

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 June 2004

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

**GAMING MACHINES (EXTENSION OF FREEZE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the bill.

ROADS, OUTBACK

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (30 March).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE:

1. Transport SA advises that damage to roads from flooding in the outback during February and March has been minor. Such damage will be addressed as part of Transport SA's day-to-day repair and maintenance practices and can be rectified within budget.

2. Transport SA advise that there has been no impact on routine maintenance in the outback area. The government has shifted its focus within the outback area to address maintenance issues as opposed to re-sheeting. The result has been a reduction of approximately 50 km of re-sheeting a year on a network of over 10 000 km. At the same time, the economics and efficiencies of the government's decision to re-purchase new plant and equipment is expected to result in an increase of 15 per cent in maintenance activity on outback roads and the addition of four jobs to the road gangs.

WOMEN, LEADERSHIP IN ETHNIC COMMUNITIES

In reply to **Ms CICCARELLO** (5 May).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: There are many dedicated men and women who give up much of their time to work for our many multicultural organisations in South Australia. Each week I admire the effort, talent and enthusiasm of these volunteers at the hundreds of events I have the opportunity to attend as Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Although some of our ethnic groups in South Australia, such as our Indian, Filipino and Islander communities are well led by women, I know that others want to get more women who can take leading roles in their groups.

In 2001 the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs formed a Women's Advisory Committee. The work of this committee has continued and strengthened under this government. Eight members are appointed to the committee to represent the commission, Multicultural SA and the Office for Women. The committee includes women from other organisations such as the Multicultural Communities Council Inc. and the Migrant Women's Lobby Group to name a few. The committee gives advice to SAMEAC on programs and policies on matters of concern to women and to encourage the development of leadership skills among culturally diverse women.

SAMEAC has held three leadership programs that target women since 2002 (two introductory and one advanced held in conjunction with Adelaide Institute of TAFE) for more than 50 women from 23 different ethnic backgrounds, many of them from new and emerging African and Middle Eastern groups.

This includes Somali, Iraqi, Lebanese, Serbian, Thai, Cambodian, Iranian, Italian, Vietnamese, Filipino, Tatar, Jewish, Ukrainian, Tanzanian, Papua New Guinean, Syrian, Sudanese, Ethiopian, Palestinian, Jordanian, Indian, Greek and Indigenous women.

I am told that the programs gave the women skills so they could take leading roles in their own groups and more broadly, as well as give support to other women in their communities. These women were chosen because of their involvement in public life and, as a result of these courses, many have told us that have become more effective leaders and are seen as role models for other women in their communities.

I am pleased to tell the house that several women graduated from the advanced course last week and that the Minister for the Status of Women and I were pleased to congratulate them and present them with their certificates for the accredited TAFE studies. The response to the program has been good and SAMEAC will offer another women's leadership program starting in May at the Adelaide Institute of TAFE. I ask honourable members to encourage women from

multicultural groups in their own electorates to contact officers at SAMEAC to find out how they can join these courses.

At the graduation ceremony I launched a multicultural women's mentoring program that is jointly funded by SAMEAC and the Office for Women, which will in turn make it possible for the participants to qualify as mentors themselves, so that they may share their skills by supporting others in their communities. This pilot program will then be assessed for its effectiveness and benefits.

Of course this is not the only way women of diverse ethnic backgrounds are helped, nor are they the only beneficiaries of these programs. I know that our ethnic and multicultural community organisations are thankful for the work of all their volunteers, men and women alike. I hope that these courses help the community groups survive well into the future so that their cultural heritage, traditions and language can be enjoyed by us all.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Fees Regulation—

Assessment of Requirements Fees

Public Trustee Fees

Proclaimed Managers Fees

Registered Agents Fees

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Urban Water Prices in South Australia 2004-05—

Transparency Statement

Regulations under the following Acts—

Land Tax—Fees

Petroleum Products Regulation—Fees

Tobacco Products Regulation—Fees

By the Minister for Police (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Firearms—Fees

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Reports

Port Access Review—Final Report

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

Regulations under the following Acts—

Associations Incorporation—Fees

Bills of Sale Act—Fees

Business Names—Fees

Community Titles—Fees

Co-operatives—Fees

Cremation—Fees

Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Fees

District Court—Fees

Environment, Resources and Development Court—

Fees

Native Title Fees

Magistrates Court—Fees

Partnership—Fees

Public Trustee—Fees

Real Property—Land Division Fees

Real Property—Fees

Registration of Deeds—Fees

Sexual Reassignment—Fees

Sheriff's—Fees

Strata Titles—Fees

Summary Offences—Fees

Supreme Court—

Fees

Probate Fees

Worker's Liens—Fees

Youth Court—Fees

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fees

Building Work Contractors—Fees

Conveyancers—Fees

Land Agents—Fees
 Liquor Licensing—Fees
 Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—Fees
 Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—Fees
 Security and Investigation Agents—Fees
 Trade Measurement Administration—Fees
 Travel Agents—Fees

By the Minister for Health (Hon. L. Stevens)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Controlled Substances—
 Pesticides Fees
 Poisons Fees
 Public and Environmental Health—Fees
 South Australian Health Commission—
 Private Hospital Fees
 Recognised Hospital Fees

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. P.L. White)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Harbors and Navigation—Fees
 Goods Securities—Fees
 Motor Vehicles—
 Expiation Fees
 Fees
 Passenger Transport—Fees
 Road Traffic—
 General Fees
 Inspection Fees
 Miscellaneous Fees

By the Minister for Urban Development and Planning
 (Hon. P.L. White)

Regulations under the following Act—
 Development—Fees

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon.
 J.D. Hill)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—
 Fees
 Vehicle Fees
 Crown Lands—Fees
 Environment Protection—
 Beverage Container Fees
 Fees and Levy
 Environment Protection—
 Heritage—Fees
 Historic Shipwrecks—Fees—
 National Parks and Wildlife—
 Hunting Fees
 Wildlife Fees
 Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fees
 Radiation Protection and Control—Ionising Fees
 Water Resources—Fees

By the Minister for Administrative Services (Hon. M.J.
 Wright)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Freedom of Information—Fees and Charges
 Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees
 State Records—Fees
 Sewerage—Fees
 Valuation of Land—Fees
 Waterworks—Fees

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. M.J.
 Wright)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Dangerous Substances—Fees
 Explosives—
 Fees
 Fireworks Fees
 Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare—Fees

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Authorised Betting Operations—Fees
 Gaming Machines—Fees

Lottery and Gaming—Fees

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services
 (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Mines and Works Inspection—Fees
 Mining—Fees
 Opal Mining—Fees
 Petroleum—Fees

By the Minister for Families and Communities (Hon. J.W.
 Weatherill)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Adoption—Fees

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Housing Improvement—Fees

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations
 (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Local Government—Fees
 Private Parking Areas—Fees
 Local Council By-Laws—
 City of Adelaide
 No 1—Permits and Penalties
 No 2—Dogs and Cats
 No 3—Local Government Land
 No 4—Roads
 No 5—Lodging Houses.

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY MARKET

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): I seek
 leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I wish to advise the house that
 on 25 May last week the final points of difference between
 the states and commonwealth on the reform of national
 energy market institutions were resolved. This resulted in the
 signing of an inter-governmental agreement. This agreement
 sets out the most substantial reform of the national electricity
 market since market inception and is a result of two years of
 preparation. On Monday of this week I took the agreement
 to the South Australian cabinet for endorsement. This
 endorsement will allow the introduction to this parliament
 of legislation of one half of that reform and the creation of the
 Australian Energy Market Commission. The agreement will
 see the federal parliament legislate to create the Australian
 Energy Regulator, the other half of the reform package. South
 Australians who have suffered badly after privatisation in the
 national electricity market know better—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Somebody over there is
 contesting that. South Australians know better than most the
 need for national institutions to deliver improved conditions
 for consumers. I am confident that these reforms will help us
 achieve that goal. I wish to offer hardy thanks to the officers
 of the Microeconomic Reform Unit of Treasury who have
 done first-rate work and who have met very difficult dead-
 lines without complaint.

NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In question time yesterday, the
 opposition raised questions about South Australia's projects

under the National Action Plan for salinity and water quality. Although the implementation of these projects can take time—because they involve local communities and the federal government—South Australia leads the nation in the roll-out of both the NAP and the NHT through a regional model. I can inform the house that there has been a delay in reaching agreement on the research projects for the Centre for Natural Resource Management. However, agreement has now been reached on \$10 million in research projects, with half of this money already allocated.

As I said yesterday, there has also been a delay in the Upper South-East drainage project. This and the Lower Murray rehabilitation program required longer consultation with farmers and communities before money could be spent on works. As members of the house would be aware, the Upper South-East project is now moving ahead rapidly. The Lower Murray Swamps project is also picking up pace, although further negotiation is still required. It is expected that all NAP funds will be allocated by 2007-08 as initially planned. This means that there will be greater expenditure in the next few years than there was in the initial budget. Some of the major projects taking place in the Murray Darling Basin for 2003-04 are:

- Design, construct and operate salt interception schemes for salinity mitigation—\$6 040 000;
- Rehabilitation of the Lower Murray Swamps—\$2 700 000;
- Developing and implementing Land and Water Management Plants—\$350 000;
- Development of a policy framework for salinity management and accounting for salinity—\$450 000; and
- Priority revegetation and remnant vegetation protection—\$150 000.

For the benefit of the member for Mawson, this is state and commonwealth money. Funding for the NAP is jointly arrived at.

In relation to the Lower Murray, we have had 40 applications for exit assistance, resulting in the retirement of about 1 000 hectares. This is out of about 120 farms (or 33 per cent of the total) and 5 200 hectares in total (which is about 20 per cent of that total), which is very close to the original estimates—as, I am sure, the Leader of the Opposition would recall—on which the funding approval for the restructuring and rehabilitation program was based.

Restructure funds are also being provided to the farmers who remain to assist them to take up land released by those exiting. We have received applications for support for the purchase of about 670 hectares. A significant proportion of released or retired land will be under management of the remaining farmers. As well, some farmers who have sold water but who have held onto their land intend to use that land for other productive purposes, for example, beef, cattle or seasonal crops. Rehabilitation plans will take account of the areas to remain irrigated and to be retired.

The restructure applications have only just closed (on 30 April), and rehabilitation funding applications do not close until 26 November. So, it is too early to say which areas will be outside the lands that will be served by rehabilitated infrastructure. The owners of the land remain responsible for its management, as with land in any other area. Other than these productive uses, there may be opportunities to develop wetlands. An example is the Paiwalla swamp (to which I referred yesterday), which has been converted to a wetland using water saved from the Loxton irrigation scheme (which

I also mentioned yesterday) and which is held in my name as the Minister for Environment and Conservation.

The total amount of ELMA (which is the water that stays with the land) is 22.2 gegalitres. It is available to landholders for use on land that was under irrigation in 1994 to maintain its condition. Continuing irrigators of dairy pastures may use some ELMA water to top up their irrigation allocations; others may use ELMA water on its own for alternative forms of land management, for example, revegetation.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I bring up the 48th report of the committee, on the proposed reduction in poker machines numbers in South Australia, interim report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just seek clarification. Mr Speaker, during this parliament you have tabled by-laws, and I note that the minister is doing it today. I thought that council by-laws were deemed to have been presented to the house and should be presented by you rather than the minister. I would like your clarification on that at some stage, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley may be mistaken in believing that council annual reports tabled by the Speaker contain by-laws: they do not. The minister responsible for whichever act it is that has had regulations made under it, or by-laws coming from local government, are not tabled by the chair. Rather, they are tabled by the minister responsible.

QUESTION TIME

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's demands for actions by the Anglican Church, will he now give those sexually abused whilst under the care of the state government the same opportunity to be heard by agreeing to an inquiry with the powers of a royal commission?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): As far as the government is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General has the call.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As far as the government is concerned, a royal commission into child sexual abuse is not the first order of business as an effective response to the problem of child abuse. Indeed, Prime Minister Howard has ruled out a royal commission by the federal government, which somewhat surprised me, because I would have thought, if there were any case for it whatsoever, it is a royal commission that would have to cross state boundaries. The first priority is to bring pederasts to justice and prosecute them for their predatory behaviour. The government has legislated to remove the statute of limitations which protected sex offenders from prosecution for their pre-1982 offending. Sex offenders, including pederasts, will no longer be immune from prosecution for their crimes predating 1982. The police are examining the hundreds of complaints made by individuals about sex abuse that occurred before 1 December 1982. Mr Speaker, remember this: if there had not been a change of government there would be no investigation of these accused people because—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Morphetts says 'Rubbish', but I have the docket on which the then Liberal Attorney-General (Hon. Robert Lawson) says that he agrees with not legislating to lift the immunity. So, those inquires, which are occurring only because of a change of government in this state—which are occurring only because of the decision you took, Mr Speaker, to put Labor into government—are proceeding. They should be allowed to proceed and a proper assessment made about whether to charge the alleged offenders. A royal commission may in my view seriously jeopardise those inquires, and any prosecutions that flow from the police inquires the government is not going to take the risk of prejudicing.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: By way of supplementary question, after hearing the Attorney, should those who are sexually abused in institutions whilst wards of the state be given the same opportunity for a measure of justice as those who have spoken up during the Anglican inquiry?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Those who allege they have been assaulted while a ward of the state or under the care of Family and Youth Services can take their complaints to the paedophile task force, which is investigating criminal allegations. Where there are allegations of crime, they should be dealt with by the police and then, if necessary, by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and taken to the courts. That is what should happen.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: By way of another supplementary, if we take the line the Attorney-General is taking, surely the witnesses before the Anglican Church inquiry could have done exactly what he said and there would have been no need for an inquiry. I ask the Attorney whether he feels there should have been an Anglican inquiry, or should it have been left, as he said, to the police and the courts?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: One of the small mercies of my life is that, though I am an Anglican, I am not a member of the Synod of the Anglican Archdiocese of South Australia, which took the decision to set up an inquiry. I believe the best way to deal with these matters is through the paedophile task force of the police and the investigations. Remember this: when the leader of the opposition was premier it was the policy of his government not to lift the immunity. The Liberal government of Robert Gerard Kerin wanted to keep a barrier to prosecutions on sex offending pre 1 December 1982.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the house why he has written to Archbishop Ian George in connection with the inquiry into the handling of claims of sexual abuse in the Anglican Church?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Yesterday I advised the house that I had referred to the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All members need to cool it. I know that for many this is an emotive topic: it is no less so for me. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yesterday I advised the house that I had referred to the Commissioner of Police for his consideration and investigation the report into claims of sexual abuse or misconduct in the Anglican Church. The report itself indicates that all files and transcripts relating to the proceedings of the inquiry would be transmitted to the church in sealed boxes for attention by the church. In my

view those records are likely to contain evidence of criminal offences and should immediately be referred to the Commissioner of Police for his consideration and to ensure their safekeeping and integrity. I have today written to the Archbishop of Adelaide expressing my view to him. I have also spoken to the Archbishop personally and informed him of my view. Those sealed boxes should immediately be handed over to the police.

We will not do what our predecessors did—the Liberals who maintained the law that protected paedophiles from inquiries for offences that occurred prior to 1982. That is what happened. The Attorney-General has revealed that the former attorney-general would not change the law which protected paedophiles. But we have changed the law.

I have today discussed the matter with Justice Trevor Olsson, who presided over the board of inquiry. He has informed me that a number of the matters raised during the inquiry already have been referred to the police. I have urged him to further liaise with the Commissioner of Police to ensure that all the material available to the inquiry is made available to the police. If the files are not made available to the police, this will only add to the public perception of another cover-up by the church. The Commissioner of Police and his senior officers are in the best position to determine which of the material assembled by the inquiry is required to assist their investigations. The government believes that any criminal conduct and any sexual offences, particularly against children, which are disclosed by the inquiry, should be investigated by the police with a view to prosecution.

The former Liberal government did not want them prosecuted, and that is clear. It would not change the law. I have changed the law: this government has changed the law. That is why, when this government came to office, it changed the law to remove, once and for all, the immunity that the Liberals gave from prosecution enjoyed by sex offenders, including paedophiles, for their crimes before 1982. I was appalled by the disclosure of the totally inappropriate handling of an incident of sexual abuse of a child at St Peter's College by the school chaplain. That incident, in my view, warrants further investigation.

The failure of persons in authority to inform the police and their allowing him to flee the jurisdiction has hampered investigations. What does it say about the values of the church and of St Peter's College at that time that they actually encouraged the perpetrator of a sexual assault to get on a plane or they would report it to the police? What a disgrace! What does it say about the values of that college and the administration at the time? The failure of persons in authority to inform the police and their allowing him to flee the jurisdiction has hampered investigations.

The school and the church also failed to properly investigate the chaplain's behaviour towards other boys. The school and the church once again put its own image and its own perceived interests ahead of the interests of those whom it had a legal and moral obligation to care for. The school acted to protect its reputation and its status to the detriment of its students. This is worse than snobbery: it is a dereliction of care and a dereliction of duty.

It is incumbent upon us now to do all we can to identify the extent of this man's predatory behaviour towards the young boys who were under his care. If there are other victims, it should be determined here and now. They needed the care and support of the church and school then and they deserve our care and support now. I believe that the Anglican

Church must involve itself in adequate and fair compensation for those who were abused.

I can now name the chaplain involved. The chaplain in question, who has been identified as Reverend John Mountford, should be located and extradited to face charges. It is clear from the report that he has admitted his criminal conduct. There is every reason why his conduct at the school should be further investigated and, if appropriate, charges laid. Those who perpetrated these offences should be prosecuted and locked up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the word 'hypocrite' is unparliamentary; it was uttered by the Leader of Government Business, and I ask that you demand that he apologise and withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The honourable the Treasurer was heard by me to say it while I was calling for order. The honourable the Treasurer will apologise and withdraw.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise and withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Without reflecting on the unfortunate use of that word, can I nonetheless, for the benefit of all honourable members, make it plain that it is my clear personal experience that paedophilia in this state has flourished under a conspiracy covered up by ministers and the police for over thirty years. It dates back to the mid-70s, and that for any member in this place to accuse members opposite of having been involved in some measure in cover-up is perhaps not without factual basis, but it does none of us any credit to engage in the kind of behaviour that I have had the misfortune to preside over these last few minutes. I will not tolerate, nor can I as chair tolerate, that kind of conduct, and if necessary during the remainder of proceedings today if it erupts again the chair will be vacated until the ringing of the bells.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Attorney-General agree that much of what is reported in the Anglican inquiry report would not have been exposed if there was no inquiry and it was just left to the police and courts, as he has said is 'the correct process'?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): No, I simply do not agree. I think that is entirely supposition by the Leader of the Opposition, and I ask everyone in the parliament to maintain a level head during this debate, because there is every sign of members behaving in a quite stupid fashion about this matter. So I ask the Leader of the Opposition to hose down his own side and look at this in a calm—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: What are you hiding?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I'm sorry—was that interjection 'What are you hiding?' Is that what—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Why won't you just answer the question?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I just don't happen to agree with the idea of a royal commission. I circulate amongst the legal profession and they regard the call of the Channel 7 *Today Tonight* program for a royal commission as something that will cost the state more than \$30 million, and it is not justified when the money would be better spent—not on legal welfare but on child welfare. It would be better spent on child protection, on investigating and prosecuting offenders rather than on a lawyers' picnic and, in particular, a picnic for queen's counsel. The government's priority is child protection not a talkfest. The government has backed up its

commitment to child protection with funding and programs that will make a real difference to children at risk and those that have already been victimised. In 2002, Mr Speaker, soon after you put us in government, we commissioned Robyn Layton QC to prepare a plan for the protection and advancement of children in this state. In 2003-2004 we allocated more than \$58 million for child protection related services and provided an additional 73 positions.

The SPEAKER: Order! the honourable member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes sir; I ask on the question of relevance of the Attorney's current answer to the question that was asked.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Napier.

TOURISM, UNITED KINGDOM VISITORS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What new initiatives is the state government taking to support the tourism industry in attracting—

Members interjecting:

Mr O'BRIEN: You haven't even heard the question—in attracting more United Kingdom visitors to South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Napier, because I know that he understands the importance of the tourism industry to our economy in South Australia. The Premier recently announced a new \$400 000 tourism package to entice more visitors from the UK, which has traditionally been one of our strongest markets. The campaign is designed to dovetail into the new national tourism campaign, which will see visits to Australia marketed and promoted as a lifetime experience rather than one to a particular destination.

The package will predominantly market our icons—Kangaroo Island, the wine regions and the Outback—and, with the recent publicity of the new Ghan and the Outback travel that that has promoted from Darwin to Adelaide, it is an enormous incentive for people to come to South Australia. Specifically, the marketing package will include extensive advertising campaigns including rather dramatic visual wraps (posters) around multistorey buildings, transit advertising on the Underground and some billboard activity.

We will also promote visits from the UK by Travel Trade and will be having a special campaign with backpacker operators which will market some joint marketing programs in that area. This predominantly includes some strategic partnerships with our business sector in South Australia. The UK sector is particularly significant, with 67 000 inbound visitors to South Australia in the year ending December 2003, which equates to 921 000 visitor nights during the same period—some 21 per cent of our international market. This is part of our campaign to lift our income from \$3.4 billion to \$5 billion by 2008.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. What options are available for an inquiry which will give those abused whilst wards of the state the same measure of justice and opportunity to speak as the witnesses who appeared before the Anglican inquiry?

An honourable member: A parliamentary committee; let us have a parliamentary committee.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I will give the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion my earnest consideration and bring back a considered reply.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order. I asked the Attorney what options are available for an inquiry.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: He will get a reply and come back.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thought he was a more learned man than that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is my sincere assessment that at least the Anglican Church was prepared to face its music.

MURRAY RIVER

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for the River Murray. What is the government's response to claims that the River Murray does not need extra flow to restore the river's health and keep the mouth open?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the River Murray): I thank the member for Florey for her question. Last year, the COAG agreement negotiated by the Premier with the other premiers and the Prime Minister was a breakthrough for the River Murray. The \$500 million agreement for 500 gegalitres of water is an example of the national consensus that has emerged on the need to save the river. However, every so often a crack appears in that consensus.

A couple of months ago, the federal member for Barker questioned the need for additional flows. More recently, it was Dr Jennifer Marohasy from the Institute of Public Affairs in Melbourne who expressed a similar view. Dr Marohasy would have us believe that the river is in good health. This view may suit the water wasters, but it is simply not true. In *The Australian*, on 12 May, at page 25, Dr Marohasy is reported as stating:

Much has been made of the Murray's blocked mouth as a symbol of irrigators taking too much water. It is evident, however, from the diary of explorer Charles Sturt that in 1830—before water was diverted for irrigation—the Murray's mouth was then, as it is now, a maze of sandbars.

From that quote, you would believe that the Murray Mouth in the 1830s was blocked with sand. My staff, who are clever people, checked the record for Charles Sturt's diary from 1830. In 1830 Sturt and his party were not able to reach the mouth by boat—that is true. It was not because the mouth was blocked by sand but because of high seas and strong currents. According to Sturt at the time, and I quote from Sturt:

At the time [they] arrived at the end of the channel, the tide had turned and was again setting in. The entrance appeared to [him] to be somewhat less than a quarter of a mile in breadth. Under the sandhill on the off-side, the water is deep and the current strong. . . the mouth is defended by a double line of breakers, amidst which, it would be dangerous to venture, except in calm and summer weather.

I acknowledge that it is important to learn more about the River Murray, but what we do know about the river and its flood plain is that it will benefit from extra environmental flows. That is why this and other governments are working in concert to make sure that the next generation will, indeed, inherit a healthy River Murray. I remind members that tonight Dr Peter Cullen, the current Thinker in Residence, will meet with all members interested at 6 o'clock in The Old Chamber.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I have a supplementary question: can the minister please advise the house of what was the first reporting of the Murray Mouth closing?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have history references in front of me, but I am not an historian. I suggest that the member for Davenport seeks advice from the Parliamentary Library.

SAPOL BUDGET

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Police. On what basis did the minister determine the allocation of funds in the budget for SAPOL for overtime, relief calls, allowances, stationery, uniforms, mobile phones and general services and supplies?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): The honourable member was former police minister, so I would have thought—but maybe he was not involved in budget deliberations. However, I do not make specific appropriations for specific items of expenditure. The police department is resourced according to the appropriate formula, and it is for Police Commissioner to divide up the broad allocation he is provided with to the functions to which he wishes to have those funds applied. As Treasurer, I do not to drill down and approve, line by line, the police budget.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: As a supplementary question: therefore, how does the minister explain a SAPOL memo to LSA managers that states:

Following the SOS managers meeting yesterday, we have been left under no illusions as to our budgetary responsibilities. We are not to spend any money that we don't have, and seeing how we have none it means we can't spend any.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Shock, horror! The Police Commissioner sends to his offices a note saying, 'Please don't spend money you don't have.' I would have thought that it is a fairly sensible piece of budget policy. I have news for the former police minister: I am not quite sure how the member for Mawson used to administer the police budget, but there is one thing that I do not do, and that is I do not allocate to LSAs (local service areas). I doubt that the former minister did either, but I will check that, because that is clearly the management prerogative of the Commissioner to do so. That is clearly an internal document. As I said in this place before, this shadow minister, in just about every question and attack he makes on policing, in doing so, in my opinion, he directly attacks the Commissioner, because he is the person who has responsibility for that. So, I will take that question, provide it to the Commissioner and ask him to give me a response.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I have a further supplementary question to that, if I may. Based on that answer, I ask the Minister for Police: why is the largest program in police operations seeing a reduction in supplies and services of nearly \$9 million?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not know what the honourable member is referring to, because as a former serving police minister he knows that the Commissioner of Police is provided with a budget. That budget is adjusted for inflation, so the base budget of the Police Department since we have come to office—and it has been increased with added police officers—is larger than the last budget when the honourable member opposite was the minister. How the Commissioner of Police then decides to allocate it is a matter for him, and I reiterate that criticism of the budget of the Police Department in terms of how it is applied is a veiled

criticism of the Commissioner of Police. And I will defend this Commissioner: he manages the department extremely well. The Commissioner fulfils the requirements in terms of policing policy and the laws of this state as laid down by the government and the parliament, and he has a larger budget under this government than under the last government.

