. I would like a dollar for every time—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** South Torrens, and he is out of his seat! If the member wants to make a contribution, he should return to his seat. The member for Kavel should ignore the member for South Torrens, who is still out of his seat.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you, sir. I will move on. When we look at the law and order portfolio, we see that this government has ranted and raved about being tough on law and order. It has even used taxpayers' money to make television advertisements to try to convince us. Once again, it is an absolute joke. There may have been advertisements, but this budget has failed to deliver funds for one additional police officer. In fact, South Australians have been told that there will be no additional police officers for the next three years. That is an absolute disgrace.

However, on a more positive note, and, as a fair man, as members opposite would agree, I like to put both sides of the story. There will be some new police stations, but, unfortunately, no additional police to staff them. I am thankful that this government has committed to building a new police station in my electorate at Mount Barker. However, I want to put that into perspective, because I know that it was the former Liberal government's initiative. Before the election in February last year, the former tremendous Liberal government was looking to build a new police station in Mount Barker. It is another initiative that has been picked up like all the other former government's initiatives.

In the short time I have left, I want to focus on some of the critical needs in the electorate of Kavel. The first is Birdwood High School, which has worked tirelessly and shown huge commitment to the task. The Hon. Kate Reynolds in the other place resides in Mount Pleasant, and some of her children have attended Birdwood High School. She was a member of the review committee that looked at the overall needs of the Birdwood Primary School and the Birdwood High School. Funding for a feasibility study is now needed, and I referred to that last week in a speech I made to the house. Woodside Primary School is in the same position, and funding is required for a feasibility study.

The significant redevelopment of Oakbank Area School, again, was another initiative of the previous Liberal government. However, there are still some outstanding requirements, such as looking at the infrastructure in terms of the toilet facilities. I know a gentleman who would be about 65 years of age who attended that school, and he says that the present toilet facilities existed when he attended the school.

I want to turn now to the areas of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne. I have raised this issue previously in this house, but that region is the fastest growing in the state in terms of residential development. I met with some of the council officers last week, and they advised that there is significant population growth projected in the short term. Over the next three years, I believe that they are projecting an increase of about 4 000 additional residents.

New homes and new development obviously come back to the need for significant state government funding for infrastructure. I am referring in this respect to the second interchange needed in and out of Mount Barker. Transport SA and this government need to address that issue sooner or later,

because the problem will not go away; it will only become more urgent.

**Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey):** Another budget, another shuffle of the cards in the budget deck, fiscal responsibility, not enough money to go around, budget black holes, budget windfalls, and spend, spend, spend are the catchcries from the government and the opposition. The fact remains that South Australians want more than our tax base can deliver. Governments have a very limited capacity to raise the funds to provide the services to meet growing community expectations. The truth is that there is not enough money to go around, and both the government and the former government (the now opposition) know this.

With each budget, we see movement in the margins, and we see winners and losers. We do not seem to be building on a long-term vision to build capacity to meet community expectations, particularly in health and education. We have virtually nothing left to privatise. We are still paying dearly for the privatisation agenda of the former government via our electricity bills, and gas bills will be next. In reality, increasing cost pressures due to public sector wage increases without the corresponding revenue increases mean that less and less money is available for the provision of services. Our hospitals and schools have cost pressures that marginal revenue increases cannot hope to cover—for example, cost pressures in respect of electricity, insurance, emergency services and other levies, and public sector wage increases. Unless we can substantially increase revenue to cover these cost pressures, services will have to give.

The Economic Development Board has identified public sector efficiency as an issue that needs to be examined. However, efficiencies will go only so far, and the political will to implement far-ranging changes, such as outlined in the Menadue report on our health system, is hindered by public reaction to what may be perceived as a reduction in services. What we need is a government with the will to implement unpopular change for the long-term benefit of the state. What we need is a government that will be brave enough to tackle the very real issue of taxation reform in this state. We cannot expect future expenditure to be funded by a myriad of levies: a levy here, a levy there, we see them everywhere. Whilst the intention to ring-fence revenue for specific expenditure purposes seems attractive in the short term, inequities soon appear, and certain sectors of the community invariably feel aggrieved that they may be contributing disproportionately. It can also lead to an inability of government to have the flexibility to apply resources to meet changing community needs for the provision of services in the future.

In the absence of a complete review of South Australia's taxation base, I am, however, supportive of the levy that will see an increase in funding to the River Murray. However, it is disappointing to note that general revenue contribution to complement this necessary investment is lacking. For some time now I have been an advocate for the introduction of a national levy to fund the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling system. I believe that the federal government should take up water as a nation-building, future-securing exercise. Getting our national water infrastructure right is such an important long-term issue for this country that the federal government must show nation-building leadership on it.

I was disappointed that the federal government did not take the opportunity to use its large budget surplus to allocate funds to support the Living Murray process for restoration of environmental flows and sustainable management of our

waterways in the Murray-Darling Basin. A cappuccino and sandwich per week tax reduction was generally considered a token gesture on behalf of the federal government, yet it will cost the budget \$10 billion over four years—\$10 billion that could have been invested in getting water right for future generations.

In lieu of the fact that the federal government has not yet seen the merit of applying a national levy to support sustainable management and restoration of our waterways, I am supportive of the state government taking the lead. This levy will raise \$20 million for the River Murray. I hear the discontent in the community about the inequity of such a tax, particularly from people who see themselves as not reliant upon the River Murray. However, I still contest that every South Australian benefits from the productive capacity of this valuable resource—from recreational use to value-added commercial uses, to providing water to keep our city parks green, to watering our home gardens, and to providing government services right across the state out of the general revenue that is in part funded by the taxes this state collects from the wealth generated as a result of our irrigated industries.

In the vicinity of 4 200 irrigators already contribute substantially to the cost of rehabilitation of the system via investment in efficient water use technology on farm and infrastructure projects, such as the Loxton irrigation rehabilitation project, and Qualco Sunlands ground water control scheme and environmental levies. A new natural resource management levy is also proposed later this year. The community is demanding that more action should be taken to save our Murray, and it is now time for one and all to put their hand in their pocket and contribute. The future of South Australia depends on the future of the River Murray; therefore, it should be a shared statewide responsibility to fund the works required to secure this resource into the future.

Stormwater reuse will also require significant funding in the future. The city of Adelaide, with a population of over 1 million, relies on the River Murray for up to 90 per cent of its water supply in drought years. However, stormwater is a resource in itself, and Adelaide's total run-off is approximately equal to the total amount of water used in Adelaide. I am pleased that investigations are under way to determine how Adelaide and other areas can become less reliant on the Murray but, once again, I am concerned about our capacity to be able to afford the necessary investment to capture and use this stormwater in the future.

I want now to touch on the topic of regional impact statements and assessments. A total of 60 per cent of the state's export income comes from the regional areas. At the recent economic summit, it was recommended that the government target be to triple our exports over the next 10 years. How are we to do this if our regions are under-performing? How are we to do this if we continue to erode services to our regional industries? How are we to do this if government policies do not consider in detail the impacts of cost cutting in the regions? How are we to do this if our regional infrastructure and support mechanisms to industry continue to deteriorate?

A recent example was the potential move by Primary Industries to reduce the staff at the Loxton Research Centre yet again. A research officer was to be re-stationed at Struan, and this officer provided vital research assistance to farmers in the upper Mallee region and was also supported by an officer funded by GRDC. It was highly likely that the GRDC

officer would also be withdrawn as a result of this government decision. Apparently, the idea was to service the upper eastern Mallee by funding the Victorian government to supposedly provide much needed services from over the border at Walpeup.

The wisdom of this decision was questioned by the local agriculture bureau, so the Loxton Waikerie District Council and I took up the argument with the minister. Fortunately, commonsense prevailed and the officer has now been reinstated at Loxton. This highlights the problems associated with blanket savings targets imposed by looking only at the bottom line and not at what the costs to the state and communities might be if services are cut. This is particularly relevant in regional areas, as the political pain is often less if the cuts are imposed on small communities with limited capacity to brave the necessary political storm to have these decisions reversed.

Another example is the ill-conceived crown lands policy introduced at the last budget and, 12 months after this debacle commenced, the community is extremely angry and resentful towards the government because the process of developing this policy was so flawed. No regional impact statement was undertaken, and no consideration was given to the impact that this measure might have on regional communities.

The information provided by the department to the minister, and to the select committee that investigated the matter, was incomplete. Whilst the select committee process has resulted in some significant relief in the cost of free-holding perpetual leases, it has not relieved the anxiety and anger felt by the community over the injustice imposed by this policy. Imagine if we were to apply to southern suburbs householders an unbudgeted cost pressure of in excess of \$1 500 without notice and say, 'Tough. That's just the way that history has allocated the land.' I am sure that the outcry would be enormous. This debacle sends a very powerful message to the government: make sure you know the implications of your actions prior to imposing major cost imposts on communities and ensure that regional impact assessments are undertaken. The regions will not be taken for granted any longer. They have learned from the crown lands debacle that they need to rally and ensure that their voice is heard.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my concern that we cannot hope to meet the expectations of this state unless we can address the imbalance between our expenditure growth and our revenue base. Our capacity to fund services to meet growing community demand will only diminish if the government is prepared to tackle the unpopular issue of major tax reform. We cannot hope to achieve the goals, the expectation and the vision of our community unless we are prepared to tackle this very important issue.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I rise to speak to the budget, but I cannot support it because not only is it the worst budget that I have seen in the 13 years that I have been here: it is the worst budget in my living memory. It is an absolute disgrace when one considers the condition the state was left in by the previous government. I can understand that, last year, the first budget of the Labor government was tight and conservative, but there is no excuse to continue that policy and make it a lot worse.

I was very disappointed in the state budget, both for the state but more particularly for my electorate of Schubert. There was great expectation, particularly after Treasurer Foley had been saying that he would be guided by the

economic summit chaired by Robert Champion de Crespigny. Public expectation has been shattered. Not only is there meagre spending on education and health but the public has also been hit with a new tax.

Only token recognition was given of the Barossa Valley region as the powerhouse driving the state economy, and that is a totally indisputable fact. The only projects in my electorate to receive any recognition were \$400 000 for the Murray Valley Institute of TAFE (Barossa campus), for the construction of additional teaching facilities, and \$250 000 for the Kapunda Primary School, to upgrade and refurbish the stone heritage building and the redevelopment and upgrade of residential accommodation on that site. I was very pleased with the allocation to the Kapunda Primary School and the Nuriootpa TAFE, which at least have been recognised. The upgrade of the heritage building at Kapunda Primary School is to commence in February 2004 and is part of a larger allocation of \$2.2 million for this project.

However, I was disappointed that there was no mention, not even a comment, about the new hospital for the Barossa Health Service. I hoped there would be a mention, at least in relation to some money for planning and more preliminary work, subject to the hospital being built later, say in 2004, 2005 or even 2006. I note that the Minister for Health is in the house, and I welcome that. I am not picking on her personally, but with her visit to the area I felt sure that at least this project would advance to the next stage. However, I feel that I have let the people in the Barossa down. Something has gone desperately wrong.

I challenge the minister to find any hospital with worse facilities than this one. The minister was not shown the kitchen, the sewerage system or the airconditioning in the theatre, because she would have shut it down there and then. To top it off, the minister gave the hospital accreditation for standard of service, which was due because the people who work at that facility do a fantastic job. I cannot pay a higher tribute to these people, who enter a T Ford in the Formula 500 and win, because that is what it is.

I say very guardedly and very carefully that there will be an incident at that hospital. I only hope it is not a bad one. There will be an incident when the minister realises that not only does that kitchen serve the hospital but it also serves the whole community by providing for Meals on Wheels. Those meals come out of a facility that is way below standard. In fact, we dare not let the health inspectors near the place because they would have to give it a very black bill. I do not want to deal in scare tactics, but what does one do? I believe that I would be derelict in my duty as the local member not to try.

This problem has been going on for many years but in the last five or six years not one cent has been spent on this hospital because it was not worth it. What do we have now? A tragedy is waiting to happen, and incidents do occur in the Barossa. There was a terrible bus smash and the hospital was taxed to the limit. Angaston Hospital plays a pivotal role in a growing community. It is a community that is full of confidence and enthusiasm, but its hospital is basically an old house that has been renovated several times.

If the minister is not going to give us a new hospital, I suggest, first, that she keeps the health inspectors away and, secondly, that she sends in the repair gang to solve some of the problems in the kitchen and the airconditioning, not to mention the occupational health and safety problems of having three different levels in the hospital, the leaks, the wall covering and the carpet. I challenge the minister, as I

challenged departmental officers in the Public Works Committee: I want to see a priority list of hospitals in South Australia and I invite the minister to show me a worse one.

