

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 April 2005

The SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such) took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

AUSTRALIANS AIDING CHILDREN ADOPTION AGENCY

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to immediately reverse its decision to close the Australians Aiding Children Adoption Agency, was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S TRUST ACCOUNT

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (28 February).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have no recollection of any knowledge of the existence of the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account prior to being informed around mid August 2004 of its misuse by senior public servants in the Attorney General's Department.

UNIVERSITY SALARIES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (25 October 2004).

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The remuneration packages for university senior management outlined on pages 405, 472 and 504 of the Auditor-General's report for amounts of \$320 000, \$510 000 and \$410 000 were paid to the vice-chancellors of Flinders university, the University of Adelaide and the university of South Australia respectively.

The recipients at the University of Adelaide of two remuneration packages in excess of \$300 000 and \$350 000 are the head of a key research unit and a former senior manager of the university who has left to take up a senior position interstate. The later payment covers all accrued entitlements including significant long service leave.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT, GRANT FUNDING

In reply to **Mrs HALL** (25 October 2004).

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The issues raised on page 553 were the result of an audit conducted by the Auditor-General's Department on grant funding to non-government organisations by the Department of Human Services. The issues relate to the provision of appropriate controls at a whole of department level regarding the administration of grant funding.

The comments were not specific to any one division. They were not, therefore, directed at the Office for Women.

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to **Mr SCALZI** (25 October 2004).

The Hon. S.W. KEY: In 2003-04 the number of employees who took a targeted voluntary separation package was 126.

In 2004-05 it is predicted that nil separation packages will be offered.

BUSINESS AND SKILLED MIGRATION PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (Estimates Committee B, 18 June 2004).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY The Premier has provided the following information:

During the period March 2002 and December 2003 (after which the function of migration attraction was transferred to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet), through *Immigration SA*, our State attracted 3 004 business and skilled migrants.

These migrants were attracted under the following arrangements:
Business migrants

Sponsorship is required by DIMIA from a State/Territory Government for potential business migrants to be eligible for a Provisional Visa as the first stage of their visa process. Under these arrangements, the following business migrants were sponsored:

Number of business migrants sponsored by the Government of SA:	810
Total amount of funds available for transfer to SA:	\$113 230 457
Potential number of jobs created:	995

Skilled migrants
The Government of SA is involved in two Commonwealth migration schemes to attract skilled migrants.

State/Territory Nominated Independent (STNI) Scheme:
The Government of SA is able to nominate suitable candidates whose occupation is on this State's list of skills in demand under the (STNI) Scheme. Successful nominees pledge to migrate to and settle in SA for at least two years. Under this scheme the following were nominated:

Number of skilled migrants nominated by the Government of SA:	1151
Total amount of funds available for transfer to SA:	\$26 918 870

Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (RSMS):
To assist employers fill vacancies they are unable to fill from within the local labour market, the Government of SA can certify these vacancies available for filling by suitably qualified candidates from overseas through the RSMS. Employers sponsor these candidates and an employment contract is signed for at least two years. Under this scheme, the following were sponsored:

Number of skilled migrants certified by the Government of SA:	1043
Average salary of positions:	\$64 886

BAROSSA COUNCIL

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 131 of the local Government act 1999, I lay on the table the annual report for 2003-04 for the Barossa Council area.

MURRAY RIVER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have today written to New South Wales Premier Bob Carr and Victorian Premier Steve Bracks to appeal for their better cooperation in our collective responsibility to restore the ailing health of the River Murray and associated river system. None of us should underestimate the importance of this national project, and nor should we allow anyone to undermine the cooperation for the project that we achieved last year. We all know that the River Murray is in bad shape. It is an environmental calamity that is in danger of becoming a full-blown catastrophe if we do not give this restoration project our full support. That is why the historic agreement signed at the Council of Australian Governments meeting in Canberra last June to secure an extra 500 gegalitres of water to flow down the river was so incredibly important.

I made it clear at the time that this agreement was a first step in securing an eventual 1 500 gegalitres of extra water flow for the River Murray. We cannot and will not give up on this project. It was with great disappointment that I learnt of the recent decision of the New South Wales and Victorian governments to oppose the proposed budget for the \$111 million for the Murray Darling Basin Commission for the coming financial year, 2005-06. New South Wales refused to commit an extra \$3.56 million, and Victoria decided to withhold \$2.1 million in 2005-06 to the

commission's budget. This has led to a serious shortfall in the commission's budget which means its existing commitments to restoration projects will at best be delayed, or simply not go ahead. I am appealing to both Bob Carr and Steve Bracks that any flagging of our resolve now has the capacity to do great damage to the project in the future.

At the recent Murray Darling Basin Ministerial Council, South Australia and the commonwealth both went in to bat strongly for the River Murray. The Minister for the River Murray made it clear that, as a state, we intend to meet our financial obligations to ensure that the environmental work that is now under way in the River Murray continues on time and on budget. South Australia has stuck by its commitment, and we will continue to do so. We are already spending—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Apparently, members opposite don't support what we are doing, but never mind. We are already spending more on improving the health of the River Murray than ever before. We have allocated \$233 million over four years as our part of the rescue package. South Australia continues to lead in the rescue of the River Murray.

Today, I want to detail to the house the South Australian funded projects that are now under way. We are contributing \$65 million over five years to secure an additional 500 gigalitres of environmental flows for the basin by 2008. We are watering stressed and dying river red gums on the Chowilla floodplain near Renmark. This program, which is diverting millions of litres of water into these fragile environments, has resulted—I am pleased to inform the house today—in 90 per cent of the stressed trees in trial locations developing new leaves. We are constructing fish passages at the Barrages to allow fish to move freely between the Coorong and the River Murray. Recent monitoring has revealed that 4 000 fish use the fishways in a three week period, and scientists predict that the passages will be used by more than one million fish a year.

We are building additional salt interception schemes at Loxton and other locations to prevent 150 tonnes of salt a day reaching the river. The last thing that we can afford right now is a weakening of our collective responsibility and commitments to save the River Murray. Improving the health of the River Murray is not a luxury. A healthy national river system is essential to our nation's productivity and prosperity. We owe it to our children to continue the rescue of the River Murray with resolve and not to back out of it. We signed a deal last year; we must honour that commitment. South Australia will continue to confront any obstacle that stands in the way of preserving our most important natural asset.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Premier and all other—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister for Agriculture will be dealt with if he is not careful. I warn the Premier that he had leave to make a ministerial statement. He should not make inflammatory comments about the opposition.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
Water Resources—
Licence and Permit Fees

Marne River and Sanders Creek

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. S.W. Key)—

Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology,
Department of—Report 2003-04
Training and Skills Commission—Report 2004

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—

Citrus Board of South Australia—Report 2003-04
Sabor Ltd—Financial Report 2003-04

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

Rules—
Local Government—Local Government Superannuation Scheme—Marketlink Basic Insurance Benefit.

QUESTION TIME

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's ministerial statement today, will he now confirm that the money that the government has saved through the reduced state contributions agreed at last week's ministerial council will now be committed to other projects and not returned to Treasury if his plea to the other premiers is not successful?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): As Minister for the River Murray—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has been warned. He will be out of here very quickly if he is not careful. He has been warned once; he is very close to being named.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: As Minister for the River Murray, I am responsible for answering this question, whilst I understand that members opposite do not understand ministerial responsibility. I thank the leader for his question.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is warned. The Minister for the River Murray has the call and she is the only member who does.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The leader asks a very important question. The leader should have been listening to the radio yesterday when this question was asked and the confirmation was given that the government intends to invest the money, which would otherwise have gone to the ministerial council, in projects in South Australia. That was also advised to this house previously.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What action has been taken to safeguard the Torrens River against spills and potential hazards along the river?