In terms of individual allocation, the member for Mawson loves to throw these criticisms into the parliament. I will refer the question to the Commissioner of Police as is required of me and ask for a response.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No wonder the member for Mawson made such a terrible mess of being a minister that the Auditor-General has had to look at some of his practices. I do not allocate individual amounts of money to LSAs, to operations or to functions within the department. That is the responsibility of the Commissioner.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: You don't resource them sufficiently!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't resource them sufficiently, says the honourable member. We resource the Police Department much more than the last government did. We are building police stations that the last government would not build. We are giving equipment to the Police Department that the former government would not give. We are giving them another helicopter, buying them a new aeroplane, and putting up to 200 more police on the beat in this state than under the last government. So, let us cut this nonsense. Under the Liberals, police numbers were cut: under Labor, they are substantially increased.

PNEUMOCOCCAL VACCINE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is to the Minister for Health. Following support by the President of the Australian Medical Association for funding for pneumococcal vaccine, has the minister received any advice from the commonwealth government as to whether this vaccine will be funded as recommended last year by the federal government's own Technical Advisory Group on Immunisations?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Already this year, more than 20 children under three years of age have contracted pneumococcal disease here in South Australia. No, I have not received any advice from the federal minister and, yes, I am certainly aware of comments made by the President of the AMA that funding would be good public health policy. This, of course, reinforces the bipartisan support given by this parliament last November for the introduction of pneumococcal vaccine free to all South Australian children. While the federal Minister for Health said yesterday in parliament that he is negotiating with suppliers of the vaccine, I believe it is about time the federal government acted to protect all Australian children from this deadly disease.

Not only is this disease deadly but also children are often left with significant disabilities as a result of contracting pneumococcal disease. These include severe brain damage, blindness and deafness. The member for Wright has been a great advocate on this issue, and I know that parents from all round South Australia have supported her work over many months trying to convince the federal government to fund this vaccine as recommended by the National Health & Medical Research Council. While the federal government did not fund the vaccine in its recent budget, I was delighted by the announcement of the federal Leader of the Opposition,

Mr Mark Latham that, if elected, a federal Labor government will fund this vaccine.

SAPOL BUDGET

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is directed to the police minister. As the police minister is referring all global budget allocations within police to the Commissioner, did the minister in his capacity as Treasurer give the commissioner the money the Commissioner advised the Treasurer he required to run SAPOL effectively?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I am happy to answer that question, but it is debating the budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, I have not blamed the Commissioner for anything. I am actually very confident—
An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, I have not blamed the Commissioner for anything. The Commissioner of Police does an excellent job in administering the policy of this government and managing his budget. I just imagine that, when members opposite referred to a memo that said, 'Please don't spend money you don't have,' when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was the health minister he would have put out a memo that said, 'Feel free to spend money you don't have,' because that is what the health department did for four or five years under the deputy leader.

This question is for estimates, and I am happy to provide a detailed answer during estimates. But the Commissioner of Police, through the bilateral process, put forward a budget bid, and, to the best of my recollection (and I am happy to have this teased out during estimates), the budget provided to the department was pretty well intact from last year, together with the appropriate CPI improvement and with budget improvements. This really is a specific budget question, but I am happy to be forensically examined by the shadow minister. I will provide more information during the estimates process.

I will be able to correct off the cuff any information that I have just provided. But let us be left with this very clear assurance that, under this government, police are receiving more money.

Mr Brokenshire: No, they're not.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, the member for Mawson says, 'No, they're not.' In real terms—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, in real terms. Do you know the difference between real and nominal?

Mr Brokenshire: I know a lot more about business than you ever will.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I am just stunned by the interjection from the dairy farmer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have nothing against dairy farmers. Some of my best friends are dairy farmers. Robert Champion de Crespigny is a dairy farmer, and he is a good friend and a good businessman, too, I might add. There is a slight difference to the honourable member opposite. What I can say is that, in real terms, the police department receives more money under this government. I am happy to elaborate on the answer further in the appropriate forum, which will be the Estimates Committee.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Minister for Families and Communities explain to this house (and I quote from the report of the board of inquiry) why FAYS was dismissive of an approach to it by a group of young homeless lads who were grossly and continually abused and who had produced a tape recording of what occurred during an incident of sexual abuse? What actions will the government take to ensure that future claims by our most vulnerable are treated seriously? What steps will it take to ensure—and I quote the Premier—that ‘fair and adequate compensation is paid in respect of possible dereliction of duty by the Crown in this matter’?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): On behalf of the Minister for Families and Communities, I am happy to take that question on board and to ensure that the honourable member receives a considered answer. However, I would ask the honourable member to be more specific, perhaps after question time, about the reference from which he has quoted so that I can make sure that Family and Youth Services does answer his question.

SAPOL BUDGET

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Police. What immediate action will the minister take to address the situation where 11 local service areas are identified by police as having exhausted their budget? A leaked SAPOL memo received by the opposition states that their budget is ‘one of only two reasonably healthy LSA budgets within SOS at the moment’. Will the minister explain why the other 11 are not healthy and are in despair?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I have never heard a more nonsensical question in my time from the shadow police minister. He refers to a memo that he has not given us the liberty of seeing or quoting extensively from—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Just quoted from it—where apparently it said that one of two LSAs (or whatever it was he said) are reasonably healthy, so the other nine—what were his words—had exhausted their budgets. The question was that he deduced from this minute (which we have not seen and which, I do not think, we have had fully quoted to us) that nine LSAs have exhausted their budget. That means nine of the 11 local service areas have run out of money. I can tell members that, to the best of my understanding (and I will have this confirmed in one way or another very shortly, and hopefully my office is listening to this and we will have something before the end of question time), I can be reasonably confident in saying that our nine local service areas have not run out of money.

Mr Brokenshire: Yes, they have.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He is saying they have. The shadow police minister—and this is a very serious allegation—has just stated in this house that nine of the 11 local service areas have run out of money. That is the allegation. If that is the case, I assume we do not have any police patrols on the streets or any police officers operating. I assume that we have a serious financial crisis in our police department. That is the allegation. Hopefully, I will have an answer before the end of question time. If not, with your approval, sir, I will find a way to come back to the house, because we cannot have this allegation running loose. The shadow minister for police is saying that nine local service areas are broke. At this

moment, I am very concerned that such an allegation can be made, and I will endeavour to have an answer as quickly as I can as to whether or not this extraordinary allegation made by a former police minister is correct. I hope it is not a reckless, careless, politically motivated, sensationalist allegation. I hope that, if the shadow minister is wrong, he will apologise to the house. I will find out as soon as I can.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Mawson had indicated that he has quoted from a government document. Given that we have been asked to table such documents—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sorry, sir, he said he quoted from the memo directly. I would ask you, sir, to ask him to table that document for the benefit of the house.

The SPEAKER: Has the honourable member quoted from a government document?

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I have quoted from a leaked memo within SAPOL.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a further point of order. I assume that the honourable member refers to a memo leaked from the police department, which is part of the government.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is of no consequence or concern to the chair whether it has been leaked, dribbled or splashed, or however else it might have come into the possession of the member for Mawson. If the member has quoted from a government document, then the request is that the document be tabled, and it is so ordered.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Mr Speaker, I will bring the leaked memo to you immediately after question time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I have a supplementary question for the police minister after his response to the shadow minister’s last question. Will the police minister advise the house whether the under-establishment numbers of police officers in local service areas across the state relate to under-resourcing by the police minister or mismanagement of the Commissioner, as the establishment numbers at the Holden Hill—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of Government Business has a point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am struggling to understand how it is a supplementary question. It is exploring entirely new material. We have been tolerant in hearing question after question described as supplementaries. Could you, sir, bring back to the house a description of what is a supplementary question for the assistance of members opposite?

The SPEAKER: Order! In response to the point of order raised by the Leader of Government Business, I make plain that supplementary questions can only seek clarification of material sought by or through the original question asked or from the answer provided by the minister in response. It cannot go to new material that was neither thought of as relevant in the context of the question asked at the time or in response to that by the minister. The member for Norwood.

CRIME

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Attorney-General. In the light of recent statistics showing a

reduction in crime rates, what proactive action is being taken to further minimise crime in the community?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The government is committed to working with local government and community organisations to reduce South Australia's crime rates and, in particular, repeat victimisation. On Wednesday 28 April I was pleased to launch the residential break and enter community awareness package at the Maltese Cultural Hall in Jeanes Street, Beverley, in my electorate. More than 120 people from local government, Neighbourhood Watch, the police and community groups attended. The package includes an interactive CD-ROM, a facilitator's guide and an information booklet. It is produced by the Justice Department's Crime Prevention Unit and is jointly funded by the state and commonwealth governments.

The package increases awareness of residential break-ins and provides practical tips on reducing the possibility of becoming a victim. I have written to all members of the house advising them of the program and the availability of a half-day induction and training workshop about the package that are ideal for community organisations such as local Neighbourhood Watch groups. I would encourage all members of the house to take up the offer and embrace local community organisations and groups in their electorate.

The other matter I wish to touch on is the latest developments in the regional crime prevention program. On Tuesday 18 May I was pleased to attend the Norwood Town Hall in the company of the members for Norwood, Bragg, Morialta and Hartley to launch the eastern crime prevention program—a cooperative effort between the state government and local government as part of the regional crime prevention program. The eastern region consists of the cities of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, Burnside, Campbelltown, Prospect and the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville. It is one of eight regions funded throughout the state under the regional crime prevention program.

The eastern region crime prevention program has already recruited 27 trained volunteers, who will conduct home security audits for victims of residential break-ins, develop audits for car parks within the region and help market the crime prevention initiatives throughout the community. This is another example of the Rann Labor government's commitment to a working partnership between government agencies, local government and communities to improve crime prevention.

The state government is committed to funding local crime prevention initiatives and welcomes the efforts of local governments in working with the state government's Crime Prevention Unit and through the regional crime prevention program.

POLICE, NUMBERS

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister advise the house whether the under-establishment number of police officers in local service areas across the state relates to under resourcing by the police minister or mismanagement of the Commissioner? In a further leaked memo, it is advised that the establishment numbers at the Holden Hill local service area are now 40 full-time equivalent police officers under establishment, which includes some 26 senior constables and constables.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): Another leaked document! Well, it looks like a handwritten bit of paper, so I hope that the same ruling will apply and that the

member for Newland will release this 'leaked memo', not some piece of paper with handwriting on it.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: So you have it with you?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do, actually.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Hon. the minister is answering the question.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I still have them. I know where they came from.

The SPEAKER: The honourable minister will proceed with the answer.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And they are still sitting in the house.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I will not take it as a factual statement that the staffing level is 40 FTEs down at the Holden Hill LSA: I will ask the Commissioner to provide me with that advice. And I will not—like the member for Newland—be critical of the Commissioner of Police. I think her words were 'mismanagement by the police commissioner'. I do not believe it is: in fact, it is not. Our police numbers are heading towards being the largest in this state's history. We can see that the member for Bright is keeping pretty silent on this because when he was police minister numbers reached the lowest level in the state for many years. On 30 June 1997 there were 3 410 police: under this government, after we recruit the new 200, we will be heading towards 3 970 police. That is the difference between 1997 and this government's term.

But, members opposite have come here with unsourced suggested leaks and scurrilous, reckless, potentially morale-damaging innuendo, and nothing more than criticism of the Commissioner of Police. They can criticise the government all they like—I am happy to wear the criticism—but I will stand in this place and defend the Commissioner, Mal Hyde. If members opposite want to launch an attack against the police commissioner, I will defend him, because we have total confidence in his ability to manage the police force. So, I say to members opposite: show us your leaked documents and prove your assertions.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I ask you to make a ruling. The member for Newland says she is quoting from a leaked document and she will not show it to the house but will show it to the press. I ask for a ruling about whether she should bring it into this place.

The SPEAKER: Standing orders are quite plain. Honourable members who are not ministers cannot table anything. However, in order to ensure that allegations of impropriety of some form or another do not distract us to the point where we end up pursuing a privileges inquiry, I have directed the member for Mawson (who has nodded approval and agreement) to produce to me that document from which he quoted after question time. That does not constitute tabling. The Hon. the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I am a sensitive person. The member for Newland just said something and, particularly because there are people in the gallery, I ask her to withdraw the statement she just made.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the statement.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: She told me to 'get stuffed'. I think that is unparliamentary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a poultry processing plant, and I have to confess that I have never seen the Deputy Premier as a turkey. The member for Newland may not refer to other honourable members as chooks worthy of being dressed for preparation for the table, or anything else. I did not hear the comment. The Hon. the Deputy Premier takes offence at the word and, accordingly, I invite the member for Newland to withdraw it so we can get on with question time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to let it stand, sir. I have to accept it from my colleagues; I just get annoyed when I have to accept it from members opposite.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point or order, Mr Speaker: you have given some consistency in your rulings on documents, and I therefore refer to the Attorney's answer to a question today wherein he specifically referred to a docket of the previous attorney-general and ask that, consistent with your ruling, that docket be tabled. Also, the Treasurer appeared to be reading from a government docket and I ask that that be tabled. Could I also finally say, in accordance with your ruling on possible impropriety and avoiding allegations of impropriety in this house, that the Premier and the Treasurer have continually alleged that they are in possession of documents leaked to them, and that matter should be equally tested with the matter raised by the member for Mawson. I do not mind if they produce them for you sir. But they either stop making the allegation or you have a look.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give careful consideration to the member for Unley's inquiries and will bring back a considered statement before dinner.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Police advise the parliament what sections of the Police Act he is continually referring to in question time when he says that he has no opportunity to interfere in police numbers, police locations and police resources?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I might be wrong but I do not recall saying that I cannot interfere with police numbers. I think we have increased police numbers. I would call that positive interference.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not know the exact section of the Police Act, but I do know that when the member for Mawson was police minister he used to lecture us consistently that, on operational matters, it is the statute—

Mr Brokenshire: Go and read it; don't waste our time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not know what section of the act specifically prohibits me. All I know is that the act prohibits me from interfering in the operational matters of the day-to-day running of the police force.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If the member opposite thinks it is different he should say so, because from what I can understand the former minister used to try where he could to interfere, and I think at times his—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We've seen the legal opinion about you, mate.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly. The former police minister would have loved to interfere, if he could have found a way to do it. I am different. I will respect the office of the Police Commissioner. I will not interfere in the operational running of the police department for as long as I am the

Minister for Police. I understand the division of responsibilities—even if the member opposite didn't.

STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): In view of the current government advertising in relation to the state budget, does the Premier stand by his statement to the parliament on 19 June 2001, that:

We all know that when we see a politician on a taxpayer funded ad it's just a cheap way of doing the party ads.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Well, members will be pleased to know that on my instructions there will be a major cut in the expenditure on budget advertising, compared to when the honourable member apparently was a junior minister—

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker, under standing order 98. I asked the Premier a very specific question: does he stand by his statement that, 'We all know that when we see a politician on a taxpayer funded ad it is just a cheap way of doing the party ads'? I ask, yes or no, does the Premier still stand by that statement?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Premier has the call.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am going to make an admission: there were times when I made mistakes, but—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: But one thing that I was right about is that I know how much members opposite spent on their budget advertising, and I know how much I have spent—and that is a massive cut, saving tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money. That is the difference. There are a couple of junior shadow ministers who I know are a bit desperate to get the title 'honourable', but they will have to try a lot harder. The fact of the matter is that we made a decision to cut the expenditure of the previous government, and I am proud of that.

SURF LIFE SAVING SA

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): My question is to the Minister for Volunteers. Why will he not meet with Surf Life Saving SA in accordance with their requests dating back to November 2003 to discuss their budget concerns and what they describe as an impasse with the minister? On 18 November last year, the General Manager of Surf Life Saving SA wrote to the Premier seeking an urgent meeting and stated:

We have been negotiating with the minister and his representatives since that time and would appear to have now reached an impasse.

He further stated:

This impasse has serious implications for the continuance of Surf Life Saving SA.

The opposition is advised that, while Surf Life Saving SA signed an agreement with the government in January, these critical issues are still as at today not resolved.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): He is at it again. He has been advised. He is hearing more voices. Well, he hears voices and I see dead people! The problem with the question from the member for Bright was that we had a long set of discussions with Surf Life Saving SA. We provided extra funding to them but on the advice of

the Auditor-General we could not fund them until they signed a funding agreement, because we take seriously our responsibilities over public money, not like the other side.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I rise on a point of order, which is under standing order 98 and, while I recognise that it is the Premier's right to defer the answering of the question to the minister, the minister is required to explain to the house why the Premier would not meet with Surf Life Saving SA, because that is the question that was asked of the Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Quite clearly, for the benefit of those who want to be honourable, who want desperately to have the title 'honourable', let me answer that question quite clearly. I have confidence in my minister.

POLICE, NUMBERS

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: In a question that I asked the Minister for Police today, I mistakenly gave the wrong figure as the number of police officers in the underestablishment numbers at the Holden Hill police station, so I want to correct that. The actual number was 39.9 full-time equivalents from the leaked document. That is the conclusion of my personal explanation.

However, I seek a point of clarification on the rulings we have heard today as they relate to previous rulings that we have had in the House of Assembly over different governments and different oppositions. It is my recollection that in previous times in this house when members of the opposition have stood on this side of the chamber and said that they hold in their hands leaked documents there has been no requirement for that opposition member to actually table, show or provide that leaked document to any other member or to the Speaker. In this instance, Mr Speaker, I have already agreed that I will show that document to you and the press. But, sir, I ask you to clarify that ruling on the grounds that at any other time when I have a leaked document I will no longer offer it to anybody, because it questions my integrity in the information that I put to this house in genuine ways.

The SPEAKER: Order! The first point is, quite simply, that members of the opposition and other backbenchers cannot table anything in this chamber, under standing orders as they exist and as established at present. The second point is, quite simply, that, in telling the member for Mawson to provide for me a copy of whatever it was he was quoting from, I have sought to avoid the prospect of questions of privilege developing in consequence of reference to such documents. The offer made by the member for Newland to do as she has indicated is something for her to make and to execute. It does not call into question her integrity at all. The veracity of information contained in government documents relied upon by ministers when they are quoting them in the house was the basis, I believe, a long time ago for the requirement that such documents be made available to the house on the request of any honourable member. That is the way it is still to this day.

MINISTER'S REMARKS

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In question time today during the course of answering a question in relation to policing matters the Minister for Police claimed to be quoting figures from 30 June 1997 and attributed that time to me as police minister. I remind the house that I was police minister from December 1993 to December 1995 and as at 30 June 1997 had not been in that particular portfolio for a period of one and a half years.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): Sir, can I apologise to the member for that. I had forgotten that he had been sacked by that time.

MURRAY MOUTH

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In question time today the member for Davenport asked me when was the first time the Murray Mouth closed, and I referred him to the Parliamentary Library. I am pleased to inform the house that the Parliamentary Library was listening to question time and has provided me with this note, and I quote:

The Murray Mouth closed for the first time since settlement in April 1981 after extended periods of drought. It did not re-open until July 1981 when two channels were dug.

I am indebted to the Parliamentary Library.

HINDMARSH SQUARE APARTMENTS

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I am pleased to advise the house that the state government has given major development approval for the go-ahead for what is expected to be the most environmentally advanced residential apartment block in Australia. Cabinet approval has been given for an \$80 million office and apartment complex in Hindmarsh Square, featuring state-of-the-art environmentally sustainable design. The development will see the transformation of the RAA site in Hindmarsh Square into offices and apartments.

The Hines Group and Grenfell East Pty Limited development will comprise a 19-storey apartment complex incorporating sustainable development features. The heritage listed former YWCA building next door will be integrated into the project, restoring that building to its former glory. The developers advise that the construction, design and demolition will provide the equivalent of at least 193 jobs, as well as direct and indirect employment from the construction project of 445 jobs.

The developers have committed to incorporating into the 19-storey Hindmarsh Square apartment tower a range of environmental sustainability measures that will set new benchmarks for high rise residential developments in Adelaide. These include fuel-efficient generation of electricity and water heating; innovative rainwater collection and reuse, including recharge of the Adelaide aquifer; closed-loop waste management; and provision of car pool, bicycles,

electric charge bay and public transport incentives. The building will incorporate recycled non-toxic materials and is intended to significantly reduce energy, water and natural resource consumption.

I welcome this significant investment in our city and challenge all developers to adopt environmentally sustainable solutions in their designs, something that will support the objectives of our state government's Green City initiative.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I seek leave to make a second ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Working with local government is an important part of my work as minister, and there are a number of opportunities to join with councils. The Places For People program is one such program. It is specifically for urban design improvement strategies and projects to revitalise public places. Some \$3.5 million has been allocated from the Planning and Development Fund over four years to fund the program. This funding is generally provided to councils on a dollar for dollar basis, assisting in the cost of preparing strategic urban design frameworks and master plans and for the subsequent detailed design and construction of key public place improvements. To date, four rounds of funding have facilitated 41 diverse projects across the state, attracting grants totalling \$1.7 million.

One of those projects was the work on developing a new square at Grange and enhancing the existing Henley Square in the City of Charles Sturt. This has provided excellent opportunities to build valuable community space along the Adelaide coastline. Other projects have included the redesign of the Salisbury town centre; and the development of an urban design framework and cultural precinct master plan for Port Augusta. Just recently, a further \$388 500 has been given to councils to keep this work going. This includes a project in the Light Regional Council to implement improvements to the main street of Kapunda; the Onkaparinga Council, to create a 'beachside precinct' at Christies Beach; and in the Northern Areas Council, to develop an urban design framework for Ayr Street and Belalie Creek in Jamestown.

The funding of these important community projects complements our government's commitment to supporting local government, providing opportunities for arts and culture, and protecting South Australia's heritage with opportunity for innovative urban design.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, RELOCATION

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I wish to expand on my question to the Minister for Primary Industries yesterday about the feasibility of relocating the Department of Primary Industries out of the CBD and, indeed, out of Adelaide. This concept is not new: the Bannon/Arnold Labor governments and the then Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Terry Groom) were only weeks away from relocating the department to Clare. Land was acquired in Clare and the decision was only weeks away when the 1993 state election intervened and the project was abandoned.

Even before this, in the 1960s, it was mooted to move the department out to Northfield. You, sir, would be aware of that, because there was also a plan to put the new Rural Youth Centre there at the same time. So, this is a bit of history.

I was involved with the Clare push with the then mayor, Mr Bob Phillips, and the CEO Mr Ian Burfitt, as was the Clare council. The land was acquired and it was only hours away from becoming a reality. The reasons for that proposed decentralisation are as valid today as they were then. Why does the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Primary Industries, depending on what age you are, need to be in prime real estate in the middle of the CBD in Adelaide, and why does it therefore have the huge cost of this high rise accommodation, which we know is very expensive, in Grenfell Street?

Why are they there? That is the question? Their role is to serve the rural industries; and, as the minister said yesterday, surely, that need not be done from premises right in the middle of the city. We should decentralise it. How many farmers park their ute out the front of the 'black stump' in Grenfell Street and go in and see the departmental officials? We know that they cannot do so, and they do not. Why is it there? Is it there for the convenience of farmers or for the convenience of the Adelaide-based public servants who work there? There is no reason at all that it could not be moved to a near-city site.

I made the recommendation yesterday that we have an excellent and ideal site and a largely unused facility (previously operated by the department) at Roseworthy, and much of it is quite new. It could be headquartered at the Roseworthy campus, and nearby departmental properties could be located at the Nuriootpa Research Centre and at the Turretfield and Kingswood facilities, which are not very far away. There are precedents for this type of decentralisation, as you would know, Mr Speaker. New South Wales' entire department of primary industries was relocated out of Sydney. Even the minister's support staff was moved to Orange approximately 15 years ago.

I did inspect that site when I got elected in 1990. I believe that it was a very successful shift, even though it was fiercely opposed by all the public servants at the time. Some did not relocate, but I am sure that it is now proving very successful. I intend to travel to Sydney on 15 and 16 July to ensure that this is still a very effective relocation and that it is still delivering not just for the public servants but also for the farmers. I am not sure who owns it now but, when I was there years ago, the new facility at Orange was owned by the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

Now, is that not a coincidence? The South Australian Superannuation Fund owned the new facility. There is always opposition to a move such as this, particularly from the bureaucrats and the government employees who work there. They are very comfortable in the centre of Adelaide. It is easy to access by bus or train (not many car parks, though), and, also, they can go out onto the city streets at lunch time and have lunch with their mates, and also do a bit of shopping. But, what are they there for? They are there to serve their department (primary industries), and, surely, the farmers.

A new facility headquartered at Roseworthy is only a couple of kilometres from Gawler, which is served by regular rail services to the CBD, as well as buses, and it is only a 40-minute drive on good roads to suburban Adelaide. It is also central to many of South Australia's country regions: the Yorke Peninsula, the Riverland, the Lower North, the Mid

North, the western Mallee and, to a lesser extent, the Upper South-East. It is a good concept and should be explored in an effort to make the department more efficient, to assist farmers and to lift the profile of the department. I know that the member for Light supports me on this, and I thank him very much for his assistance. I hope that the minister can do this.

TERRORISM

Mr CAICA (Colton): Late last week my attention was drawn to a newspaper article on terrorism. I guess it is not unusual to see articles on terrorism in the newspapers because they are either reporting on terrorist attacks or on terrorism as it exists in the world at the moment. But what I found interesting about this article was the fact that it was headlined with the statement that it was expected that there would be a major attack on American soil by al-Qaeda. What was especially interesting about this article—not so much the half dozen faces that appeared in that article as suspected terrorists—was the questioning of the US officials who had stated that this attack would happen.

They did not know when, but it would happen. When questioned, they could provide no real evidence or information to enable them to make such a statement. To a certain extent, this article got me thinking: why would you make such an announcement if, indeed, there was no concrete evidence linking this assertion to the statements that were made by those two officials? Admittedly, we know that terrorism is a major international issue and that all countries need to be on guard, particularly the United States. However, without there being any evidence, I wondered why such a statement might be made. Of course, there is to be an election in America later this year, and far be it from me to say that this process of heightening the American citizens' awareness was a way of promoting fear in the context of that election.

We only need to look back at what happened in Australia prior to the last election and what was undertaken by Prime Minister Howard and his government in respect of *Tampa*, refugees and terrorism. Who would forget the big posters on election day saying, 'We will decide who will come to this country and on what terms.' I am not suggesting that that is an analogy or a comparison with what is happening in America at the moment, but it made me think about what John Howard had done at the previous election in respect of terrorism, *Tampa* and heightening people's fears about circumstances in the context of an election.