The Barossa Valley is delivering millions of dollars to this economy but the government cannot give its health service \$50 000 for ongoing planning. It does not rate even a mention. What do I tell the people of the Barossa? Let us consider the attention this region got from the previous government over eight years. The list is huge. All I can say to former premiers Dean Brown and John Olsen is, 'Thank you very much for the money delivered, because we returned that to the state tenfold.'

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Go and tell it to Beringer Blass, which from memory is spending approximately \$55 million; to Yalumba, which is spending approximately \$40 million; and to Orlando Wyndham, which is spending more than either of these. That is confidence and it is overseas money coming into South Australia. Yalumba try to send people here from interstate, particularly French-influenced people, urging them to live in the Barossa—not in Sydney or in Adelaide—and they get a precis about what it is like to live in the Barossa: the schools are excellent, it has a marvellous climate, but the health facilities are below standard. The minister points to the shadow minister. I had a commitment from the shadow minister, and it was being delivered. I am confident that, if we were still in government, we would be building that new hospital right now. At least the previous minister did something: he cleared the site and made it ready. What has this minister done? The previous minister undertook studies in relation to the facilities that would be required. What has this minister promised?

Mention has been made of a PPP. Several companies would be happy to join the government in a public private partnership, but it has not been offered—not a sound has been made about it. This is a blatant exercise, and I take it personally, of totally ignoring a very successful region of our state. I do not have answers for those who have asked questions, because the expectation was there. The minister has been there and I thank her for that. I do not blame her for this: I blame the terrible trio—the Premier, the Treasurer and the Leader of the House, Patrick Conlon. They are the three who make the decisions, and I am sure that the minister was not present when that triumvirate made its decisions.

I was in business before I came here, and some would say that I was reasonably successful. I did not inherit my wealth (admittedly I got a start), but I learnt in life that the way to encourage business is to promote it, to spend wisely. You do not cut off the money. I have known people who have stopped spending. They have gone through a period of abstinence and for three or four years they spend nothing. What happens is that the confidence you had is gone, and we have had a tremendous inertia in South Australia with respect to confidence.

Sir, when we are long retired from this place, pick up your year books of South Australia and look at the graphs. The graphs will show a peak in the year 2002, flattening in 2003 and falling in 2003 and 2004. I bet you, sir, on the finest red wine that the Barossa can produce, that that will be the case, because that is what this government is doing. It has totally pulled back on those things that are making this state great.

Members of the previous Liberal government were very proud of how we were stacking up against all other states in Australia. We were showing them a set of heels on all our business acumen and the confidence people had in us. So

many of the head offices came to South Australia. It was a phenomenal reversal of the situation that existed when we came to government in 1993. I know what I would do if I were the Treasurer: I would pick up in the same vein and run with the same story. But this Treasurer turns the tap off so tightly that it is screwed off the tank. He just cuts the supply, absolutely and totally. Sir, think back to 1993, 1994, 1995 (and you were here then), when the previous government was in office. We had as tough a Treasurer as the current one, the Hon. Stephen Baker. I received \$19.7 million for the road from Morgan to Burra in the second year that we were in government. Show me one project here that goes near that.

I am a member of the Public Works Committee. What has it done in 14 months? Not a thing. When I read the papers here, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I almost feel as though I am being dishonest: that I am taking pay for not doing the work. When I read this document, I wonder what is about to come. What is there? I sought advice this evening from a person who would certainly know his finances. He said that this government has spent all its money on recurrent expenditure, and that is probably the case. It has spent a lot of money on recurrent expenditure, because it certainly does not have the money to lay out on capital public works. We need to have a healthy capital works budget. We have a Public Works Committee that is here to do that job—to scrutinise the projects.

Mr Champion de Crespigny recommended that the ceiling for works to come to the Public Works Committee be lifted to \$10 million. I wonder about that wisdom. We are getting no projects now. Rather than lift it from \$4 million to \$10 million, I suggest that it go from \$4 million back to \$1 million. At least then we might get some work to do. But I do not see anything coming through in the pipeline.

I want to change tack and talk about another pet subject of mine. I am very lucky to have one of the finest public schools in the state in my electorate. I know that this government champions very strongly public schools over private. I have in my electorate the second largest country public school, the Nuriootpa High School. We all know how famous this school is, with its wine education program. It is renowned Australia-wide—in fact, world wide—for what it has achieved. It has been doing this for 30 years. I certainly have been lobbying very strongly to the current government about building some adequate facilities to house this magnificent wine program. The minister has visited. Indeed, she was there a few weeks ago, and she was very impressed. These wines are world-class. Not only is it a great curriculum, but also they make a world-class product.

In the last 10 years many other schools in Australia, including private schools, have come along, picked up the curriculum activity, copied it, and are doing their own thing—of course, with adequate funds. The private schools are being funded by private enterprise, particularly wineries. One such school, the Faith School, which is just up the road from Nuriootpa High School, has a fantastic wine education facility. It is brand new; it is wonderful. I am very proud of it. But when I think that most of the ideas came from the public school, I wonder what this government is doing in recognition of its own school, that is, the public school. I just despair. The plans are there, and everything has been done to attract the finance. The winemaker at the school is a teacher, Kevin Hoskin, who last year was the winemaker of the year in the Barossa Valley.

The whole community is very supportive of this school. I know that the school has applied through the capital works

assistance scheme, hoping for some money—even for one-third or two-thirds of the project. I know, too, that private companies are prepared to put in extra funds to back this facility. I mention companies such as Beringer Blass, Penfolds, Vinpac and AQ, to name just a few. They will help. But the government has to give a direction. One cannot expect private enterprise to come on board in a public school unless the government provides, first, some direction and, secondly, some token finance towards it. But that is what happened; we have gone nowhere. I despair.

At this point in time, when the Australian economy is booming and the South Australian economy is doing better than most, this Treasurer seems to be hell-bent on just slowing it all down and changing the direction of the economy—putting the money back into the public sector, and backing projects such as establishing two ministerial offices, one at Port Augusta and one at Murray Bridge. And guess who gets to man the office at Port Augusta? The failed Labor candidate. I thought we were past that. I thought there were more important issues than this. I thought that the Treasurer would be another Bracks or another Carr. There is very little separating these sorts of premiers from their predecessors in Liberal governments. But this Treasurer has not taken that trick; no way. He does not see it. He is still tied by the old dogma of the past. I never thought that it would happen, but I believe that we are going straight back whence we came, with or without the State Bank. Governments get desperate and deliver documents such as this. All that matters is image and projections in the media. I totally despair.

In his report, Robert de Crespigny recommended that the government should even borrow money—and I am happy for the government to borrow money to put towards the right projects. We know what they are—projects that return to the state; projects that will deliver back to the people of South Australia. The management of Orlando Wyndham is pouring millions of dollars into this state—and not just into its own infrastructure: it backs every public event that we want to hold, particularly our major events, as the previous minister alongside me will tell members. They are really pouring it into South Australia. And the French people come here—

**Mrs Hall:** They are great corporate citizens.

**Mr VENNING:** They are great corporate citizens. And what sort of message are we sending them? I heard what the member for Chaffey said a few minutes ago: that we do not have enough money to go around. In some ways, that is correct. But we have to do the same as a farmer does: generate your money, and get out there and be entrepreneurial. You get out there and run with private enterprise; you get out there and promote them; and you get out there and do your public and private partnerships. But what have we heard? Only that we are building new police stations with PPPs. Where are all the other PPPs taking place? We could have had a great PPP with the Barossa hospital. There has been nothing; not a sound. The minister might surprise me and say, 'Ivan, we are still planning this and I will come up with a PPP in a couple of week's time.' I live in hope. The minister could surprise me. That would be worth a very fine bottle of Barossa red, but I think my Barossa red is quite safe for the time being.

But I do despair. I am not a trained economist, but I have learnt in days gone by how to use one's money wisely, how to promote excellence, and how to encourage this economic inertia that we have. If we lose it, it will take years to regenerate. After all, we have to remember that we are a small state. We are a small cousin of the Victorians and the

New South Welshmen, particularly their wine industries. Where is all the wine bottled in Australia? Where is all the premium wine coming from? Where is the largest, newest glass factory in Australia? It is all right here.

What have we done about it? What are we doing about it? Well, the message we got from this budget and from this Treasurer is, 'We're going to milk you dry and we'll give nothing in return.' We know what this is about. The Treasurer has turned off the tap ready for the big bang budget in the year after next. Well, by then it may be too late. The graph will be dipping—and try to turn it the other way; it is almost impossible. It is a sad day, but it is not too late. The Treasurer has the money, and he should release it into those key projects.

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

**Mr VENNING:** The Treasurer said that I am a big spender; maybe so, but you spend it in the right directions for the right reasons.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before calling the member for Mitchell, the chair did not want to interrupt the member for Schubert in full flight, but thumping the desk repeatedly may cause angst to the Hansard staff. However, I do not want to spoil the colour of the house. The member for Mitchell.

**Mr VENNING:** I apologise.

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** Speaking to this budget, I take a very different view from the member for Schubert, and I am less of a percussionist! It seems that the honourable member is criticising the budget for being too much like an old-style Labor budget. I think that nothing could be further from the truth. It is a very modest budget in a way. It is a pedestrian budget, one might say, given the very slight increases in spending on health and education—admirable in themselves but not particularly impressive. There is some repayment of debt. I am not sure whether the case has been made out for the preference of that measure over additional spending in health and education and other areas that involve improving the lives of people.

I call it a hollow-log budget, because it is quite apparent what this Treasurer and this government are doing: they are building up a surplus—that is shown in the forward estimates—so that in 2005, the pre-election budget, the Treasurer will be able to come in, dressed as Santa Claus, and throw lollies around to all the marginal seats and in terms of capital works programs, etc. So, somehow, I think that by the time of the next election the surplus will have evaporated for political reasons.

I want to comment on only a couple of particular areas, one of which relates to the River Murray. Of course, I applaud any additional expenditure that will assist in solving the problems of the River Murray, but what do we really have in this budget? We have an extra \$20 million a year to cover such a wide range of problems as are entailed with the river. The so-called River Murray levy is clearly just a trick: it is another way of imposing a new tax. It is a flat tax, not a progressive tax, and that rankles with me. It means that people, whether they are well off or poorly off, end up paying the same amount; whether they have a \$1 billion business or a \$100 000 business, they pay the same amount, and that is regrettable. The main point is that it is simply another tax.

Calling it the River Murray levy is simply a clever way of marketing it, because there is such public sympathy for the plight of the river and such widespread understanding of what it means for us socially and economically. The fact that the levy is hypothecated to be spent on River Murray expenditure

is, as I say, a trick, because the money can and should be spent from general revenue. By and large, treasurers frown on hypothecated taxes. It is not really good policy but, in this case, it is being done just to give a spin, a marketing advantage, to the imposition of a new tax.

I will say something about spending on rehabilitation of prisoners. Again, this is an area where every additional dollar is to be applauded, so it is great to see an extra \$6 million a year budgeted for rehabilitation of prisoners, including those prisoners who have committed sexual offences. However, I was grossly disappointed to hear the Premier's comments just a short time ago—before the budget was announced—that he was going to put the wood on correctional services and the Parole Board to make sure that this rehab works, otherwise the money will be withdrawn. He said that during a radio interview.

There are a couple of points about that: first, there is a suggestion of the government improperly influencing the deliberations of the Parole Board, which is highly objectionable to anyone who has respect for the Parole Board or the principle of separation of powers and respect for the independence of quasi judicial bodies in our system of government. Secondly, the suggestion is made that if some smart results are not seen in the short term the money will be taken away, and that is an utterly regrettable approach to the problem. The other point to be made about that is that we look utterly insincere, in terms of reducing long-term crime by changing prisoner behaviour, when we compare ourselves to the state of Victoria.

The spending in Victoria on the same sorts of programs is around \$335 million per year. Now, that is taking the problem seriously. Even allowing for the fact that Victoria is three or four times larger than South Australia, depending on how one measures it, one can see that its investment in prisoner rehabilitation is vastly more than ours. Victoria is serious about reducing long-term crime, reducing reoffending rates, so that it does not have to build more prisons. At the end of the day, it is not just about reducing crimes so that fewer people are bashed and raped: it is also, from the point of view of economic rationalists, bureaucrats and good managers of the state's finances, to avoid the need to build further prisons.

In this budget, consideration is given to the building of a new women's prison, a new juvenile detention centre, an increased capacity in our male prisons, and I think I saw the design of a business case for building a new adult male prison at some time in the future. So, you can go down that track and spend hundreds of millions of dollars on building new prisons over five or 10 years, or you can invest that money now and make sure that reoffending rates are cut drastically in five or 10 years and obviate the need for those additional prisons. It is pretty obvious to me which makes more sense.