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): Thank you very much. I acknowledge the nomenclature of the member for Bright. I am very pleased to be the Minister for the River Torrens. I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. It is a very timely question, given the public's interest in the health of that river and also because an extensive audit of potential hazards along the river

has just been completed. The Torrens stormwater audit project was announced in the wake of the TransAdelaide diesel spill in July 2003. Members would recall that that spill—15 000 litres of diesel went into the river—caused widespread environmental damage, including the death of 20 birds and the removal of 165 other birds.

The thorough audit covered waste management, waste water storage and bunding, and spill management—basically all potential hazards along the river. The 47 EPA licensed sites were inspected and I am advised that the site inspections found that there were no identifiable environmental disasters waiting to happen on the scale of the TransAdelaide diesel spill. So that is the good news. However, there were cases where improved practice was needed. For example, two sites had above ground storage tanks that were not bunded and only six of the 47 sites had adequate spill management procedures and spill equipment in place; and a greater focus was needed on hazard identification and emergency response preparedness by licensees.

I am advised that, as a result of this audit, all licensees voluntarily completed required actions, no environment protection orders were required to be issued and risk strategies leading to enhanced environmental outcomes for the river were implemented. In other words, we did an audit; we found that, of the 47 licensed sites, I think at 41 of them things had to be done; and they have all agreed to do them without any prosecution and without any environment protection orders in a cooperative manner. I think that is a good outcome both for the environment and for those individual businesses.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):

Given that the Minister for Industrial Relations has had 24 hours to check with his advisers, will he now confirm that South Australian taxpayers are exposed to nearly \$1 billion in unfunded liabilities for workers' insurance; and what he is doing about it?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): In part, I answered what we were doing about it yesterday when the leader asked this question. I talked about the consolidation of the management of workers compensation to deliver better decision making and management. I also talked about greater emphasis on preventing injuries. It is also—

Ms Chapman: Big deal!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: 'Big deal', the fount of all knowledge says. Despite the comments by the member for Bragg, I advise the member for Bragg and the Leader of the Opposition that, over the last nine months, the figures have been heading in the right direction: a 7.8 per cent reduction in public sector claim costs; and a 4.7 per cent cut in the number of new claims to March 2005.

TOBACCO SALES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the government doing about retailers who sell tobacco to children?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Florey for the second question this week on this important issue in relation to tobacco control. I can inform the house that, as part of the recent reforms to tobacco laws, the state government is now cracking down on retailers

who sell cigarettes to children. This will involve a \$315 on-the-spot fine. Under the new tobacco laws, anyone who is caught selling or supplying tobacco products to children can now be fined on the spot, even if it is a first time offence. Previously the health department has issued warnings to first time offenders, but those days are now gone. Tobacco retailers need to ensure that their staff are trained and aware that they must ask for proof of age if there is any doubt that a purchaser of a tobacco product is under 18 years of age.

Under the new tobacco laws, employers are now also equally liable for any tobacco sales made to children by their employees, and both employers and employees can be fined for the one offence. Officers of the Department of Health regularly conduct controlled purchase operations using volunteer young people to test compliance with this law. Of those retailers tested in 2004, 24 per cent sold cigarettes to children without asking to see any identification to ascertain how old the young person was. That is not only unacceptable but it is also illegal.

While we are seeing a decrease across the board in the number of people smoking, the key to future reductions is preventing children and young people from taking up smoking in the first place. Each day in Australia almost 120 children become established smokers, and a quarter of them will die prematurely from a smoking-related illness. That is why we are cracking down on sales to children; that is why we are now restricting access to cigarette vending machines; and it is a primary motivation behind the smoke-free laws for pubs and clubs, to create an atmosphere where young people are not so easily tempted or able to light up.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):

Sir, I have a supplementary question. How many shop owners or retailers have been prosecuted in the last three years for selling to minors?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: My understanding is that it is in the vicinity of five. This is where the changes that the government made to smoking laws will—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley will be in trouble if he is not careful.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I would like to explain to the house that this is the very reason why the government changed the laws last year: firstly, to introduce on-the-spot fines and, secondly, to make employers vicariously liable in relation to the sale of cigarettes to children. Again, just as we have improved immensely on the efforts of the previous government and, in particular, the previous minister, who did absolutely nothing in this whole area (what a surprise) during his term as health minister, this government has made a commitment to improve tobacco control. We have done it in a number of areas, and today's question and answer simply highlights one such area.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):

Does the Minister for Industrial Relations have confidence in the four major claims agents of WorkCover and, if so, why is WorkCover looking for new claims agents?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The WorkCover board is trying to achieve the very best possible results with regard to the claims management agents. It would probably be fair to say that the WorkCover board does not think it is receiving the best possible value that it can from the claims agents. It is the

board's responsibility (whether it is claims agents or any other form of the business) to make sure that it receives the best possible value. With that in mind, both the Chair of the WorkCover board and I have met with the four companies that are the current claims agents in Sydney (on one occasion Jane Tongs attended in the absence of the Chair, Bruce Carter) and, obviously, the board will go about its business which, in part, is to look at re-tendering with respect to the claims agents.

QANTAS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for Tourism.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for West Torrens.

Ms CICCARELLO: What benefits have the new direct Qantas flights from New Zealand to South Australia had on our tourism and convention industry?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Norwood who has been a consistent supporter of the tourism industry, partly I suspect because of her electorate, which is one of those urban villages that attracts many tourists. It is an icon during the days of the Tour Down Under, and it is one of the small heritage areas that attracts tourists all through the year. The member for Norwood knows how important tourism is to our economy and, in particular, she recognises the government's achievements in lifting the number of inbound international seats by 40 per cent over the last two and a half years. That increase in seats internationally into Adelaide is significant because one of the problems with tourism is actually gaining access to South Australia. Even though we have the destinations and the products, sometimes getting here is a challenge. The new flights by Qantas providing direct flights from Auckland to Adelaide were fought for by the South Australian government and were delivered by Qantas just before Christmas.

The efforts are beginning to pay off now that ACTA is working to promote Adelaide as a convention destination. I commend its approach in working in New Zealand to attract particular conventions, especially those in the winter months. It has just won a conference called the 2006 Insurance Brokers of New Zealand Conference for which it beat Melbourne and New Caledonia in the bidding. This conference will come to Adelaide in August 2006, which will bring 550 delegates to the state. It is one of the 20 events secured by the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority in the last year. The direct flights mean that we are not only more competitive in terms of New Zealand travel but also in conventions. The other events it has secured are bringing 2 000 delegates for the District. 201 Lions Conference, 1 300 delegates for the Sweet Adelines Convention, 800 delegates to the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements, and 700 delegates to the Australian Society of Ultrasound in Medicine Conference.

These conferences are big business, and they draw 900 000 visitors a year, injecting \$356 million into our economy. The importance of conventions is found in the statistics on the spending profile of visitors. The average international visitor is expected to spend \$1 860 only, but a convention delegate will spend \$3 500. This can be leveraged into more dollars if we can encourage them to 'Linger Longer' and visit our regions as well as our urban villages like Henley or Norwood and the many urban centres that are attractive to visitors. Our state is a good value for money

destination with wine and food tourism opportunities, great regional visits and urban village opportunities. I am delighted that ACTA has had time to leverage opportunities—no doubt helped by our really sparkling television campaign in New Zealand which has put Adelaide on the map.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT, WORKCOVER OH&S AUDIT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Has non-conformance with occupational health and safety legislation within the Attorney-General's Department been addressed? The WorkCover audit conducted in December 2003 reveals that the Attorney-General's Department did not comply with the law.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I shall get a report on that very matter and get back to the house and, in particular, to the Leader of the Opposition swiftly.

CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS, REGIONAL

Ms BREUER (Giles): Can the Attorney-General inform the house how the government is supporting regional crime prevention programs?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The state government provides funding for the regional crime prevention program. The program identifies local crime problems and solutions based on local knowledge and the specific needs of regional communities. It provides funding to local councils and organisations to operate specific on-the-ground projects. I had hoped that the opposition would support our endeavours in this respect, but I note that the member for Bright interjected earlier—and I wrote it down because it was so extraordinary—that 'We don't support you on anything.'

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Mawson is correct: the member for Bright said, in response to the Premier, 'We don't support you on anything.' I thank the member for Mawson for confirming what the member for Bright said. The Crime Prevention Unit staff from my department monitor what happens in our neighbourhoods and provide advice on regionally-based crime prevention projects. The City of Adelaide is working on improving city safety and has projects addressing crime prevention through environmental design, motor vehicle theft and alcohol misuse. The eastern region is running three major projects this financial year aimed at car crime, crime prevention through environmental design and serious criminal trespass—and I was so pleased to read the leaflet produced for motorists by the eastern region of the regional crime prevention program that I read out its tips on Radio 5AA's Bob Francis program, because I think it contains tips that all motorists would be interested in.

A northern region crime prevention committee has developed a program tackling early intervention approaches to the misuse of drugs by young people. This project will be delivered through schools. In the western region, the City of Charles Sturt is undertaking a crime prevention through environmental design pilot project in Athol Park. The City of Port Adelaide Enfield has contributed its funds—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the member for Schubert knows that.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It has contributed its funds towards a graffiti management program. Also in the west, the City of West Torrens runs a residential break and enter awareness package to minimise the effect and incidence of break and enter.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We put a vast amount of money into it. The southern region has chosen a graffiti management and prevention project, and I hope the member for Mawson was listening when I mentioned the program I have initiated through the Christies Beach Magistrates Court to have graffiti vandals wipe off graffiti in the southern region as part of the community service order issued to them.

The rural city of Murray Bridge employs a part-time crime prevention officer to oversee four projects, with support from local volunteers, dealing with domestic break and enter, graffiti, car theft and domestic violence. The Ceduna region will recommence—

Mr Venning: Why is it in Murray Bridge?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Schubert asks why we are funding a crime prevention project in Murray Bridge—because it is deserving! The Ceduna region will recommence the successful—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson could be moving off the question list.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Ceduna region will recommence the successful Bush Breakaway program—which the opposition so deplored in an earlier question time—in conjunction with Children, Family and Youth Services, SA Police and the Ceduna Area School. I personally intervened to save the Bush Breakaway program and I was so disappointed when the opposition criticised this program, and my intervention to save it, in question time earlier this year.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg is referring to the program as, ‘What a disgrace.’ I do not know what the member for Bragg has against the Ceduna Bush Breakaway program. This highly successful program provides an intervention that diverts young Aboriginal males from a criminal pathway to stop them offending and to reduce the factors that lead to their offending. I am so disappointed that the Liberal opposition will not support the Ceduna Bush Breakaway program and that the member for Bragg is deploring it in the house even today. The City of Port Augusta and the City of Whyalla share the funding for the Iron Triangle region. Projects in Port Augusta include: the installation of a closed circuit television camera network; security bike patrols; the Port Augusta Youth Support Strategy; and the Port Augusta City Council Summer Activities program. Whyalla’s program is called ‘Hangin at the Yarra’ and is conducted at the Whyalla Youth Activity Centre. This project provides a safe, drug and alcohol-free space for youths.

The government’s regional crime prevention programs are providing targeted assistance to projects with a proved record in areas that need it the most. If the government did not have to spend \$180 000 of taxpayers’ money paying for the loose lips of the Hon. Robert Lucas and the member for Bright, we would have more to spend on regional crime prevention.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That was inappropriate comment from the Attorney-General.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Not only was it inappropriate, it was a reflection on me. I ask the Attorney-General to withdraw immediately.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: The Attorney knows that it is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bright will not debate it!

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Would the Attorney like me to reveal to the house the full extent of what he did?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Attorney-General will come to order and will not speak over the chair! The member has taken offence. Is the Attorney prepared to withdraw?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, sir: the facts are absolutely true, as I have stated outside the house.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: you and previous speakers have ruled that it is inappropriate in answering questions for ministers to reflect on members of this house. The Attorney-General has just done that, and I ask that you rule that he withdraw that statement and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is against standing orders to reflect on other members. I did not hear the complete sentence but I ask the Attorney to withdraw in the context of the cordiality of the parliament and the better workings of the parliament. I ask the Attorney, if he reflected, to withdraw.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It is extraordinary to be asked to withdraw remarks that are true and are a matter of public record.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: It is not: the fact that you offered a deal is true. Do you want the details—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bright is warned for talking over the chair. I have asked the Attorney to withdraw to the extent that it was a reflection. He has given his response. Unless the parliament wishes to do otherwise, that is the situation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I take it that your ruling was that that was unparliamentary and a breach of standing orders, and I ask that you insist that your ruling be upheld.

The SPEAKER: No; I said, ‘To the extent that it was a reflection, I ask the Attorney to withdraw,’ because I did not hear all of it; but the Attorney has refused.

TRAMLINE, SOUTH ROAD CROSSING

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Transport advise the house of the government’s plans for the tramline crossing at South Road? With the current South Road overpass of Cross Road, the proposal for a tunnel at Anzac Highway and predicted extra tram traffic, the tram crossing at South Road is now a major bottleneck.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): If I understand this correctly, the shadow minister for transport has walked in, asserted that the South Road tram crossing is a bottleneck, and that I should do something about it.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Please, Mr Speaker. Eight and a half years of indolence—of wine centres, of soccer stadiums—

Mr BROKENSHIRE: On a point of order, sir, relating to standing order 98. There was a specific question. They

have a blown out budget and a new tramline. We want an answer for a change, sir. Come on!

The SPEAKER: Members do not give a speech when they raise a point of order. I ask the minister to focus on relevance and to answer the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will, sir. Relevance is about clearing a bottleneck on South Road. The point that we make is that we are the first government in 30 years to tackle the issue, and after—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On a point of order, the question was specifically about what the government is going to do with the tramline on South Road.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The question related to the tramline.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It does relate to the tramline. The shadow minister specifically referred to a bottleneck on South Road. In our infrastructure plan we have said that we are going to tackle South Road—the first government ever—and we have started with the two biggest bottlenecks. The shadow minister might think that he is smarter and that we should start with a different bottleneck, but we have started with the two biggest bottlenecks that the RAA and the Freight Council say are the most important ones. So, what I would say to him is that, after nothing was done for 8½ years, let us start with a big project first—the RAA's preference, the Freight Council's preference and Transport SA's preference, and not the misguided member for Mawson's preference.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will be on a tram shortly. I take it from the minister's answer that it did not really address the issue of how the tram will get across South Road, but maybe it will get across with its own devices. The member for Playford.

TRAVELLER'S AID SOCIETY

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Can the Minister for Transport advise whether the Traveller's Aid Society was forced by the Department of Transport at short notice to vacate its premises without alternative? If not, what are the circumstances of the society?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I am more than happy to provide the information because, regrettably, the member for Morialta asserted yesterday that the nasty Department of Transport had kicked out the Traveller's Aid Society at short notice without alternatives. The circumstances are actually that TransAdelaide, in conjunction with the department of admin services, assisted the Traveller's Aid Society in finding new accommodation. It has moved to shop three in the underpass to North Terrace—some 75 metres from the current location. I can assure the member for Morialta, if she is worried about travellers and travellers' aid, that I think they will make the next 75 metres. If people have travelled so far, I think travelling the next 75 metres shall not be too much of a difficulty for them.