I did digress, but I return to the United States. If the threats are real—and I am not in a position to question whether or not they are; and I guess, if US officials are saying that an attack will happen sooner or later and that it will be perpetrated by al-Qaeda on US soil, then it must be real—the next question is: how successful has the US and its coalition (of which Australia is a member) been in its war against terrorism?

Indeed, if these reports are factual, the answer is that it has not been very successful at all. If it has not been successful in its war against terrorism, bearing in mind that it will be a long-term fight against the perpetrators of terror, why is it that it has not had many initial successes? From my perspective, the answer is that it has spent an enormous amount of money, time and energy fighting a war in Iraq which had precious little to do with fighting terrorism. Indeed, I would like to undertake an exercise in the not too distant future to look at the statements made by members of the house at the time of Australia's committing to go to war with the US as

one of its allies in Iraq. I would like to compare the views—and not to suggest who was right and who was wrong—that prevailed at that particular time with what we now know to be the reality.

Why is it that America's fight and the world's fight against terrorism has not been successful? As I said, I think that the war in Iraq has been a distraction from the real perpetrators of terrorism, al-Qaeda. It needs to be chased and it needs to be chased by a world coalition which is really determined to stamp out terrorism. I question how committed the American government really is given its foray in Iraq. I can hear my colleagues now in their rooms saying, 'Here is Caica ranting on again about the Americans.' The fact is that I do like Americans. I do not particularly like their government, and I say that because I believe the American government has so much to offer this world, yet it has been distracted from the issue of helping the world. It could have done so much and it has not and, unfortunately, it has become a militaristic empire. We know what happens to empires, and that same fate will one day occur to the United States.

Time expired.

SURF LIFE SAVING SA

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): In the time available to me today, I rise to state the case for Surf Life Saving South Australia. During question time today, I asked a question of the Premier which initially he dodged and gave to his Minister for Emergency Services, but then, thankfully, he stood up and at least answered the question, but indicated to the house that the reason for his refusal to meet with Surf Life Saving SA over their concerns in relation to their funding was simply that he had trust in his minister. That was not the message that had been conveyed to that organisation. In fact, the message that had been conveyed to Surf Life Saving SA by the Premier's office was that he did not have the time to meet with them.

The issue was a fairly fundamental but simple one. In 1998, as you would be aware, Mr Speaker, on the introduction of the emergency services levy, Surf Life Saving SA was named in the Emergency Services Act as an organisation, amongst others, which would benefit directly from the introduction of the levy. That was done for very good reason by the then Liberal government. It was done to give surf lifesaving organisations throughout the state an absolute guarantee of the funding that they could expect.

It was also done to recognise that surf lifesaving clubs are providing an emergency service. This government has chosen by its actions to relegate surf lifesaving clubs to that of sports groups that must beg for a grant. That is the way these clubs are now being treated. That appears to be the indifferent attitude the Minister for Emergency Services has toward surf lifesaving clubs in this state. He believes they should approach him for a grant and he should give out that grant. That is not in keeping with the intent of the emergency services levy. It is certainly not in keeping with the intent of the Emergency Services Act.

Surf Life Saving SA made numerous representations to the Minister for Emergency Services and had numerous meetings with his staff, and at the end of that process they reached an impasse. So great was that impasse that in November last year they wrote to the Premier seeking his intervention to meet with them. He refused to do so. They indicated that they had been negotiating with the minister and his representatives but, on reaching an impasse, saw no other option but to go to

the Premier. They said in part, 'Premier, we urgently seek an appointment with you so as to inform you directly of our concerns.' We have now had the state budget handed down in this place and still Surf Life Saving SA has no certainty about its funding.

The government is failing to take into account in relation to its funding that Surf Life Saving SA has lost some \$700 000 a year that it was receiving from shopping centres and other similar locations from the sale of bingo tickets. Poker machines decimated that revenue source. It no longer receives revenue from that source. This government will not acknowledge that fact or give Surf Life Saving SA the opportunity to recoup those funds from any other means, so we now have an organisation that risks its very future and that of the clubs it serves because this government fails to understand the use of the emergency services levy, fails to implement the intent of the act that controls it—the Emergency Services Act—and fails to have a Premier who is even prepared to meet with those clubs.

Today I issue a challenge to a number of members of parliament (not just the Premier or the Minister for Emergency Services), namely, the members for Kaurana, Colton and West Torrens (who represent coastal electorates and who are supposed to represent surf lifesaving clubs) and to the Parliamentary Secretary for Volunteers, to take up the cause of these clubs to ensure that they are provided with the funding that they so richly deserve, to stand up for surf lifesaving and recognise that it provides an emergency service, and that it is not as the government sees it—simply a sporting body in need of grant—but providing an important lifesaving emergency service, utilising the services of many volunteers who proudly and unselfishly serve our state. The treatment of Surf Life Saving SA by this government has been nothing short of shabby.

PNEUMOCOCCAL VACCINE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Today I call on the federal government to stop playing games with the health, wellbeing and lives of Australian children. It is time for the federal government to come clean. Is it going to fund pneumococcal vaccine for all Australian children under two years of age? As this house knows, as I have told it on a number of occasions, pneumococcal vaccine for all Australian children under two years of age was recommended last September by the federal government's own immunisation experts—eight months ago. The federal government has sat on its hands hoping no-one would notice, that no one would care. The community and parents were generally kept in the dark, but I have made it my business to raise awareness and the community has responded.

I knew that if I could not convince the federal government and if this parliament and the health experts could not convince it, the parents in this state and around the nation would be able to convince it. It is disgraceful to see an issue such as this being raised in the context and the pressure of a federal election. We have had to use this to force the federal government to act.

Yesterday, we heard of its Clayton's announcement—the announcement that you make when you are not making one. Indeed, some of our Adelaide radio stations were broadcasting that the vaccine would be provided but, when the minister's office was contacted, it said there was no announcement. The minister did say in parliament, however, that the federal government does want to fund it. He said that

funding the pneumococcal vaccine makes considerable sense and the government intends to supply a universal pneumococcal vaccine. The question is: when? The cynical amongst us probably would say: just before the announcement of an election. I truly hope not because, as we speak, our children are becoming sick and the pressure is mounting. Parents are becoming aware, and I have met and spoken with at length parents whose children have been struck down by pneumococcal. The trauma remains long after the disease has gone, and it is a trauma that no child should have to endure. Why? Because it is preventable. To cover his embarrassment (and I am sure the federal Minister for Health is embarrassed, because Mr Abbott wanted to provide the vaccine, and we have seen media reports where he put it up for funding but got knocked off by the federal government's razor gang), he has tried to divert the issue by debating the death rate numbers. I am curious what rate is acceptable for a totally preventable disease.

The minister's excuse is that he is now trying to broker a deal for the cost of the vaccine. The opposition has been able to broker a deal, and that included the inactivated polio vaccine and the chicken pox vaccine, as well as the pneumococcal vaccine. We have to consider the ongoing costs of dealing with the disabilities that children suffer as a result of pneumococcal. Many are left with brain damage, deafness, blindness or significant learning disabilities; and, more importantly—indeed most importantly—the enormous cost of loss of human potential. Perfectly healthy babies with every life chance in front of them are disabled by a preventable disease.

As we heard from the Minister for Health today, more than 20 babies in South Australia have contracted pneumococcal this year. Labor has committed to funding the vaccine. The federal government did not do so, and is now playing catch-up. Parents will not be fooled. The federal government needs to listen to parents and fund the vaccine, because it is simply the right thing to do.

If pneumococcal vaccine is funded, it will be thanks to the ongoing support of the AMA nationally, and locally by Dr Michael Rice; the College of Physicians; the liquor and hospitality workers union, which represents childcare workers; Business SA; local media outlets, which have been vital in getting the message out (and in South Australia they have led the nation in getting out the information to parents); the staff of childcare centres; and parents around the state. If pneumococcal vaccine is funded, it will be thanks to them, not thanks to the Liberal government.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I am always grateful for *Hansard* staff and the work that they do. I do not know where chambers such as this would be if it was not for the record of *Hansard*, and we can all be grateful that some people actually bother to read the parliamentary record and what is said here rather than what the media reports. I say that because I am told that, as we debate in this chamber, members of the media are going 'ballistic' because the Premier has named the Reverend John Mountford as if it is some startling revelation. I could have told people his name years ago, as could most members of this house. Incidentally, *The Advertiser* printed the name on its page five this morning.

For some reason the media thinks that is the story of the minute when, in fact, the Speaker of this house yesterday made what I think was one of the most damning indictments

I have ever heard of this house when he talked about (and I do not want to misquote the Speaker but it was something like) the highest level of cover-up in three decades by very senior levels within all governments of all persuasions in this state. It is surprising to me, and in many ways I am left to wonder, when a speaker of the House of Assembly in South Australia makes a statement like that, when we have had the question time that we have had today, that the best the media can find is that the Premier repeated a name from page five—not even page one—of *The Advertiser*, and that is the news of the hour. Well, thank God for *Hansard*, and thank God there are some intelligent people who, perhaps, reading the proceedings of this place in the years to come, will find that there is a bit greater depth in the debating chambers of South Australia than there appears to be in the populist press.

I want to briefly expand on what the Speaker said yesterday by alluding in more detail to the complaint against POI6 in the Anglican Church report, which we have all been greatly interested in today. This is a matter of much more serious consequence—although I do not diminish what may or may not have happened in one of the wealthiest schools in South Australia—because this matter did not involve the privileged, and it did not involve the literate and intelligent young man who managed as soon as something was wrong to report the matter and expose it, with all the consequences that happened. Rather, this is a matter that happened when a brother of a church order ‘grossly and continually sexually abused a series of young homeless lads coming to refuge in a city shelter maintained by the church’.

While we are in here grizzling, screaming and carrying on about a lad who was—and I am not diminishing his case at all—from one of the best schools in South Australia, who was wrongfully abused, and took up the matter straight away, with no delay in reporting, we are completely ignoring predatory behaviour of the most vulnerable people in our community— young, homeless people seeking shelter. What bigger betrayal of trust can there be than that? And it was persistent. The report continues:

When the Chaplain working at the church complex sought to draw the attention of the priest in charge of the parish to persistent general suggestions that abuse was occurring in the shelter at the hands of POI 6, he was dismissive.

Despite the evidence that obviously begged questions and his own, now admitted, concerns at the strange comings and goings of [another brother] an associate of POI 6 who was a brother of the same religious order, the priest in charge persisted in an attitude of apparent wilful blindness.

The offender was ultimately sent to the United Kingdom—

Strange: it appears to be a place of refuge for such people. Immediately one wonders what the United Kingdom may be like in consequence if they are getting all the flotsam and jetsam from Australia. The report continues:

... to another post immediately following an incident at the shelter in which he was assaulted by a young lad with a brick... His departure also followed a situation in which some of his victims produced a tape-recording of what occurred during the incident of sexual abuse and took it to FAYS or its predecessor. The Department was dismissive.

I ask this house, as the house which is responsible for FAYS, how we can sit here and debate what the church may or may not be responsible for when there is clear and emerging evidence to every one of us, every day, in relation to our own departments, our own instrumentalities under Labor and Liberal governments; if the best we can say is that they were derelict in the performance of their duties, that would be a

mercy. There are situations which are much worse than those being alleged against FAYS.

ROAD SAFETY, SEMITRAILERS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I want to raise an issue that unfortunately is occurring all too often with too many drivers, and I will have to include myself in that. This morning I nearly ended up crushed under a large semitrailer which was towing a very large, high-sided trailer. Last Friday morning a similar incident also happened to me. At that time I was driving towards a ‘T’ junction and the traffic lights turned amber when I was about 50 metres from the lights. I slowed down and, by the time I reached the lights, they had turned red. Naturally, I stopped at the red light. Suddenly, I heard a horn tooting madly and I looked in the rear vision mirror to see a truck rushing up behind me. Obviously the driver could not stop in time, either because he was inattentive at the wheel or speeding and, from what I could see, I would assume it was both.

Thankfully the other drivers who were also stationary at the junction could see what was happening. I was forced to go through the red light, and it made me feel quite ill because, had I not done that, I would have been slammed into from behind. What really perturbed me about having to go through that red light was simply that I may have injured somebody else. This morning while I was driving down Grand Junction Road in the 80 kilometre per hour zone, the cars in front of me had started to slow down as the lights at the intersection of Fosters Road and Grand Junction Road were turning amber. Naturally, I slowed down behind them and, as I did so, I glanced in my rearview mirror and to my horror there was another huge truck—

Mrs Redmond: Not the same one?

Mrs GERAGHTY: No, it was a semi this time. As I said, it was towing a big trailer filled with soil. It was just a few metres from my car and it was coming fast behind me. I had nowhere to go, because the cars in front of me were stationary and the truck was boring down behind. Suddenly the driver swung into the righthand lane and went through a red light. He could not stop; he had no hope in hell of stopping. The irresponsible behaviour of some drivers of heavy vehicles is disgraceful and life-threatening to people who use the roadways. They are selfish and, quite frankly, need a good smack in the chops, a hefty fine and loss of licence. They actually give a bad name to the other drivers of heavy vehicles who drive responsibly and courteously on the road.

So many of my constituents use this intersection—Fosters Road and Grand Junction Road—and they have expressed their concerns to me. They have had similar experiences and, like myself, they have just had enough. Many of these folk are simply going about their business: going to work or taking their children to school. They have the right to feel safe from lunatic drivers and particularly those driving heavy vehicles who need to be much more careful and mindful on the roads. As I said, they are in the minority, but they are a damned menace.

I will be asking for red light cameras to be installed at the Fosters Road-Grand Junction Road intersection. If people get caught putting other people’s lives at risk, they deserve it. I also have the registration number of this semi and I am certainly going to pass it on. I hope that the driver is dealt with in the most appropriate and severe manner because, had the driver slammed into the back of me, I would have been slamming into the vehicles in front, and we would all have

ended up in an intersection where the light had gone red and there could have been a fatality. Quite frankly, I think that I would probably not be here today. I am really angry that people who are driving heavy vehicles behave like this. They really should not have a licence if they are going to behave like that.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 May. Page 2341.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): It is a pleasure to resume my comments from last night which were beaten by the 10 o'clock bell. In doing so, I want to go back over a couple of things that I said, because I started out by noting the utter hypocrisy of the Premier in his advertising campaign, and I think it deserves repetition. It is the most utter hypocrisy and, whilst he is getting away with that for the time being, eventually the public will wake up to it, because it takes a certain amount of arrogance to treat the public with such disdain that you can say one thing one day and another thing the next and think that you can just get away with it and say nothing. I think that he will get his comeuppance eventually. I referred to the announcement of the government that it asserted \$360 million in tax cuts over four years which, as we know, was actually at the most only \$180 million and, that being over only four years, I then suggested that that might be equivalent to about \$45 million a year. In fact, on their own figures in the budget, it transpires that it is this year only \$40 million, so it is a long way short of the \$360 million being asserted by them.

I think I have dealt with land tax, payroll tax and stamp duty, and the next topic I want to touch on before dealing with the specifics of the portfolios for which I now have shadow responsibility is that of concessions. As has been pointed out by a number of other speakers during this debate there is nothing in this budget to help pensioners and self-funded retirees. In the electorate of Heysen, it is a significant problem and one which I am confronted with almost on a daily basis. Many people have lived in the area for long periods of time—30 to 40 years in one spot is not uncommon. People have therefore often bought houses at very modest prices. They have now entered into their retirement years, whether as self-funded retirees or pensioners often in those still quite modest houses, but because of the area and the enormous price rises that we have had, those houses are now extremely valuable which confronts these people with a difficulty in simply staying in the home that they may have lived in for 30 or 40 years. Did the government do anything to address that in the budget? No, not a thing.

I want to briefly touch on tourism, because I am just astonished at this government's attitude to tourism. It is clearly one of the areas where we could become a market leader. We were heading in that direction under the previous Liberal government, but this government continues to cut its funding for all sorts of tourism programs. Certainly with the member for Reynell's idea of adventure holidays in South Australia with potholed roads, I do not think that we are going to be attracting many more.

Indeed, their own figures show that they have cut international marketing for the second year running, and that this year they hope to reach a target of 300 000 international visitors, when, under the Liberal government, we already had 359 000 international visitors per year. They are still, obviously, some years away from being able to even get back to the levels that we enjoyed under the previous government and which gave quite considerable attention to the issue of tourism.

From time to time, I have heard the minister say that it has to do with international events, but the fact is that the figures show that other states have recovered much more quickly; they have already bounced back, and they no longer suffer the effects of September 11 or Bali; yet the state continues to lag behind. Rather than try to address the problem and put more money into marketing what a fabulous state we have for a tourist, this government's response is to spend money on lots of other things, but not on tourism in this economy.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What are the things you cut?

Mrs REDMOND: Well, the thing that I am going to talk about next is one of the things where the government is spending some money, and I congratulate it. The government will spend quite a bit of money over the next four years by putting money into FAYS. It is a very significant injection of funds—\$148 million over four years, and it will specifically address the urgent need for more staff to deal with child protection.

It has also announced the establishment of the Child Protection Review Committee which was, of course, recommended by the Layton Report. I note in passing that the Layton Report was introduced into this parliament in either late February or early March 2003, and this government is yet to formally respond to it, and to make a formal response to each of its 206 recommendations, notwithstanding that many of those recommendations were notified in a report to be either of moderate or minimal cost implication.

However, I congratulate the government on the injection of these funds over four years. Of course, I have a couple of questions about it. In an interview I heard with Simon Sharple, the Chair of the Child and Family Welfare Association, he suggested that the establishment of the Child Protection Review Committee, in fact, only brings us up to the same standards as other states. It has also been suggested by a reporter from *The Australian* to whom I was speaking, that the money that is to be put in will go nowhere near addressing the needs of the FAYS report, the Layton Report and the workload analysis that was subsequently done into the FAYS workload.

Indeed, I have also been told that there is not a sufficient number of skilled people in our community to take up positions which the government seeks to fill. So, whilst I congratulate the government on seeking to fill it, it must realise that putting in money is not, in and of itself, the answer to the problem. It needs to take a long term and deeper look at how to address the problem. Their workload analysis report indicates that the problems within FAYS are deep and systemic, and, indeed, in dealing with the caseloads, it is clear that they are basically going from crisis to crisis.

In saying that, I do not mean any criticism of the FAYS workers. The ones I have met and dealt with over the years have, to a person, been hard-working and genuine in their attempts to do their best under very difficult and underfunded circumstances. But when you have a situation where almost half of the case workers are in their first two years post-graduation, and half of them or one quarter of the overall

case workers are in their first year post-graduation, then, clearly, the system will head into crisis, especially when those people, in turn, will have to deal with, from day-to-day, the statutory problems of having to investigate the emergency situations and the notifications received because of statutory obligations and without being able to get into any long-term planning and management for the actual case management of these families in crisis.

I briefly want to touch on areas of disability and housing. Again, in the area of disability the government appears to be putting in a significant funding increase. On my calculation, disability services seems to up by \$5.5 million; Julia Farr by \$900 000; and the Independent Living Centre is up marginally on last year's budget and down slightly on the actual spent. There seems to be a significant increase in the money paid to IDSC (Intellectual Disability Services Council). I am, of course, happy to see that, but I make that comment on the basis that I have a number of provisos.

One relates to a program called the Moving On program which provides options for the post-school care of children with significant or profound disability, the sort of disability which will prevent them from ever becoming even able to work even in a sheltered workshop. That program has apparently been under-funded by some \$3.2 million, and that has come about because, whilst the amount paid into the program each year has increased, it has only been basically increased by the CPI, and it has not been increased sufficiently to account for the additional number of people entering the program.

It is important for this program to continue because these parents have actually done all of us and the whole state a favour by raising these children rather than institutionalising them. They raise the children in their homes, and give them the best that they possibly can, and send them to school. But, when their school days are over—I understand that when they reach the age of 20 they are no longer eligible to go to school—if they are so profoundly disabled that they cannot go to a sheltered workshop to work, then the failure to provide that Moving On program or some other post-school option means that these people are then left with an adult sized child to manage; that child needs the stimulation to be able to keep whatever skills they have learnt during their school years; they need the peer contact and the ability to associate with the group that they had gone to school with; and the parents need a level of respite.

It is extremely important that that program be funded at an appropriate level to allow the parents to continue to give those children every opportunity, because they are members of our community and they deserve to be treated as such. I think we need to remember that these people have, as I said, done us all of favour by not having these children institutionalised for their whole lives as would have happened a generation or two ago.

Lastly, I want to briefly touch on the issue of housing. I was pleased when, the weekend before last, the Premier and the minister made a pre-budget announcement on 22 May regarding a \$12.5 million injection of funds to address the issue of homelessness. Most particularly, \$6.5 million of that was being put towards the construction of a new 60-bed facility that was to be constructed in conjunction with Anglicare. Although the building of a 60-bed facility is to be applauded, this government has promised to halve the numbers of homeless during its term. According to its own figures, this government acknowledges that we have 600 in this state who are absolutely homeless and another 6 900

whose accommodation is either inadequate or inappropriate. Even if you take only the 600 who are absolutely homeless, if the government is actually going to be true to its word—although I have nothing in front of me at this stage of the four-year term to suggest that it is going to be true to its word on any of the Premier's so-called promises—half of 600 means that 300 homeless will be provided with appropriate housing. So 60, whilst it is to be applauded, goes nowhere near it. It is just a drop in the ocean.

In the meantime, whilst it has put money into that facility, the government has delivered significant cuts to a number of other areas including the following housing areas: the Better Neighbourhoods program; the Home Renovation program; house purchases; urban regeneration programs; crisis accommodation; and private rental assistance. As well as all those cuts, the government has reduced the number of tenantable dwellings available through the Housing Trust so, year by year, instead of increasing our number of tenantable dwellings, we are actually going backwards. This year we went from something like 47 310 tenantable dwellings down to 46 710.

So, although the government is putting this amount of money in conjunction with Anglicare—so it is not even all the government's money—towards housing a small fraction of the homeless whom it has promised to deal with, in the other areas, areas that are just as important and areas that involve whole families rather than just the individuals who are homeless, it is taking money out. I have not yet finished the sums to see whether the amount that it has cut from all those housing programs, which could and should have expected an increase, is actually going to be the amount that is put in by the government to this new 60-bed facility. If it is, it is a disgrace. This government needs to be called to account and needs to be made to answer for its failings.

Time expired.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I rise to make my contribution to the debate about the 2004-05 budget, a budget that I describe as a cynical, insincere sham, known in the industry as a 'Rann sham'. The reason it is a sham is that the government's economics are based on three policies that the Labor Party totally opposed. In all three policies debates were won, and the economic base of the budget is the result of the three economic debates that the ALP lost.

The first was the introduction of the GST; the second was the sale of ETSA; and the third was the Roxby Downs project. Labor opposed the GST for at least two elections. It has now rolled over after rolling back. The GST will now deliver to this state \$750 million more over the next four years than originally estimated, so the state is benefiting by some three quarters of a billion dollars over the next four years thanks to the GST, something totally opposed by the Labor Party and this current state government.

To put that in context, the interest paid on the State Bank debt was around \$700 million per annum. Of course, that was in 1994 dollars. We are talking now of \$750 million more over four years in 2004 dollars. So, the GST windfall, while significant, is small in regard to the amount of interest being paid in 1994 on the State Bank debt. The second area where the Labor Party lost the debate was in the sale of ETSA which, of course, significantly reduced state debt. I note in the budget speech that the Treasurer says that reducing debt is good economic management. Apparently, it is good economic management to reduce the debt slightly when a

Labor government is in office, but when a Liberal government reduces it by some billions that is somehow wrong.

So, the sale of ETSA was lost by the Labor Party. That has allowed the state to reduce the amount it is paying in interest. It allowed the state government to significantly reduce the debt and allows this state government to parade the possibility of getting a AAA credit rating. Of course, it took out of public ownership the risk of the ownership of electricity assets.

The third area where the state Labor Party lost the debate was in regard to Roxby Downs. It was described at the time by those in leadership positions as being a mirage in the desert. The mirage has now been expanded a number of times, and only in the last few weeks the Premier was out there suggesting that he supported the concept of Roxby Downs being expanded yet again. All those three public debates provide the structural floor for the state budget to be fixed, as it has been over the past 10 years.

So, the budget in my view is a sham. It is a sham because the government promised to govern for all of South Australia, yet it is this budget that actually hurts many South Australian families. It is a sham because this government went to the election with a promise not to increase fees and charges, yet the state government intends to collect \$587 million more this year than it did in 2001. That is something like \$1.6 million extra a day that the state government is collecting. This is a government that went to the electorate with its pledge card saying that it had no intention to increase fees and charges. This budget does hurt families, and for that reason it is a sham budget.

It is a sham also because it talks of being pro-employment and pro-business, yet it predicts the lowest growth rate in mainland Australia. Just .75 per cent is the growth rate predicted within this budget, and, in that respect, I think that illustrates that the budget is a sham. It is a sham in that it talks about giving business tax relief. Payroll tax, supposedly, is reduced, yet the budget papers show that the government will collect \$8 million more in the next 12 months in payroll tax than it did over the last 12 months. Then, of course, we have the NRM levy being introduced, and we had the River Murray levy introduced.

We had the disgraceful exercise of the deception of the hotel industry in relation to the pokies tax over its last two years; and, of course, the EPA has doubled all its licence fees. So, this government is saying that it is pro-business. I do not think that the business community would believe that for a minute. I do not think the business community believes that this government is pro-business. This budget is also a sham because of its tax relief measures. It claims to provide some \$360 million in tax relief. Now, the reality is that \$180 million of that tax relief was signed up in 1999 as part of the inter-governmental agreement in relation to the GST when it was introduced.

Something like \$180 million of the tax relief currently being delivered in this budget was, to all intents and purposes, actually locked in some five years ago. Of course, this government is saying, 'The reduction of these taxes is a good thing,' but what it forgets to tell South Australia is that it actually opposed the GST that allowed these taxes to be deleted or reduced. On the one hand, the government says that the GST should never have been introduced and, on the other, it is running around saying, 'Aren't we a good government because we are getting rid of these four or five taxes.'