But, of course, such a rational approach, such a caring approach, conflicts directly with the public relations exercise, which is the government's so-called law and order campaign. It is not about law and order. None of the measures the government has introduced, either through legislation or in this budget, add to law and order. They do not reduce the fear of people in relation to crime. They do nothing but add to the fear of people and are claimed to be the protectors of people in a false way. That whole issue is best characterised as crime reduction because that is what people really want. That is what it is really about and, if this government were serious about it, it would be wholeheartedly committed to implement-

ing appropriate rehabilitation programs for offenders in our prisons.

With those comments about specific areas and my general comments about the budget, I will conclude but, before I do so, I note that the journalist Terry Plane, writing in the *City Messenger*, made a number of similar points. In relation to my comment that it was a hollow log budget, Mr Plane had this to say:

It's take and take, not give and take, and it makes it look as though this government is playing the age-old game of hitting us early in their term and stashing away the dollars so they can ease up in the budget before the next state election. They still think we are mugs.

In my opinion, that sums up the situation very aptly and very concisely. Mr Plane also in that article of 4 June makes the point that the so-called River Murray levy is a good cause but a bad tax, and particularly so because it is a flat tax which means that rich and poor alike pay the same amount of money, thus offending one of the basic principles with which taxes should comply, as far as I am concerned.

In conclusion, I say that it is a pedestrian budget. It allows the government to stash money away for the pre-election budget in two years' time. There are very limited advances indeed in the critical areas of health and education. In that sense, it is very disappointing, particularly as it is labelled a Labor budget—

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** You predicted when you resigned that there were going to be huge cuts in health, and that is exactly what has occurred.

**Mr HANNA:** The deputy leader interjects, and I am grateful for his interjection.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I start by saying that this is a cruel and heartless budget, and I back up what the member for Mitchell has just said. I remind the house that it was the member for Mitchell who said, when he resigned, that, in fact, there would be significant cuts in health in this coming budget, and I will outline those shortly. But I want to explain first why it is such a cruel and heartless budget.

There have been effective cuts and, therefore, reduced services in the area of health; there have been cuts in education; there is no additional assistance whatsoever for child protection; the most vulnerable people within our community are left absolutely high and dry (and I will come to that shortly): there are no extra police, despite the demand within the community for additional police; there is no help for pensioners in terms of increased concessions; and, of course, once again, self-funded retirees have missed out. That is one side of the ledger.

On the other side of the ledger, this budget imposes significant increases in taxes and charges, particularly because of the rise in property values and the lack of relief given by the government in terms of adjustment of the rates in the dollar for those taxes and charges. There is, of course, the major new tax, and there is no need for that tax at all. The money for the River Murray could and should have been taken out of the existing surplus within this budget. And, of course, new significant charges and taxes are imposed on motor vehicles.

So, literally hundreds of thousands of people are caught in the cost increases of this budget with no relief, and a reduction in services to go with it. That is why it can only be described as a cruel and heartless budget. So, I endorse what

the member for Mitchell said, and I think people need to understand just how heartless this is.

I highlight, and I briefly want to go back to, what it was like more than eight years ago when the Liberal government came to power. We inherited a budget deficit of \$350 million in our first budget from the Bannon-Arnold government, whereas this government has inherited a surplus from the former Liberal government. We inherited a huge, unfunded liability for WorkCover of over \$300 million, and we wrote it off. We inherited a huge debt of the South Australian Housing Trust, and we wrote it off. And we inherited a massive \$3 500 million unfunded liability for superannuation in the state for which the former Labor government was not paying off \$1 in terms of covering that unfunded liability.

I wish to come to the quick overview of what this budget means in health terms. The first point I make is that this budget means that there will be significant cuts in health services, in the metropolitan area and in the country, in hospitals and in community health services, and in the very important areas of community health and preventive health. The operating budget of the Department of Human Services has increased by a mere \$75 million, compared to the increase last year of \$106 million—so there was a bigger increase last year than this year, even though inflation is higher this year. But, in the last Liberal government the increase in the departmental budget was \$213 million—approximately three times the increase that has been given this year.

In fact, if you look at the percentage increase, there is only a 2.4 per cent increase in funding for the Department of Human Services and, of course, the main expenditure—the overwhelming expenditure—in that area, is health. That 2.4 per cent will not cover inflation, let alone the 4 per cent to 6 per cent salary increases that have already been decided in terms of the employees—the doctors; nurses, in particular, who have had the biggest percentage increase; and many other staff within the department. So that increase will go less than half way towards even covering wage increases this year, let alone other inflators in the medical area. And it is generally acknowledged that the medical inflator is around 5.5 per cent to 6 per cent. So, members can see that we have fallen a long way short of that with an increase of only 2.4 per cent.

So, I am able to say that this budget will mean even greater cuts than have occurred over the last 12 months. I know, and members need only to look at the budget documents to see, the extent to which there have been very significant cuts over the last year. There have been longer delays in emergency departments: a much higher percentage of people who are critically ill who need to be seen within 10 minutes have not been seen within the 10-minute standard; and a much higher percentage of emergency cases who need to be seen within 30 minutes have not been seen within that time limit.

The next issue I highlight is the extent to which health has been downgraded as a priority. We heard the rhetoric before, during and since the election campaign from the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for Health, and how they weep that some other area must be cut to put the money into health. The reality is that this budget has a smaller percentage of the funds going into health than did the last Liberal budget—24.7 per cent in the last Liberal government budget, 24.1 per cent in this budget under Labor and 24.1 per cent in the first Labor budget last year. So, all the rhetoric that we hear time after time tires and sickens the people of South

Australia because they know it is absolutely dishonest. It is the great lie of this Labor government: it has reduced the priority for health: it has reduced the proportion of the state budget going towards health.

The third point I make about the state budget is that, despite all the pre-budget releases about putting extra money into employing more nurses and doctors for our hospitals, the budget documents reveal no change in staffing levels at all. The staff in the hospitals throughout the state amount to 22 800 people—as it was last year, and it is projected to be that again this year. Again, it is a major lie of this Labor government. It makes such outrageous claims and has no intention of following them through. I look at the Department of Human Services and find where FAYS sits. Again, there is no change in staffing levels at all, and that was revealed on radio very tellingly this morning by the CEO of the Department of Human Services, Mr Jim Birch, who acknowledged that there is no extra staff at all for child protection. The fact is that there is a real cut in services and expenditure for this health budget.

Dealing with capital works, I heard the member for Schubert talk about the need for a new hospital in the Barossa Valley. This past year in the capital works budget the minister underspent by \$11 million, and that money has now been lost and will be clutched back by Treasury, and the hospitals will miss out. We have a health minister who cannot even organise and get a capital works program in place to make sure she spends the money allocated by the Treasurer at the beginning of the year. It is an appalling indictment to have \$11 million unspent on the projections so far, and it may go further.

Let us look at where the money has not been spent. With the Murray Bridge Hospital—in the electorate of the member for Hammond—\$2.9 million failed to be spent. The money was taken away from the Millicent aged care facility. The Margaret Tobin Mental Health facility had \$8.5 million committed to it at the beginning of the year, but the government failed to spend it. The mental health facility at the Repatriation General Hospital failed to have \$2.6 million spent on it. The \$11 million could have gone a long way towards building approximately half the new hospital in the Barossa Valley, but instead it has all been lost because of the incompetence of the Minister for Health—it has gone back to the clutches of the Treasurer.

I refer to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment, involving stages 2 and 3. We heard during the election campaign that the people of the western suburbs have been waiting too long. I quote what the minister said in a press release on 7 July last year:

People in the western region have been waiting too long. . .

She is referring to stages 2 and 3 of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The hoax is that last year in the budget funds were allocated for that work to at least start in terms of planning. To quote last year's budget document:

Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment stages 2 and 3: commencement September 2002—

that is almost nine months ago—

completion, September 2007—

and they allocated \$500 000 to that. These budget documents showed that they did not spend one dollar of the \$500 000 allocated for stages 2 and 3. The budget documents for this year refer to exactly the same project and state:

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment stages 2 and 3: completion due June 2009.

That is a delay of two years. When I revealed that on Sunday, this government had the gall and dishonesty to go out and claim that I was misquoting the facts. I was simply quoting their own budget documents, which reveal a delay of two years. Now the completion will not occur until June 2009. We see that the cost has blown out from \$41.6 million last year to \$60 million this year, so there has been a cost blow-out of approximately \$19 million, and we find that \$900 000 has been allocated this year towards this grand project. I found out last night that in fact it has not even gone out to tender for the architects, engineers or other professional people who will do the design work for stages 2 and 3, let alone the design work, which will take 12 to 18 months to complete, actually commencing, prior to coming before the Public Works Committee and then going to tender. It is a complete hoax that this government has inflicted on the people of the western suburbs of Adelaide, saying that it would get on and build this hospital when it has delayed it by two years on the time frame put down by the former government and not spent the money allocated for that project.

I turn now to FAYS and child protection. I heard with interest Jim Birch's comments this morning. Just 24 hours before the budget was introduced there was a budget leak that said two things. First, there was a firm announcement that there would be more than \$3 million for FAYS to employ 40-plus extra staff. That information was leaked to the media, and at the same time it was claimed that there would be \$60 million for child protection. The budget documents show that this year \$88.1 million is being spent on FAYS, which is less than the Liberal Government spent (\$89.3 million) on FAYS two years ago. So, there has been a budget cut from what the Liberals spent two years ago. Last year it was cut from \$89.3 million under the Liberals down to \$84.9 million, as part of the \$56 million cut in the social justice portfolio. Jim Birch this morning said on ABC radio:

So we're not cutting FAYS staff, but we are not actually increasing them.

That was his defence—that they were not cutting them but were not increasing them. Last week we heard all this garbage about how an extra 40 FAYS staff would be employed. In the Department of Human Services there are no extra staff at all. Jim Birch this morning went on to say—and I can understand why they did not put up the minister, because at least Jim Birch came out with the truth:

I mean, the budget papers certainly show that there is less funds for FAYS this year.

In other words, there is a real cut. He was asked by Matthew Abraham:

Well, if there's less funds then it is a cut, isn't it?

Mr Birch said:

Well, it's a cut certainly in the budget papers.

It is a shocking indictment on this government that we find there are cuts in health and now cuts in the very area the government claims it is funding. Despite having Layton QC carry out a full investigation, all of which has come to nought in terms of funds, we find that there will be no extra staff whatsoever.

I now turn to concessions, bearing in mind that in the last year pensioners in this state have found that they have had to face a very substantial rate increase, particularly in council rates, because of the rise in property values. They have had to pay higher water and sewerage rates because of the rise in property values of about 20 per cent, as well as having to pay

higher rates for electricity. Now we find in this budget that they will have to pay a substantial amount more not only to register but also to run a car because of the very substantial additional charges being imposed in connection with compulsory third party insurance.

However, there is not one extra dollar in funding in terms of concessions for pensioners. Twelve months ago, this Labor government actually took away the \$20 per year promised and funded by the previous government for electricity concessions for pensioners. This government took it away, but promised all sorts of things. It is interesting that the government also promised that leading up to this budget. I remember seeing one of the Labor members being interviewed, where he tried to imply that this budget would deal with the issue of concessions. However, not one dollar of additional funding is contained in the budget, and, to rub the salt into the wound of those people on low incomes, they refused to give those same concessions to self-funded retirees.

An agreement reached by the previous Liberal government and the federal government and funded in the budget was due to be introduced by 1 July, but now for the second year it is being denied to self-funded retirees. Through no fault of their own, these are the people who have borne the brunt, in terms of their income over the last year, of the crash in overseas and Australian share markets. These people are being driven into poverty by this Labor government's increasing taxes and rates. However, they receive no concessions even though their income has dropped dramatically. Many of those people have had their income halved in the last year, but they have received no concessions whatsoever.

I highlight how cruel and heartless this budget is. It will cut health services, and it will not protect the children most at risk in our community. Children at risk who being left in their home because of the failure of this government to employ more staff in the FAYS area to protect them. The damnation that this budget will bring on this government will be shown over the next 12 months, and we will see the magnitude of these cuts and the extent to which essential services are not being provided.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

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

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (24)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Caica, P.
Ciccarello, V.	Conlon, P. F. (teller)
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hanna, K.	Key, S. W.
Koutsantonis, T.	Lomax-Smith, J. D.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
O'Brien, M. F.	Rankine, J. M.
Rau, J. R.	Snelling, J. J.
Stevens, L.	Such, R. B.
Thompson, M. G.	Weatherill, J. W.
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

NOES (16)

Brindal, M. K.	Brown, D. C. (teller)
----------------	-----------------------

NOES (cont.)

Buckby, M. R.	Chapman, V. A.
Evans, I. F.	Goldsworthy, R. M.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.	Kerin, R. G.
McFetridge, D.	Meier, E. J.
Penfold, E. M.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H.