The refurbishment is being assisted by the government and it came about as a result of the Traveller's Aid Society being advised in November 2004; and it ceased using these premises on 31 March. So, there you go—this is the society being thrown out at short notice with no alternative. It was thrown out with four months' notice. It was not thrown out but was relocated 75 metres away with assistance from the government. The comments were not terribly accurate; she was advised about this but I think the member for Morialta

might have been hearing voices. It is important to be accurate in explanations to questions.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that graphics had the tramline on the east side. We have been back and looked at all the graphics; we cannot find it. Maybe, if he has a copy, he could provide it, or maybe he was looking at it upside down. But, if he has a copy, sir, we would love to see it, because, unfortunately, the only reference we can find of the tram being on the east side was from my very good friend Greg Kelton. It is very important to try to be a little accurate when you bring claims into this place.

TRAMLINE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Transport while he is in good form. Will the minister confirm that BeeLine buses between the railway station and Victoria Square will no longer run when the extended tramline opens?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): No; I will not confirm that. I will do what I said yesterday: I will bring back a detailed answer to the house. A lot of consultation has to occur regarding this tramline. If you prefer—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Okay; it is not. I will tell you what we are doing this week. We are meeting the Adelaide City Council to talk about how the new tramline will work and the council's interests; that is what you do when you are a good government. So, we are not going to confirm or deny; we will provide a detailed answer in due course. I hope your assertions are more accurate on this occasion than they have been in the past.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: How then has the government been able to announce that 20 per cent of bus routes on King William Street will disappear?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, we will enter into the appropriate consultation with the Adelaide City Council. Can we get this on the record: do you want us to extend the tramline or do you not? Do you want the tramline extended? That is what we want to do. We are going to talk to the Adelaide City Council because they have an interest. The member for Holdfast Shores or whatever it is—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Morphett.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Morphett wants it extended to North Terrace and beyond. I think he wants it to go to Alice Springs. Just be clear: do you want us to do it or not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members are getting very excited about buses and trams.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE FLEET

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Will the Minister for Administrative Services update the house on measures to reduce the environmental impact of the government's vehicle fleet?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): The government has set a target of having 20 per cent of its passenger and light commercial motor vehicle fleet

as alternate fuel vehicles. I am pleased to advise that as at April this year we are on track to meet that target with 18.7 per cent of the government vehicle fleet alternate fuelled, including dual fuel and dedicated LPG vehicles and 13 hybrid petrol/electric vehicles. I am advised that in percentage terms the South Australian government has the largest alternate fuel vehicle fleet of all state governments across Australia.

We have also embraced diesel engine vehicles with computer-controlled electronic fuel systems, because these systems greatly improve fuel consumption and reduce emissions. Furthermore, the environmental benefit of these vehicles is passed on through government vehicle auctions, which have seen some 1 500 alternate fuelled vehicles sold to members of the public over several years. The government also liaises with the vehicle manufacturing industry to ensure the continued availability of manufacturer backed LPG vehicle fuel systems. To that end, new vapour injection LPG vehicle fuel systems have been piloted in a number of government vehicles.

We also work with our service providers to encourage environmentally friendly service delivery practices: for example, the appropriate management of waste materials such as oil, cardboard, solvents and metals. Government agencies now receive annual reports detailing the environmental impact of their fleet vehicle usage which includes year-by-year comparative data that allows them to proactively manage the environmental impact of vehicle usage. The government is taking a number of positive steps to reduce the environmental impact of its passenger and light commercial vehicle fleet. We are continuing to keep sustainability issues as a high priority and we are working towards achieving the target set objectives that we have set for ourselves.

TRAMLINE

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is also to the Minister for Transport. Which of the 70 bus routes currently passing through King William Street will make up the 20 per cent of bus services that will be cut as a result of the tramline extension from Victoria Square to North Terrace?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I will explain this slowly for members opposite. We have some very clear proposals to put to the Adelaide City Council about what we are going to do through the whole route. We are going to give them the courtesy of having real consultation with them about these things.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will explain this again. If the member for Mawson does not understand how putting trams in a place where buses used to run reduces the number of people catching buses, I have difficulty explaining it to him. For the member for Mawson, the simple truth is: they cannot catch both forms of transport at once, so if they are on the trams, they will not be on the buses. What we have found around the world is that trams are six times as popular as buses; that is, trams are six times more likely to get people out of cars and onto public transport—

The SPEAKER: The minister will complete his answer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is a very reasonable assumption for the Department of Transport to make that people will catch the tram instead of catching the bus—

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister needs to conclude his answer; he is not answering the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I assure the member for Mawson that we will reduce the number of buses on King William Street. We will consult about these issues with the Adelaide City Council, and I can assure him that the intelligent people at the Adelaide City Council will be meeting with us this very week.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I have a supplementary question, sir. Given that answer—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have not called the member for Mawson.

Mr Koutsantonis: Yeah, sit down!

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson. The member for West Torrens will be in trouble soon.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: My question is: where will the commuters who are not travelling between the city and Glenelg connect with buses currently heading north and south through King William Street?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Can I get a set of earphones so that I can have the question translated so that it is intelligible? The member will have to ask it again; I do not understand him.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I will repeat it with your permission, sir. Given the last answer, where will the commuters who are not travelling between the city and Glenelg, that is on the tram, connect with the buses heading north and south that currently go along King William Street—70 of them? Where will they connect when you are going to pull 20 per cent of them out of King William Street? Where will they connect? It will not work.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will get a collection of people at the Department of Transport to attempt to decipher that question and provide details to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. There used to be a comedy show called *On the Buses*—I think it is getting a rerun here.

PRE-APPRENTICESHIP PILOT PROGRAM

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What new approaches are being taken to increase the number of apprentices in areas of skill shortage?

The SPEAKER: I ask the minister not to mention buses or trams in her answer.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): Thank you, sir. Last Friday morning I was present at the launch of the pre-apprenticeship pilot program at Mac Weld Industries at Largs Bay, which the member for Port Adelaide would be aware is just up from the old McKell's pool which he will probably remember as that is where we both learnt to swim, I understand.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: And my two kids.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: And the Deputy Leader's two children. This particular pilot program is costing \$430 000 and it will deliver pre-apprenticeship training courses to 114 young people. There will be six courses in fabrication or mechanical engineering and two plumbing courses. Seven of the courses will be delivered in metropolitan Adelaide, with one of the engineering courses being delivered at Nuriootpa in the Barossa Valley. I believe that this is an exciting pilot

program because it will test alternative models for pre-apprenticeship programs which focus on attracting suitable participants and which also have strong links between employers and registered training organisations. One of the reasons why I think it is significant is that there will be shorter accredited training period (between 12 and 14 weeks) in comparison to the existing pre-apprenticeship programs that are generally six to 12 months in duration. It will also test whether these shorter programs will attract more participants and, hopefully, increase the rate of successful completion. The aim of this program is to equip its participants with the knowledge and skills to hit the ground running before they start their apprenticeships.

The programs will involve training in the areas of communication in the workplace, occupational health and safety, maths and numeracy and hands-on skill development specific to the area—for example, welding would be one of those areas. Credits gained in these units can be transferred when the apprentice starts his or her formal apprenticeship. In short, the pre-apprenticeship program will smooth the transition into an apprenticeship by helping potential apprentices to navigate the system and work more closely with employers to achieve the result that we want, which is more apprentices working in the areas of skill shortage.

MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELLOR

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Is the Minister for Health now in a position to inform the house whether she has made a decision in relation to the appointment of a mental health counsellor for the northern parts of the state?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for the question and for his advocacy in relation to this issue. I am pleased to inform the house that a pilot project to support the needs of drought-affected people living in isolated rural locations in South Australia's Mid North will now be extended until the end of 2006. Extra funding of \$144 500 will be allocated to the Rural and Outback Social Support Project to continue a social support worker position.

A project officer has been working in the mid north, northern and far western health regions during the six months of the pilot program, and this additional funding will allow that position to continue. The project officer has been able to work with families to provide information about counselling and support services, including how to access services and provide referrals where needed. The support worker is able to refer people to rural financial counselling services and has given assistance in how to deal with stress during times of drought, managing family life and dealing with the relationship pressure that can result from the difficulties that families can face during these times.