Well, the reality is that South Australians will see this government as simply not sincere about the way in which it presents its particular achievements. The other \$180 million, of course, is delivered over a number of years—\$40 million of that over the next 12 months. The stamp duty reform for first home buyers is nothing short of a disgrace. South Australia still has one of the highest stamp duties for first home owners in Australia. It still costs something like \$9 000 more in South Australia for first home owners in state stamp duties.

The reforms the government has introduced in this budget provide relief of only about \$792 for the first home owner buying a house of medium value—something around \$250 000, from memory. Let us put that in some context. The government is saying that this \$792 saving is a magnificent thing for home owners. There are only 7 700 home owners in any one year in South Australia. So, 7 700 people are going to get \$792—rough enough—yet, if the government has its way, when the bargaining agents' fees are introduced, those people will be charged \$825 by their unions for enterprise bargaining arrangements.

On the one hand the government is saying that \$792 is a good reform and a large relief for first home owners, but, on the other hand, people are going to get charged \$825 every two years for a bargaining agent's fee. I think that people will see that this government is not sincere about its concern for first home owners. The reality is that the \$9 000 extra cost for first home owners (if you build that into the loan and pay that over 30 years) will mean that young families in South Australia will have to pay tens of thousands of dollars extra to own a home that they would not have had to pay had they purchased that house as a first home owner in other states.

The budget is a sham because it deliberately under-estimates property tax gains. For instance, in the last year there is something like \$1 billion in property taxes—up some \$263 million on the previous year, or something like 30 per cent more than predicted. This has been the pattern of Labor governments around Australia generally. I think that Western Australia may not have followed this pattern but, generally, other Labor governments around Australia have deliberately under-estimated property taxes so that they can put their hand on their heart come April/May each year and say, 'Well, shock, horror, we've got some extra money; we've got a hollow log—it is called property taxes. We can spend some money in some other areas.'

I think that people are starting to see through this particular strategy. The land tax reform is a sham. The land tax reform group and those being hurt by land tax have no need to worry, because this government is so cynical that this time next year it will reform land tax significantly. There is no doubt about that in my mind. What they will do to all those paying land tax is put them through another 12 months of paying. The land valuations that will come out later this year will show a significant increase. Those who pay land tax will go through another 12 months of paying, just so that this Treasurer can stand up next year, at roughly this time, and say, 'Aren't we a good government because we have reduced land tax.'

Those people who are paying land tax have every right to be annoyed and angry with this government, because what it has done with land tax, I think, is just a cynical exercise in politics. We will see that this time next year land tax reform will come on stream. The Treasurer will say what a great Treasurer he is for reforming land tax, but he is going to put many families through a lot of pain over the next 12 months.

I think that those families will be selling assets they have had in their family for generations because they will not be able to sustain the high level of land tax being charged by this government.

The amount of land tax collected last year is something like \$267 million. It was up 32 per cent on what was in the budget. So, it is up to \$267 million, an increase of \$64 million. The lobby group has learnt its lesson. There is a lesson in this budget for lobby groups. You see, when the hotel industry lobbied the government about pokie tax it got a handshake; it got a letter; and it got done over to the tune of \$18 million. The land tax group lobbied the government, and it is the one group that got nothing out of the budget other than a blood nose—come back next year! So, there is a message to some lobby groups about this government and this Treasurer in relation to how they handle lobby groups.

The land tax issue illustrates that it is the view of this government that, if you own a second home or a bed and breakfast, you are rich or you are well off. I do not think that is necessarily true. I believe that many people have worked really hard and made lots of sacrifices to buy an investment property, and this government sees them as a group of the population who can be penalised and taxed at every opportunity.

The capital works budget is another sham. The capital works budget was announced by the Premier: '\$950 million; the biggest capital works project ever in the state's history'. When we look at the capital works budget, we see that they have treated the cars in the government accounts differently. There is \$111 million worth of cars in the budget. They classify that as a capital work and, if you take the cars out of the capital works budget, in actual fact \$50 million less is being proposed for capital works this year, as I understand it, than last year.

Then there is a whole range of sham new announcements. There is \$14 million extra on the trams. The \$14 million extra on the trams is a blow-out because we do not get one extra tram or one extra seat. All we are doing is paying \$14 million more for something that we had already announced. They announced \$30 million for the Bakewell Bridge: not one cent will be spent in the next 12 months on that particular project; all we had was just simply the announcement. The marine innovation, \$12.9 million, \$12.1 million of which is to be spent after the 2006 election. They talk about \$3 million being contributed to tourism infrastructure—but not one cent is being spent in this particular budget. They talk about the bioscience incubator, a \$2.37 million project: \$2.2 million will be delivered after the 2006 election. They announced a living coast strategy of just \$500 000 this year. They announced a contaminated land strategy of just \$500 000 this year.

Then, of course, you get the sham reannouncements: not only do we have sham new announcements but also we have sham reannouncements. We get the reannouncement about shoulder sealing of \$6.8 million. Sounds good! When you go to the budget papers, guess what? It is the exactly the same figure; there is no change really to what has already been in place. They talk about \$5 million in overtaking lanes. When you go behind the figures, you see that it is a reduction in the money spent on overtaking lanes. They talk about the Mawson Lakes road and bridge, approximately \$8 million—but only \$500 000 is being spent this year. They refer to the Mawson Lakes public transport interchange, on which only \$300 000 is being spent this year out of a \$2.7 million project. Then when you look at the reference to the Port

Augusta courts, you see that that has been deferred for three years. Again, that community will be most upset about that announcement.

Then, of course, you get the sham no announcements: you have the sham new announcements, the sham reannouncements and then the sham no announcements. The no announcements are: the women's prison has disappeared and the juvenile youth centre seems to have disappeared as well. The reason that this is a sham budget is that it hurts families, and it hurts families in this way. Third party insurance is up 5.5 per cent; water supply charges are up 4.4 per cent; public transport is up over 3 per cent; car registration up 3.8 per cent; and speeding fines are up 3.6 per cent—and speeding fines have brought in a 40 per cent increase in revenue for this government. It is targeting families with speeding fines by a further 40 per cent and, on top of that, they will get demerit points.

Water costs are up 4.8 per cent; gas is up somewhere between 12 and 20 per cent; and the CPI in the budget is generally around 2 per cent. It is the families who will wear the hurt in this budget. There is nothing in this budget for families. There is a trickle for first home owners and business, if they pay payroll tax, but after that there is nothing. If you are a family that owns a property, this government is doing you over.

The figure that is not in the budget is the enterprise bargaining agent's fee which every family will have to pay when the union movement rolls it out over the next two years. That does not show in the budget, of course, because that would be a payment to the union, but it is another payment that this government is endorsing. It is another form of tax upon the family, and this budget will hurt families more than any other budget.

This is an insincere budget. This budget is a sham. This government suggests that it is governing for all South Australians, but there is nothing in this budget for families. This budget will hurt families because it has increased the charges well over and above the CPI. It has increased the charges which families will have to pay out, and it is the families who will wear the front of this budget.

Families will have to pay higher taxation, and it is families who can least afford that. If you believe the Labor Party rhetoric that the GST is collecting more money—and even their own budget papers show that; \$750 million more will come into this state over the next four years—it is the families, to a large extent, who are paying the extra GST; and, on top of that, they are paying all the state government charges. Families are getting done over by both the federal and state systems in relation to taxation. This budget misses the mark in the way it treats families. In my view, this budget hurts families and it is nothing but an insincere cynical sham.

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I, too, rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill. I believe that this budget is about the big print because the truth sure is in the small print. It is another piece of smoke and mirrors that this government has brought down this year, and it does rely very heavily on spin, rhetoric, newspaper headlines and television grabs. It is a government which has attempted to hoodwink South Australians into believing that there is something for everyone. It started in the days leading up to the budget where we saw that there was to be more money for health and children: the Treasurer was on a mission and we were all going to reap the benefits. It was in keeping with this self-proclaimed theme of this government which we have seen over many months now; that

is, it is bigger, tougher, stricter and larger, but of course, on this occasion it proclaims that it is more generous. They are more headlines from a big talking government.

However, as South Australians are beginning to realise, within the shell of the headlines, the spin and the rhetoric is a Labor government. The Treasurer has used mind games by promising and taking credit for tax relief from this the highest taxing Treasurer handing down the highest taxing budget in the state's history.

Stamp duty has been addressed in this budget, but there is a distinct lack of generosity, and for many South Australians it is minimal relief. It is real Scrooge economics. The stamp duty relief in this budget hardly compares with the massive tax revenues received by this government since it came into office some two years ago. Clearly the Treasurer does not want to use his war chest of dollars and the appropriate relief he sees for his election budget, which I have no doubt we will see next year, but the community will not be fooled.

I will deal with some of the specifics of stamp duty. For example, a house brought for \$250 000: concessions lead to a first home buyer receiving a net benefit of \$792. That equates to \$8 040 of stamp duty—nearly \$9 000—more than a first home buyer pays in New South Wales and Queensland. South Australia remains, as has already been said, the state with the highest rate of stamp duty in the country. To put this into perspective, let me give examples of my own local electorate of Morialta and the local median house prices there for the March quarter this year. In Rostrevor, \$285 000, a 24 per cent increase on March 2003; Athelstone, \$270 000, showing a 17 per cent increase; Newton, \$251 000, a 24 per cent increase; Woodforde, \$590 000, a 60 per cent increase; and, Magill, \$320 000, a 23 per cent increase. There is not much there for the young home buyer in the electorate of Morialta. This is going on while the Treasurer counts an additional \$263 million of property taxes not predicted in last year's budget. South Australians will have to anxiously await land tax relief but, as we have seen, it was not to be this year.

My office has received calls over the past year from constituents very concerned over land tax issues and I would be surprised if that has not been the case with all members in this chamber. The government it seems is not satisfied with the property tax windfall it has already received and it will gladly rip another 32 per cent of land tax receipts out of South Australia in the coming financial year. The bed and breakfast operators, who have fallen victim of the land tax squeeze, will look forward to yet another year without tax relief from this government, despite detailed and well documented submissions pleading for relief. So, too, will be those retirees who have invested in rental property and those tenants who will be forced to pay the increased rentals.

Then there are those who have scrimped and saved for holiday shacks and, despite Labor claims, they are not all rich. Our constituents will also have to swallow the increased charges for motor vehicle registration, bus fares and water—just another range of more broken promises. As our leader has already said, many sectors of our community, in particular the pensioners, have been ignored. This government continues to take from South Australians while giving little and it has the cheek to await the plaudits. It took office in March 2002, inheriting a very healthy economy, state finances that had been rescued from the brink by a Liberal Government, and the gift of GST payments (this year and forward estimated to be \$750 million), yet it still denies South Australians a slice of the pie.

It is hard to swallow and I do not agree with the praise being afforded this budget by the Chief Executive of Business SA, Peter Vaughan, when he said that the Treasurer has juggled all the fiscal balls and produced a budget that satisfies everyone. He says the payroll tax concessions will provide a boost and send a signal that South Australia is open for business. I fail to understand how business can be excited that it will have to pay an extra \$8 million in payroll tax and, as the leader said earlier yesterday in speaking to this budget, it is hardly what you would call tax relief. Not only will a lot more companies pay pay-roll tax, but for small businesses in South Australia they will provide absolutely no relief whatsoever.

I turn specifically to tourism because in this budget tourism in particular has again received the cold shoulder from the Treasurer. With a healthy economy, buckets of dollars in hand and a growth in the tourism sector that has already declined under Labor in comparison with other states, one may have made the mistake of hoping the Treasurer may have kept tourism in mind with this year's budget, but most of us know better. Do we find a remedy in this budget? Has the Minister for Tourism prevailed in cabinet? No. We got a budget that was little more than an insult to the hard-working people of the tourism industry. Despite the continued warning signs, South Australia continues to be in a state of denial when it comes to tourism. South Australia is lagging behind the tourism recovery experienced around our country following the downturns caused by SARS, 9/11 and the Bali bombings, but this government continues to turn a blind eye. We have the third successive year of budget cuts. It is a major disappointment for the industry and for those of us on this side who oversaw record highs in tourism and it surely is a disappointment for the minister.

I do not believe any minister could feel good about a record three out of three budget cuts, even if she has learnt to live with a Scrooge treasurer. It is on that basis that I thought I would offer some assistance to the minister and make specific reference to the newspaper article yesterday about the travel coup that will be worth millions of dollars to South Australia. We on this side of the house would be very happy to support the minister in her endeavours and that of the South Australian Tourism Commission, to host the Australian Tourism Exchange in the year 2006.

For the record, back in about 2000, the smaller states (including South Australia) had a major brawl—some would say 'animated discussion'—with the then chief executive of the ATE, and our case was that the eastern seaboard has always hosted this important tourism event. We said that it should be rotated among the other states. I urge this government to support the request that I have no doubt will come from the tourism minister and commit its resources. It could cost about \$1 million. It is outrageous that, until recent years, the eastern seaboard has hosted this event but, arising from the discussions held in 2000, it was agreed that the ATE would rotate clockwise around Australia.

It was agreed that Adelaide will host it in 2005 but, at that stage, there were still some difficulties in accommodating some of the requirements so it was agreed that Perth will host 2005 and Adelaide will host 2006. However, Darwin and Alice Springs could host the event after Perth, but at this stage that looks unlikely. So, 2007 will go back to Brisbane, 2008 to Sydney and 2009 to Melbourne. I urge the Treasurer, cabinet and members opposite to support the dollar request that I have no doubt will come from the tourism minister. I believe it will be a great day for South Australia when

Adelaide is able to host this event, as was agreed four years ago, and I wish that that will be confirmed rather than later.

The tourism industry in this state is full of hard-working, innovative individuals—small and large business operators—who have set an extraordinary example. The work of these individuals and this industry sector generates more than \$3.4 billion for our economy, employs more than 37 000 people and accounts for about 10 per cent of our state's growth. But the tourism graph lines, sadly, are on the slide, and the indifference of this government frustrates tourism operators to desperation. The messages sent by this budget are an insult, in my view. Overall, there has been another cut in government funding for the tourism portfolio to the tune of nearly \$5 million over last year's estimated result.

The programs of strategic advice, tourism development, tourism events and tourism marketing have all been cut, and I think it is very short-sighted. The government talks big but, when it comes to tourism, will not put its money where its mouth is, and I have no doubt the tourism minister will not be happy with what she has been able to extract from our scrooge Treasurer.

Quite frankly, my view is that the budget is not good enough and, while this situation prevails, the tourism industry in this state—and that means jobs and investment—will continue to suffer. The federal minister for tourism (Joe Hockey) will not think it is good enough, either. He has already warned us, and other states, about declining the marketing dollars, and the federal marketing contributions are at risk and under threat by the Labor government's shirking of its marketing responsibilities. It is not fair to have a halfhearted tourism budget in the face of a \$235 million injection from commonwealth government funds to tourism initiatives. Again, in this morning's paper the federal minister is quoted as saying that South Australia will suffer from funding cuts announced in last week's budget.

I believe that a number of areas require urgent attention, including the appalling slide in international visitor numbers. As I said earlier, in 2001 it was at an all-time high of 359 000. It has already slipped to 296 700 and it is particularly depressing that in this year's budget papers the objective of the government is to maintain international visitor numbers at 300 000, which is 60 000 fewer than a few years ago. There has been a crash of nearly 40 per cent in backpacker visitation, which is a hugely lucrative area of the tourism industry; and VFRs (visiting friends and relatives), a very important component of the tourism market in South Australia, is slipping again. These sorts of areas need to be addressed. The South Australian Tourism Index indicates tough times ahead. It predicts that the next three months hold a 9 per cent drop in performance from the previous corresponding quarter while over the next 12 months minimal, if any, growth is to be expected, in contrast to the rest of the country.

The industry is acutely aware of the danger signs, and the operators, large and small, are very concerned. They are talking about the need for a recovery program as a matter of urgency in the face of the international collapse, the backpacker crash and a government that is turning its back on major events. The industry is not, unlike the minister, cherry picking favourable figures to paint a rosy picture. It is raising current and relevant issues. This industry consists of a range of very professional, successful operations, and the operators will not lie down in the face of the threats to their industry, and nor should they: but they insist that the first priority must be to acknowledge that there is a problem and then to

acknowledge the urgency of the situation. This government must learn to do both.

Recently, this house witnessed what I think were the most extraordinary statements from members opposite trying to justify the shocking state of roads, particularly in our outback areas, but I believe it sums up the attitude of the government. I think it should be of concern to all of us when we talk about potholes being an advantage for adventure tourism. It may be that members do not care or members opposite just do not understand but, either way, the tourism industry does not have a chance when the government takes that sort of attitude.

It is the attitude of a government that wants to slap tourism operators and employers in the face further with the proposed Fair Work Bill, which is already being described as the most anti-business, anti-employer and anti-employment legislation that has ever been proposed in this state, and already Prime Minister John Howard has labelled it as a 'shocker.' It is the kind of attitude that will not see the targets contained in this year's budget papers achieved over the coming year.

We are in a position to capitalise further on the opportunities provided by direct flights to New Zealand and the burgeoning Asian market but we need dollars to capitalise on it. Mention has been made in this year's budget papers of the dive market, the food and wine market, and the nature and overseas student market—all to be commended—but you need dollars to support it. We know that we have a world class and very successful Convention Centre, and in the words of the federal minister Joe Hockey we have, and I quote, 'God-made infrastructure that other countries would die for.' There is undoubted potential in our state to meet the lofty targets. The Liberal government did just that by supporting a very vibrant industry. There are high potential and hard working operators and the future should be bright, but this government certainly gives the impression that it couldn't care less.

With the few moments that I have remaining I want to touch on two other matters. In relation to multicultural affairs, one of the particular issues that I wish to raise, that is of great interest to our diverse communities, is what is happening to the funding arrangements for the combined chambers of commerce of South Australia. There have been a number of positions, as I understand it, put forward so far, and I certainly look forward to learning about the detail as we get into estimates later this month. The combined chambers is a most important group. They have made an extremely valuable contribution to South Australia's trade and export operations and they deserve better treatment than they appear to be getting at the moment.

I also acknowledge that in the area of multicultural South Australia there is a need for special assistance for aged multicultural communities, and I know that this is an area of particular interest to the minister and I look forward to seeing what we can achieve in that area. There is also, in my view, a need for more focus and importance to be placed on the language and multi-lingual skills, particularly across our public sector, and I believe in many other areas, because South Australia at the moment has a very low record of university students that speak a language other than English. It is something less than 5 per cent, which compares very unfavourably with other like democracies throughout the world.

The other area of interest to me is the very complex issue of recognition of international qualifications, and I look forward to pursuing that further. In winding up, and I will

come to women in another section later on, I would like to welcome the additional funding for child protection and particularly the additional funding to Operation Flinders.

Time expired.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I contribute to this debate as the member for Waite, representing the people of Mitcham, but also as the shadow minister responsible for economic development for small business, the arts and science, innovation and information economy. I regret to say that it is not a good budget, either for my constituents, or for those portfolio areas for which I am responsible. It is a big taxing budget with precious little spending in the areas that matter most. There have been substantial cuts to the Department of Trade and Economic Development, which as we know, has gone through a period of chaos and confusion involving three to four reorganisations in as many years. There has been reduced expenditure in the area of administration, industry investment attraction and departmental capabilities, and I note that over \$63 million is to be slashed from this area over the next four years.

In the area of science and information economy, it is steady as she goes. There is nothing bold but the continuation of the policies of the former Liberal government. It is with great regret that I see this budget has not reintroduced the \$40.5 million innovation fund that was put in place by the former government when I was acting as minister, and the current Leader of the Opposition was Premier, to bid and provide for attracting centres of excellence to the state. It has not been replaced and there are cuts and savings initiatives to administration, IT and work force restructuring throughout this portfolio. This area of science, innovation and information economy is at the heart of the solution for transformation of the state economy.

In the arts, Labor claims a significant increase in expenditure but examination of the fine print, that will be explored further during budget estimates, shows this is not so. The country theatres needing \$7.2 million for refurbishment have been given \$500 000 per annum, barely enough to meet the urgent needs for rectification of occupational health and safety issues, certainly not enough to reconstitute those country theatres as they must be. Not only that, a \$4 million blow-out in the budget has been revealed for Wagner's *Ring* to be conducted by the State Opera. It will be a splendid event but there is concern as to whether or not the government can stick to a budget. The first event cost \$8.6 million—\$11 million was provided for this forthcoming event—and it has been blown to the tune of \$15.3 million. I am sure that the money has been well spent in that we will see, probably the world's best ever performance of the *Ring*, but it does raise questions about ministerial oversight and it rings an alarm bell that if this sort of mismanagement is to be repeated, and the savings are sought elsewhere within the arts budget, then we will be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

There is a need to look at funding for the second tier arts companies and for ongoing maintenance, administration and activity levels at the Museum, the Library and the Art Gallery. I am not going to dwell on those during this address, because I want to focus on the financial aspects, the jobs and the creation of business activity in this budget. It is a government awash with cash—\$750 million extra from the GST deal over this year and the forward estimates. This is the GST deal that the current government opposed; the GST deal that the Premier and his ministers all thought was a shocking idea. Of course, they are going to reap in \$750 million of

extra revenue and hundreds of millions of dollars on top of that in extra property taxes due to the property boom and the Premier's broken promise where he increased some stamp duty rates on property conveyances by up to 25 per cent.

Why is the state enjoying such buoyant economic times? As Standard and Poor's pointed out, it is principally because of the debt reduction strategy of the former government that was achieved through its sale of the electricity generating and transmission assets. Again and again it is pointed to as the main cause for lifting South Australia from its malaise and kick-starting the current economic good times that we enjoy. Together with that, the government is enjoying low interest rates and generally buoyant national economic circumstances thanks to the Howard federal government. Despite that, there are still signs of waste: the \$4 million blowout (and rising) on the Sturt Street School; the \$14 million blowout on the Glenelg trams, which is not going to give rise to a single new tram, but is simply an example of mismanagement; the aforementioned \$4 million blowout for the conduct of the *Ring Cycle*; and, of course, we have the \$30 million blowout on the Port River crossing. There is also the explosion in the number of senior public servants. We were assured, when the present government was in opposition, that they would be out to get the fat cats but, of course, they have multiplied.

It is really the tax rip-off that worries me most of all, because that tax is taking dollars out of the economy and out of people's pockets, reducing consumption and placing an uncompetitive burden on South Australian small businesses, and upon South Australians. We had the mid-year budget review back in January which revealed \$2.6 million worth of state taxes. In just two years this present Labor government has taken an extra \$459 million out of South Australian pockets. Of course, this budget simply confirms and adds detail to that mid-year budget review. Property taxes—which will include stamp duties, land tax and the emergency services levy—are \$263 million higher and at a level now of \$1.046 billion than that which was estimated by the Rann government last year.

So, they have underestimated the revenues they would achieve. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that gives them room to fudge mismanagement. It gives them money to throw at issues as they see fit. It is a deliberate device that has been built into the budget for its own fiscal purposes. Next year, in 2004-05, the budget estimate for property taxes is \$979 million—almost \$1 billion. However, based on the inaccuracy of the government's recent estimates, there must be a good chance that it will again go well above \$1 billion.

The Premier offered a miserly \$14 million in stamp duty relief for first home owners when it will actually collect an extra \$64 million from land tax alone. I am deeply concerned about this on behalf of my constituents in Waite, many of whom are paying these land taxes. They are really coping it in the Mitcham area and in the eastern suburbs as a consequence of these hikes. I hasten to point out to the house that not everybody living in the eastern suburbs is wealthy as the government seems to think is the case. There are first home owners and buyers in Mitcham as well as in any other part of the state. It is these first home buyers who will be paying the highest level of stamp duty in Australia even after this budget.

New South Wales Premier Bob Carr gave first home owners \$8 081 worth of stamp duty relief. Mike Rann is going to give them \$792. It is amazing when you look at other states and you compare our competitiveness. The stamp

duty payable on the first home owner home (a \$250 000 home) in South Australia is \$8 940. In Western Australia it is \$5 050. In New South Wales, Queensland and the ACT it is now zero. If you are a first home buyer, where do you want to live? Where do you want to set up home? Stamp duty payable on a \$400 000 home with a \$360 000 mortgage by a first home owner in South Australia will actually be over \$16 000 higher than for a first home owner in New South Wales.

Not long ago there was a time during the former Liberal government where we could proudly say that it was cheaper to live in South Australia than it was to live in Sydney. A few more years of this government, and I think the tables will be turned. Regarding these soaring property tax receipts, the budget papers forward estimates show that they will result in a surprise \$757 million GST bonus from the GST deal, as I mentioned earlier, when compared to the pre-GST funding deal with the federal government. So, it is a government awash with cash. Is the spending there to match? It is normally 'tax and spend' from Labor. At the moment we are getting the tax part, but I am sure in the pre-election budget we will get the spend part, in a cynical pork-barrelling exercise.

It is really the small business sector that worries me, because there is nothing in this budget for the small business sector. Labor has attacked the small business sector in the budget and shown an abject failure of leadership. In 2004-05, this budget shows, small business funding will be slashed by 47 per cent down to \$2.1 million; it is down more than 52 per cent since 2002-03 when we spent \$5.1 million. Labor's lack of leadership and support explains why the ABS has recently reported a fall of 13 per cent in the number of small business operators in South Australia over the past two years; it is the worst result in the nation.

The budget papers show a serious decline in the support that will be available to small businesses as a result of the closure of the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing and its replacement with a down-scaled and under-resourced system of business enterprise centres. What is the result of that? The budget papers' own key performance indicators reveal them. They state that the number of small business development services that will be provided by the Labor government falls sharply by 65 per cent from 2002-03 to 2003-04. The budget papers state that small business training programs and export assistance advice to small business have been slashed.

Let us look at the figures. In 2002-03, the number of people completing business training programs was 2 710; in 2003-04 it was 1 200; and in 2004-05 it is likely to be zero. The number of small business development services provided in total was 910 in 2002-03, down to 320 in 2003-04. The number of occasions when export assistance advice or overseas market intelligence was provided to South Australian companies amounted to 360 in 2003-04, and only 130 in the year that is now coming to a close—almost a two thirds reduction. The number of businesses matching appointments facilitated for South Australian companies with overseas companies with tangible help provided by the government to South Australian businesses was down from 400 to 274. This is what is being delivered by this savage reduction in investment in building this economy.