PAIR(S)

Rann, M. D.	Matthew, W. A.
Hill, J. D.	Brokenshire, R. L.

Majority of 8 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ABOLITION OF TIME LIMIT FOR PROSECUTION OF CERTAIN SEXUAL OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL 2003

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mrs HALL (Morialta):** If there is one word that describes Labor's second budget it is 'spin'. It was the end game in delivery because of the relentless program of pre-releases by the Treasurer and his ministerial colleagues to target and to extract the most calculated publicity, favourable headlines and spin about Labor's programs. It goes without saying that these targeted exclusive budget stories and leaks were the good news stories of spin. The bad tidings and broken promises were left for the end game, in the hope that they might be submerged under the Treasurer's plans and claims for perfection in his ministry. This is a budget of broken promises, and the community is beginning to feel a sense of betrayal. The next 12 months will fill out the government's report card of the 2003-04 budget, and we will see how it will undermine the confidence in the government not only of the community but also of the business community, particularly as it relates to future business investment. No-one can have faith or confidence in a Treasurer who boasts (and, in fact, wears as a badge of honour) that he has the moral fibre to go back on his promises. He has the recipe to do that—one that he has cooked up, and we have seen so often when he boasts that he can do it because he can. This Labor government:

1. fiddles the numbers of a surplus and claims the reduction of debt because of the savings of the previous Liberal government;
2. fails to meet its capital program;
3. preaches about its goal of a AAA rating that originally collapsed because of Labor's bizarre financial management that involved the demise of the State Bank;
4. in the 2002 election promised no tax increases, but this time has delivered tax increases;
5. introduces a new flat tax to source funds for the River Murray, completely ignoring the inequity imposed by regressive taxation; and
6. talks about its priorities of health, education and law and order, completely ignoring one of the most important priorities for any community, that is, employment.

A government that is facile and hypocritical to front up to parliament with this sort of record will depend, inevitably, on media hype and manipulation to survive. As to dependence, the members for Fisher, Mount Gambier and Hammond (all Independents supporting the government in office and, therefore, as responsible for its policies and deficiencies as any of the government's hard-headed Labor supporters) must stand responsible for these policies.

I now return to the first of my original points, that is, fiddling the numbers of a surplus and claiming a reduction of debt. Last year, the Treasurer tried to create the fictional black hole by putting into his first budget a big surplus of \$313 million. We know how that surplus was created: it was the result of the accounting fiddle well acknowledged by a former New South Wales auditor-general.

Our Liberal government had budgeted for about \$300 million to be put into the budget from SAFA and SAAMC in 2001-02. So, this Treasurer fiddled the accounts by reversing that decision to try to create the fictional black hole for the last Liberal budget and put it into his first Labor budget. At long last, we know that that was recognised for the fiddle it clearly was. That was bad enough but, fortunately, it is now well recognised.

In relation to point No. 2, that is, that this budget fails to meet its capital program, we understand that there is an underspend of capital works by more than \$100 million, or around 23 per cent, as has been mentioned by a number of my colleagues. Our so-called 'priority areas' of health and education have also missed out: health and our hospitals by at least \$10 million, and education and our schools by at least \$7 million.

Point No. 3 refers to the government's preaching about the goal of a AAA rating, never mentioning why and how we lost it in the first place, namely, Labor's bizarre financial management, which resulted, as we know too sadly, in the demise of the State Bank and a state debt in excess of \$9 billion. We understand very well that the Liberal government's financial management improved our state's credit rating from AA, which the Labor Party achieved, to AA+, and set in place the foundations for achieving the AAA rating in the medium to long term. However, we know that Treasury advisers—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation. I cannot hear the member for Morialta.

**Mrs HALL:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. We know that Treasury has already advised that achieving a AAA rating will not lead to a significant reduction in the state's interest costs. It may improve the perception of our state to some international investors, and the Liberal Party supports policies that are designed to achieve a AAA credit rating in the medium to long term.

I refer to my original point No. 4, that is, the 2002 election promise of no tax increases—the now infamous false promise of the former leader of the opposition, now the Premier, on ABC radio in January 2002. He said:

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

We now recognise what that promise meant—that is, as I mentioned in point No. 5, the introduction of a new flat tax to source funds for the River Murray. As so many speakers have already discussed, this budget is one of broken promises. It is mean, it is tricky, and it announced the Labor's new water tax of \$30 each year per household and \$135 each year

on non-residential properties. As we know, that covers clubs, businesses and schools.

As I have already said, we know that it is a flat tax and a regressive tax, with no fairness being applied to capacity to pay. In addition, as has already been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, not one extra cent has been allocated for buyback—again, clear spin and rhetoric, but no dollars commitment, despite a genuine expectation by the South Australian community.

As to flat taxes, I happened to browse through the Labor Party policy and platform for government. Point No. 38 states that Labor will ensure the tax system is:

Progressive and fair, so that those on low and medium incomes do not face an excessive tax burden. Taxes should also be fair in the sense that people in the same or similar circumstances pay the same or a similar amount of tax.

In the Labor Party's 2000 platform and constitution, point No. 14 states:

Labor will ensure that the tax base is as comprehensive as possible, consistent with the achievement of other objectives in a way that ensures that all sections of the community pay their fair share and no-one is disproportionately burdened.

I wonder how many members of the Labor Party have bothered to read their own platform and their own constitution, because clearly flat taxes contravene it, as do regressive tax policies, and that is what it has just introduced.

Point 6: when the Labor Party budget talks about its health, education and law and order priorities, it completely ignores, in my view, one of the most important priorities for any community, and that is employment. The budget says this is a government that is committed to 'managing the state's finances responsibly while continuing to direct expenditure to priority areas'. It claims health and education, but the budget papers show graphically not only an underspend in capital works but a decrease in percentage spend in both health and education. The Liberal Party's last budget spent 24.7 per cent on health. Under Labor, that spend has been reduced to 24.1 per cent. The dollars expended by the Labor Party do not even keep up with inflation, and that is a disgrace.

The Generational Health Review promotes removing more than \$100 million a year from public hospitals. In this year's health budget there is no money to employ intensive care medical specialists, cardiac specialists, extra nursing staff, specialist intensive care nursing staff or to upgrade the skills of existing nursing staff. We have a new intensive care unit with no staff and no patients, and there has been no commitment to provide funds to open the eight new coronary care beds. The list goes on.

From health we move to education, another so-called priority area. Once again, the spin has gone mad, because it is not supported by facts and figures. Like health, we have a government that promises to provide more teachers and better schools, so it provides \$52 million extra with a wages bill that is going to increase by \$63 million. We have a percentage drop in education from 25.2, spent by the last Liberal government, to a 24.3 per cent spend by this Labor government.

Nowhere in this budget do we see employment listed as a priority. Yet we see buried on the last page of the Budget at a Glance (page 20) the economic forecasts based on some fairly key assumptions, and they are the assumptions that underpin this and future budgets. It is very depressing to see the predictions in gross state product, that is real growth, from 3¼ per cent in 2002-03 to 2½ per cent in 2003-04, and

it tapers off at 2¾ in 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07. The horrifying figure to me is the employment growth projections and forecasts from 2¾ per cent in 2002-03, dramatically falling to 1 per cent in this year's budget, and the projections for 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 stabilise at 1 per cent. That is not good news for the community in our state.

I move from employment forecasts and the predicted lack of growth to the Treasurer's statement, and I quote from his budget speech, as follows:

This budget will encourage business and investment.  
This budget builds on our infrastructure.  
It cuts government waste.  
It allows us to lower our debt.  
And it protects us should hard times return.

No-one can take those words seriously. The business community should be concerned, as should the general community. The Treasurer says that the government shares the goals of Robert Champion de Crespigny and the Economic Development Board. The Economic Development Board is already on record saying that this is South Australia's last chance. I would venture to say that that is not a good message for further and future investment. It is a very pessimistic message, especially in the context of what this budget delivers.

There are many issues and causes of concern to members on this side of the house, and I understand on both sides of the house, particularly the multimillions of dollars for the Treasurer's 'Power Bridge'. However, my view is that it is a most unfriendly economic document. It is very high taxing. It does not address in investment terms one of the state's most significant growth industries and one of the most significant employers across the state, and that is the tourism, leisure and hospitality industry. The slashing of the tourism budget, as well articulated by the member for Waite, for the second consecutive year, should be condemned for the short-sighted punishment that it has inflicted on such a successful growth industry.

What has happened to the much troubled Adelaide Airport and its future? This Premier has already said that he had it fixed. We know that the collapse of Ansett Airlines set back the time lines for the agreement and delivery of a new facility, but there are no dollars in this budget for that vital piece of state infrastructure. There is only the reference on page 10.54 in the budget documents, and it is just a target. There are no dollars; there are no time lines. I have no doubt it will be announced time and time again, particularly when the Premier believes that he wants another front page. The travelling public has every right to be very cynical about the constant spin of this Labor government. We all know that we have to have a new airport facility. When is this government going to deliver?

One of the issues that shows the absolute hypocrisy of this government and the spin it constantly puts on issues is PPP. In opposition, the Labor Party and its union base constantly attacked our Liberal government for its program of privatisation and public private partnerships, despite the fact that we had to address the scandalously high debt left from the bank debacle, left by Labor, and despite the fact that the then shadow treasurer, now Treasurer, made it quite clear in private that he approved our action. Now we must challenge the tricky and sneaky nature of this government and its budget, which is continuing down the policy path of PPP.

The Labor Party has changed the introductory paragraphs of its program for PPP. It has not changed the objectives or the guidelines. It is sheer hypocrisy. The electors of Morialta

have a particular interest in one of the so-called programs of PPP, and I refer to the Capital Investment Statement, where the Treasurer says:

The government is investigating a number of such programs, including:

- a new women's prison
- a new youth detention centre to replace the facility at Magill
- new regional police stations and courts
- a new state swimming centre.

If it can be shown that these projects can deliver value for money outcomes, they will proceed as PPPs.

What does that mean? Does it mean that, if they do not deliver what it says, they will not proceed? I find extraordinary the qualification 'if it can be shown that these projects deliver value for money outcomes, they will proceed'. But if one contrasts that qualification with the Treasurer's statement on page 7 of his budget speech, one sees quite a different picture.

There are many issues of concern, of cuts and confusion in this budget. My view is that it is pessimistic about the future. It has absolutely no sparkle. The Leader of the Opposition outlined and challenged the direction, the facts, the hype, the priorities and the figures contained in this budget. It is a budget of broken promises and of spin. I trust that the Labor government will be judged under the report card for 2003-04 when it is marked by the electorate. A budget should be a document with a vision for economic development and growth; it should be a document of trust, credibility and optimism. I believe that the South Australian community, the South Australian electorate, deserves better.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** What we have here is semipiternal prestidigitation. For those who came in late, that means 'endless sleight of hand'. What we have is a document that has been rejigged and reshuffled, and I think the state has been shafted. Open and honest government is what we were promised. Instead, we got measured, meticulous media management. These lovely little leaks were coming out—it was all looking rosy, the state would go ahead in leaps and bounds. But, unfortunately, what do we have? We have reannouncement, re-runs, reviews and reports over and over again. We have had summit after summit. We have had the Drugs Summit, the Economic Development Summit and the Bushfire Summit, and in July we are having an Arts Summit. I guarantee that there will be more and more summits—more and more hills to climb for the people of South Australia.

The Treasurer said that this budget is a Labor budget, with Labor compassion. That is not what Terry Plane thought. Terry Plane said that it looks like spin without substance. The Treasurer said on *Stateline* last Friday, 'You don't frame budgets with an eye to an election.' There are more hollow logs here than those poor dying trees along the edge of the Murray. The \$30 that will be put aside by every household, and the \$135 by every business, in South Australia will go a very small way to fixing the Murray. When one looks at the funding that has been put aside for the Murray, one will see that there is very little that has come from this government. More is required. I just hope that the government has the courage to allocate more money.

Let us look at the Premier's agenda. The agenda of this Premier is, first, getting back into government in 2006 (and do not ever mistake that); and, secondly, showing the Liberals up as poor economic managers. It will fail on both accounts. Legislation is secondary to survival with this government. Where have we seen this before? Don Dunstan did it all. This is just another re-run—and I am surprised that the film

festivals we are getting are not re-runs. As the 'marvel from Kavel' (the member for Kavel) said, this is like *Groundhog Day*: back to the future. It is a re-run. The Economic Development Board is just a re-run of the Industrial Development Commission. We are getting re-run after re-run. Let us just look at this budget: let us see what has been given and what has been snatched away.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** The Attorney-General asked, 'Isn't there anything good in this budget?' Members will know that there is. There is one thing that I think is absolutely fantastic in this budget. I am absolutely over the moon about this being included in the budget, that is, the trams. I am so excited about getting the trams modernised—the new light rail. It is to start at my 'paradise' down the Bay and it will come back into town and go all the way up to North Terrace—and, if the member for Norwood is really lucky, and the government is really courageous, it might even end up going out to Norwood.