The Rural and Outback Social Support Project has had contact with more than 100 people during its initial phase and has held a series of forums and seminars. The project is managed by the Booleroo Centre Hospital and Health Service and is funded by Mid North Regional Health. There will be a reorientation of the project to focus on the clients and communities of the Mid North. The pilot project over the past six months has shown us where most of the need exists, which is in the Mid North. However, clients who live in the north and far western areas will still be able to receive support through their existing health units on an ongoing basis.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What steps has TAFE taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): The Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology has an energy efficient action plan and, over the past three years, a range of initiatives have been introduced to save energy. Measures include more efficient use of lighting, heating and cooling, improved airconditioned usage and better external shading and window tinting. As a result of the current initiatives in place, TAFE estimates savings of \$1 million in power costs, and the elimination of 3 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide will be achieved over the next five years. By 2010, the department aims to reduce its energy usage by 13 per cent. It is intended to achieve this through better building design that complies with the Greening of Government Operations framework. Other measures include more efficient lighting systems, automatic computer shutdown on some computer pools, LCD computer monitors, reduced heat transfer through external windows and moving to gas only vehicles.

ABRAHAM, Ms W.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Will the Attorney-General confirm that Wendy Abraham was offered a position on the bench in the weeks before the new DPP was appointed?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney has the call.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I will check that matter and get back to the house. It seems to me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is out of order. The house is waiting to hear from the Attorney-General. The member for Mawson is a serial offender against the standing orders and he should be careful.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: This line of questioning began last week when the member for Bragg asked me what I had done to keep Ms Wendy Abraham in South Australia. I have been unstinting in my praise of Ms Abraham as a prosecutor. I answered that question in the spirit in which it was asked, and I revealed that I offered a position to Ms Abraham to become a judge.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA-MALAYSIA SPECIALIST TRAINING PARTNERSHIP

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is to the Minister for Health.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is out of order.

Ms RANKINE: What are the benefits of the proposed specialist training partnership between South Australia and Malaysia?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Wright for the question. Just last week the Children, Youth and Women's Health Service entered the first stage of an agreement—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has been given a caution. He will be warned in a minute.

The Hon. L. STEVENS:—with the Malaysian government, which will see medical specialists from Malaysia trained in South Australia and South Australian specialists trained in Malaysia. This arrangement will allow health and medical specialists in both countries to further their training and gain valuable knowledge through international collaboration. Joint research and resource sharing can strengthen the work of both countries, leading to better clinical practice, community programs and health outcomes. If successful, this strategic partnership may also be a South Australian model for the development of other such international arrangements. There will also be opportunities for other government and community health organisations to link with the Children, Youth and Women's Health Service and the Malaysian government to address problems impacting on the health and wellbeing of children, young people and women. South Australia's decreasing birth rates make it difficult to train young surgeons here in managing some rare conditions; that is why Malaysia will be an excellent training ground for many of our young surgeons once this bilateral agreement is operational.

CENTRE FOR INNOVATION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. How will the government's proposed Centre for Innovation, listed as a project within her portfolio in the infrastructure plan, differ from the previous government's Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing, which Labor closed on coming to office? Is this infrastructure announcement not an admission that it was a mistake to close the former CIBM in the first place?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Science and Information Economy): I thank the member for the question on this very important issue. The Centre for Innovation will be much better than its predecessor, and we look forward to the Centre for Innovation being able to provide all sorts of opportunities for the South Australian community and the community of innovation. It will have good links with the small business sector, and I am certain that we will see some good outcomes from this innovation.

WAITE SCIENCE PRECINCT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. What specific amount of funding has been allocated to Priority 2 and 3 infrastructure initiatives claiming to strengthen capabilities at the Waite Science Precinct in order to build new facilities, incubators and to collocate research centres of excellence? When will these infrastructure objectives be achieved?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Science and Information Economy): Again, I thank the member for Waite for his question and ask him to wait for the budget, when those answers will be revealed.

HEALTH SERVICE, GAWLER

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that tenders have been called for the supply of orthopaedic and gynaecological services at the Gawler Health Service? I have been advised that the orthopaedic and gynaecological services at

the Gawler Health Service will be tendered out and that doctors who currently perform these services will not have their contracts, which will be complete at 30 December this year, extended.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for his question, but I will need to get a report on that issue and bring it back for him.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE SCHOOL ORGANISATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Why is the government not paying for training courses for parents who volunteer to become members of school governing councils? Parents are attending courses provided by the South Australian Association of State School Organisations (SAASSO) to enable them to adequately perform their duties as part of governing councils. They pay \$65 to attend the course.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for his question relating to SAASSO courses. Of course, we do give some sponsorship money to SAASSO and they do run activities and charge according to their own desires. We have increased funding to school offices in order to manage budgets and we have improved the amount of resources in schools and in our district offices because we know that proper financial management does require skills and resources. We have put that investment into schools. However, if there has been a change in the costing of any events organised by SAASSO I am happy to look into it and give the member the information I can obtain.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why is the government not meeting the cost of training courses for Justices of the Peace who volunteer to serve in the court system? I have been told by JPs who attended a training course at Adelaide TAFE, organised by the Attorney-General's Department and the Royal Association of Justices, that they had to pay \$52.50, which was reduced to \$42.50 if they were a member of the association.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Let us just bear a distinction in mind. First, if a Justice of the Peace wants to become a special justice to serve on the bench as the equivalent of a magistrate, then my understanding is that Justices of the Peace will be interviewed, suitable candidates will be chosen, and their TAFE course fees will be paid for by the government. My further understanding is that the Liberal opposition is opposed to Justices of the Peace serving on the bench in the metropolitan area—but we will be going ahead with that because we are the government. Secondly, if Justices of the Peace who are not going to be special justices, who only witness and attest documents (as I do as a Justice of the Peace) wish to do a TAFE course they have to meet that from their own resources. That was the case under the previous Liberal government and it continues to be the case; there is no change.

TOURISM, CHINA

Mrs HALL (Morialta): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Will the minister take immediate action to

ensure that South Australia does not continue to lag behind the rest of the nation in attracting Chinese tourists? China is recognised as one of the world's fastest-growing tourist markets and one of significant potential for the Australian tourism industry. However, according to the latest international visitor survey results Chinese visitors constitute a mere 1 per cent of all visitors to South Australia, ranking it behind all states and territories except the Northern Territory in terms of Chinese market share of visitor numbers.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Morialta for her question. Inevitably, there are differences between different markets and their accessibility and penetration into South Australian tourism numbers; there are variations between countries. Canada, for instance, really punches above its weight as an origin for our visitors. New Zealand has delivered very poorly because of the lack of international air linkages, but we are hoping to regain a parity with the rest of the country because of our new flights. Clearly, China is an emerging market and we have invested significant sums of money into promoting into China, with staff appointments on the ground in the mainland, as well as in Hong Kong.

We are running trade shows and familiarisation trips, and I am confident that we will improve on our market share. But, in saying that, I point out that the Chinese market is quite segmented. There are parts of the market that we would have some difficulty in servicing because of the lack of direct flights from China and the lack of capacity for high volume trade. I suspect that we will always be a low volume, high yield destination for the Chinese market, but I am very confident that next week, when the Deputy Premier visits China, he will be carrying out significant promotions for us, and encouraging more visitors to come to South Australia.

SA WATER, RELOCATION

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Can the Minister for Administrative Services confirm that SA Water is relocating to the former JP Morgan site at Felixstow and, if so, how many employees will be moving to the site?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the member for the question. I will check the detail and get a response as quickly as possible for the member.