As I mentioned earlier, over \$63 million is to be slashed from the area of business, trade and development over the next four years. Business and manufacturing capabilities have been cut by 47 per cent (or \$8.6 million). There has been a

significant cut to major project facilitation and implementation—50 per cent (\$35 million); grants and subsidies for industry development have decreased by over 50 per cent (\$32 million); and the number of people employed in helping business to grow in this state is down from 212 to 120. It is a government that does not know where it is going with industry development. The strategy is to leave things be. The strategy is that if you do nothing business will automatically grow and prosper. Well, business will not automatically grow and prosper; small business will not automatically grow and prosper. Business needs a partnership with government. It needs the government's good offices; its trade offices overseas; its training resources here in the state; and it needs the government's expertise and contacts to facilitate its growth. We are a regional economy. If you leave things be, gravity will suck business enterprise towards Sydney and Melbourne, where there are markets and levels of activity with which we will find it difficult to compete.

Governments of regional economies need to do something extra; they need to do something more. A hands-off approach is not, in itself, enough. Small business is in free-fall under this Rann Labor government. It is even harder for women, because the ABS has shown that there has been a 25 per cent drop in the number of female small business operators in the state over the past two years. We are the worst performing of all the mainland states; we have a problem.

What is the cause of that problem? Is it the tax regime that I talked about? Is it the chaos within the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade? Is it this withdrawal of funding? Is it red tape? Is it a government that has taken its hands off the wheel for small business? What is the cause? The government must explain.

There are other concerns about this budget. I draw attention to the contribution by the member for Napier—a very good contribution yesterday to the debate—about the woes that this government faces in funding its long-term superannuation obligations, because the government will be battling with the blow-out of \$1.16 billion in the past year in superannuation liabilities. The liability was \$4.4 billion in June 2003, and it was expected to be \$4.6 billion by the end of this month. But now we find, largely as a result of accounting changes, that this week's South Australian budget reveals that state obligations under its old defined benefits superannuation fund is now \$5.75 billion, and it is forecast to rise to \$5.83 billion by June 2005.

The former Liberal government did something to address this by modifying the super scheme, but we are facing some serious issues here. The obligation is equivalent to around 11.2 per cent of gross state product—the highest of any state except Tasmania. By comparison, Victoria has a combined net debt and superannuation liability of 6.9 per cent of gross state product. We really need to sit down and ask ourselves how we are going to fund this superannuation liability.

I note with interest the comments that have been made by the Grants Commission in regard to this problem. It needs to be addressed. It is not only about superannuation and funding that superannuation liability; it is also about the blow-out in our obligations in regard to WorkCover. These are two major concerns: two major potential torpedoes lurking in the depths in regard to this budget and for which the budget does not prepare the state. In good economic times such as we enjoy, we prepare for the bad.

A couple of per cent increase in interest rates, softening in the housing market and one or two other changes, perhaps further increases in the price of oil, and this economy could

stop dead in its tracks. This budget should be preparing the state for the bad times, but it is not. There are some serious concerns about the underlying strategy that binds this budget together. In fact, there seems to be no underlying strategy.

Time expired.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): The third Labor budget has now been tabled and gives lots of promises, particularly for those who live nearest the city of Adelaide. However, for those who live outside the city, pensioners and self-funded retirees, there still remain many promises that have not been honoured from the first and second budgets, and it is disheartening that even the few budget items that we have received in this budget may not be delivered either, judging by the Labor government's track record.

The Treasurer is struggling to make his name as the Treasurer who delivered a AAA rating to South Australia. However, the glory will not be his. Was he not part of the Labor government which presided over the State Bank debt and which lost our AAA rating in the first place? Who left our state unable to pay even the interest on that debt, let alone the expansion of our infrastructure and the stimulation of industry to provide jobs for our people? Dr Hayden Manning, Senior Lecturer, School of Political Studies at Flinders University, said about the Liberal government on the ABC yesterday:

They sold ETSA, and they sold ETSA for one big objective: to bring the state debt down; and what Mr Foley doesn't remind us voters of is that the only reason he's within cooee of the AAA rating given by the international financial ratings agency Standard and Poor's is because we relieved so much debt by selling ETSA. Whenever you turn the heater on you can think that in your own small way you're contributing to the AAA plus announcement, which I expect will probably happen within the next six months, at least within the next year.

The provision of new power in the state to enable more people to have airconditioners and time-saving appliances in their homes and for businesses to expand has come from private enterprise, with no help from this government. Not even help with the augmentation costs to provide upgrades of general community power services that would enable businesses to expand and housing developments to proceed in our regions have been offered. Yet \$64 million has been paid to the providers of gas through the Adelaide pipeline to ensure that those gas users connected to the pipeline will not have to pay more. This is despite the users of bottled gas having to pay about twice as much.

What would the multiplier effect have been and jobs created if this \$64 million had been used to enable business and housing to go ahead? It is interesting to see the recognition of the need for the funding of power connection with the state government taking responsibility for assisting in the provision of \$2 million only to provide upgrades to the Kangaroo Island power supply in 2004-05. How much better if the \$64 million spent on reducing the cost of gas to a few had been spent on power upgrades across the state and not just lost without benefiting most taxpayers. Now the former Liberal government has the state back on track with the AA plus rating, and the benefits are flowing through from the federal Liberal government's early GST payment (\$28 million this year) and tax increases, an additional \$587 million more than in our Liberal government's last budget (more than a billion dollars is coming from property taxes alone). Bearing this in mind, the Treasurer could afford to be more generous in what is his third budget.

But not only have many of the other promises not been delivered: even the promises in this budget are mostly in the third and fourth year, cynically matching the time of the next election, with very little being promised for this year. To illustrate the anger in education, I quote from a letter to the Editor of the *Port Lincoln Times* about a meeting described by the writer Mark Pfitzner from the little town of Butler Tanks as a war council to discuss resources and facilities, and held at Wudinna in my electorate on the Eyre Peninsula last Sunday. The principals and governing school council chairpersons from the 12 area schools that I represent were all present, despite some having to travel more than 400 kilometres to attend. The letter reads:

The 12 far west tribes (Eyre area schools) came off their reservations to sit at a war council meeting to discuss resources and facilities with all principals and governing school council chairpersons present. The common problem discussed was the lack of deliverance, empty promises of money to be spent on asset management which has a huge backlog of work identified. Superintendent for Learning Resources and Services Mr John Gregory attended the meeting although not initially invited was welcomed to smoke the peace pipe. John's responses took the tone of I am just the messenger I can't give you what I haven't got, and 'I have only six staff to process 1 200 applications for the backlog of work.' He also described a total of \$45 million of works to be completed with just \$6 million. This fact outraged those present. Once again Eyre Peninsula missed out on a fair share. Only one of the 12 area schools has had its building works completed. A minute share of the promised works money has been spent out west. The P21 system of local management is dead. The system although underfunded did work, at least improvements could be seen.

The new Russian roulette smoke and mirrors approach which is already 12 months behind might give you something if you're running on a hot streak. Best bet would be to send your children to teachers college at least for a unit or two because home schooling might be the only option in 20 years time if facilities can't be even maintained. Next War council sitting is August this is not satisfactory.

The letter is signed, 'Mark Pfitzner'. In a separate note emailed to me, Mark said how the group acknowledged the tremendous outcomes for the reception to year 12 students, which were currently being achieved in the area schools across Eyre Peninsula. He mentions the concern of the meeting when they compared notes and found that only one of the 12 schools had last year's asset-funded projects completed, and most had not yet even been started. One of these would have been Ceduna's junior school, which was originally funded with \$5 million (including \$1 million of federal funding back in 2001) and which has been included at \$3.9 million in the last two Labor budgets—but which had disappeared without trace in this budget.

Fortunately, after a question in the parliament the week before the budget, the new minister promised that it will be completed without the administrative section before the first term next year. We will wait and see. Meanwhile, the unnecessary Sturt Street School in the city has been reopened for students. It now has, I understand, around 70 students, all of whom have other options. The cost of renovating this school has reached around \$6 million, and arsenic and salt damp issues are still being dealt with. No wonder the people attending the Wudinna meeting, who have hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of work to be undertaken, are angry.

Similar outrage is being indicated with respect to the situation in our 10 regional hospitals in that, for the third time, funding provided is less than inflation. The minister knows that it is impossible to maintain them as acute care hospitals, despite her undertaking to keep them as acute care when I specifically questioned her in parliament when she

first became minister to make sure that her response was on the *Hansard* record. With funding being cut, services are being withdrawn back to Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Adelaide.

Last year the cost of the Royal Flying Doctor Service retrievals of patients from Eyre Peninsula to Adelaide was \$800 000. Thousands more were spent under the Patient Assisted Travel Scheme (PATS) and thousands more by private individuals to travel to and from appointments. This puts further pressure on the Adelaide hospitals, and puts already ill country people and their families through major trauma as they try to organise their lives and finances to ensure that their loved ones get the treatment they need. These patients are being sent home often earlier than they should be, again putting pressure on everyone, only to find that the expected support services are not available in the regional hospitals due to lack of funding.

During the year, five new paid ambulance officers were placed in Port Lincoln, doubling the number of paid people. But funding could not be found for allied health personnel, such as physiotherapists and speech therapists. Perhaps putting the ambulance under the health portfolio will mean that there can be some job sharing and that, perhaps, the ambulance officers can also be physiotherapists and speech therapists, or fill other health positions to ensure that essential jobs are filled. As all the other ambulances on Eyre Peninsula are manned by volunteers (many of whom are holding down full-time paid positions within their communities), this suggestion does not seem to be unreasonable.

There are many other issues in this budget, such as water supply charges up by 4.4 per cent, car registration up by 3.8 per cent and drivers' licences rising by 3.4 per cent, but I will finish on two that, despite delays, are positive if they are followed through. The first is the proposed \$32 million public/private partnership desalination plant which was written in blood by the then minister after the last budget and which should have been operating by now. In this budget it has metamorphosed into a \$25 million desalination plant to be built by SA Water, with the first \$5.2 million only to be spent in the 2004-05 financial year, which begs the question: when is it going to be finished—if, of course, it even gets started this time?

An opportunity to use the wind energy from the Cathedral Rocks wind farm before it goes into the grid to desalinate sea water and shandy it with the Uley water is not being taken up, despite this option being able to reliably supply unlimited water into the existing system—a supply which would not be restricted in times of drought when the water is most needed and one which can be increased by adding further units on site at any time. The most recent price I have heard for desalinated sea water is \$1.36 per kilolitre, and it could be less with a bigger plant using predominantly wind energy.

The last item I want to mention tonight is the Marine Innovation South Australia (MISA) project to be based at Port Lincoln. I wrote to the Premier the week before the budget, again stating that this project is of national importance and asking him to give it consideration. However, as I had already been disappointed in three budgets, I was not getting my hopes up. I was delighted to see it announced in *The Advertiser* the day before the budget came down with a \$12.9 million commitment by the Labor government. I was a little disappointed when I saw that only \$300 000 was actually committed in this budget and that only \$500 000 was committed in the next one.

Is it not strange that, in an election year, we have a promise of \$4.1 million and the year after that \$8 million,

giving a total of \$12 million? However, the commitment is very important as it sends the signal that this wonderful project will finally go ahead with the state government's support, and this means that the federal government and the bodies that it funds can now seriously get on board and gather together the remaining \$12.1 million of the proposed \$25 million project to have a world-class temperate marine centre of excellence, which, I hope, will one day also incorporate our TAFE and senior high school.

To me it is the most exciting item in the whole budget. It is one that I mentioned in my very first speech in parliament more than 10 years ago, and now I may live to see it become reality. It has taken a lot of people, a lot of time and a lot of work to get it this far, and it will take a lot more before it reaches even the start of its potential. I congratulate those people who have hung in there and kept trying, despite the disappointments, particularly those from SARDI, the Flinders Marine Science Centre, our three state universities (particularly Flinders University), the Museum, the CSIRO, the Port Lincoln City Council, the Eyre Regional Development Board, the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, industry and the many other passionate individuals, such as Eric Russell.

I urge everyone to get behind this fantastic project and stay with it now until it reaches the world stage as a world class centre of excellence for research, industry development and education of temperate marine species.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): This is a budget under which South Australians will be no better off: they will be worse off. In fact, if South Australians look at the rates of increase in taxation by this government and examine how that affects their weekly pay packet, they will find that they are worse off under this Labor government. It is a budget that, on the one hand, delivers increased money into health (which we welcome) while, on the other hand, the hand of the Treasurer is firmly in your pocket extracting more tax. It is a budget that does absolutely nothing to address the backlog of road maintenance in South Australia and, in particular, the outback roads which need it. This is a budget that is deceptive in its language. For example, the Treasurer quotes some \$360 million worth of tax relief, yet we know that \$180 million comes from the debits tax which was negotiated by the former Liberal government and the Howard government as part of the GST package.

Therefore, the Treasurer's language is a sham and it is misleading. Labor was against the GST. In fact, I vividly remember members of the Labor Party in this house speaking out against the GST—what a terrible tax it was and how it would bring Australian society and citizens in South Australia to their knees! I do not hear the government saying now that it will hand back the additional funds which are flowing into South Australia as a result of the GST. In fact, quite the opposite: the government is welcoming it with open arms, and South Australia is benefiting because of that tax and the extra funds coming to South Australia.

This is a budget where the increased spending on health and a few other areas would not be possible if it were not for the decisions of the former Liberal government, which, as members may recall, came to office in 1993 and faced a recurrent deficit (I repeat, a recurrent deficit) of some \$300 million. The then Arnold Labor government (for which the now Treasurer was the financial adviser) had overspent its budget by \$300 million. It took a lot to bring that back under control, let alone deal with the \$9.5 billion worth of

debt that the state had at that time. That took very good financial management.

The Treasurer speaks about the sound financial management that he is undertaking. It is very easy when you do not have a \$300 million recurrent deficit. It is very easy when you have land tax and property tax revenue way above what was expected and when you have GST income way above what was budgeted for: it makes life relatively easy. He should have been sitting around the cabinet table when the really hard decisions had to be made to clean up the mess left by the previous Labor government. Where would we be now if the former Liberal government had not made those hard decisions and had not got the budget under control?

This budget gives absolutely no relief to those paying the huge increases in land tax. I have spoken to a large number of people in my electorate office who have seen land tax increases to the tune of 700 and 800 per cent. The Treasurer seems to think that the only people who are affected by this are the rich and famous, or those who are on huge incomes and who can obviously afford these large increases in land tax. Let me tell him something. Many people whom I know in my electorate and elsewhere are on average incomes and, in many cases, they are young people, and both of them working in an effort to improve their capital worth. They have a home loan, but they have decided to invest in their future and to buy an investment property. They are looking at setting themselves up with a superannuation benefit in terms of a property and the long-term capital gain from which they might benefit.

Many of those people are very severely affected by this lack of attention to any land tax relief—not to mention the self-funded retirees who, some years ago, invested in property for their own retirement so as not to be a burden on either the state or federal government. Many of those people will really hurt under this budget because it offers no relief from the huge increases in land tax. There is absolutely no relief whatsoever for those people.

This budget gives some relief to first home owners in respect of stamp duty, but none to other home purchasers. I draw members' attention to how much relief other states give to first home owners. As has been said by other speakers in this debate, in some states first home owners pay no stamp duty whatsoever and other states are far more generous than this state.

I would have thought that, if this government wanted to encourage first home owners and others to set up in this state, this would have been one of the areas, along with land tax, at which it would have looked far more closely and given a greater benefit to these people. This is a budget of a mean government and one that places South Australia at the top of the table regarding the amount of tax paid by its citizens. It is typical, of course, of a Labor government, whether it be federal or state: it is a matter of spend up big and, to do that, you have to increase taxes, and the average citizen ends up paying more. As I said at the beginning of my contribution, I challenge people to look at their take home pay at the end of the month and the additional charges that they will pay and compare that with any increase they might receive in their wage during the year. From what I can see, there is no doubt that they will be worse off.

This is a budget that continues the rhetoric of a Labor government without achieving anything, a lack of understanding by the Treasurer who thinks that to have a cash surplus will solve all the problems of this state. There is a lot more to it than that, as the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday,

because any economist knows that on the one hand you have a cash balance or cash policy and on the other hand you have a fiscal policy. That fiscal policy has to continue to look at how the state economy is structured, where are the points at which growth can occur, where we have our comparative advantage, where we must encourage industry to expand and where there are sunset industries that are looking, through competitive pressures, at closing.

Mitsubishi comes to mind straightaway. To give the Treasurer his due, he worked extremely hard, along with the federal Minister for Industry (Mr Macfarlane), to ensure that not all of Mitsubishi was taken from South Australia. I commend the Treasurer in his role as Minister for Industry for his efforts on that. Had it not been for the combined efforts of the state and federal governments, we may well have seen Mitsubishi move out of South Australia altogether.

But, that raises another point, because 700 workers at Lonsdale will lose their jobs over the next 18 months. What is this government doing about planning for the perhaps inevitable day when the other Mitsubishi plant closes as well? Unless Mitsubishi makes a fist of this new model that they will be bringing online, and unless it becomes profitable, I can see somewhere down the track that, unless the losses of the car business of Mitsubishi are stopped, the point will come where the Tonsley Park plant may face the axe as well. This government has to plan for that because, if it does not and the decision comes down in three or four years and we have not started to work on the fact that other industries will have to replace that car industry and the component industries that will be affected along with it, it will fail.

I do not see any planning going on. One only has to look at the former Department of Industry and Trade under the Liberal government: it was a vibrant and expanding department which had initiative and was moving forward. The department I see now is in limbo. I am told that people go to their desk and find blank computer screens. We have seen the closure of overseas offices under this government. Where does this government expect to pick up business, develop new industries or expand the industries we have currently unless it is out there selling South Australia day after day, week after week, in those Asian and international markets? It will not happen.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Kerin, in his former role as minister for agriculture and primary industries, was constantly going to overseas trade fairs with industry people to ensure that South Australia and the products we are producing here were thrust into the limelight at those fairs. Unless we are doing that, the Asian market will look at it and say, 'They were here for a while and now they have disappeared,' and if we go back again they will say, 'How can we trust you to not withdraw again?' South Australia will be seen as a supplier of which they are unsure or which they believe to be unreliable. It is something you have to work at week after week to gain the trust of these countries and to develop those relationships to ensure that the exports can continue to expand.

We will remember that this government has the target of tripling exports. It will not happen unless more work and some planning is done by the Minister for Industry. I do not see that happening at all, and that is where South Australia will fall on its face unless it happens.

Let us turn to the areas of tax. This government is the highest taxing government in Australia. We only have to look through the budget to see water supply taxes going up by 4.4 per cent, but they have conveniently not highlighted the fact

that that is the annual supply charge. If one looks at the budget papers, one sees water rates per kilolitre, supplied up to and including 125 kilolitres, going up by 4.8 per cent. We can see public transport prices going up by 3 per cent. I have had people come to my electorate office already complaining about this. One only had to read the letters to the editor last Saturday to see people on average incomes complaining that public transport costs are going up and how it will eat into their family budget.

Car registration is up by 3.8 per cent. We have to remember that this is compounding: it is not 3.8 per cent on the original \$100 or the base unit, but 3.8 per cent on the larger amount. So, each year that the government puts up these costs it then rises not by \$1 or \$2 but by \$3, \$4 or \$5, and I am sure we will see an increase next year as well. The cost of drivers' licences is going up by 4.3 per cent and speeding fines by 3.6 per cent.

I have no sympathy for anybody who speeds because a speed limit is set and if you do not go over the speed limit you do not incur a fine: but the fact is that the fine for driving at over 30 km/h is going up by 3.9 per cent. The standard compulsory third party premium goes up by 5.5 per cent. All these increases are, of course, well above inflation. This government is taxing hard and high, and people in South Australia will feel this.

Last year a lady came into my office. She and her husband have a builder's licence and are in partnership. Previously, the builder's licence has been held in joint names and they paid a set fee. This year they will maintain their partnership but, if they want the builder's licence in the partnership name, they both have to pay the full fee.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: It's an outrage!

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It is an outrage, as the member for Stuart said. It is a rip-off of average people in the community. Only the other day, after the budget was announced, a person who has a security and investigation agent's licence came into my electorate office. Again, he and his wife operate a partnership. Last year the partnership paid \$296: this year they will have to pay \$308 each.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: You can tell them who has done it!

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Absolutely. I will be telling them who has done it, all right. This is a high taxing Labor government, and the Treasurer has his hand in people's pockets in every way, and he is ripping money out of their pockets when it is not necessary. Taxation revenue is estimated to increase in South Australia by 22 per cent between 2003-04 and 2007-08, and it shows what this government is up to.

Let me turn to a couple of my favourite subjects for a couple of minutes, namely, education and transport. I well remember the then new minister for education, Trish White, coming into this house after the 2002 election and bemoaning the fact that the Liberal government over the past eight years had underspent its capital works budget by \$124 million and asking what benefits could be distributed to the young people of South Australia if the government spent that money. Well, what do we see about last year's budget alone? There was a \$15 million underspend by the Labor government on its capital works budget. I wonder what the former minister thinks of that now. Is it a deliberate plot of holding back capital works?

Look at the long-suffering constituents of the member for Flinders at Ceduna. I visited the school and it is a mass of demacs. They are still waiting for a school and, had the

Liberal party been in government, it would have been built by now.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Booleroo Centre.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member for Stuart says, Booleroo Centre is another school that was deliberately postponed, to the disadvantage of the students.

In relation to transport, there is nothing for Outback road gangs, yet this Labor government says it wants to encourage tourists into the Outback. It can encourage them all it wants, but the tourists will be pretty unhappy when they rock into the Copley garage with two or three punctures. I know the reports that come to me and members on this side, and they are that our road infrastructure is crumbling. The government has done nothing to address the \$160 million backlog of maintenance required on roads.

The government says that it has provided an additional \$6.8 million for shoulder sealing. Well, hello! All it has done is extend it by one year: it is not in addition. You have to be careful when you read the rhetoric in this budget. All it has done is put the same \$6.8 million that it is spending this year into the budget for the following year, 2006-07. So, be careful of the rhetoric. The Liberal party had an arterial roads program: I look at that program in this budget and see that it has been allocated \$1 million. We know where country people stand. We are the poor relations—there is no doubt about that, because nothing is being spent in the country.

Time expired.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I did not mean to interrupt the member for Stuart but I thought it was time, after the crocodile tears from members opposite over stamp duty, that I set the record straight. The irony of politics is that when the economic indicator is on the way up the opposition cries, 'It is all our doing'—it is because of the way they set it up when they were in government. So, when house prices go up and stamp duty revenue increases, what do they say? Lower stamp duty! Who set the rates for the stamp duty taxes that people are paying now? It was treasurer Stephen Baker, and it was increased by the then treasurer Lucas. I never heard the member for Light once get up in a supply speech and say, 'I want treasurer Lucas to lower stamp duties.' The housing boom did not occur in March 2002: it did not start then, because I have heard members opposite crying that the housing boom started when they were in government. Did they lower stamp duty in eight budgets? Not once!

But, hang on. There was the State Bank, and we were paying off debt. Well, let us talk about paying off debt. They sold an asset which they promised they would not sell.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: Buy it back!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Buy it back! The fiscal irresponsibility of those opposite is amazing. First they sell it and then they cry, 'Buy it back.' Which is it? This government has projected surpluses—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on, member for Stuart. I do not interrupt your speeches, so sit quietly and listen to my point of view for a change. I have a great deal of respect for the member for Stuart's points of view, but maybe for a change he can listen to someone else's point of view. The truth of the matter is that we have used our surpluses and our cash bonuses from the housing boom to invest in the economy of South Australia—in health, education and police. The problem with this budget is that they are green with envy, because the two people they had running their budgets

delivered nothing but deficits, and even after they sold ETSA they still delivered us a deficit. Why?

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on, I heard someone say a \$1 million surplus, and you are proud of it?

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Here we go, State Bank again. Living in the past. The member for Goyder, who was touted as a future leader of the Liberal Party when he first entered the place, talks about the State Bank. I have got news for him, it is not 1989 any more. I am very proud of this budget for a number of reasons because we are the first government in a decade or more to offer stamp duty concessions to first home owners. What did the previous government do for first home owners? Not a thing. Not once did treasurer Lucas lower stamp duty. The rate that they are crying foul about is the rate that they set.

We have a \$52 million surplus that includes \$565 million extra being spent on human services. No-one can criticise this as being a Labor budget. We have our priorities, the former government had their own. Our priorities are health, education, police and a sound economy, and I think that the Treasurer and the government have delivered South Australians a budget that they can be proud of. Of course, not everyone is happy. The RAA, and the member for Light and the member for Stuart are upset—

Mr Snelling: Members opposite are not happy; they are very upset.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: But I hear that privately some of them are saying, ‘Gee, what was Rob Lucas doing? Why couldn’t we get budgets like these? Why can’t we get surpluses?’ They went through all the political pain of privatising an asset, that they had promised they wouldn’t, to get themselves out of debt, and that they claimed we caused, and they still delivered deficits. The deputy leader, who was the minister for human services, ran a Human Services that was out of control, spending beyond its means, never following a budget, and then he has the gall to come here and criticise us for spending an extra \$565 million on the budget for health services.

What struck me was that the first thing the member for Bragg, the Labor education spokesperson, did was criticise a school that we opened. They want to attack that community twice—once when they closed it and then when we reopen it they want to criticise it again. It is not enough that they wrecked one of the great schools that South Australia ever had, but the moment we reopen it they want to tear it down. All they do is knock and whinge, and they are not even very good at that, if you look at the polls.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: We learnt from you.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: We didn’t knock and whinge; we offered alternatives. That is why we are in government and you are not. With budgets, not everyone is happy but I am very happy with the budget. The people of West Torrens have done exceptionally well out of this budget with the Bakewell Bridge.