**Mr Scalzi:** What about Hartley?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** And out to Hartley. As I have said in previous speeches, if this government has the courage of its convictions and wants to make this state really prosper and be shown to be a state that is moving forward, it will be moving towards light rail. Some 2 million plus users use the little old tram line down to the Bay and back. Imagine if new light rail is put in there, new trams—with the 'glam' trams; there will be over 10 000 a year, if not 20 000. Who knows? There will be more and more. The sad part, though, is that there are to be some cuts. There were cuts of \$10 million in transport last year and another \$22 million this year. Some 170 staff will go from Transport SA, 32 from TransAdelaide.

I travelled on the TransAdelaide train to Noarlunga centre last weekend for the opening of the Office for the Southern Suburbs. I congratulate the government on something that is as good as the Office for the Southern Suburbs. But let us just see some action: let us just not see the rhetoric and the re-runs, let us not just dupe the people of the southern suburbs. They deserve more from this government than they have received so far.

When I reached Noarlunga centre, the rail line stopped. There was an announcement that Metro tickets are to be extended down to the southern suburbs. That is another good thing that this government has done. But we need the buses to get down there at the moment. Let us hope that light rail—even heavy rail—goes down there to improve the access for the people of the southern suburbs. But at the moment it stops at Noarlunga centre. So, let us make sure that we have plenty of new buses going down there. The government should not keep cutting transport. Some \$32 million has been cut from transport in the last two years, never mind the 200 plus jobs that have been cut. It cannot keep cutting like that.

We know that the agenda of the Premier and the Treasurer is to getting back into government and putting that money away—not, as the Treasurer said on *Stateline*, funding it with an eye to the budget. We know that is not the case. We know that the 2005 budget will be an absolute Christmas bonanza for, hopefully, everyone in the state. It should be happening now. This state is performing better than most other states. It is not performing badly. In this respect, one has only to look at all the industries around the place that are being penalised by this government. The government should give them the opportunity to get out there and give them a bit of incentive to go ahead.

Education is the number one priority for this government, we heard—

**An honourable member:** Health.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Sorry, I beg your pardon, health. Education is number two on the mantra. The mantra goes health, education, law and order; that is right. Education is number two. I think, for instance, of poor old Paringa Park Primary School, with its 1953 Bristol buildings, the old aluminium buildings bought out from Bristol in England and put together out here in 1953—they look pretty flash in the old photographs. Members should go out there now. You want your climbing boots to go up and down the floors in them. They are all over the place—like some members opposite. It is rather sad; I will have to invite the minister down to Paringa Park Primary School for the 50th anniversary in November, when the fete is on, and see those buildings. They have been promised and promised and promised new buildings. I know there are other schools around the state that have some serious problems, too, but the people at Paringa Park are not your well to do, so-called millionaires from Holdfast Shores. There are a few millionaires at Holdfast Shores, but I guarantee that the people at Paringa Park and those areas are true blue workers. They work very hard, and I will do my very best as the local member to support them. I do not want those children going to the same classroom to which their parents and, in some cases, their grandparents went. Paringa Park is a disgrace.

I will give the former government lots of credit, and I will give this government credit. Brighton Secondary School and the other primary schools in my electorate are doing quite well. I ask the minister to please look at Paringa Park. Brighton Secondary School is a great school. It is a number one music school. Some of the pupils were to travel to China earlier this year but, unfortunately, the SARS epidemic stopped them and they had to return. The minister has promised me twice in this place that the funding will be there for the trip. I cannot find it anywhere in the budget but it must be there somewhere, squirreled away in a hollow log. Let us hope that it is not part of the South Australia SARS epidemic—that is, South Australia's reduced spending.

With respect to Brighton Secondary School, one small thing is that there is no money for asset management, but we will get around that. It is a good school, with good support. One thing that was almost there with a Liberal government was the state volleyball centre: we were going to get that volleyball centre there.

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** Almost, but not quite.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** It was almost there. There is a certain lady in the Department of Sport and Recreation who will be named in this place if she does not start returning my phone calls, returning my emails and taking some notice of a member of parliament making inquiries about the future of the state volleyball centre at Brighton Secondary School, because it is just not happening. I have been very polite and persuasive. I have been my normal charming self with this lady but I have gotten nowhere. I have not seen any progress on this matter at all.

Certainly, the minister told me that he is making progress but I cannot see any. It is like watching paint dry. The state volleyball centre at Brighton Secondary School should be there. The volleyball teams from Brighton Secondary School recently won national championships without the volleyball centre. Imagine what they could do if they had good training facilities. Let us not forget the good schools. Let us make them even better. Private schools always cop a belting from

the Labor socialists. Let us not forget how much federal funding goes into government schools: \$175 million is going into government schools from the commonwealth this year—up 5.5 per cent. What was the increase in the education budget? Remind me?

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** No-one can because we are not even sure. In fact, in real terms, we do not even think there is an increase. People are saying about 2½ per cent. In real terms it is certainly less than CPI. It is nothing like the 5.5 per cent the commonwealth government has put in. Let us at least match the commonwealth with state increases if nothing else. Capital works in government schools were underspent by \$5 million. I say again: poor old Paringa Park, it comes off second best. Those kids will be freezing tomorrow when that southerly comes in those buildings, but the Labor government does not care about them. They can freeze, those poor little kids. Suffer the little children! We see less money being put into child protection, just like less money is being put into looking after the kids at Paringa Park. Health was the number one mantra on this government's list of rhetorical priorities. The mantra was health, education and law and order. It is a shame that the rhetoric, the mantra, is not matched by real increases in health spending. So much for a priority. We have been promised reduced times in accident and emergency departments. The minister has made a fair bit of that in the last few days.

My poor old mother-in-law fell over recently. She is in a nursing home. We took her up to Flinders, where she had to wait only five hours! Okay, the triage nurse saw her and she was not going to die, but she waited for five hours. I repeat: this government must not downgrade health treatment for South Australians. Certainly, I realise that health and education are bottomless pits. They are like a bucket that you just cannot fill; you just shovel it in. That does not mean that you just give up. You stimulate the economy so that we have good health and good education and, certainly, we can have all the other things that South Australians deserve.

Last year the government snatched away the \$20 from the poor old pensioners. It will need to give them an extra \$30 this year to make up for that. Certainly, they will need to spend it on the buses and the taxis to get to hospital. They will not be able to afford to run a car because the charges have gone up there as well. Mind you, though, they do not have to pay the Rann water tax. I suppose that if it uses mean and tricky accounting the government will say that they are getting an extra \$30 because they are not having to spend the \$30. They are the sorts of accounting processes we are seeing implemented by this government.

When will the Treasurer spend some of those extra hundreds of millions of dollars he has been getting through increased land tax and sales tax? Conveyancing is going up again, so he will get more and more. It is continuing income. When will he spend that on some of the children at Paringa Park, the poor old pensioners and the sick and the poorly? Police is number three on the mantra chart, but what do we get? It is like the cracked record: tough on law and order and more prisons, but empty police stations. No more police. Police have come up to me and pleaded for more spending on police. They want more police officers. They want more funding for operational matters.

The police officers I know are working exceptionally hard, and to try to penalise them by not backing them up with government funding, with adequate resourcing, is an absolute crying shame. Criminologists will tell you that it is not

necessarily the penalty that is a deterrent: it is the chance of getting caught. How do you get caught? You have police; you have Neighbourhood Watch and you have crime prevention. What has happened to crime prevention? I am really sad that my friend the Attorney-General has cut crime prevention.

I received a phone call from Holdfast Bay's crime prevention officer last Friday. She is well known to the Attorney. Last Friday was her last day on the job because of cuts, cuts, cuts. We cannot have cuts, cuts, cuts and expect the crime prevention programs to be working. We cannot expect graffiti programs to be working. Remember the graffiti programs? Where have they gone? What is the Treasurer doing with all those extra millions? If you are lucky to own a house in Morphett, you are doubly lucky. If you own a house that is great, but rates are going up and taxes are going up. If you want to sell that house, the conveyancing fees for an investment property will be going up.

We need to keep stimulating the economy in this state, and housing is one way we can do it. We must not penalise people by putting obstacles in their way. I look forward to seeing some action with respect to public housing. I am told that for every three public houses sold only one gets built. The State Housing Plan needs adequate funding and I am yet to see sufficient funds. I am a great supporter of the State Housing Fund. We need more public housing. So many people are not as lucky as members in this place. I grew up in a Housing Trust house at Elizabeth, and I know what it is like. I appreciated that house, and that was after moving from a migrant hostel.

I have also lived in a shed. I know what it is like to be at the bottom end of housing. For 18 months my family and I lived in a tin shed. I do not want anyone to ever live in a tin shed. I want them to live in public houses, and we can do that. If this government stimulates the economy people can go out and get a job and buy their own house, but do not keep putting obstacles in their way. How are we going to get them jobs? We are going to stimulate the economy; we will stimulate business in this state. South Australia is a small business state.

We have 80 000 small and medium sized businesses employing over 235 000 people. This information is straight out of the Economic Development Board's report. We need to encourage those businesses. We do not need to put up gas prices or car costs. We need to give people police protection. We need to change penalty rates if people want to open their shops on Sundays. We need to remove conveyancing costs if people want to invest in building shopping centres. We need to encourage them, not discourage them. How many of those businesses are in tourism?

Down at the Bay tourism is, obviously, a number one industry. Glenelg is a tourism precinct, and we are very lucky. I thought it was 45 000 people who came down there but it's 48 000 people, on any weekend you like, who come down to the Bay, and they love it. Tourism will be the number one industry in South Australia. Just like Holdfast Shores started the building frenzy along the coast, tourism will do the same for the rest. Wines, motor vehicles, aquaculture, education and mining get the front tickets all the time, but the tourism industry should be encouraged. What have we got, though? We have a tourism minister who has duded the tourism industry. Absolutely zip!

The Adelaide International Horse Trials, absolutely zip! This government is not going to fund the Glenelg Jazz Festival.

**Ms Ciccarello:** And why should it?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** The Louisiana state government funds it, because it knows how valuable it is. People come from all around the world to a jazz festival. It is a disgrace when a state government from America funds an event in South Australia because it realises how good it is, and what do we get here? Zip! We get nothing from this Treasurer, absolutely nothing. Get a grip on where we are going, Treasurer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** We need to know where this state is headed. At the moment it is like a rudderless ship. We have a captain who is just invisible. The crew is celebrating down below. They have no course. They cannot believe their luck at getting into government. They are not plotting the course. Certainly, the ship's purser is drunk on the power of having all that money in his clutches. He will need more than opening bridges to fit the ship he wants to build down the port. With your broken promises and new taxes you are breaking their hearts out there, Mr Treasurer. Sure, you have to manage the economy. But govern this state, don't kill it off.

With a vibrant economy this state will prosper. You can have your Art Gallery, your Museum and your V8 races, and you can also have the Jazz Festival and the International Horse Trials. Do not just give them bread and circuses, do not just give them media management, and, certainly, do not just give them sempiternal prestidigitation, because that is all we have had. Let us have some reality, openness and honesty, not the meticulously managed media. Let's not do a Don Dunstan. Let's not have rerun Rann. Rerun Rann is what he is, and that is what we will get if the government does not wake up. Wake up to yourselves, Labor government, because you will not be there very long at this rate. We will be over on that side and we will get this state back on track, the way it should be.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** We recall that back in 1993 when the Liberals came to office—

**Mr Goldsworthy:** We were faced with an economic shambles.

**Mr MEIER:** We were faced with an economic shambles, as the member for Kavel says. We had a debt in excess of \$9.5 billion—that is \$9 500 million plus. We had an annual budget deficit in excess of \$300 million per year, and that had occurred for two or three years beforehand, so the debt was going up by an astronomical amount. We had a WorkCover debt in excess of \$300 million. We had an unfunded superannuation liability of something like \$3.5 billion. The state was, as I said, in a shambles.

And what happened? The Liberal government grasped the economic nettle and said, 'We have to rectify this for the sake of South Australia and for the sake of the million-plus citizens so they have some hope.' In fact, it is interesting that I said to my sons prior to that election, 'I don't think there is much future for you in South Australia: I suggest you start looking outside of South Australia, because the Labor government has all but wrecked South Australia.' So, in 1993 the Liberal government took office—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** And you fixed it all up!