TRANSPORT SA, PUBLICATION

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Transport.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHERE: You can have the portfolio if you want it. Why has Transport SA produced a book here in South Australia, written and illustrated by South Australians, paid for by South Australian taxpayers, yet printed in Singapore by Tien Wah Press?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I indicate to the member for Mawson that I have read a lot on transport in the last two weeks, but I have not gone through everything that they produce to see where it is printed. I apologise to the house for that.

Mr Brokenshere: I support South Australian printing jobs.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Do you? I am sure that comment is going to come back and haunt him. If the member

for Mawson would like to identify the missive which so upsets him, I am more than happy to find out for him.

MURRAY STREET, EDEN VALLEY

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Transport explain why his department has taken so long to respond to a safety concern regarding installation of a guard rail on a sharp bend on Murray Street, Eden Valley? This matter was first raised with me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the house will come to order!

Mr VENNING: When somebody gets killed there, we will make a note of that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair cannot hear the member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING: This matter was first raised with Transport SA and the Minister for Transport in June last year, and the problem remains; in fact, we have not even had an answer. It has taken six months for the matter to reach the minister's office from Transport SA and, even then, this happened only because of our friendly reminder. The matter continues to be drawn out and is still a real safety risk to motorists, the store occupants who live there and the pedestrians. They have raised it with me, and I raise it here—and it is not a laughing matter.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Members would be aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members would be aware that I have been Minister for Transport (not acting Minister) on two historical occasions, once for one day and the other for about six. I am very aware of Eden Valley and, indeed, I am pretty sure that I have been in Murray Street. I remember the curve there. I will make sure that the Minister for Transport is briefed on the curve at Murray Street, Eden Valley. That curve is important to you and your electorate; it is also important to the people of Eden Valley. So, I will make sure that the minister, as a matter of priority, examines the issue of the curve at Murray Street, Eden Valley. That curve is important to you and your electorate. It is also important to the people of Eden Valley. I will make sure that the minister, as a matter of priority, examines the issue of the curve at Murray Street, Eden Valley, and I am sure that when he has a report, we will be ad idem on this matter.

REGIONAL SITTING

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The chair wishes to raise a few matters. The first relates to the parliament at Mount Gambier. On the issue of travel accommodation costs, clearly, the chair was not privy to those arrangements. I intend to review those arrangements. If members have a particular view or if any member feels that they have a difficulty as a result of having spent their travelling allowance already, I would ask them to speak to the Clerk or to me. But I am going to review the arrangements in relation to Mount Gambier to make sure that they are fair

and equitable and that they are in accordance with the expectations of the people of this state.

The second matter relates to the trialling of electronic equipment in Mount Gambier, namely, electronic clocks which will be able to carry a message. The chair does not envisage that they will have frivolous messages; but we will be trialling new electronic clocks.

The next matter relates to the sesquicentenary of the parliament, which is very much at hand. There will be steps taken to celebrate that in the most appropriate way next year and in 2007. The chair invites members with a particular interest and who are willing to be part of that celebration to come forward with suggestions.

The other matter is that, in relation to possible changes to standing and sessional orders, those matters are under consideration. I invite all members, through the appropriate committee, to either propose changes or support the status quo, whatever their preference may be.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I want to thank the Premier very much for answering my question a few moments ago, and I look forward to the government announcing some action after almost a year on that guard rail in Eden Valley. I do not appreciate members from the government side laughing. If you lived behind that corner, you would be very concerned about your safety too.

Today I want to raise a new matter. As we are all aware, the wine industry and the grape growers are facing trying times with a large oversupply of grapes this vintage. Money is being lost, vigneronns are suffering and the industry is in some difficulty. The Rann Labor Government should be investigating and considering alternative uses for grapes in South Australia to eradicate problems like this, and use up the surplus grapes. As plantings still continue in prominent wine producing regions of our state, so too do the massive surpluses. Contracts have been filled, then over contract grapes are usually discounted, if they want them at all. Growers are feeling the pinch and it is raising doubt and concern about the short-term future of our industry. To think that there are still mass plantings occurring in the state in preparation for the shortage which has been predicted five years from now, at least for shiraz premium and medium-grade grapes.

Now is the opportune time for the Rann Labor Government to ease the situation of the grape surplus by introducing tax breaks to encourage grape growers, grape processors and wineries in the commercialisation of new food and beverage products produced from grapes. A key player in the Barossa wine grape industry is Mr Hermann Thumm, of what was Chateau Yaldara, now of Chateau Barrosa (with two rs), who is well known to me and to many members of parliament. He has been very successful in developing a range of products to help absorb the wine grape surpluses. Mr Thumm began investigating other uses for grapes over 20 years ago, during the first wine pull—and members will remember very clearly what happened then. Due to the success of that initiative the supply of grapes was immediately depleted and, luckily, the wine pull stopped because of Mr Thumm's and other's success. Because they stopped the pull, we still have some

very old vines in existence; and just as well, because that is where our best wines come from.

As the industry falls into the same path that it took 20 years ago—as we know, things happen in cycles—Mr Thumm has again turned to these unconventional methods to take up a portion (if only a small portion) of the industry's oversupply. He has successfully developed an extensive range of food and liqueur products. On the food side, his creations resemble honey, jelly and maple syrup, while his range of liqueurs feature eight different flavours, five of which have been available here in Parliament House in the refreshment room for sampling, and most members have sampled them.

Mr Thumm's Chateau Barrosa grape syrup, which is a low-GI food, is Australia's answer to the Canadian maple syrup. If one of our biggest economic drivers, the wine industry, has potential other than for the production of premium wine, then surely there is some sense in Hermann Thumm's message. Already Chateau Barrosa has had some interest from overseas markets, with small quantities exported to Singapore and New York. For Hermann Thumm the goal is to convert all surplus grapes into these superb products, which are good for you and have a long shelf life. Buckingham Palace has asked for samples, and they have been sent.

Having already generated interest from overseas, one must ask what is stopping the Australian grape industry from being as significant and profitable as the Canadian maple syrup industry. Imagine the further economic and social benefits this new industry would create for the state of South Australia. If nothing is done, the state will continue to lose resources, and those somewhat enormous benefits for the people of South Australia will also be lost.

Could the production of grape syrup and grape liqueurs and a lovely refreshing non-sweetened soft drink be a way to rescue the state from our wine grape surplus? I urge the Rann government to take note, to investigate these possibilities, and, if they appear fruitful, to establish ways to help the successful commercialisation of these products—it would be for the good of the state of South Australia. It is about creating an opportunity after a downturn for our premium wine industry and remaining optimistic about the prospects of yet another sensible use for our surplus grapes—at least for the next two to three years. Our world-class premium wines have put us on the map and continue to receive worldwide recognition. With the support and backing of the state government we could very well be adding yet another notch to our very important and successful belt.

SELWAY, Hon. B.M.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I rise to pay tribute to the late Justice Bradley Maxwell Selway, who died on Sunday. Justice Selway was an outstanding lawyer who served South Australia as Crown Solicitor and Solicitor-General. He was appointed a judge of the Federal Court of Australia in November 2002. Justice Selway was educated at Westminster School in Adelaide where he won the Tennyson medal for English. He also began his long service as a Rotarian through the school's Rotary youth wing, the Interact Club.

Brad Selway joined the Crown Solicitor's Office in 1977 and remained in the Attorney-General's Department for 25 years, becoming Assistant Crown Solicitor in 1987 (the youngest ever) and Crown Solicitor in 1989 (also the youngest ever). He took silk in 1994 and was appointed Solicitor-General for the state of South Australia in 1995.

Once again, he was the state's youngest appointment to the position of Solicitor-General. He was also Adjunct Professor of Law at the University of Adelaide.

His Honour has represented South Australia and intervened on behalf of the state attorney-general in many seminal cases heard in the High Court. He wrote many journal articles and some books, including *The Constitution of South Australia*, which is regarded as the bible for all constitutional, administrative and public lawyers in the state. I am grateful to have my own copy signed by Brad Selway. He had a great gift for getting straight to the point and being concise in his advice and his outlines of argument for court, and in the presentation of his arguments in court.