Dr McFetridge: When?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Ah, when? This is a good point; this is what I am coming to it. The member for Morphett would be well aware that I was calling for the Bakewell Bridge to be replaced when his former colleague the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was transport minister, and it is funny how it never really happened. The bridge was always promised but it never came forward. This government has committed to the bridge, an underpass—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: You haven’t provided any money.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Stuart says there is no money allocated. Money is allocated in the budget for it. It will be built. Can you say the same for Diana Laidlaw and your budget? No. The best thing that they can say is that there is no money in the budget but they cannot back it up. I have seen the budget lines where the money is allocated. For some reason the members opposite refuse to accept what is in the budget. It seems to me that all they are about is scaring communities. They want to scare the Sturt Street community and scaremonger against that. They are actually upset that we are spending \$6 million on a school. Why are we spending \$6 million? Because when it was closed there was no upkeep on the school; it was left to deteriorate. There was no ongoing recurrent capital works at that school. So, if it has been closed, it will need work, and I think that it is great that we have finally got a government that is prepared to spend money on opening a school.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Light thinks \$6 million on a school is too much.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: They’ll rattle around in there.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I think this is just an example of the different priorities that we have. I think it is good that we are opening the school. Members opposite are upset that we have.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: What about the arsenic underneath it?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I will ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition in the upper house how much he spent on cleaning up arsenic poisoning at Sturt Street Primary School when he was minister for education. Indeed, how much did you spend when you were education minister on cleaning up the arsenic? You spent nothing, zero. Why? Because you closed the school, and no-one from the opposition can come here and say that they closed the school because of arsenic poisoning. No, they did not. They closed it because they were trying to rationalise education services and close schools. That is the only reason that they closed schools.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Here we go—in 1983 we closed a school. In 1983 I was 12—it is true, I was 12. I am not really interested in what we did under the Bannon government. I am interested in what we do under the Rann Labor government, while I am here. It is not a matter of me getting up here and criticising the member for Morphett for something his predecessor did. It is not his fault. It is not his fault that ETSA was privatised out from under South Australians without their consent. It is not his fault. He was not here.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: It’s the Labor party’s fault.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, it’s the Labor party’s fault! Anyway, back to the budget. The great thing about this budget is our commitment to health and I think that the Labor government has done an excellent job in showing the people of South Australia what our priorities are. The thing that I like best about it is the extra \$8 million for elective surgery because I have had a number of complaints from people in my electorate who have been waiting a long time for elective surgery.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Of course I do. That is why I ring my secretary—I am connected to my electorate. I actually live with my electors. I know my community, member for Light. I understand their needs and concerns.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 pm]

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir, for allowing me to continue my remarks after the dinner break. Over the next four years, this state government will inject into our road funding programs and state infrastructure some major developments which the opposition failed to mention: \$30 million for the Bakewell Bridge; \$18.1 million for the upgrade between South Road and Port Road (between Port Road and Torrens Road); \$6.4 million for the Mawson Lakes interconnector; \$24 million for the Port River Expressway; and, finally, \$8.8 million for the upgrade of the Britannia roundabout—something that is long overdue.

The member for Bragg and the previous member for Bragg, the then deputy premier, were unable to deliver this for the eastern suburbs, but this government has delivered convincingly for the eastern suburbs. That is a total of \$87.3 million on new road infrastructure, including \$8 million on overtaking lanes, \$5.8 million for state black spot programs, and \$6.8 million to extend existing shoulder sealing programs on rural and arterial road networks—that is \$6.8 million. Between 2003-04 to 2007-08, \$14.4 million will be spent on new trams, which is something that the Leader of the Opposition has attacked because he thinks it is not up to date.

We have allocated \$10 million for infrastructure to deepen Outer Harbor. We have committed to lowering and deepening the Outer Harbor to 14.2 metres to accommodate large container ships. We have committed to opening police stations in Mount Barker, Port Lincoln and Gawler—three Liberal-held seats. So, no-one can accuse this government of pork-barrelling, because we are opening police stations where there is a need. For the first time in our state's history, above and beyond what we are doing after the Layton report, we are implementing the key recommendations and we are backing it up with money.

We have already allocated about \$58.6 million to increase total forward estimates to \$244 million over the next four years. That is a commitment. Actions speak louder than words when it comes to sustaining our child protection.

In the area of health, we have increased spending, and the most important part for me is that home support involves discharge from hospitals, so there can be a home support service to unclog our hospital waiting lists. We have increased funding: \$8 million for elective surgery, \$4.5 million to reduce dental waiting lists, and \$4.2 million to transform our health system to a regional model—all the things that the previous government in its eight years had a chance to do and did not.

As I said earlier, this government has increased its spending by about \$565 million. That is over half a billion dollars into human services—the biggest commitment of any state government. It is the biggest one-off increase by any state government in the history of this state, something of which I am extremely proud, because it shows that this government is prepared to deliver on human services. We are not talk: we are action. Every time I hear the former health minister, the now Deputy Leader, get up and criticise health spending, it warms my heart, because I know that my constituents say to me when the member for Finnis criticises our health system, 'What was he doing for eight and a half years as premier and then as health minister?' This shows me that, with the latest series of demotions in the latest opposition reshuffle, the member for Finnis is well and truly back in charge. You might notice in that strategy that the member

for Finnis is now the de facto leader of the opposition who is running the opposition. He is just as successful at that as he was a premier. It gives me great comfort to know that he is leading the charge on behalf of the opposition. While he is Deputy Leader, the government will, no doubt, be re-elected with an increased majority.

The most important thing about this budget is the good economic management that we are offering the people of South Australia, well and truly throwing the State Bank monkey off our backs. Members opposite would delight in knowing these figures from when they were in office: in 1988-89, they had a \$306 million deficit; in 1999-2000, a \$471 million deficit; and in 2000-01, a \$399 million deficit. They are nearly half a billion dollar deficits for three years in a row. They clawed that back to \$124 million in 2000-01. In our first year, we have delivered a \$414 million surplus—that is nearly a half billion dollar surplus. The projected surpluses are to grow. I add that we are the only state government in the country to have projected surpluses for the next four to five years—something of which we are all very proud.

This government is reducing government debt from an estimated debt of \$382 million this year, \$314 million in the 2004-05 period, \$64 million in the 2005-06 period, dropping down to a surplus of \$155 million in 2006-07. This government is delivering on all its key promises. You only have to read *The Advertiser* editorials—and you could probably argue that *The Advertiser* is the official opposition in this state (courtesy of the Attorney-General's grammar lessons) given the ineptitude of the Leader of the Opposition and his hapless shadow ministers. What did *The Advertiser*, the official opposition in this South Australia, in its editorial the day after the budget, say? It said, 'Labor delivers what it promises and delivers it with good economic, sustainable policies'—something that the opposition was never able to do given their infighting and leaking throughout their entire period of government.

Literacy programs are something dear to my heart, and I would like to congratulate the former education minister and current education minister for their intervention. There are four schools in my electorate which are beneficiaries of this early literacy program: West Beach Primary School, Lockleys Primary School, Lockleys North Primary School, Torrens-ville Primary School and Cowandilla Primary School, which is in the member for Ashford's electorate but which services mine as well. The western suburbs finally has a government that is committed to the key concerns of its constituents. Indeed, we are also looking after people who do not live in Labor electorates.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Hartley who is yakking opposite will know that, despite his government's inability to deliver Lochiel Park as a 100 per cent open space, this government delivers 100 per cent, and I am proud of it. The member opposite yakking across the chamber could not deliver that for his own constituents and he scraped in on a lie for his re-election. More importantly, payroll tax deduction is down to 5½ per cent, coming into line with other major states. We are becoming competitive; we cannot be as competitive as we would like just yet, but we will move on to it.

I have already talked about the first home owner's grant, and reducing stamp duty and, of course, as I said earlier, members opposite shed crocodile tears for first home owners yet home owners are paying stamp duties on the rates that the

opposition set. Throughout its entire term in government not once did one Liberal treasurer ever cut stamp duty for first home owners—not once. Never let it be said of Liberal in this chamber that they ever cut taxes. In fact, for all the rhetoric of members opposite claiming that we are the highest taxing state government in the land and in the history of South Australia, we are not the ones who introduced the emergency services levy. We are not the ones who forced it upon South Australians as a new tax.

They talk about the highest taxing government in Australia's history—let me introduce you to the Howard-Costello government and the GST. It is the highest taxing federal government in Australian history since federation. It is the highest taxing government ever. So, do not tell us about being high taxing, because if there was ever a term that suited the Liberals it was 'tax and spend Liberals'. That is all they are. They cannot run a surplus budget to save their lives, and they just tax South Australians out of existence.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Here we are with the former failed premier who could not run a budget to save his life. Can I just say that the longer you are shadow health minister the better it is for us, because people do not trust the member for Finnis when it comes to health, because he has got form, and they know just what he is about.

I am proud of this budget, I am proud of this government, I am proud of our Premier and I am proud of our Treasurer, because we have delivered sustainable economic growth, relief to first home owners, a health budget, an education budget, and 200 more police—more police on the beat than ever in South Australia. These have been delivered by a Labor government with surpluses. This is something that the opposition was never able to do. Not once in its eight years did it deliver a surplus.

The Hon. Dean Brown: That's wrong.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Finnis says that is wrong. We are not talking about accrual and cash surpluses—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, well, you know—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for West Torrens's time has expired.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I am pleased to participate in this debate. Since the budget was introduced I have given a great deal of my time to examining the multitude of documents that have been put before us. I gather, from the comments that the member for West Torrens made, that he has not actually read the documents. I do not know where he has been during the past few years in this state, but it would appear that he needs a slight lesson in history, and I will set out to remind him of one or two matters.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member for Giles should not get herself excited.

Ms Breuer: We did all right, Mr Gunn. Upper Spencer Gulf did very well.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has probably got as much opportunity to contribute formally.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: This particular budget, Mr Speaker, sets out to appropriate some \$6 800 million, and I suppose the real debate is how you are going to allocate that particular money and where the emphases should be. That is what the real debate here tonight is about. I hope we all agree that we should have balanced budgets. I recall that during the

last parliament I wanted the Economic and Finance Committee to recommend that we have a system of balanced budgets in South Australia and that there be penalties upon ministers and others who do not deliver. It is a system that they have in Canada. However, the then treasurer, who was a member of that committee, was not particularly keen on that proposition, but it is proposition that I may revisit again in the future.

However, when we examine this particular document we can see that the biggest single item of expenditure is in Human Services in relation to health, which is in excess of \$1 800 million, and followed by education of some \$1 400 million. It is a very large percentage of the revenue available to the government. We all recognise that there is always going to be a huge demand on the health budget in South Australia. In my own constituency that is increasing. We have an ageing population and we have vast distances, and we need to ensure that those people have access to a very good health system. It is something that has to be maintained.

As we are debating the health system as a part of this budget, I want to indicate to the house that there is an urgent need to get through to the people running the Flying Doctor Service in South Australia that it is not acceptable to downgrade, in any way, the current services which operate out of Port Augusta and which are provided to the northern parts of South Australia. Port Augusta has a proud history. The Flying Doctor Service has had a base there for just over 50 years. It was put there on the advice of former premier Sir Thomas Playford. It is all very well to review one's operations but at the end of the day you have to take the community with you. The people who have gone out and worked exceptionally hard to raise funds to maintain this excellent service are very concerned about any proposition that will in any way downgrade those facilities.

If there is a need for extra resources, I believe that both state and federal government should not hesitate to invest them responsibly in the Flying Doctor Service. The important thing is to get patients to a medical centre as quickly as possible, to ensure that they can be retrieved and brought to Port Augusta in the quickest possible time. That was one of the reasons why that excellent hospital was built by the previous government.

The next issue that I want to address is in the field of education. We have in the electorate of Stuart very dedicated, hard-working teachers who are doing their utmost to provide the best education possible. I believe that one of the most important areas that I can be involved in as a local member is to regularly visit the schools and be in contact with the education providers, to ensure that we are giving the students the best possible opportunities. It is very disappointing that the government, for reasons best known to itself, has slowed down the redevelopment of the Booleroo Centre school. The community readily agreed to combine the primary school and the high school. Those schools have an outstanding record of giving wonderful education to the students in that area, and the students have had excellent results.

It is terribly disappointing and frustrating that they have had to go through this bureaucratic nonsense in relation to any development at the school. I hope that this is the last of this sort of nonsense and that government can get on with providing services as quickly as possible. Examining the capital works program, I cannot find the redevelopment of the kindergarten at Peterborough. Whether it is included in the general miscellaneous line, I am not sure, but I have to say that it is appalling that it is over three years since that particular project was originally announced in the budget. For

reasons best known to itself, the government has messed around and frustrated the school community. Everyone knows that the best education outcome is to transfer the old kindergarten to the primary school, where there is an excellent vacant stone building.

There will always be a need for a kindergarten at Peterborough: we all know that. For goodness sake, let us get on and do it and provide the best outcomes, because unfortunately you have a lot of children who are socially deprived, and I have been told by the staff at the school that it will be easier for these students to get to that kindergarten. We all agree that we have to try to give these children the best opportunities possible, and upgrading this kindergarten, transferring it from the oval site, is long overdue. In my view, wherever we have transferred preschools or kindergartens to a school site is the best education outcome. In the long term, it will save money for the government.

In relation to school buses, the ongoing effort to try to take school buses away from rural South Australia I hope is brought to an immediate end. We have the nonsense at Hawker, and at a little school close to where I have a farm in Port Kenny, where the bureaucrats have been around and want to take the school bus away. They want to close down the facilities of the school and have from year 4 onwards going to Streaky Bay, some 60 kilometres up the road. It is absolute nonsense. People in rural areas are entitled to a reasonable cut of the cake. It is my job as a member representing rural South Australia to draw these matters to the attention of the government and the house, so I support the member for Flinders in her ongoing criticism of the lack of attention to some of these—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I have taken on another role, in which I have enjoyed the challenge.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It's been a challenge that's coming to a close.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member is going to have to put up with me for another four or five years. Let me say to the Attorney-General, Her Majesty's chief law officer in this state, that I am surprised that he goes down that path and associates himself with that. In the last two elections in my electorate, a scurrilous, untruthful, malicious campaign has been launched against me: it had nothing to do with policies or who could best represent the electorate, but was based on personal vilification that was untrue. They trotted out a few lackeys to run round with this sort of material, paid for by the long-suffering little shop assistants who were not aware that they were having their pockets raided to fund and promote this.

The unfortunate thing about this is that the person meant to benefit from this scurrilous, mischievous and malicious campaign has been given a government job. He makes out that he is above all this, but he was happy to have this material circulated. I say to the Labor Party: if that is the game you want to play, just remember that people have long memories. If members opposite want to go down that path, that is fine. But I thought the Attorney-General, Her Majesty's chief law officer, would want to conduct campaigns based on fact.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Always have in Spence and Croydon.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It was your mates: your organisers and your Mr Farrell and his henchmen were the ones—and I am surprised that the Attorney-General of this state would want to comment favourably on that sort of activity

and so lower the standard of political debate in this state. Unfortunately, members of parliament and politicians are not held in the highest regard. This sort of campaign is, in my view, just a diversion from the real activity that should take place. But I am not surprised, because members opposite had nothing to offer, and they have now treated the people in quite a cavalier fashion.

The first matter I want to raise is that a brochure dated 30 April and which the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation issued to people involved in sporting clubs states:

A regulation will be drafted under the Water Resources Act 1997 to bring into effect water conservation measures that will apply to water courses, lakes, service water, underground water, effluent (as defined in the Water Resources Act), reclaimed water and direct extraction from rivers (such as the Torrens and the Murray). The aim of the measure is to change the way South Australians think about water, regardless of the water source. The measures will be identical to those currently in force in South Australia. Customers will relate to the time and manner of watering private and public gardens, recreation areas, grounds, nurseries, the cleaning of vehicles, boats, paved areas and construction activities.

This brochure has come from the head of the department, and it has already attracted a great deal of debate and discussion. The president of a golf club in my constituency of Peterborough contacted me and asked, 'What does this mean? Does this mean that the volunteers who look after the golf club will have to go there after tea, at night, to water the golf course?' because that club has its own bores. All I can say is that the way in which the River Murray levy has been inflicted on isolated communities is an outrage. It is unfair, it is unreasonable and it is unnecessary. Slugging small communities which are not connected to the River Murray and which have poor water sources with this tax—

Ms Breuer: We're all connected to the River Murray, Graham.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would suggest to the honourable member that she go and tell that to my constituents in Marree and other such places, because they take very strong exception to being lumped with this. They have the worst quality water. You have nearly bankrupted their little progress association. They do not have the money to run their hall and various things, and the honourable member thinks that is good. I will be very happy to pass her regards on to them. When I am at the races in a week, I will be very happy to pass on her regards.

Ms Breuer: All roads end here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Giles will have the opportunity to contribute by way of rebuttal what may have been said that she regards as illogical, inconsistent or inappropriate, but not by way of interjection on the member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What I am doing is raising the attention of the house to what my constituents regard as unfair, and I believe that they should be exempted from paying this outrage which is inflicted upon them. I continue to advocate and debate that issue at length. I look forward to the Attorney-General's colleague trying to justify to those people at the appropriate time that this is a good thing. I look forward to it, because I know what the results will be.

You will need more than \$3 million in the Upper Spencer Gulf fund. There is nothing in this budget that tells us where that money is going to be spent, who is going to access it, who is going to make the recommendation, and what is going to happen to it. What will the programs be? The government

has already slowed down the progress being made on school in my district. The road funding is coming to an end. If you stop the road being sealed to Marree you will have an effect on the future tourism industry. You are probably going to have a serious effect on the future of Australian plant hire, because the Sir Humphreys in the department want to play tractors and graders. Buy a new grader, like big boys with big toys! That is what they are up to, instead of putting the money back into the road system.

We are going to have an interesting debate in relation to this matter. The member for West Torrens talked about debt reduction. If the honourable member closely examines page 25 of the Budget Statement, looks at the graph on that page and reads the explanation, he will see who should get the credit. This is an excellent result. It has not been achieved without some pain, but, certainly, this graph demonstrates how it will be in the long-term best interests of the people of South Australia.

In 1994-95 we were paying over \$600 000 a year in interest, but in the not too distant future no interest payments will be made. That is a good result. No government should ever be allowed to mortgage the future of South Australians, and I think that this graph and this explanation ought to be circulated to the people of South Australia to show them that this government is now benefiting from the tough but right decisions of the previous government.

It is a great pity that the member for West Torrens did not acknowledge that, when we came into government, South Australia was an economic basket case. It was a basket case. Millions of dollars had been squandered and lost. We had to set about rebuilding business confidence, getting the economy going and putting the finances right in this state. This current government is benefiting because it has the resources. If you are running a business and you have a good income you can do lots of things. You can spend—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That is why we are so popular. That is why we are off the graph in popularity.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member has never looked in a mirror. If he did he would not be so vain. It is unfortunate that he cannot understand and accept that the difficult decisions that had to be taken have laid the foundation for a sound economic base and a good future for the people of South Australia. Governments should act wisely and sensibly and deal with the difficulties of over-regulation, bureaucracy and red tape. This government is like lots of Labor governments: bureaucracy thrives under Labor governments—bureaucracy thrives. These people become more powerful and they inflict more unreasonable decisions on unsuspecting people.

The greatest threat to democracy is bureaucracy, and what we have to do is to try to make this government come to its senses. We have the EPA out of control: it is standing in the way of responsible developments. Many other organisations are interfering with the ability of people to make a reasonable living and to get on with their lives, and the further one gets from Adelaide the worse it gets and the more insensitive these people become.

I wanted to talk about many other things, but it seems that my 20 minutes is almost up. I am normally quite shy when I get on my feet and a man of few words, but I have enjoyed this opportunity because the people of South Australia understand that many of the tax cuts are a result of the GST agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to speak about the health budget and to highlight the extent to which the budget (as outlined to the public of South Australia) is no more than a con job of the worst type one could possibly have. Let me start by running through some of the key areas of the health budget and what has occurred with expenditure for next year, that is, the year 2004-05, compared to anticipated expenditure for the current year, because that gives members some indication of whether the level of activity next year will increase or decrease in the health area.

The first part on which I touch is country hospitals. The total state government allocation for country hospitals has been cut by \$5.6 million, or an actual reduction from the state government to country hospitals of 3.2 per cent. I will give the exact figures. The estimated result for 2003-04 is \$173.7 million of state funds; and the budget allocation for next year is \$168.1 million: a cut of \$5.6 million for country hospitals.

True, the federal government has given some money for country hospitals as well, and that will increase. The federal government's aged care money for country hospitals will increase, and the Department of Veterans' Affairs money for country hospitals is likely to increase. However, the crucial thing is that the state government reduced its money for country hospitals by \$5.6 million (or 3.2 per cent). It is basically accepted that the health inflator around Australia is about 6 per cent; in other words, health costs are increasing by 6 per cent a year. If members take the 6 per cent into account, in addition to the 3 per cent cut, then they can see that state government funds for country hospitals have been cut by up to about 9 per cent this year. That means that there will be a substantial reduction in services. The only thing that will tend to mitigate that reduction in services is the fact that the federal government has put an extra \$2.7 million into country hospitals directly. It has put extra money in for aged care and also the Department of Veterans' Affairs for country hospitals.

This cut for country hospitals comes on top of an actual cut in services of about 3 per cent a year across country hospitals for the last two years. It is having a devastating effect. At present, in country hospitals we are seeing surgery cancelled at Wallaroo Hospital, Victor Harbor Hospital, Port Lincoln Hospital and Streaky Bay Hospital, and I could go on and name others as well. Also, those hospitals are saying that last year was the toughest year they have experienced. Now they are saying that this current year is even tougher. Wait until they feel the impact of the budget for next year! Of course, they are cutting back on specialist medical services to country areas as well as on allied health services such as physiotherapy and podiatry. For instance, we know that there are a substantial number of vacancies at Whyalla, as there is across the Eyre Peninsula, for physiotherapy, podiatry and a number of other services.

I highlight the fact that I believe that this parliament deserves an explanation why country hospitals—and there are about 66 of them—have been so significantly discriminated against by the health minister and in her explanation as to why she has cut funding for country hospitals.

The next area, environmental health management, has had a cut of \$1.4 million for this coming year compared to what has been spent in the current year; that is a reduction of 22.6 per cent. Health promotion has had a cut of \$1.9 million (a cut in percentage terms of 20.6 per cent). Grants to metropolitan non-government health are unchanged, which,

when members take inflation into account, means a reduction of about 5 to 6 per cent. That is for the Royal District Nursing Service, blood products, mental health services and other areas.

In relation to Incorporated Aboriginal Health Services, an area which the government claimed was a priority area, saying that it was going to put more money into Aboriginal health, we see that there is no increase in funding at all; and if members take inflation into account, there will be an effective reduction of about 5 per cent in their services. Grants to Aboriginal community health services have been reduced by \$800 000 (a 20.6 per cent reduction). Metropolitan Domiciliary Care, which is very important in terms of helping to keep aged people in their homes, sees a mere increase of \$637 000 (or 1.5 per cent), so we can expect an effective reduction in services probably of about 3 to 4 per cent.

The community health services area is probably the most important recommendation out of the Generational Health Review, which the minister stood up and lauded just 12 months ago. Yet we see that the money for community health services, the independent incorporated bodies that deliver community health, has increased by only \$54 000, a mere 0.3 per cent—effectively no increase at all, which means that again that service will be cut in effective terms by 4 to 5 per cent.

I refer to the South Australian Dental Service. We heard the minister claim that the waiting lists were too long and that she would allocate an extra \$1 million for the state dental service. However, we find its total increase for the year is only \$1 million, which means that no allowance for inflation has been provided to the state dental service at all. If that is the case, then once the \$1 million for additional services is taken into account we can expect a 5 to 6 per cent reduction in what they do currently. Put those two together and you get an effective cut across the state dental service compared to this year of 2.5 per cent.

The Drug and Alcohol Services Council is put down as one of the three priority areas for the Social Inclusion Unit—an area in which the government held a summit early in the piece. What has happened to the budget of DAASC (the Drug and Alcohol Services Council)? It has been cut by \$563 000 this coming year—a 3.2 per cent reduction. What priority is that? None whatsoever! Then we look at one area in which there has been a substantial increase, namely, the bureaucratic area, the strategic policy and advice area—the bureaucrats who do not deliver services but protect the minister. That area has gone up by \$3.06 million, a 31 per cent increase. We have cut funding to Aboriginal health, dramatically cut country hospitals funding and funding to drug services and dental services, yet we have money to provide a 31 per cent increase in the administrators who sit around the minister.

I also note that some significant mistakes have been made both in the current year and next year's health budget. A mistake was made in classification that has overstated the results for the next year by \$14 million, which must also be taken into account. It is not played up by the minister, who has boasted of \$1 million extra for this or that, but has not talked about the \$14 million mistake that has to be repaid. I also note that a \$67 million mistake made in the current year's budget which also had to be repaid. It was revenue that had to be reimbursed as an extra expense, so it overstates the health budget position by \$67 million. I also see that the government has deferred a fringe benefits tax bill from this year to next year.

So, out of the so-called marvellous increase in health for next year, \$11.8 million has to be paid against a bill for this year for fringe benefits tax. In March this year the minister, when pinned publicly for the disgraceful blow-out in the biggest waiting lists this state has ever seen, I noticed she put in \$5 million as a sop to the public for additional elective surgery. However, the budget documents show that only \$3.8 million has been paid in, despite the minister's promise of \$5 million. If you add up the mistakes in classification, they amount to \$81 million of overstating this and next year's budgets.

I would like to mention a couple of other things as well. By the time I have finished, I will be able to highlight that, frankly, if this was to occur in a private corporation at present under the higher accounting standards, somebody would be under severe investigation by ASIC for what could be only regarded as a fraudulent claim in regard to the financial position. I will come to that in more detail.

I return to the key points in the country budget. There is no money for the Barossa Valley Hospital, even though money was due to be allocated this year to allow design work and final documentation to be finished. We find that the extension to the aged care facilities at Millicent, Kapunda and Kangaroo Island have been considerably delayed again—a clear statement to the country people of South Australia that this Labor government has absolutely no regard for them at all. I quote what Dr Bill Heddle, President of the South Australian Branch of the AMA, said about this budget, as follows:

But of particular concern to your listeners would be the decrease in funding to regional South Australia, and that's the second consecutive year it has gone down. The actual increase is about 3 per cent, and if you add in the health CPI it's a lot more than 3 per cent. That's based on the expected workload going to be the same, which means that if our interpretation is correct there will be a deterioration in services to regional hospitals.

He went on to say:

There is probably going to be an increase in waiting lists for elective surgery. I can't see them cutting back on those urgent procedures, but it probably means that the waiting list for elective surgery is likely to increase to a greater extent than is already there. I expect if the listeners are unhappy about it they will actually get on to their local member and the government and let them know.