**Mr MEIER:** —and, in fact, in the words of the Attorney-General, we fixed it all up. We reduced the \$9.5 billion-plus deficit to just over \$3 billion. That is \$6 500 million that we paid off the debt. Just imagine what we could have done with that \$6 500 million. We could have replaced every road in

Goyder without any question and, in fact, probably throughout most of South Australia. But, instead of doing that, we simply reduced the debt by over \$6 500 million.

We brought the budget deficits from \$300 million back to surpluses. In fact, our last budget, as the Treasury has indicated, was something like \$20 million in surplus—with the now Treasurer trying to indicate it was in deficit and subsequently proven to be wrong. We brought the unfunded superannuation liability down to a more realistic level, we reduced the WorkCover unfunded liability from \$300 million-plus down to well under \$50 million, and we restored total confidence.

One would have hoped that the current government, with a deputy leader who has indicated that he wants to continue with financially responsible budgets, would have brought down a budget that would continue to promote strong economic growth. What was some of that strong economic growth? We saw, for example, that exports tripled in the period that the Liberals were in power.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** It's all your good work!

**Mr MEIER:** As the Attorney said, it was all our good work, and I thank the Attorney for acknowledging that. One would have thought that this government would make sure that in this budget economic development was continued at the same rate to which we had managed to bring it up. You, Mr Speaker, would have been aware, as you were integrally involved in much of that government, that it requires a darn lot of hard work behind the scenes to get proper economic development in any institution in this state or indeed any state. It comes not simply by announcements but by making sure that, first, the officers behind the scene are there, and, secondly, knowing what is their situation and what is their aim; otherwise, you will have a disaster.

The Liberals brought this state to a new height not only in economic development but also in unemployment. Shortly before we took office unemployment was running at near 12 per cent, and when we left office the figure was about 7 per cent. It has since continued its downward trend to nearer 6 per cent, which is obviously because of all our policies that were put in place, and those policies will continue through for at least 12 to 24 months. We are still experiencing the benefits of the Liberal government's policies.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The Attorney says that he hopes our positive policies will continue through for the end of the four-year period and they will still benefit from them. That is where the Attorney is wrong because, unless his government starts to do something positive and takes hold of the real situation, we will start going back down the track where the previous Labor government left us.

I was a member of the opposition for 11 years. It was a long 11 years, and I well remember two or three different treasurers telling us that things were okay. I well remember the then Premier, John Bannon, telling us how things were great and how good it was, and all the time the debt kept going up. I well remember the then leader of the opposition, Dale Baker (you and I, Mr Speaker, were both shadow ministers under Mr Dale Baker) indicating clearly how things were in a crisis situation. I well remember him also indicating that he did not ask any questions about the State Bank unless he had the answers in his top drawer, and those answers proved to be correct. I well remember, too, members in my electorate abusing me for what we were doing to the State Bank, yet thankfully we were identifying those negatives.

I do not want to see us go back to the days of the previous Labor government. I should hope that this government would at least have addressed the situation of regional development and made sure that it was continuing. Where does the real impetus come from? It comes from the regions. In my own electorate I identify the Primo Port Wakefield Abattoir, which currently employs some 220 people and hopes to bring it up to 300 people. It did not exist when we came to government—we brought them in. I could look at companies such as Balco, Golden Plains Fodder or Yorke Hay Pty Ltd, all hay processing companies employing a significant number of people in my electorate. None of them existed when the Liberals took office some nine years ago.

Do you think they came there by accident? No. They came there as a result of hard work. The Attorney-General laughs about it. He could not care less. You know what he cares about? Even though he uses public transport, he cares about his car, his driver and his public position, and being able to go on talkback radio. That is a great shame, because I have from time to time had respect for the Attorney. I can see that he could not care less where South Australia is going. I do not think he is doing anything in cabinet to make sure that regional development is progressing the way it should be, and that disappoints me. However, I will not get sidetracked on to that.

All these companies—and I could mention many others—have come only as a result of a lot of hard work behind the scenes not only by the appropriate ministers but also by the appropriate departments that were there. What we have seen in this budget? We have seen that the industry investment attraction fund—which, in my opinion, gave real hope for industries in rural areas—has been slashed by \$31 million. That will not instil confidence into this state. It will not help attract other industries. Sure, the argument in the budget is that—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I've been listening to you lot for two days, and you've spent more than the gross state product in increased government spending.

**Mr MEIER:** I can't understand your argument. I just said that you've slashed the industry investment attraction fund by \$31 million. Why, Attorney?

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Balance the budget!

**Mr MEIER:** What a joke! You inherited a budget surplus.

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

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, you did. The honourable Attorney has been deceived by his own Treasurer. I do not believe that the Attorney is so unintelligent as to be deceived by his own Treasurer. I really do not believe that. I have enough recognition for the honourable member opposite to not believe that. We can go on and look at what happened in this budget. Let us remember that the now Premier Mike Rann, on 17 January 2002, some weeks before taking office, said:

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

He has been caught out, and how. We have seen this so-called Save the Murray Fund tax. I was amazed how the press responded in a positive way, initially. They are starting to come around a little bit, because they find that Eyre Peninsula does not have Murray water, and they have to pay the tax. They have also come around to the fact that the previous government had committed \$100 million to the Murray. I ask the Premier and Treasurer: where is the \$100 million? Why are you having to tax us the way you are, when you already had that money in forward estimates? Suddenly it has

disappeared. Of course, we know where it has gone. It has gone into that budget chest, ready for the election in two and a bit years' time.

**Mr Goldsworthy:** Into the war chest.

**Mr MEIER:** Exactly! That's right. It is ready there for the lead up to the next election. Of course, it is not difficult to work out what this government is doing. You only have to look at the Blair government—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Is there one single thing that is good in the budget?

**Mr MEIER:** Oh yes, there are some good things in the budget—I will identify some. The Liberal initiative to upgrade the road from Port Wakefield to Kulpara continues in this budget, thanks to the Liberal initiative. The passing lanes on the coast road of Yorke Peninsula, instigated by the previous Liberal government, continue in this budget. The Port Wakefield Inlet dredging, previously committed by the Liberal government, will, I hope, continue into this budget. There are some positive things. It is just a pity that there are not any new initiatives.

**Ms Chapman:** How many school upgrade works?

**Mr MEIER:** There is zero for school upgrades. In fact, in relation to school upgrades, thankfully Moonta Area School continued to have its upgrade completed, and I was delighted to be at the opening. Of course, as with so many openings recently, it was the now Minister for Education who attended the opening and opened what had been a Liberal initiative. Likewise with the upgrading of the road from Marion Bay to Corny Point, the now Minister for Tourism presided at its opening. Some weeks later, when speaking in this house, the minister was very condescending towards the locals and about the Corny Point to Marion Bay road, and it was very embarrassing. I cannot believe that the minister does not see that tourism money should not be used for road infrastructure. For donkey's years, the local council has said that the road from Corny Point to Marion Bay should be upgraded because thousands of tourists travel on that road to Innes National Park, which is the most visited park outside the metropolitan area. The former Liberal government identified that need and provided in excess of \$2 million for those roadworks, but the now tourism minister considers it to be a waste of money.

I am pleased that the member for Waite identified so many of the negative things that have happened in relation to tourism. It is a disgrace to the state. The member for Stuart is in the house, and I can imagine how he must feel about the lack of road funding for tourist areas in his electorate, let alone for general roadworks. I remember our 10-year plan for all arterial roads to be sealed. It would have been the first time in the state's history, and we had only two years to go. In her speech, the member for Flinders identified so well that about \$80 million is still required, and this budget provides just over \$2 million; in other words, a tiny drop so that the government can say, 'No, we haven't dropped the program.' It is absolutely hopeless. In fact, some \$22 million has been cut from the transport budget this year, and that is a tragedy. How many people will fall by the wayside? So many of my people are absolutely furious with what is happening with the roads in my electorate.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Your people?

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, my constituents.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** The Attorney continues to interject. I want to read a letter dated 18 May 2003 (which is not that long

ago) from my constituents Greg and Suzanne Twelftree of Wauraltee. The letter states:

Dear John,

I am disappointed, dismayed and pretty well disgusted with what has been happening to our local main road. I wrote to you and the council in April last year concerned about the state of our roads, in particular, the sealed road from Maitland to Minlaton. In this letter I stressed it was a complete waste of taxpayers' money to run a thin layer of hot mix/bluestone over the road, without fixing the base properly.

Even the contractors I spoke to while they were working on 'surface corrections', as Michael Wright refers, admitted it was a waste of time and tended to make the road rougher to drive on. If 'surface correction' was the way to go, why not do it properly and iron out all the bumps and holes which have been there for many decades? I would refute Michael Wright's statement last year that the section of road 1.6km south of Maitland developed undulations due to subsoil movement. I am sure if a proper base was formed the undulations in a newly laid bitumen would be minimal.

My wife Sue, who suffers from permanent back fractures due to a medical condition and has to wear a brace to help minimise this problem, is finding driving on our main road more and more uncomfortable. Indeed, in many spots, unbearable. So much so that she has to raise herself off the driver's seat for long periods to alleviate pressure on her spine. This in turn of course is putting extra strain on her shoulder, elbow and wrist joints. This lifting technique is not necessary when driving on the Curramulka-Port Victoria bitumen. You can't tell me there is less subsoil movement on this road. It was constructed properly and will last for many years.

In Trevor Graham's letter to me (22/4/03) he stated the Port Victoria-Mt Rat road was undertaken by council staff and maintenance activities to this road are minimal due to intelligent and careful planning in conjunction with sound effective construction techniques. Why not apply this to the Maitland-Minlaton road instead of the existing work??? I have enclosed both photos and an article from the *Advertiser*. The article is self-explanatory but surely we will not have to wait 15 years for a new road!!!

You stated in your letter to me 13/6/02 that you would be lobbying the Minister for Transport for appropriate upgrades to the road to occur in the near rather than distant future. You even added a PS in your own handwriting saying you would be pursuing the upgrade further. I think, you'll agree we have all been waiting long enough.

The photos enclosed are of an accident which occurred on our bitumen January last. It happened on the very bumpy and uneven section of road 25km south of Maitland, just north of the Black Bob's road intersection. A trailer loaded with peas sustained a broken A frame and left the road running across the other side into the roadside shrubbery. I shudder to think what would have happened if there had been vehicles travelling in the opposite direction. These sort of accidents will be more and more common unless something is done to rectify the situation.

Please John, dispense with any more surface correction work unless it is done properly. I would appreciate an answer by return mail when we can expect major road correction on the Maitland-Minlaton bitumen. Is funding in the current budget? If not, why not? I look forward to a positive reply, sooner rather than later. Thank you.

That letter was from Greg and Suzanne Twelftree. With \$22 million cut from the budget in transport alone, what hope is there for our rural roads? What hope is there for our metropolitan roads? This government is already mismanaging this economy in a shocking way. I fear for the future of South Australia and I wish it would change direction before it is too late.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning):** I move:

That the house note grievances.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise in this grievance debate to point out to the constituents of Waite the damage done and the lack of vision contained within this second Labor budget. I remind the constituents of my

electorate that this budget contains a massive tax slug on all South Australian families. It is a mean budget from a high taxing government and it will cause some pain to tight budgets for many families, particularly low income families. While the federal government returned a small dividend through tax cuts to families, the Rann government continues to ratchet up taxes, fees and charges on South Australian families just as it did last year in its first budget.

The new Rann water tax of \$30 a year per household to be paid by all my constituent households and \$135 a year per business is simply unnecessary, given the windfall income the government has achieved in the past 12 to 18 months. Of course, the \$135 will fall most unfairly. A small struggling business will pay \$135—it is a flat rate tax—while a very large enterprise will also pay \$135. Flat taxes are unfair taxes. They do not recognise the income level of those taxed. They simply apply unfairly and unevenly to all. However, not only will that increase worry many constituents within my electorate but there is also an increase of 50 per cent for apprentices and trainees—Rann's training tax. For example, an apprentice hairdresser will pay an extra \$160 a year for training. A total of \$480 per year is simply unfair. I have many such apprentices living within Mitcham and Waite.

Again the Rann Labor government has hooked into car owners. In just 12 months, the Rann Labor government's charges on six cylinder cars will have increased from about \$85 to about \$641—a \$37 increase in this budget alone. If a householder runs two cars, the total increase in 12 months will be \$170, and I have many such householders in my electorate. All government fees and charges such as bus, train and tram charges are to increase by 3.9 per cent and we will also have a 40 per cent increase in mining royalties. Total revenue by this state government next year will be almost \$600 million higher than what was budgeted for the year. Where does that \$600 million come from? It has come from:

- tax revenue (my constituents are paying \$120 million worth of property taxes);
- payroll tax increases, \$65 million;
- gambling taxes (doesn't the Labor Party love poker machines), \$35 million;
- insurance taxes, \$32 million;
- \$120 million of sales of goods and services; and
- \$143 million in commonwealth grants, mainly GST revenue that this government so strongly opposed.