Brad was Crown Solicitor at a most difficult time, including the time when some of the government's legal work became contestable with private law firms. This change required a shift in attitude by the staff of the Crown Solicitor's Office to clients. He always insisted that lawyers in his office not just give the client what the client wanted to hear. He insisted that the client be advised about matters such as *ultra vires* (namely, whether there was legal power to do what the client wanted to do).

He also insisted that his lawyers try to take into account government policies generally. He was an early advocate of a whole of government approach. He took this approach even though it was likely to annoy the client and agency and raise a risk of the agency going to a private law firm. He encouraged high standards of objective and fearless advice. He believed the Crown Solicitor's office should keep clients by the quality of its work, rather than by flattering and entertaining the client.

Brad Selway will be remembered as the architect of the arguments accepted by the High Court in the Bropho case. Before Bropho, at law, the crown could do no wrong. Bropho established that the crown, that is state governments, were liable for their own negligence in the same way that other citizens and organisations were.

He was also instrumental in developing the plan to rescue the State Bank. Legend has it that, when the bank went belly-up, Brad went to the Crown Solicitor's library, borrowed its three books on banking law and read them cover to cover over the weekend. Next week he walked into cabinet, sold his plan and took over rescue operations. Whilst Solicitor-General, one of his many important papers challenged the utility of the long-held theory of individual ministerial responsibility in the Westminster system of government. Brad pointed out the inconsistency upon which our system is based: ministers are expected to manage their portfolios competently without necessarily having the skills or expertise to do so. He said:

The circumstances of the appointment of ministers are such that their skills and experience to perform that task will be largely fortuitous. Ministers who are required and expected to be responsible and accountable for the management of departments of government are politicians elected on the basis of party allegiance and (perhaps) their policy positions, but certainly not their management skills. Ministers are not elected to carry out the management tasks and are not trained for it. What may be surprising is that many prove to be very successful in the task.

Brad Selway argued that ministers are appointed for their political vision and should be accountable for that. Alas, the public and the media want the buck to stop with someone and I cannot see Brad's view catching on.

Justice Selway had a formidable intellect, an incredible capacity for work. He was a great champion for South Australia, particularly in defending our constitutional powers

against the constant encroachment of the commonwealth. He will be missed. He is survived by his wife, Christine, and two daughters, neither of whom followed him into the law but have done very well in their chosen fields. Vale Brad Selway.

MENTAL HEALTH

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I also support the comments of the Attorney-General in relation to Mr Selway. In my dealings with him, I found him to be a most competent, good officer of South Australia and a decent person with whom to work. He will be sadly missed and I pass on my condolences to his family. I sincerely hope we have more people with the capacity and intellect of Brad Selway serving the people of South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The Attorney is right, he did give fearless advice, although not always the advice that attorneys-general and ministers wanted. However, my own view is that they benefited from his fearless advice. In some of the dealings in which I was involved, I thought his views were very sound.

May I say how pleased I am that the Minister for Health has approved the ongoing mental health program for the northern parts of the state. The program so far has been successful. It is needed. I thank the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, the member for Mount Gambier, for his assistance. I am sure that many people will benefit from this particular program.

I know there are certain people involved in the administration of the regional health services who are not so supportive. I am pleased that the minister has used her influence to ensure that the program continues. It is necessary for people to have an experienced counsellor with whom to talk, particularly in times of great stress: it is too late after there is a tragedy. I commend the people who put up this proposition for their foresight and I am looking forward to the program continuing for a considerable time in the future. I thank the minister for accepting the advice that she received from those people and I am sure that they will appreciate the decision she has made in relation to the scheme's continuing well into next year.

There is another matter that I wish to raise. If one reads the Victorian *Weekly Times*, which is an excellent agricultural newspaper, one can see the further anti-farming activities in which the government is liable to be involved. The Victorian government, of course, is noted for its anti-rural and anti-farming activities, and its latest escapade is to become involved in banning 1080 fox baiting. Currently in South Australia, national parks runs an excellent program that assists farmers to bait foxes. I know, from having a farm, the extra work it has done there in coordinating a program where a large area was baited, which was very effective. In addition, it is also involved at certain times of the year in blasting rabbit warrens, which helps to control the rabbits and which also is a very good program, as is the fox baiting program.

In Victoria they have banned 1080 (which is what they are using), for some reason best known to themselves. Obviously, the same sort of advice will be tendered here. I call on the Minister for Environment and Conservation not to accept this foolish advice and to allow the continued baiting of foxes with 1080 and also to allow rabbits to be poisoned with carrots (which has proved to be a most effective way of destroying them), and not use some other method that rabbits do not readily take to. It appears to me from reading this

paper that there are two other areas where they are attacking the rural sector. I will make sure that farmers in my electorate are fully aware of this, because we know what the government has done in other areas and it seems to follow the same program.

I wanted to talk about the member for Giles. It appears that the member for Giles is being out-manoeuvred by the Premier's little mate, because he is writing letters to people in Quorn and Hawker saying that he still thinks they are in Stuart. Recently, a letter was circulated around Quorn and Hawker. But I will talk about that a little later this afternoon, because there are some interesting comments in relation to that document that we need to bring to the attention of the people of South Australia.

ROYAL ADELAIDE ZOO

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): The Royal Adelaide Zoo is a favourite place for so many Florey residents, Adelaideans and tourists alike. Much is happening at the zoo's city site and also at Monarto, not only with the breeding program (and I ask: will that baby rhino ever be born?) but also in the way in which the animals are exhibited. A great deal of work has been done over the years and now, with the help of the Future Zoo Foundation, work has begun on the new enclosures for the big cats. On Friday evening, in the beautiful weather that we enjoyed in Adelaide on that day and the magnificent surroundings and noises of the zoo by night, it was my great privilege to be invited to join Gordon Pickard, as a guest of the Pickard Foundation, for dinner in the lion's den.

The Pickard Foundation is well known for its work throughout Adelaide. It was involved in the new toilet block in the Royalty Theatre, for which the Calisthenic Association is truly grateful, and I would like to acknowledge the work of Coralie Cheney, in her role as a representative for the Pickard Foundation, for arranging the evening. The event was jointly hosted by the Director of the zoo, Mark Craig. Along with other guests, I enjoyed a beautiful meal and good company in the worthy cause of raising funds for the latest project. The Adelaide Zoo is lucky enough to have Ed McAllister (who is now World President of the International Zoo Association), along with a passionate board (including our dear friend Rob Morrison), working on its extensive program of education, research and conservation of the world's endangered species. These dinners are taking place to raise the funds needed to complete the ambitious project that has been undertaken to make our zoo the envy of the world.

Lord Mayor Michael Harbison was there that evening with his wife Cathy (who by now is trekking in Nepal). The Lord Mayor told the gathering that, during a recent visit to Montpellier in France, the Director of that city's zoo made sure he was invited along to one of the functions so that he was able to ask the Lord Mayor about things that were happening at our zoo here in Adelaide. That is an indication of how word has travelled on the eminence and calibre of our zoo and its work. Needless to say, it was a wonderful evening, and it was not until the following morning when I returned to the zoo to represent the Minister for Environment and Conservation at a function that I realised how close we had been to the lions that evening—a mature male lion, a mature female and their four cubs who are now 14 months old. Some are soon to go to Monarto. Monarto hosted a jazz event on the Saturday called 'Serengeti', which I hope will be held again at another time (because I was unable to make

it to that function,) not only because of my love and support of the zoo but also jazz music which has been nurtured in me over the eight years I have been here by the work of the school bands at Modbury High School, particularly on their weekends away in Mount Gambier for Generations in Jazz.