How right Dr Heddle was. I now move on to the next point I want to raise, namely, the capital works budget. Before doing that, I will as shadow minister for the ageing touch on the aged people within our community. Pensioners and self-funded retirees have been completely left out in the cold by this budget. Despite the fact that their council rates and water and sewerage rates will increase dramatically because of the huge escalation in property values of 20 per cent plus, there has been no compensation for the pensioners who struggle to live on about \$230 a week (if you are a single pensioner).

We also know that the government has increased its charges across the board by about 3.8 per cent and, therefore, car registration and public transport costs will go up. Despite this, there is no compensation for pensioners having to register their motor vehicles. This is a very cruel budget indeed for pensioners because they have been completely ignored, yet there is probably no group of people in the community struggling to make ends meet more. One very angry pensioner rang me on Friday and said, 'Mr Foley wouldn't know what it is like to live on \$230 a week.' That pensioner went on to express her fear that she is likely to have to sell her car just to make ends meet. She had every

right to be angry. Self-funded retirees are in the same position.

I now pick up the health capital works area. For the current year the minister achieved the incredible result of underspending the capital works budget by \$35.6 million in health alone. In other words, 27 per cent of the money allocated for the minister to build new hospitals just 12 months ago has not been spent. That is an appalling performance by the Minister for Health. Projects that have missed out include: the Royal Adelaide Hospital linear accelerator and the stage 4 development; the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (and I am sure the honourable member opposite will be interested in this) has missed out on stage 2; the Millicent aged care has missed out; the Lyell McEwin Hospital stage 4 missed out on \$9 million; the Strathmont centre missed out on \$3.1 million for housing for disabled people; the Repatriation General Hospital has missed out on considerable spending on its mental health unit; and the Flinders Medical Centre, with the Margaret Tobin—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How do you calculate this?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is out of the budget documents that your government has put out. It lists which projects have missed out on money that was allocated 12 months ago. The Margaret Tobin centre missed out on \$7.8 million; and the Murray Bridge hospital substantially missed out on the money allocated to it as well. If you put all of that together, the government underspent the capital works budget by \$35 million.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Let's get it on the record—you would have spent the lot!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that in my last full year I slightly overspent a much bigger capital works budget by about \$1.5 million, and we were asked to compensate for that in the next budget. So, in answer to the Attorney-General's question: yes, and my track record is there to show that I spent the lot.

I also highlight that this coming year, despite the request from the AMA for a substantial increase in the budget for bio-medical equipment (it is fearful that the bio-medical equipment in our hospitals is falling behind substantially so it put a submission to government for money for that important area), the budget for bio-medical equipment has been cut by \$1.5 million next year. That highlights the fact that this government pays no regard to any submission made by an organisation such as the AMA.

We also see that \$20 million was cut out of the capital works program over the next four years and, of course, one of the projects that has been affected is the paediatric intensive care unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital. I put it out to the media on Tuesday morning and it was denied by government sources but, in fact, now this document verifies it. I also have a newsletter from the Women's and Children's Hospital saying that it was expecting finance for the redevelopment of the paediatric intensive care unit but, unfortunately, it did not get it. It is just one of a number of projects that has become a victim of this government.

However, this minister has the gall to say in the budget documents that there has been a \$35 million increase in the capital works program this coming year. It is not a \$35 million increase on what was budgeted for last year: it is no increase. It is only that she underspent by \$35 million this year that she is able to say, 'I am hoping to spend \$35 million more next year.' That is basically dishonest.

Other mental health projects are listed as well in her press release, which promises that millions and millions of dollars

will be spent on mental health facilities. Not one of them will start before 2006-07 and, in fact, there will be no considerable expenditure until 2007-08. Again, that is a grossly dishonest statement.

The second page of the ministerial press release lists all of those projects on mental health. Mr Speaker, this is a dishonest health budget indeed, and the people will suffer accordingly.

Time expired.

Mr SCALZI: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

DOCUMENTS, TABLING

The SPEAKER: Before proceeding, can I invite all honourable members to take a seat so that I can elaborate upon the material that I had promised the house in response to the inquiry made by the member for Unley during the latter part of question time today about the tabling of documents upon which honourable members rely, and, in particular, all members, including ministers, are ultimately responsible personally for their words, whether they are quoted or not.

With regard to members who are not ministers, it is important to note that they do not have the right to table documents, nor can they be required to table a document from which they quote unless the tabling is the subject of a resolution of the house. That may be a resolution taken at the time or at some subsequent time.

In New Zealand, there appears to have been a greater measure of consistency than in other Australian parliaments in recent times. The practice in New Zealand reinforces my own view of what should be done and why, and reasoned statements by speakers over contemporary times, of the last three decades, tend also to support the propositions which I believe should obtain, and upon which I therefore rule accordingly.

The Speaker in New Zealand may require a member, that is, any member, to authenticate a quotation used as the basis for a question, and it seems eminently sensible to me, in light of the requirement, that ministers desist from quoting from official documents unless they are prepared to table them. I note that there is no similar requirement in New Zealand in relation to quotes by non-ministers in debate, only questions.

Further, honourable members should note, as I pointed out earlier, that the house itself may direct the member to authenticate the quote and table the document upon which they rely. The requirement for other members to satisfy the Speaker about the authenticity of a quote from a document is very important, because it ensures that there is no attempt to hold ministers to account for matters that are not soundly based in truth. New Zealand has a strong committee system, can I say as an aside, which is not controlled by the government or the opposition, which I believe should have a second chamber, as I believe we should have here, dedicated to review, and not a rehash of partisan debates in the house of government.

In the last 25 years there have been a number of rulings regarding ministers who quote from documents and/or dockets being required, or not required, to table them. Regrettably, they are eclectic, that is of a great variety, distinguished by their inconsistency rather than their consistency, though wherever reasons are given in any detail they line up with the propositions which I put down now, as I did

for the benefit of honourable members virtually two years ago on 14 May, on page 153 and 154 in *Hansard*.

The requirement to table official documents quoted from is based on an important principle which should be upheld. It is best expressed in my judgment in all the written tomes available in that prepared and provided to us by Erskine May. It states:

A minister. . . may not read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper not before the house unless he or she is prepared to lay it upon the table.

In continuing to discuss this issue, Erskine May makes it clear that the practice in the Commons relates to documents. There is nothing to suggest that a complete docket must be tabled. That has its origins in the practices in this place, and also in New Zealand. Some other parliaments in Australia have, from time to time, followed it. The view of Westminster and the practice there is reinforced in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, which simply states:

Where a minister has only an extract from an official document and quotes from that extract, it is only the extract that is required to be tabled. There can never be any question of a minister having to go away and procure an original or a complete document for tabling.

However, I do not share that view. Let us return to the practices here. The situation involving former minister Wilson in 1980 arose when a point of order was taken that the minister had—and I quote from *Hansard*—‘quoted from an official document’, and the honourable member said:

. . . I ask that the document be tabled pursuant to the traditions of the house. . . as set out in Erskine May.

After some discussion the point of order was emphatically upheld by the acting chairman who said:

The practice of the house is that, if it is a docket or part of a docket, the whole docket must be tabled if it was quoted from.

That was not only an emphatic ruling: it was a quantum leap for us. Nevertheless, this house can and now does have a different practice. Examining the rulings of the past 25 years or so to determine what can be regarded as that practice reveals the inconsistency to which I have referred and qualified. I guess I ought to reiterate that.

I will ruminate upon those ideas in a moment. Whether a document or a docket was involved is a matter of semantics. Both are involved in such rulings. Firstly, there is the difficulty of establishing from the chair the precise nature of what is being quoted from. We must be able to rely on each other’s honesty in some measure. However, I will come to that a little later. In addition to the 1980 example, already referred to, the various rulings can be summarised as follows:

That if the quote is from an official document it should be tabled.

That tabling of a document was not required as it had not been identified as being from an official docket.

That having quoted from a docket it should be tabled.

That if a quote was from a document but not from a docket it need not be tabled.

I leave honourable members to come to their own conclusions about those quotes. Clearly, from my point of view, they are not well researched opinion but perhaps rulings of convenience backed by numbers of the moment. Bearing in mind the underlying principle from the House of Commons, as I have said, I am of the view that the rulings which suggest that the document quoted from need not be tabled, unless it was a docket or any official document per se need not be tabled, are precedents which do not constitute good practice. In fact, that was and is bad practice.

Further, I am of the view that a requirement for a complete docket to be tabled simply because an extract from it was

quoted is beyond the intention of the fundamental principle; that is, if a minister quotes from a document which provides a concise statement of advice (relevant information) upon which the minister seeks quite properly to rely, the minister must be prepared to table so much of the original record, whether written or typed, in the file which will enable all honourable members in the house to understand the background to the opinion of the minister and the policy.

The watchdog in all these practices is the Speaker. Whilst I do not think a complete docket should be automatically tabled as a requirement, if documents or extracts are quoted from it, I am nonetheless of the firm view that the simple tabling of the documents or extracts may not be sufficient to satisfy the principle I have enunciated. All honourable members should be able to read the information in the original file which will enable them to understand why it was quoted by the minister and relied upon by the minister in making the remark.

Equally, so it goes for other honourable members where they make a quotation. The Speaker is best placed in the case of other honourable members who are not ministers, on behalf of the house, to exercise so much inquiry and scrutiny as the house directs the Speaker to do in order to satisfy the house that it is authentic material from which other honourable members who are not ministers are quoting.

I will be prepared to rule on any occasion when a minister is required to table an official document or extract that sufficient other documents or extracts should be tabled so as to leave no doubt regarding the context of the quote and thus its relevance and appropriateness to the point being made by the minister. Of necessity, the practice of ministers not tabling such documents or extracts from dockets in circumstances where security or confidentiality requirements are paramount will continue, as has always been the practice in this chamber. I do not expect this to be the case very often, as direct quoting in these circumstances would in itself be unwise for any minister.

I emphasise that quoting private rather than official documents or referring to notes or summaries rather than actual quotes does not, in my view, based on that underlying principle, require the tabling of that document or docket. Yet, I worry. These days, private staffers—euphemistically called spin doctors or minders—have great access to the written advice of the professional public servants, and the conversations and interviews with them.

In these recent times, that practice has had unfortunate consequences very often for the ministers in whose employ those advisers, private staffers, spin doctors or minders have worked. They are from all sides of the political spectrum. When I say recent times, I mean not in the last few weeks but in the last decade or so. I do not think that honourable members need to be reminded of the painful consequences for those ministers who have found themselves, if you like, discovered in using or misusing their staff to do what they should have done themselves and then being able at least to attempt to hide behind that in the belief that it was safe, only then to find that further down the track that it was anything but safe.

I draw honourable members’ attention to those remarks that I made on Tuesday 14 May for the simple reason that there are other things which I mentioned there, one of which I wish to mention before concluding here. That is another equally important underlying principle for requiring ministers to provide access and, indeed, to table so much of the written material upon which they have relied when making a

quotation to support the view that they are expressing to protect the reputations and professional standing of those public servants providing that advice, such that the views being given to the house, ostensibly coming from the professional advisers, are indeed as the house can then be satisfied is being authentic and honourable. Yet again, without wanting to refer to any particular and painful instance in recent times, honourable members do not need to reflect very far or for very long on what has happened to discover the wisdom of that aspect of my reasoning for the ruling.

Altogether, I draw honourable members' attention, should they wish to examine the background research which I have done with the help of others, to page 152 of the New Zealand House of Representatives practices, which states:

Quotations in notices of motion and questions are subjected to a much closer scrutiny than are those in debate, not least because there is time and opportunity available to do so. In particular, sources are required to be disclosed to the Speaker for checking as a condition of allowing the notice or question [where quotes are provided]. The member [in New Zealand] is faced with the choice: to disclose the source of the quotation. . . or to lose the notice. Most members freely provide the source of their material.

On page 429, it states:

. . . members are under two obligations if they do employ a quotation or make any other statement in a question. First, it must be truly necessary to the question being asked, and, secondly, the member must provide authentication of it.

Whether the statement or quotation is necessary will depend upon the terms of the question itself. On the matter of authentication, members are not asked to verify the underlying truth of the quotation if they employ one; they must only ensure that they are quoting accurately and, if paraphrasing, that the paraphrase is a fair one.

It must cover the test of fairness. The quote continues:

A member's duty to authenticate the statement or question is a duty to the Speaker, whose job it is to ensure that the Standing Orders have been complied with.

The Speaker, of course, is a member who has the trust and respect of the house (these are my words, not the practices of the House of Representatives in New Zealand), to protect, enhance and promote, may I say, the role of the house in the peace, order and good government of the civilised society which it was established to provide. The quote states:

. . . members using quotations are required to authenticate them to the Speaker is a condition of having their questions [or other contributions] accepted [by the chair].

I thank honourable members for their attention, and I trust that that makes clearer the reasons for the practice and the rulings, and the way in which we might proceed in future.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask a point of clarification in relation to your statement which I listened to quite closely. I understand the precedent that you have established for the ruling that ministers have to show documents which they quote from as based on a New Zealand precedent and a decision made extempore in the South Australian parliament in 1980. My question to you, sir, is this: what is the consequence of a minister who refuses to comply with an order to produce a document? Is it only that he or she loses leave to continue with the answer, or is there some greater consequence? Is there a breach of privilege?

The SPEAKER: That is very good question and one I which I hoped nobody would raise, if, for no other reason than it has very dire consequences for the minister. The Speaker, of course, is therefore required to make the observation that the minister defies the chair, and the remedies for doing so are in the hands of the house. In the past, it has resulted in ministers losing their office, though not the

membership of this chamber. It is impossible for this chamber to remove any honourable member from their role.

The only circumstance in which it is unlikely that that would be the consequence is the circumstance in which the public interest is not well served, such as I referred to in my remarks, namely, that it needs to remain in confidence lest it destroy the confidence and faith that other interests have in dealing with the government in contracting arrangements between the government and those interests—usually corporate, of course, but they could be citizens. Firms which deal with the government, and in which, for good reason, there is commercial in confidence arrangements need to have that arrangement protected. That is the reason for the Speaker to be involved in a review of the material, thereby ensuring that the public interest is well served from all points of view.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr CAICA (Colton): In the interests of having an early night, I will be brief. I find the attitude of the opposition very interesting with respect to what is a solid budget that is going to be for the benefit of all South Australians. It seems that all we hear is whingeing, carping, complaining and 'We would have done this or we would have done that'. I heard the deputy speak about the fact that he will stand by his record, and I am sure that the entire opposition would stand by its record within government. Of course, its record is that good that it has found itself in opposition. I can expect and understand that the opposition would be cranky—and ought to be cranky—about this particular budget. One reason might be that they did not get the specific things that they wanted for their electorates. The other reason why they are cranky is the fact that this is a budget that is supported by the majority of South Australians.

For that reason, they are somewhat green with envy. The fact is that it will keep them in opposition for a longer period of time. What members opposite have trouble handling is the fact that we do have strategic plans that look well into the future for South Australia. Since coming to government we have had the Generational Health Review, the Social Inclusion Unit, the Economic Development Board and a host of other bodies that have looked at the long-term planning and the long-term structures that we should have for the benefit of all South Australians—and our budget priorities focus on health, education, the environment and, indeed, safer communities. We have delivered on those priorities in this budget. The fact is that you can deal only with what you have, not with what you wish you had. I am sure that all of us would like to have another \$8 billion or \$12 billion to splash around. The reality is that we have not, and we can only deal with the amount of money that we have.

This is a budget that focuses on Labor Party priorities, and that is why the opposition should be cranky. Members opposite have a right to be cranky, because their priorities are not our priorities. That is why we are in government. We will deal with our priorities, and that is what this budget has done. I congratulate the Rann government for this budget.

On a more specific point, I am pleased that Henley High School has finally been recognised after many years of neglect by the opposition and, indeed, hollow promises about funding that were never honoured, with respect to its redevelopment. I know that the six parliamentary colleagues that I have across both houses who attended Henley High

School will be pleased with that, and I know that Hansard reporter Ms Joycie Strangio, a former Henley High School student, will be equally pleased that Henley High has received its funding.

I am very pleased about that. Not only have we looked after Henley High School with respect to redevelopment, but also we have looked at a variety of schools across South Australia. That was a point made by my colleague the member for West Torrens: that whilst this government is finally delivering to the long-neglected western suburbs—and they were neglected under the opposition—what we are doing is making sure that we govern for all South Australians. Members will see from the budget that it is not just the western suburbs that have benefited from this budget but many areas across South Australia. It is a very balanced, solid budget.

The other issue I want to raise of a specific nature is the money that is being spent in and on Gulf St Vincent. We know that the priorities of the previous government were to build the Barcoo Outlet and spew more water out into the gulf without any balance in relation to—

Ms Thompson: And it smelled when I was down there the other day.

Mr CAICA: As the member for Reynell said, it smelled the other day. I live next door and it smells quite often down that way. But we are looking at making sure that there is long-term sustainability for Gulf St Vincent. I have a lifelong association with the gulf, having lived on the coast all my life, and through lifesaving and fishing. I am glad that our government has committed to making sure that Gulf St Vincent is long on sustainability, and we do have long-term plans for our priority areas. As I said, I intend not to keep the house for very long. I commend the bill to the house. I congratulate the government on a solid budget and look forward to the implementation of these initiatives that form the core priorities of our government.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I will speak briefly on the government's budget. I have described it as a solid, middle of the road budget from a solid, middle of the road government, and I am sure that there would be plenty on both sides who would agree with that assessment. It does appear to be fiscally sound. No doubt, that will be further explored in the Estimates Committee process, for what it is worth. I would like to commend the government on its focus on health care and child protection. I do not think anyone could argue with those priorities.

When it comes to my area (in the south-western suburbs), I am pleased to see additional funding for Flinders Medical Centre. Of course, the health portfolio under the Liberals was bedevilled by capital funding not being spent and being rolled over into the following year's budget. I trust that will not happen with that \$30 million that has been earmarked for Flinders.

One aspect of the health care system that does need addressing in my area is the Inner Southern Community Health Service, which has been struggling on valiantly, providing a valuable service to the local community in substandard accommodation. At some stage in the health budget the government will have to bite the bullet and either relocate or improve the accommodation for the Inner Southern Community Health Service.

While I am on a wish list for the local electorate, I also mention the so-called Oaklands crossing. That is at the boundary of three electorates: Mitchell, Morphett and Elder

or, in language more familiar to the community, at the intersection of Oaklands Road, Morphett Road and the Noarlunga train line. It is a site of increasing congestion, especially given the ever-increasing business in the Westfield precinct. That congestion is only going to continue, particularly if the Marion council is successful in its bid for a state aquatic centre next to Westfield and, incidentally, next to the Oaklands crossing to which I have referred. I wish the council well in its endeavours to find a suitable developer for the site.

One area of the budget that I feel justifies criticism is in respect of the environment. I do not see a lot of new money for the range of problems that we have to deal with there. Admittedly, millions of dollars are soaked up by the creation of the natural resource management boards, which phenomenon is an initiative that I have endorsed on behalf of the Greens.

Certainly, there are pleasing aspects. In particular, the Living Coasts strategy is essential if we are to look to the future of the gulf and our beaches in particular. It is pleasing to see extra funding for a new heritage program, but I note that the emphasis here is on built heritage rather than our environmental heritage. It is disappointing that our national parks have not received a huge boost in funding, with the exception of Belair. Most of our national parks will be left to struggle on with inadequate resources, and threats to the flora and fauna in our national parks seem to be increasing every year.

In relation to probably the most critical environmental issue, the health of the River Murray, I notice that some new money is to be spent on improving the river, but, in my submission, nowhere near enough. We know that on an annual basis even spending \$17 million or \$20 million is nowhere near enough to achieve what we need to achieve in respect of the Murray. The river really is the future of South Australia—the future of our economy and our society. We therefore need to redouble our efforts in that area.

On the whole, as I said, this is a solid, middle of the road budget. It has certainly been well received in the community as a whole. People are annoyed, of course, by the government's political advertising that goes with the budget. The Premier is quite accurate in saying that less has been spent than under the previous Liberal governments but, on the other hand, people are still upset by it. I suspect that it is generally counterproductive, no matter who is in government. With those words, I commend the government for a sensible budget, and I look forward to asking some questions in the estimates committees.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I have listened very carefully to many speeches on both sides of the house and, indeed, the contribution made by the member for Mitchell, representing the Greens. I think that we should go to the start. What is a budget? *The Macquarie Dictionary* indicates that it is a plan or a list of expected income and spending for some future period, and, in this case, it is a year. The definition also states, 'Specifically a plan for government income and spending'. Basically, that is the definition of a budget—what you are going to do for the year, where you are going to get your income and how you are going to spend it.

If that were the only criterion, I could say that this is a good budget. It does that. It states the money that it is going to get and that which it is going to spend. If we judge a good budget by whether the government can balance the books, then we can give it a tick. It does that. It makes a slight surplus of more than \$50 million. If we want to achieve AAA

ratings, well, it might get that in the future, so we will give it another tick. However, I think that members on both sides believe that a budget is not just that. The budget is an instrument, a tool, that is available to governments and to parliaments—and, indeed, firms—to make sure that they get the best possible outcome. It is not just about balancing the books, because you can juggle figures here and there to make sure that they balance. Indeed, I have heard many members say tonight that that has actually happened.

The real purpose of a budget—to be used as an economic tool or an instrument—is to address the needs of the community whom it represents. I acknowledge that this budget has put more into health than has been done previously. But as we have heard from the deputy leader, the government has still underspent on capital works by \$35 million, and one should have thought that it would not do that in relation to a top priority item such as health.

However, I note that *The Advertiser* headline with respect to the state budget reads, 'Intensive care for hospitals'. There is no question that intensive care was needed. If we looked at the waiting lists and at the emergency services in the hospitals, we realise that something had to be done. It would have been more than highly irresponsible if this government, which had listed health, education and law and order as its main priorities, had not addressed that.

Yes, more has been put into the area of child protection and youth. There will be 180 new social workers. The money that has gone into those areas has been a long time coming, and I acknowledge that. However, because of increasing demand, in the short term we must address the crises with which we are faced. However, we must also put in place measures that will ensure fewer crises in the future to maintain a good standard of health, education, law and order, and so on.

Today the Attorney-General referred to the crime prevention strategy which he announced at the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council chambers a couple of weeks ago, which the members for Norwood, Bragg, Mordialta and I attended. Do members know why so many members attended? It is because, in the past, the same amount of money that went into Norwood, Payneham and St Peters is now going into five councils; that is, the same amount of money going to five different councils. This is how this government addresses some of the priorities. If we look at what the budget is meant to do, we could say that, although it has a budget surplus, it can also be regarded as a budget of lost opportunities. The real judgment should not only be whether or not the budget balances but also whether or not the government is using it for the good of the community.

It should not only be about public perception but what the government has available to it. Not only does the budget need to be about perception but it also needs to have a future direction. I am sad to say that this budget does not do that. As I said, I welcome the response to the health crisis, the hospital waiting lists and the literacy initiatives in education—indeed, there is not one person who does not support that. The earlier we tackle problems in education the better.

I commend the member for Bragg, the shadow minister for education, for the forums that she has held in this important area. I am sure that we will be addressing many of the issues that are in the community today. To talk about whether or not this budget is a good or bad is simplistic. One has to understand where we were and where we are now.

Let us look at what the previous government had to face in 1993-94, and I know, because I was there; I was a new

member of this place. What did we have? We had the biggest debt in South Australia's history; unemployment was very high—indeed, youth unemployment was over 30 per cent; the SGIC saga; the Myer-Remm problem; high interest rates; and, of course, who can forget the State Bank?

As a percentage of GDP, we had to pay millions of dollars a day in interest rates, and I think at one stage it was \$2 million. That was the reality with which we had to deal. Obviously in 1993, you could not deliver what you can deliver now, so you are not comparing apples with apples, or pears, although today is apple and pear day! If we look at today, what has the government had to deal with? It has the budget, which is a tool to achieve the wellbeing of the community, but what resources does it have to deal with?

The Labor government came into power at a time when we had increased exports, a debt which had been reduced from that \$9 billion; and lower unemployment figures, thanks to the federal government and the restructuring that had taken place—and some members opposite have acknowledged the returns that we had from exports, the wine industry and so on. It had the funds with which to work from the GST revenue—the dreaded GST—the electricity privatisation and, let us face it, increased property land tax and stamp duty. This is a government that has had its budget position propped up by land tax, the highest that we have ever experienced—

Mr Koutsantonis: You set the rates.

Mr SCALZI: The member says that we set the rates, but what have they done? The real measure of whether or not someone is using an economic tool such as the budget properly is what it has to work with. I will give a simple example. If you give someone \$100 and say, 'Go shopping,' they cannot come back with \$150 worth of goods. They cannot: it is impossible, you only gave them \$100. If you give them \$200, and they only come back with \$175 worth of goods, I suggest that the one to whom you gave \$200 has failed miserably. That is the reality of this government. It has had more with which to work and it is doing less with more. We had a minimal amount of resources to deal with, yet we structured the economy to ensure that this present government is in the position that it is.

Mr Koutsantonis: Thank you. Sit down.

Mr SCALZI: The member thanks me, and I appreciate that he acknowledges that they inherited a good economic position, but the real judgment is about performance. If we are talking about the performance of economic indicators, that is one thing but, if we are talking about the performance of media spin and gloss, that is another. The Premier's performance is very good on the gloss and spin. Indeed, he could take away a job from his own film awards. He is never here for the hard questions, but he is always there for the camera and for the good news: he positions himself well.

It is important to look at jobs. I note that unemployment is lower than it has been in the past, but you must compare it with the employment in other states because you cannot compare apples with pears: you must compare apples with apples, even though it is apple and pear day! There is a little bit of honesty in this because in its own budget the government tells us about its job projections. The budget lacks a focus, as the Leader of the Opposition said. Our leader has gone straight to the crux of the matter: the importance of full-time jobs and how well the economy is doing. That is where our leader is going. He is not a leader dealing with perceptions. But there is an element of truth in the budget projections for jobs.

Despite the good news rhetoric, the Rann government this year expects only .75 per cent employment growth—the lowest in Australia. If it is such a good thing, why is it expecting such low job growth? I suppose it cannot change that because it is the economists, the public servants, who must make those projections—you cannot put a spin on that. Other states are predicting up to four times this rate: the Northern Territory 2.9 per cent; Queensland 2.5 per cent; Tasmania 2.4 per cent; Western Australia 2.3 per cent; New South Wales 2.1 per cent; Victoria 1.5 per cent; and, ACT 1.5 per cent.