This government does not need to inflict these taxes upon the people of my electorate—it is having windfall gains—but it has, miserably, done so. In addition, the government is not delivering to the people of Waite or to any other South Australians.

It promised us a focus on law order. There has been lots of smoke and mirrors, much reintroduction of bills already under way under the former government and lots of shifty little ideas that grab a media headline but, underneath it all, there has been little real investment in law and order. We do not have a single new policeman and, in addition, crime prevention programs have been cut again—this time by 24.7 per cent, down to \$1.77 million. That is \$1.77 million compared with the last Liberal budget allocation of \$3.2 million.

One of the most disappointing aspects of this budget is the lack of investment as recommended by the Drugs Summit. This government is not interested in addressing the causes of crime, or in doing anything meaningful by way of partnerships with the community and local government. However, it is interested in a sassy headline. It wants to lock everybody

up, and that is fine. However, we must remember that 98 or 99 per cent of prisoners in Her Majesty's care will become somebody's neighbour one day when they are released. Unless we tackle the core problem, they will continue to reoffend.

The government has failed miserably in health. Under the Liberals, 24.7 per cent of the budget was spent on health; under Labor, this has decreased to 24.1 per cent. Labor is spending less on health than we were. The increases of about \$125 million in this budget will not even keep up with inflation. This government is not delivering on health.

Stages 2 and 3 of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment, which were started by the Liberals, have been dumped by at least 12 months, and the Rann government has allocated only \$900 000 towards the \$60 million project. All the hoo-ha about health, yet this government is delivering less on a percentile basis than we did in our last year in office. I have particularly focused on the Repatriation General Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre, which are in my electorate and which need further reinvestment.

What has Labor done for education? Under the Liberals, 25.2 per cent of budget outlay was spent on education; under Labor, this has decreased to 24.3 per cent. However, the meagre increase announced in this budget will see real cuts to schools and pre-schools. Only \$52 million extra has been allocated, whilst salary costs have increased by \$63 million.

There is not much joy for aged care. South Australia expects to receive over \$3.5 billion over the life of its agreements with the commonwealth (an increase of more than \$800 million), but only if the Rann government will at least match the rate of growth and deliver on its commitments under the agreement. This budget shows that that is unlikely to happen.

It is a miserable government and a miserable budget. Unfunded superannuation liabilities are rampant. Under the Liberal Treasury it was estimated that unfunded superannuation liabilities for June 2003 would be \$3.3 billion. However, in just 16 months, Treasurer Foley has reported that within four years this will have blown out to \$4.9 billion.

Thanks to the Liberals, debt is at a manageable \$3 billion. We inherited debt levels of almost \$10 billion and a current account deficit of \$300 million per annum, but Labor delivered ruin. By contrast, this government inherited an excellent set of accounts and an economy, both state and federal, that is booming. A group of gorillas, almost, could manage the state with things going so well after years of federal and state Liberal governorship.

The strategy from this government is clear: do nothing; keep your head down; do not make any bold or visionary decisions; most importantly, do not stick your neck out; and hope that in years three and four you will have enough in the budget to throw a bit of joy around in the run up to the 2006 election. It is a mean and tricky strategy. It takes the people of South Australia for fools. It is a government driven by the media, and it takes the media for fools, too. It thinks it has got the media wrapped around its finger, and I hope that the media soon wake up to the spin and start to do some very intensive investigation of the tripe that they are having served up to them.

This government will build no great developments, and it will take no bold or visionary action. It is a Labor government that has abandoned its core principles. As the member for Mitchell pointed out when he left the party, it is driven by power and the need to hold onto it. A party that has lost its

principles delivers budgets such as we have had delivered to us.

The people of South Australia expect a future for their children—they expect vision and purpose. There is nothing in this budget and nothing in the government's initiatives to date that show that vision or purpose—

Time expired.

**Mr SNELLING (Playford):** I wish to make a brief contribution to this grievance debate on the budget. It has been pointed out in the budget papers that one of the reasons for the relative affluence of the state at the moment is increasing house prices and the resultant increase in stamp duty revenue. While this is very good news for the government, I am not sure that it is good news for the state as a whole. The parliamentary library has been very kind and have compiled some statistics for me about housing affordability: going back to 1984 the price of the average house was 170 weeks' average earnings; in 2002 it has gone up to 249 weeks' average earnings. So, average earnings have not kept up with the boom in house prices and, as a result, housing is becoming increasingly less affordable.

Increasing house prices are good for people who hold property—it gives them a capital store on which they can retire. My concern is for those young couples who are marrying and who are finding it increasingly difficult to purchase a house. This boom in house prices is not really being caused by a relative increase in the state's population. It is being caused by two factors: firstly, by a drift from our regional areas into the city; and, secondly, because of a massive reduction in the size of households.

Whereas 40 or so years ago the average household would have had three or four people living in it (mother, father and children), these days households increasingly have only one person living in them. So, this increase in house prices is not even being caused by an increase in population. Rather, it is being caused by an atomisation of the population which has profound social consequences and also environmental consequences.

With urban sprawl, more people have more cars, more people travel greater distances, and obviously two people living in two separate households consume far more energy than two people living in one household. But these are all side issues. My main concern about this reduction in housing affordability is the reducing capacity for young couples to marry, have children, purchase a house and pay that house off, because what is increasingly becoming the case is that on an average wage you just cannot pay off a house, you cannot service your average mortgage. That results in couples having to defer having children, and, in those circumstances, they have fewer children, and that also has a big effect on the future prosperity of this state. If this state is not reproducing, if we cannot sustain our population, then the prospects for the state are very bleak indeed.

So, I just wanted to get up and in a very quick way raise this issue because it is a concern to me, and it is a concern to young people in my electorate who want to be able to purchase a house, who want to be able to raise a family and who expect to be able to service a reasonable mortgage on a reasonable wage and not be placed under mountains of debt. So, with that I conclude my speech.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I am pleased to have the opportunity in this grievance debate to make one or two comments in relation to future elections in South Australia.

I think that in a decent democracy people have every right to debate the issues, the policies and the performances of governments and oppositions and to challenge the policies in a fair and transparent way, but they do not have any right to seek to go out to publicly vilify people in an untruthful way and in a manner that is contrary to all forms of fair play and decency. In particular, they have no right to make assertions in relation to people's entitlements. The reason for my concern about this is that what happened to me at the last state election could easily happen to any other member of this place.

Let me make it very clear: if this is the way the Labor Party wants to carry on, then it will be returned. Make no mistake. Be under no misapprehension that it will be returned. If that is the level they want to play the game at, well fine. But this is a government that sets out to talk about honesty and accountability. Yet it produces documents, authorised by the state secretary, one Ian Hunt of 11 South Terrace Adelaide, printed by a printing house which is Jarvis's, I believe, father-in-law's printing business, and puts out a document, which has also got on it copies of legal tender—I do not know whether copying legal tender is legal or not—and it has a calculation that I had racked up \$1.3 million in superannuation entitlements.

It talked about my superannuation and it was trying to create the image that I would receive something that I was not entitled to. Any superannuation which I receive in the future will be not one more dollar than I am legally entitled to get, as would be the case with any other member in this parliament. This is an attempt to smear me by indicating that I am going to receive funds that I have no right to. I have paid into a superannuation scheme for over 33 years. At 11 per cent of my salary, a considerable amount of money has been paid into it. To this date I have not received one dollar. It goes on to say:

Now he wants another turn. What has he done for us?

Well, if you go around the electorate, it is not hard to see what has been done. It continues:

Tell the government that country people expect better.

Country people certainly expect better than what they are getting now, because they are not getting anything. All that is happening is that they are being taxed and charged, and I will talk about what the government attempted to do to plunder people's pockets in relation to Crown lands. A mock cheque was circulated throughout the electorate, and it is headed, 'Parliament of South Australia' and it has on it the taxpayer accusing me of being entitled to \$1 337 971. How did they arrive at that calculation? Who did the calculation? It is untrue.

There was an attempt to give it respectability by stating that the source was the Parliamentary Library of South Australia. The Parliamentary Library has no skills in actuarial calculations. It does not know which superannuation scheme I am in, it has no knowledge of which committees I have served on and it has no right to make calculations that are inaccurate, misleading and downright untrue. If that is the standard that the librarian wants to circulate in South Australia, then he has brought on his own head what is coming to him. He has brought it upon himself, because I am not going to allow people to publicly besmirch my name and that of my colleagues without responding.

What was attempted to be inflicted on me at the last election had nothing to do with the issues that were affecting the people of South Australia. It was nothing more than a

dirty, gutter, smear campaign. The character who was meant to benefit from it calls himself an upright citizen. He is now established with three staff in an office down the road at Port Augusta, paid for by the taxpayer. He is going around the electorate, making inaccurate comments about me. Public servants have complained to me about the comments that have been made. If that is the game he wants to play, we will take him right on. The government has gone down this track, it has started down the slippery slope, and it will reap the benefits. I have written documents from public servants complaining about what has been said in their presence. They object to it, and they tell me about it. This character does not know who he is talking to. The taxpayers are now funding a Labor Party office in Port Augusta.

Let me go further. They then circulated another misleading, quite disgraceful document talking about members' travel, indicating that I had done something wrong. What looks like a postcard, with a photograph of the Coldstream Guards in front of Buckingham Palace, was circulated. It asks how many overseas trips I have taken or how many I will take if I get another four years. Any travel expenditure that I am involved in is only what I am entitled to, the same as with any other member of parliament. It states:

Graham Gunn spent \$13 000 on overseas travel last financial year.

In his last year in opposition, the Treasurer spent more than that, and no-one has criticised that, nor should they, because that is his right. This states:

During his last visit to London he had as few as one appointment a day.

That is untrue. It indicates that I stayed in a \$370 a night hotel, but anyone who knows anything about London and the exchange rate would know that it is not much of a hotel. The member for Schubert and I shared a room to keep the cost down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If this is the sort of behaviour in which the Labor Party wants to engage, fine, but it will be repaid with compound interest. The point which I want to make and to which I take strong exception is that the Parliamentary Library was used for political purposes. When I objected strongly to it they refused to give me a copy of the calculations that were done about me. When the then Speaker complained, they refused to give it to him. They have had over 12 months in which to apologise, but the librarian has not done that. I appreciate the comments made by members of the government and the minister earlier today. I will provide them with all the material, but a motion will be moved in this parliament in relation to those activities. I do not think anyone should have to put up with a nasty smear campaign which is not true, which is implying improper motive to me and which cannot be substantiated. If it was me last time, who will it be next time?

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** I hope it is not me!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If the minister allows this sort of behaviour to go on, it will be repaid—make no mistake. The purpose of making this speech—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** This information from the Parliamentary Library was done at the request of a member of parliament. One member of parliament refused—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I did not point the finger at you, but it might have been someone who sits close to you. So, if

that is the game they want to play, then the game will be played because everyone can kick in the same circle. We have not yet started. I do not think it is healthy in a democracy to try to run an election campaign based on blatant untruths, misrepresentations and deceit.

Time expired.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I support what the member for Stuart has said. I toured with the member to London, and I do not think any other member works so diligently. Mr Gunn is not a person to socialise. Certainly, he worked every day. In relation to the recent trip we made to London and the subsequent news comment that was made, one ought to consider a libel action. People say that it is a waste of time, but I believe it is quite honest for us to go to London—two members of parliament—with no wives, girlfriends or staff to do the job and work solidly every day for 10 days. I believe to get that sort of treatment was shabby, untrue and actionable. I thought for the sake of all members, we should have made a stand, but I was told not to waste my time; there is nothing I can do. I think it is a credit to Mr Gunn to survive what he has faced over 33 years in this place. He is a great survivor. I am sure he not yet finished.

I want to continue my speech from earlier this evening. I touched on only three or four of the 10 major points I wanted to make about this disastrous budget. Who is giving our Treasurer advice? In the budget speech, he said it was Robert Champion de Crespigny. I very much doubt that. Should we take the Treasurer and his budget seriously? The government came into office with much fanfare, pomp and media comment. There was so much expectation as a result of Treasurer Foley saying that he would increase expenditure on health and education and not increase taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth. I thought I had an honourable life before I came into this place. Now as an MP I am uneasy with the way we collectively are treated as MPs. Sir, you have referred to it often in your position as Speaker. I have never, either in my early life or now, deliberately set out to mislead.