Mr Williams: What is South Australia?

Mr SCALZI: The member for MacKillop asks what is South Australia's position.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Members opposite say that it is a good, solid budget. Tell that to those people who are unemployed and those reading this projection of .75 per cent! There is not even a 1 per cent chance of getting a job. I have a newspaper article which states that poor job trends have been evident for the past year. In South Australia, 14 500 full-time jobs have been lost, while 180 000 jobs have been created nationally. We are comparing apples with apples, state with state and making comparisons with the national figures. Members opposite will tell me that there is a global reason for this: .75 per cent—the lowest job projection.

We have lost 14 500 full-time jobs while 180 000 jobs have been created nationally. Why is that? I ask members opposite why that is the case. It is because this government has lost the opportunities. It could have continued with the momentum of increasing exports, but you must have the structures in place—it will not just happen, but it is where you focus. The government's own economic development function is dysfunctional and lacks direction, because the government does not have a clue about economic development. For a government that professes to have a social conscience and those areas as priorities, it should stimulate the economy to create the jobs in order to ensure that the best way you can help the poor and under-privileged is to give them a job. That is the best way to do it, because it gives them a greater ability to buy goods and services. You have to address the needs and you empower them at the same time. That is the best way to help.

If we look at the performance, we see that exports have fallen from \$9.1 billion a year to \$7.4 billion. Do not tell me that is not the case, as these are official figures. The government's obsession with a triple A credit rating is stifling the economy, but it does not realise that. A budget surplus and a sound economy are not the same thing. A budget is an instrument, a tool. A lot of Labor governments in the past that have experienced difficulties in the economy have stimulated it by creating jobs to give the economic multiplier effect. What do we have here? A government that does the opposite! It taxes!

Mr Koutsantonis: You are a socialist.

Mr SCALZI: I am a Liberal with a social conscience and proud of it. Taxes are a leakage in the economic circular flow. The more taxes you have, the less ability you have to multiply jobs and investment: simple economics.

If we look at infrastructure, we see that this government has spent a considerable amount of money at the Sturt Street school—millions of dollars, in fact. Why has that much money been spent on 70 students? You would think that a government which says that it should target jobs would spend that money in areas where the multiplier effect would have

been fairer, with more equitable jobs creation. This is the government that carried on about Hindmarsh Stadium, which held 12 000 people the other night. Indeed, during the National Soccer League competition, what happened? They had the highest attendance at a soccer stadium.

Time expired.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I will contribute very briefly to this debate. First, I congratulate Melissa Bailey and the Hon. Jay Weatherill on the birth of their little girl Lucinda late this afternoon. I am sure we are all looking forward to seeing her.

I feel compelled to say that I am quite bemused by the number of members opposite who have stood in this place and talked about how it is wrong to apply appropriate penalties for traffic offences. The opposition cried that speeding drivers are paying too much for breaking the law, and God forbid that we should actually increase the penalty or the fine. The fact is that speeding can and does cause the death of innocent people—a father, a mother, a child, a brother, a sister or a friend. It causes permanent debilitating injuries, huge medical costs, great property costs and absolute human misery. Surely, no-one can complain that speeding fines are unfair.

They are a deterrent, and I realise that sometimes we make a mistake and we may go over the speed limit and get caught going down a hill, but the foolhardy recidivists get out there, think they own the roads and drive how they like without any regard for anyone else. I think members opposite ought to remember that, if they do not want to pay a speeding fine, they should not speed. I think it is poor form and offensive to people who have been injured in road crashes when drivers have been speeding to politicise this issue. It causes human misery and, to quote the member for Davenport, those kinds of comments from the opposition are just a sham.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): We all know that a picture says a thousand words and, if we could have had a camera in here on budget day and taken a photograph of the stunned looks on the faces of the members opposite, we would not need to make our contributions tonight about the budget. Their faces said it all. They were gobsmacked and looked like sulky children who had had their lollipops taken away from them. Irrespective of that, I will make a few comments this evening about some specific issues of concern to me and to many thousands of families in my electorate. In the main, they relate specifically to children, and this budget focuses heavily on the development of our children—their education, health and well-being.

This budget has a strong focus on the years of a child's life which really do make a difference. We have all the scientific evidence which proves a child's life, from pre-birth to around eight years of age, sets the stage for the rest of their life—their learning ability, job opportunities and health status into adulthood. If we are to make a difference in society and ensure that our state and community prospers, we must guarantee that each and every child has the opportunity to develop to their full potential.

Yesterday the Minister for Health launched the smoke-free pregnancy project at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and this is a perfect example of what I am talking about. It is a proactive program that will have a direct impact on the health of the mother and, very importantly, the baby. The minister outlined a range of problems yesterday that can be directly linked to smoking during pregnancy—for example,

increased risk of ectopic pregnancies, miscarriages, low birth weight, stillbirths and SIDS. She also outlined a range of health problems that the baby can suffer as a result of its mother smoking, including increased risk of asthma, ear infections and upper respiratory tract infections.

Interestingly, the link between smoking during pregnancy and the aggressiveness of a child is the subject of a study in Canada. We also know that simply treating symptoms is not the way to go. If we do, we will spiral downwards, with poorer community health, greater costs and overall poorer outcomes generally. In this budget, and the previous budget, this government has promoted healthy pregnancy, strengthening the development of our children in those important early years and improving support for parents.

In November, the Every Chance for Every Child initiative was launched by the Premier and Minister for Health. They launched the universal home visiting program, which is a program for all parents of newborn children. It is universal for a number of reasons. In Canada, the research showed that home visiting is not about targeting people in low socioeconomic circumstances because, if they had fixed all the problems for children from poor backgrounds (and I do not dispute for a minute that poverty is a determinant on your life outcome), they would have fixed only 10 per cent of the problem. The vast majority of children suffering one or more problems were, in fact, from the middle income bracket simply because of the vastness of numbers.

We know that being a parent—and a new parent, in particular—is not an easy task. In this budget those programs will be extended. The family home visiting program will assist those families which have additional difficulties for a range of reasons, and they will get the vital extra help they need. That roll-out has begun and I know that the department is extremely happy with the take-up rate to date. This strategy is aimed at healthy babies and, as I said, supporting families during those difficult times. It is a very significant commitment and it is one that we can be proud of. It is one of those programs that very clearly defines the difference between a Labor and a Liberal government.

In addition to that, we also have the massive \$35 million commitment to the Early Years Literacy Program for our children—from kindergarten through those very important junior primary years. We have a commitment to employ 125 new teachers and 60 extra teachers to provide one-on-one support to year one students falling behind in literacy. We have got tutors to train the existing 120 teachers delivering the Reading Recovery program, teachers to mentor, teachers to provide additional services and learning support for Aboriginal students—a whole range of those sorts of programs—and again it is one of those very defining programs.

I was very pleased to be at the announcement with the Minister and the Premier, and the President of the South Australian Primary Schools Association, Leonie Trimper, was there, and I have never seen anyone quite so excited. I do not want to misquote her but she certainly said something along the lines of she had 'never seen such a comprehensive commitment to early childhood learning in all of her 30 years of teaching'. That is on top of the additional allocation of books for our kindergartens and libraries around the state, and I am delighted out in my electorate—we look like receiving an additional \$40 000 for our kindergartens and schools.

Whilst I welcome the massive increase in funding in the FAYS budget to support the recommendations of the Layton review into child protection, I have to say that it very much

saddens me that we need to spend such enormous amounts of money to protect our children. It is a very sad indictment, I think, on our community. What does it say about us, particularly in light of the report that was lodged in this house in relation to the Anglican Church yesterday? Our children have the absolute right to be safe and to be able to develop to their full potential. This government is taking action: improving alternative care; additional counselling and therapeutic services for children who have been neglected or abused; the creation of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee; the Office of the Guardian for Children and Young People; increased family support services for training for school counsellors; and increased money to help participate in the implementation of the Australian National Child Offender Registry.

When Labor came into office we made a commitment to health. Every budget has seen that commitment honoured and this budget in particular has a very strong focus on health. It was an area that was badly neglected by the previous government. Public hospitals had capital works projects announced and re-announced, but not a brick laid. The Premier has said, and I think it is very true, that our hospitals are now like building sites. I had the pleasure of visiting the Lyell McEwin Hospital to look at their new birthing facilities and I have to say they were better than anything that I have ever seen anywhere, better than I have ever seen in any private hospital, and that certainly is something that we can be proud of. Again, it was an initiative that was promised and re-promised and never delivered by the former government. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is having a massive upgrade. That never would have happened under the previous government.

Mr Williams: We started it.

Ms RANKINE: It started? Did it have any money? Nothing happened. In this budget we have got \$30.1 million going into the Flinders Medical Centre, and \$41.5 million into mental health.

Members interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: We acknowledge that there were problems. The difference is that this government is about trying to work towards solving those problems, not neglecting them, and not hiding them. Many young people in my electorate are also delighted with the concession that has been made for first home buyers. That has been warmly welcomed. The first home is the hardest to attain, and these additional concessions will help many young people make that initial purchase. This budget has its focus on the wellbeing of the community. Budgets are not about getting up in the morning and seeing what Santa has delivered. We have heard contributions from members opposite bleating about their pet projects that have not been delivered on, and why hasn't this one got this little bit, and why hasn't someone else got another little bit.

This is about the wellbeing of our whole community. We promised better schools, we promised a better health service, we promised a safer community, we promised to protect our children. This budget is about social justice and we are delivering on those promises. We are improving the health, and we are improving the opportunities for our children to develop. This budget has focused on protecting those children and it has focused on helping young people attain their first home. Can I congratulate the Treasurer on what I think is an excellent budget and one that has been warmly received out in the community, and one that has turned the faces of those opposite as green as the benches that they sit on.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I am glad that I was not in here for too much of that speech or I would have been turning green, I can tell you, Mr Speaker—quite sickening to say the least. We have now seen three budgets delivered by the Rann government and these three budgets come on the back of economic growth, sound sustainable planning, significant debt reduction from the years of the previous Labor government when this state was put into ruin, and trend indicators that consistently—from 1997 until 2003—were showing good growth for South Australia.

First and foremost, I want to thank the community that assisted us when we were in government to be able to achieve that result, which we have enjoyed so much over the last six or seven years. We were able to see increased job growth until last year, and, rather than the supposed \$950 million record capital works spend that this government announced, we saw successive capital works spends where I sat around a cabinet table and enjoyed seeing—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I know that the member for West Torrens gets a little upset, because he will probably never sit around a cabinet table. Notwithstanding that, the capital works budgets then were pretty well consistently around \$1 billion a year. For a start, there is no record capital works spend and, where capital works were announced by this government last year, we have seen tens of millions of dollars of slippage. We only have to talk to the architects around the state right now to learn that they are very concerned about the plateauing effect of significant building works, particularly the lack of government projects. In fact, if it were not for the private sector, very little capital works would be occurring in this state at the moment.

Sooner or later, the South Australian community is going to realise that this government is about spin, rhetoric and painting glossy pictures, but it is not about delivering ongoing sustainable growth for South Australians—as the community was getting used to when we were in government—ensuring that our older people deserve the sort of lifestyle that they should, rather than the situation in this budget where, sadly, there is virtually nothing for them, and I have looked through the budget papers. I challenge the government to actually show me what they have done for senior South Australians with this budget. It is a very sad and disappointing situation right through to aged care and public housing where there is a reduction next year of 700 houses in the Housing Trust stock. If Sir Thomas Playford were alive today, he would be extremely disappointed with the results of this government—a government that tries to say it is a social inclusion government.

Where is the social inclusion for people who desperately need housing? Where is the housing for the homeless? Even the head of the Social Inclusion Board, in recent times, has come out on the front page of the *City Messenger* and condemned this Labor government for not delivering on its promise of improvements in homelessness. What did we see? We saw the Premier say that he would belt together the heads of the CEOs. He was not saying, ‘We have not delivered in cabinet and we had better get on with the job.’ It is important that we have low debt in this state, because a number of trend indicators at the moment are going the wrong way for South Australia. From my experience, whilst it takes up to two years to actually—

Mr Koutsantonis: Give us a few examples.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Just read last week’s *Financial Review* for one example.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for West Torrens must be having some pain in his knees. The honourable member for West Torrens will listen to the member for Mawson in silence.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Trend indicators normally take about two years, from my experience, whether they are going up or down before we actually see the impact in the community. I simply say to government members when they ask about our naming trend indicators that they look at page 3 of the Budget Overview 2004-05 which shows that the trend indicator for gross state product is trending back from an estimated result this year of 4 per cent to a forecast result of only 2.5 per cent next year and then a flat trend indicator for gross state product real growth. I know for a fact that, having studied those figures for years, you know you have a problem looming with your state and particularly so when that comes against national trends.

One national trend at the moment is another example of trend indicators where we have problems looming in the state. One that is very dear to me is job opportunities for women. In Australia, job opportunities for women are forecast to grow and, indeed, in the last 12 months have grown significantly. What have we seen in South Australia over the last 12 months when it comes to job opportunities for women? We have seen thousands of women losing their jobs in this state.

The government, when delivering the budget, made claims that it was trying to parallel itself with the Hon. Peter Costello, the federal Treasurer, and the honourable Prime Minister, John Howard. The government was saying that the budget it was delivering was comparable to the federal government’s. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth because, for a start, I can assure the house that the federal Liberal government has been able not only to perform but also to perform consistently and, in fact, to lead the other OECD countries, even through the Asian crisis, the September 11 tragedies in America, and the list goes on. They rebuilt Australia. They got the debt down. They created the jobs. They built the infrastructure, and so did we when we were in government.

How dare this government try to compare itself to the federal Liberal Howard government! The good management of the federal Liberal Howard government has seen GST revenue coming back through growth. The fact is that this government is the highest taxing government. This Rann Labor government is the highest taxing government in the history of South Australia and yet, it is not delivering with those taxes. It is, in fact, building up a war chest and hitting again the people who can least afford it.

Have a look at how much it cost to register your car last year and at how much it will cost with the government’s recent announcement of fees and charges. Have a look at the increases in water. We can also look at our fuel prices as compared to states like New South Wales and Queensland. We can then look at more fundamental basics that we need in areas such as the Mawson electorate where we need cheap public transport to enable young people to get to schools and universities and for the elderly to go shopping. What have they done there? They have again significantly put up the cost of public transport. It is a sad situation for those families, and we will do what we can to try and fight this government on their high taxing imposts.

With respect to my own electorate, whilst I am pleased to see capital works continue in McLaren Vale and Willunga Primary Schools, and some work going on at McLaren Flat

Primary School, it would be remiss of me if I did not put on the public record the fact that the ground work for McLaren Vale was done when we were still in government. In fact, the planning started several years ago. Also, the Willunga Primary capital works was approved in the May 2001 budget. Many of the year sixes and sevens in that school will not now enjoy the new classrooms but they would have had this government not put that project on hold, delayed it and then, sadly, extended it again to tender calls in October this year. So, I am disappointed for our community in relation to that and I have had significant representation from the community about their concerns over this matter. However, I am pleased that ultimately those projects are continuing.

Other than that, when looking in the electorate of Mawson or, indeed, in my capacity as shadow minister for the southern suburbs, there is very little in this budget for the south—apart from the state government contribution of \$5 million towards the Mitsubishi disaster for the south. I am appreciative of the \$5 million, but I would like to have seen a better contribution than that. The federal government put \$40 million directly into job creation and investment in the region to offset the tragedy for those workers and their families—and my heart goes out to those families—and \$10 million to help them retrain and get back into employment.

Apart from the \$5 million package, we cannot find virtually any new projects in the budget for the south; they are all a continuation of announcements over the past several years. In fact, when you have a look at this budget I do not think we need a budget next year, because probably all we need is a report to the parliament on year-to-date financial performances. Everything that has been announced in the budget has been announced for the next four years. In fact, for some of it, whilst announced in this budget, there is no intention to spend the money for two years, and in fact some of it will not be spent until after the next election. If ever anything was deceiving the community of South Australia, that is.

I have never seen a budget like this before where so much announced is actually wrapped up in a figure where, for example, they might say that they are going to spend \$180 million on extra councillors and social workers to assist with child abuse. Certainly, all of us in the parliament support that, but when you look at the fine print most of those sorts of programs are over three or four years. When you look at some of the capital works, there is no start until after the next election. Whilst they were fortunate that *The Advertiser* gave them some good headlines, if you look at the detail, I think *The Advertiser* was extremely generous to the government and should have pointed out that many of those projects would not start for several years, and that they were four-year programs. It is only now when people are starting to wake up and have a look at this budget that they realise that this is a budget that is not going to, as another treasurer once said in another government in the federal parliament, 'bring home the bacon for South Australians.'

If you had look at Saturday's *Advertiser* it was interesting because, after all the big announcements that we see on a day-to-day basis in this state, *The Advertiser* ran a features section in its Letters to the Editor. On Saturday it was the response to the budget. Not one of those responses was favourable to the government. What did we see? We saw a premier who was happy to get in the parliament when we were in government, with the Hon. Nick Xenophon in another place, and say that any advertising by a premier or by a government to do

with budgets and like-natured promotions was nothing short of politics.

In fact, according to the Hon. Nick Xenophon in another place, and recently on television talking about this, he understood that the premier said he would never spend money on political advertising. What have we seen? We have seen \$90 000 spent on trying to promote a budget that lacks substance, direction and a sustainable future and opportunity for South Australians. Frankly, that \$90 000 would have been much better spent looking after literacy and numeracy programs in our schools, or giving some sort of deduction to seniors for public transport costs, rather than an increase.

I want to touch on how disappointed I am that the government has not seen fit to address what our community is calling for on a daily basis, and that is a road upgrade as you come off the Victor Harbor Road at Old Noarlunga onto Main South Road. It is very disappointing that the government has not seen that as a priority, but we will continue to push for it. Whilst it is not immediately in my electorate, on behalf of the community in the Aldinga, Sellicks, Port Willunga and Silver Sands area, I am sorry for them that the government did not take an opportunity in this budget to deliver some of the windfall gains that they had from our immediate area there in land sales through the Land Management Corporation to put infrastructure back into their area.

It is disappointing for that community, but I will work with the community to ensure that we keep the pressure on the government to get honest with that community and to deliver. Back in the early 1990s and late 1980s the south was known as 'the forgotten south'. We worked very hard in government to turn that around. We delivered a Southern Expressway; we delivered visitor centres for tourism development; we delivered a vocational education college; we delivered capital works at police stations and courts in the south; and we delivered upgrades at Woodcroft Primary School, Willunga High School, Wirreanda High School and Christies Beach High School, just to name a few. I say to the South Australian community and particularly the south: please pay attention to how you are being deceived by this government.

Obviously, next year they will do the old Bannon trick, come out and make all these announcements the year before the election to the people in the south and people generally in South Australia. But they will not deliver. In fact, for three consecutive elections when Labor was last in office it announced the third arterial road as a policy commitment. And it never, ever delivered. Tonight, together with a lot of our community from the south who have been in Adelaide today, I will be able to travel home on a Southern Expressway that was committed to by a Liberal government and delivered by a Liberal government, and we are driving on it today. That is what we want: that is what the community of the south wants. It wants to see results, not facades, gloss, propaganda and a Premier who spends all his time spinning with the media rather than concentrating on the main game.

I want to finish on my concerns about the police budget. Everyone in South Australia is well aware that, if it was not for a concerted effort by the Police Association of South Australia and the Liberal opposition, a petition tabled here in the parliament, and the police and community telling those of us in opposition that they needed additional police, the 200 police that the Premier, the Minister for Police and the government make so much of now would not have occurred. If members do not believe me, I say: read the *Hansard* for the 18 months when we were continually in this parliament

asking for the delivery of additional police. The answer was, 'Our policy is that we will recruit at attrition.' That was their answer. But pressure came to bear and finally we are seeing some additional police.

That will help the Commissioner to do the good job that he does without enough resources. When it comes to the operational recurrent budget, if you open Budget Paper 4, Volume 1 and go to the police section, you will see there that the situation we have been seeing on a regular basis since November 2003, where there simply is not enough money in the local service area budgets, will continue next year. That is not good for the police and that is not good for the South Australian community. We will do what we can to get that corrected for police and the South Australian community. What it confirms again is talk, rhetoric, spin, but a government that is actually soft on law and order, because if you cannot deliver sustainable budgets for your police, then all the paper that we debate in this parliament is not worth what it is written on.

It is a disappointing situation to see the minister putting too much pressure on the police budget when it comes to the recurrent operational situation. The police have had enough. The minister might say that talking like this upsets their morale. I am not upsetting their morale: they are ringing me, faxing me, emailing me every day because they have had enough of this government.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development (Hon. P. Holloway) and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. T.G. 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.

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

That the house note grievances.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): If I could say something nice about this budget, I would. I have been listening to the speeches, and nobody likes people who are unduly negative, but it has been going on and on now for about 20 speeches and it is quite depressing. I would like to add a positive to this budget. I also wonder what you, Mr Speaker, think about this budget. We will not get the opportunity to hear from Mr Speaker, and I wonder if he could come to the floor of the house and say what he thinks, since he could not be too rapt about it, because like me he represents a country electorate. Admittedly, he has had a couple of wins with the hospital.

I have just thought of something nice to say: \$10 million towards Outer Harbor. But hang on: did I not hear Mr Vincent Tremaine of Flinders Ports and also Mr John Lush, the President of SAFF, say that the minimum requirement for the port was \$30 million to dig it to the 14 metres minimum depth to keep the port viable and competitive? I do hope that the money is forthcoming, because it is a very important project.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I declare my interest as a barley grower and a wheat grower, and I am also a member of Ausbulk. I have declared that interest previously. My brother now happens to be the Chairman of Ausbulk, and I congratulate him on the pending merger. You cannot choose your family, can you? You can choose your friends but you cannot choose your relatives. You put up with what you have got. I am proud for my brother because our father Howard—as members would know, and the minister would know because our fathers were colleagues together in this place—was also Chairman of South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling—the forerunner to Ausbulk.

History does repeat itself, doesn't it, minister? Anyway, on with the job. I am very concerned about schools in my electorate. I am just wondering, sir, whether you intend to have any input into this debate. The Speaker is not responding at all. I would love to hear what the Speaker has to say about this budget one way or the other. Is the Speaker going to send out a memo, or is he going to let us know somehow, somewhere, some time? I would be very keen to know what he thinks about it. I am very concerned that schools in my electorate attracted no new money at all.

The Mannum school is undertaking a new joint venture, a new campus, and no assistance was offered at all. No reference was made at all to this new campus, and that has been happening for three or four years. Also, the Kapunda Primary School has no commencement date for its refurbishment. In fact, I understand that the project is now underfunded to the tune of some \$400 000. The school is being forced into a corner. Does it choose to look after the beautiful heritage building, which all members would have seen and which houses the library, some classrooms and the school's open space area, or does it build a new administration block and four new solid classrooms and not touch the heritage building? It does not have the funds to do both.

There was never enough funding to do both. This heritage building was always going to soak up the money, as we all know heritage buildings do. If you want some proof of that, just look at Sturt Street Primary School, but we will get to that in a minute. I am concerned that there is not enough money in that respect. You do not have to be Einstein to work out that the longer the heritage building is left the more expensive the repair bill will be. I do not believe it is fair for the school to have to choose. This minister and other members have been inside this building, and it is a disgrace.

Members would not allow their children to be educated in that building. It is an old building, it is dark, dank and unhealthy. On the outside it is a fine building but it does need total refurbishing. The old building at least ought to be painted or repaired, even if the school forgoes creature comforts, such as airconditioning and a new internal wall, or two. The \$2.2 million allocated to the project was never enough money in the first place. Of course, one wonders why more money was not allocated. Of course, we know who the winner is. The winner is, Sturt Street Primary School.

Look at the money: a \$2 million project is now up to a \$6 million project. It is before the Public Works Committee; and, sir, you would be aware that these projects do come before the committee when expenditure exceeds \$4 million. I am trying to do the right thing. I want to be responsible. I do not want to destroy that school, but we must be responsible, and I have a political duty as well. It does concern me greatly. That is where the money has gone. Before the election the Premier said that he would re-open Sturt Street Primary School. Well, he should have checked the fine print,

because, if he had, he would never have made the comment and we would not have wasted \$6 million.

The Tanunda Primary School has severe problems. We have a new primary school at Tanunda, but no-one planned the set-down area. We have real problems when school starts and finishes. Great numbers converge on a small area—school buses, parents and cars; it is just a total mishmash, and it is dangerous. Parents were using a paddock alongside the school to pick up their kids. That has been now banned. We have gone from crisis to crisis. I will be looking at that on Friday morning to see what can be done. It is not good, and I put on the record that something has to be done before someone is hurt.

I was very disappointed because, in every budget, primary industries seems to get cut, and, in real terms, we are down a further 9 per cent. We are just declining all the time. I am very concerned because of all the times we do need primary industries to be giving us independent advice, non-commercial advice, now is that time in this age of genetically modified foods and everything else. We need a strong, viable and vibrant Department of Primary Industries, and what do we see? Further cutbacks. It really is a concern. A major expenditure in this budget relates to the area of child protection. It is a huge amount of money—I think in excess of \$200 million all up when you round up all the various figures and lines.

Why throw money at the problem when you do not do enough about the cause? Why is it happening? We are in charge of the adoption laws. Look at our adoption laws. Family and Youth Services needs more capacity to access

dysfunctional families and to help them. If all else fails, these children ought to be put into permanent care. It is a very tangled web and a very sad state indeed. We should not put up with it. What will the problem be like in another 10 years? We all see it and we all share the great concern. I am not criticising the spending of the money, but just walk around the city and suburbs and look.

What sort of parents will some of these kids make? They come from totally dysfunctional families: no love, violence, drugs, abuse, no role models, no hope and no job. Some of these people are third generation welfare recipients. We need to implement a study to see what is happening overseas in relation to this problem. Is it just a South Australian problem? Is it a problem interstate? A huge amount of money is not going to solve anything. You are just helping people who are victims of what governments are doing or not doing to help them. This is a bandaid, and what a massive bandaid it is—almost \$200 million. Look at the fat cats. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (EXECUTIVE BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.01 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 2 June at 2 p.m.