I have delivered everything that I have promised my electorate I would deliver, except the Barossa hospital. And I will deliver that before I am finished, if it is the last thing I do—I will build it myself! What gets me is that we have this stigma of being politicians, and we are looked down upon, on a similar level to used car salesmen and the like. Is it any wonder, when a person has, for the last eight years in this place, criticised the previous Liberal government for all the bad things it did, and has said, 'When we get into government, we will increase expenditure on hospitals, we will increase expenditure on schools and I will not up the taxes.' And what has he done? We wonder why we are treated with some disdain by the public. He has done exactly the opposite on both sides. He has, in fact, decreased expenditure on schools and hospitals (mine included) and, to make it worse, he has raised taxes—and how!

This is the guy who said, referring to us, 'You do not have the moral fibre to go back on your promises,' (like he had). He said that in *Hansard* on 15 July 2002. What a thing to say. Was that arrogant? We wonder why, as MPs, we are treated with some disdain. What sort of person can make a comment like that? I think it is a disgrace. No wonder people think that we do not really need to have a state parliament. Some people say that we need only one house; others say that we do not need a house at all. It is a disgrace. It is mickey mouse stuff—that of a rank amateur. I think that everyone who comes into

this place ought to try his or her hardest to deliver what they honestly think they ought to deliver. If they promise that they will do something, they should earnestly try to deliver it. If they cannot, at least they should say why they cannot and have the heart and the courage to apologise. But this Treasurer says to us, 'You (the Liberal Party when in government) do not have the moral fibre to go back on your promises—I have.'

Mr Speaker, what do you expect people out there to think of us? No wonder that everything we do, what we are paid, is absolutely ridiculed. I am ashamed of it. I do not need to go through my life in this place being looked upon as a second-class citizen, as a sponge on society. That is how we are seen, because of comments like that. The Treasurer of South Australia, the number two citizen of this state, makes comments like that. And he has backed it in absolutely, in this instance, because he has done exactly the opposite: he has increased taxes and he has not increased expenditure on hospitals and schools. I do not think that this will always be the case, because he has another couple of years to run—maybe he does not.

It is quite a disgrace that the Treasurer makes comments like that. He trumpeted loud and clear that the whole budget process would be based on the economic summit, chaired by Robert Champion de Crespigny. When one reads the report (I think Mr Foley had a different copy from the one I had), one sees that he has taken out the parts that suit him and forgotten the parts that do not. When one reads the findings of the summit, one sees that it is very strong on the government's making hard decisions and spending money on infrastructure—even borrowing money for key priority projects. This is nothing like the documentation that we have seen in the last four days. It also recommended that the government support successful export industries. However, when one sees the realities of what happened, I doubt whether Mr de Crespigny would be pleased with how Mr Foley has interpreted his recommendations.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that he must refer to other honourable members by their ministerial portfolio or by the electorates that they represent. He should not refer to the member for Hart by his family name.

**Mr VENNING:** I apologise, sir. I believe that Mr de Crespigny would be not be very happy with the way in which the Treasurer has interpreted his recommendations. He recommends (and the Treasurer has just walked in) that we triple our exports over the next 10 years. What in this budget even hints at that? It is the opposite, as I said in my earlier speech on the budget. The wine industry is a fantastic export industry. This government does not recognise that, and it has done nothing to promote the fact—

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Sir, will you turn the volume down over the other side? The government has not backed that recommendation at all. What did country South Australia get in relation to the roads, a matter that was also mentioned in the summit? We have to upgrade our road assets. As you would know, sir, as a country member, our road assets are 60 years old in many cases. And what has this government done? In the Year of the Outback it even cut back the outback road gangs! I could not believe that, but it did. I have been a champion of roads since I have been in this place. I was very pleased that in the second year of the Liberal government we spent \$19.6 million on the Morgan to Burra road, and that

community really appreciated that big expense. It was one of those jobs that was too big, but we broke the back of it.

But our road assets now are worn out, many of them being 60 years old. In the Barossa we have six to eight bridges, all of which are designed for eight-tonne trucks. Some of the wineries have several hundred truck movements a day of B-double trucks and semitrailers weighing 42 tonnes. And guess what those bridges were designed to carry? Eight tonnes. Yes, they have been propped up and jammed up, so what do members think is going to happen? You cannot expect the councils to pick up these sorts of bills, because the cost is way over their heads.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** These were the priorities. This woman is saying that we did nothing about it. In the eight years that we were in government my district did extremely well. I can recount a long list of the things that were achieved. The people in my area cannot work out what has happened. Were we over-serviced before? Did we get more than a fair go, or what is happening now? Are we being treated unfairly? Are we being completely and totally ignored? I believe we are. The Premier and Treasurer can do that at the expense of the state and this government.

Time expired.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I would like to refer to the effect of some aspects of the budget on the seat of Hartley. We can all argue about budget surpluses or deficits or whether it is a slight budget surplus in cash terms or is a small deficit in accrual terms, but the reality is that people are affected by this budget. I will not discuss the class sizes in the primary schools in my electorate, which still have not been addressed, although the government says that education is a priority. We know that there has been a decrease in education spending in real terms when we look at the last Liberal budget compared to this one.

I will not discuss school counsellors, a subject that has not been addressed; nor will I discuss law and order, because I have mentioned that before, or the cut in crime prevention programs in the Norwood, Payneham, St Peter's and Campbelltown area, which were so successful.

The government is tough on law and order and will build prisons, and maybe it has to build more if it continues with its policies, unless it has programs for rehabilitation. I note that there have been some rehabilitation programs for sex offenders. However, it is far from what needs to be done. You cannot solve the law and order problem just by being tough. You have to deal with education and prevention.

I will not mention the promise of 100 per cent open space at Lochiel Park, and I am still waiting to see what is happening to the former school site at Hectorville Primary School. What I want to talk about today is the heartlessness of programs that have been cut. For example, I mention accessible passenger services. If we looked at 2002-03, which was \$9.5 million, the actual estimated result is \$8 million and the new target for 2003-04 is \$7.9 million, a cut of around \$1.5 million for areas that deal with Access Cabs. That is what we must be concerned about, because this government prides itself on health, education and law and order; it is about looking after those people who cannot look after themselves and those people who are less fortunate. If one looks at the budget in detail one can see what has happened, with \$1.5 million cut in such an important area.

I would like to read a constituent's letter to illustrate the problems that exist with Access Cabs and what needs to be done. The letter states:

For 3½ years I looked after my husband Ted at home before placing him in North Eastern Community Hospital Nursing Home in December 2002, which was very distressing on its own. On 17 March 2003 he had another stroke which now leaves him unable to walk, so he is dependent on a wheelchair, up until then I used to take him for drives or home for coffee, etc. I then applied for Access Cabs and after being approved and receiving a book of vouchers I was keen to use them while the weather was good. Wednesday 28 I rang and booked for Thursday 29, 1 p.m. and a return trip for 2.30 knowing cabs were needed for school runs. The nursing home staff are great and had him ready by 12.45.

We went to the main entrance to wait. By 1.30 the receptionist asked if we were okay. I told her I had prebooked a cab and was patiently waiting, she kindly rang for me to see what was happening. By this time 1.40. I was told we were next on the list. The cab came at 2 o'clock. I was very uptight knowing my daughter was also at home waiting for us, and no way to contact her. Talking to the driver he told me he had answered the call within 10 minutes of receiving it. Had also added there were two other cabs in the area that had ignored the call because it was a short run. I felt rather furious as I would not ask for help if I could manage myself. I feel these people are in the business to transport people far less fortunate who cannot get around.

I then asked the driver what should I do as I had the return trip booked for 2.30. He suggested I ring and complain and rebook time. My complaint fell on deaf ears. They only wanted to know what time I needed the next cab, which I booked for 3.30. Fortunately the next driver came on time so I was greatly relieved. I told my story and he agreed a lot of drivers won't be bothered with short trips, and I might add both of these drivers said that they do not do the school runs, so I feel this is another cause for some drivers not to be committed to their job. Over the years I've heard many complaints, and you often hear on talkback shows on radio, but I was hoping it really wasn't that bad.

I'm not a person to kick up a fuss but I thought I was being fair ringing and booking early and trying to have Ted back before the school run started. I don't mind waiting a short time but an hour I think is a bit much. I hope in some ways you might be able to see this problem fixed not only for me but many other people that need these cabs as the only means of transportation. I don't mind if you need to use my name if it will help prove something. Thanking you for your help and kindness and understanding this problem.

This lady really makes quite clear what needs to be done. We are all aware of the problem with Access Cabs and this problem of short runs must be dealt with. People who are in this situation should not have to wait an hour for the service. It is not good enough and this area must be addressed.

We also know that we have to look at extending these services, for example, to the visually impaired and others who are in the unfortunate situation where they do not have their own transport. The reason why this is so annoying is that when you look at these budget papers you know that \$1.5 million has been cut from this very area that this lady is talking about. Is this the caring government that made promises that health, education and law and order are priorities? If they are its priorities, it is lacking sensitivity in this important area. I think the government has to think very seriously; if it wants to be believed, it must address these problems. A cut to \$7.9 million to a sensitive area is not good enough.

I have not talked about the continued waiting lists for dentures for the aged or the increasing gaps that individuals have to pay when they use health services. Yes, we appreciate that the \$30 does not apply to pensioners, but what about other self-funded retirees? Not everybody is well off, and often in some suburbs such as Hartley the reality is that people are asset rich and income poor. Their real disposable income has gone down and, with increases in rates both at the local and state level as we have seen with the increases in

registrations and just maintaining a car, you can see that people are hurting. This is a prime example of the things which we need to address and which must be addressed by all governments regardless of their political persuasion because, if we do not take care of people in need like this, what does it say about our priorities as members of parliament and this government now in power in trying to make a difference?

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** The railway line on the Eyre Peninsula is under threat and the region could soon find itself with a closure of lines. This would result in chaos for the grain and future mining industries and could well be tragic for motorists on the roads, particularly given the paltry amount of regional road funding allocated in this budget. According to a Transport SA report, an injection of \$50 million is required to make the railway competitive with road transport and ensure its survival. Eyre Peninsula covers an area almost the size of Tasmania and produces up to 30 to 40 per cent of the state's grain harvest. Its vast area has a huge underlying mineralisation called the Gawler Craton. This area is host to gold, diamonds, iron ore, coal, jade, gypsum, graphite, granite, marble and much more.

Transport SA investigated the future of the transport and delivery aspects of the grain industry, particularly in relation to the future of Eyre Peninsula's rail system and the ports at Port Lincoln and Thevenard. However, it is imperative that another report be undertaken with wider consultation about railways with all the affected businesses, communities and industries. It must not be limited to grain only. We must be proactive and lateral thinkers. In particular, the potential growth in the iron ore and coal mining industries must be taken into account when considering rail transport. These industries could be decimated by any closure of the railway in the region. However, imagine the possibilities for the state if the railway were upgraded and the opportunities that could be provided by linking the largest natural deep water harbour in the southern hemisphere, located at Port Lincoln, with the new Adelaide to Darwin railway.

At the moment the railway is in a terrible state. Tracks are buckling due to heat in the busy harvest seasons, while ageing wooden sleepers need to be replaced with steel or concrete ones. The existing infrastructure has loops that are too short to allow for long trains to pass, and there is limited track space in Port Lincoln to allow for unloading. Operation of a rail service with such bad infrastructure in this environment is unsustainable and not viable. We are just about to see the track connecting Adelaide to Darwin and the economic opportunities of having this new connection with Asia come to fruition. The length of that new railway is similar in length

to the existing Eyre Peninsula railway. Is South Australia trading a new railway for an old one? Closing the line would have a serious impact on the transporting of bulk goods throughout Eyre Peninsula. It would reduce competition and leave road transport as the only alternative, throwing more than one million tonnes of grain onto the peninsula's roads. This would create serious congestion problems, with large vehicles on the road adding to the probability of a greater number of accidents.

According to a press release by the Hon. Rory McEwen MP, 'accidents cost the community \$220 million annually, with 10 per cent of road fatalities caused by trucks'. Some of the most dangerous stretches of road for heavy vehicle accidents exist within the Flinders electorate, with regular truck accidents on some parts of the Eyre Highway. Closing railways would only add to the danger and likelihood of more heavy vehicle accidents, particularly at locations such as Wudinna and Kimba.

Moving from railroad to road transport increases air pollutants and greenhouse gases and the consumption of more non-renewable fuels. These would add up to between seven and 11 times as many pollutants and gases than if rail was used. As a Transport SA papers states:

Any complete shift in grain from rail to road on Eyre Peninsula would produce external costs that far outweigh the cost of any rail upgrade.

Any study that looks at closing the railroad must also take into account the costs of the upgrades needed to bring roads to a heavy transport standard and of the inevitable heavy vehicle by-pass that would be required in Port Lincoln due to the quantity of heavy vehicles accessing the storage area of the town. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. Paul Holloway) and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. Terry Roberts), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 11.59 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 4 June at 2 p.m.