The Saturday function was held by the ParaQuad Association of South Australia, and I acknowledge the plethora of MPs of state and federal varieties who were in attendance. Another of the annual events of the Adelaide Zoo is its Accessible Adventure Days held with the help of the zoo volunteer network. There could be no better place for an adventure than the Adelaide Zoo as attested to by the large number of disabled people present. Mark Craig had also returned to the zoo that morning to take part in the event, and he was also going to the Serengeti afternoon, so his passion and commitment to the zoo cannot be questioned; it is greatly admired and appreciated.

The ParaQuad Association's president, David Fabbro, and sponsor, Peter Scargill, from United Water welcomed us all. Guest speaker on the day was Tony Dunn from Braydun Hill Vineyard. Mr Dunn suffered a horrendous accident off a horse which injured his C3 to C6 vertebrae. The story of his recovery after that accident was inspirational. He told us about being laid up in the spinal unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and then Hampstead Centre and how the thing that actually made him recover was the fact that a doctor referred to him as being someone else's problem and someone who would never ride again. Of course, he did and, not only does he ride, although not as much as he used to, he has a vineyard called Braydun Hill. His beautiful wines were part of the refreshments that day. The wines are hand picked and have been recognised with awards throughout Australia and at the Royal Adelaide Show.

The ParaQuad Association is to be congratulated for its work in making the zoo adventure days possible for people to enjoy. I know that on the day many of the people who were in the rotunda for the opening went off and saw all the new work being done at the Adelaide Zoo. When the new lion enclosure is finished, it will be a highlight, not only for the people of Adelaide, but also for the international visitors who come to see our zoo.

YOUTH ISSUES

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Yesterday I spoke about National Youth Week, and I referred to the recipients of the Young Achievers Awards which I attended last week and the fact that only one of the recipients was under the age of 20. I spoke about the need of giving more recognition to young achievers (teenagers) so that they, too, can be role models for young people, because we know how much of a great need there is for young people, in the later stages of primary school and early stages of secondary school, to have good role models. I am sure that every member this morning has seen the front page of *The Advertiser* which carries the story of the tragic death of Mr Mick Cowdrey who drowned saving his son, Jonathan. I am sure that all our condolences go to the family in this difficult time. Our prayers and thoughts are with them. I also bring to the attention of the house that we often hear about young people not doing the right thing and, indeed, on page 10 we have an example of such an article entitled 'Teenagers charged after car chase' which states:

A boy, 14, allegedly led police on a 15-minute high-speed chase through the western suburbs in a stolen car early yesterday.

The article continues, mentioning two other boys. I thought it was important to highlight, as *The Advertiser* did today, the bravery of young people. I would specifically like to note the bravery of Karly Harris who, at 15 years of age, yesterday put the life of another young 15-year old before her own. She jumped into the water to save Jonathan and then went back again to see if she could save his father. That is extraordinary bravery; it shows us what young people can achieve, and I thought it should not only be noted in *The Advertiser* but also recorded in this house. Another local teenager, Matt Reid, also 15, jumped in to help Karly who had by this stage, as *The Advertiser* said, tied a rope around her waist and jumped back into the water. Damien Tehaney, who lives less than 200 metres from the jetty, was also alerted to the drama as it unfolded about 5 p.m. yesterday and he grabbed a surfboard and headed into the water.

These are examples of extraordinary acts of bravery by young people, and I am sure there are many volunteers who join St John Ambulance Australia or the Country Fire Service, for example, who get involved in whatever community work they can for the betterment of others. I was certainly touched by Karly's bravery yesterday as, I am sure, all of us in this chamber were touched, and we are saddened by the tragedy for the family of Mick Cowdrey. He gave up his life for his son and I do not think that there is any greater love than to give up your life for someone. That may be expected of a family, but it is extraordinary bravery for a young teenager of 15 who, without thought of danger to herself, jumps in to save the life of another.

Time expired.

EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): This government's record in respect of early intervention for difficulties faced by four-year old children is not good. The Labor government has been in power for three years, and the stories I hear in my electorate of Mitchell suggest that there has not been any improvement in this area during that time. If a child goes off to preschool—otherwise known as kindy—with a hearing, speech or psychological difficulty they are not going to get a lot of help from government services. To give an example, if a child has hearing difficulties which are leading to learning difficulties it will often not be discovered until the child gets to preschool and has interaction in groups. In the home such a child is often able to cope with a lack of hearing through a combination of lip-reading, sign language and guesswork on an informal basis, so it is not any fault of parents that such hearing difficulties go unnoticed. If kindergarten, or preschool, teachers—who are trained to look out for such things—discern that there might be a hearing problem, that is when the deficiency in services becomes apparent because it is one thing to have an assessment through the local agency but if treatment is required for a young child, say a four-year old, then mums in my electorate tell me that there is a wait of nine months for proper treatment. By that time, the child has nearly finished kindergarten and, obviously, if difficulties arise from the hearing problem, they are going to be well behind by the time they finish their kindergarten year if they are not getting treatment for that hearing problem until nine months after it is first observed.

There is just as much of a difficulty with speech problems. The waiting list is less; it is about six months to get treatment on a public health basis, whereas the private cost of getting hearing treatment and assisting children overcome hearing

difficulties (according to one parent in Mitchell) was about \$1 200 on a private basis. Paying for speech pathology to improve speech problems is similarly costly. A couple of examples: even those with private health insurance were paying between \$300-600 for a course of speech pathology after the insurance payment was taken into account. That is the gap payment that I am talking about, and that is unacceptable and un-affordable for a lot of the parents in my electorate.

There is even more of a difficulty with psychological problems. If a child goes along to a preschool in my electorate (and I presume that it is the same around the state) and the director of the preschool centre observes that there are psychological difficulties that need to be assessed and treated, there is a 12 month waiting list. That is the case in my electorate and, I presume, a number of others. Of course, after 12 months, the child has finished kindergarten, anyway, and any learning difficulties that arise from that put the child well and truly behind, and in a very difficult position by the time they get to school. So, the government has failed very badly in relation to children with these kinds of physical and psychological impediments, which create learning difficulties.

I will finish on one other note. I was speaking to a 80-year old woman pensioner in my electorate who, with her electricity bills around \$200/quarter, has given up putting on her heater on cold days, and now wears a doona to watch TV in the evenings. That could well be the defining image of the Rann Labor government, and I am sure that it will be used to effect as we approach the election in March 2006.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 6 April. Page 2197.)

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Supply Bill is an opportunity for us to again point out the fact that this government is totally about spin and, as a government, is huge on talk yet constantly missing in action. That spin is all embracing, and the government attempts to dominate the state's media with spin. This is aimed at hoodwinking the general public into believing that spin, instead of realising that this government is a high taxing, wasteful, inactive, totally indecisive, public relations machine. It is becoming frustratingly obvious that much of the ministry have little (or in some cases no) idea of what is going on within their portfolios. Being the Supply Bill, I think that we should first look at the taxation. This is the highest taxing government that South Australia has ever seen—that is an easy statement to make, and it probably applies to almost every government—but this government has actually seen a huge increase in taxation intake, and it is about 23 per cent higher than when they came to office three years ago, which is way ahead of inflation. On top of that, we have the prediction of the enormous windfall of GST.

If we look at the 2001-02 budget papers and the Treasury estimates for revenue over the next four years, we actually find Treasury saying in 2002 that, over the next four years, the government's revenue will be \$33 billion. Instead of that, it is actually \$38 billion. We have seen this government enjoy

an extra \$5 billion in revenue above what was estimated just before the last election. I would argue that we have very little to show for that \$5 billion. Certainly, we have not seen \$5 billion come off our debt. Just where the \$5 billion has gone really is something of a mystery.

If you then go further and look at what has actually been estimated as revenue in each of the budgets versus the actual tax take, yet another picture emerges. In 2002-03, the actual take over what was in the budget was an extra \$528 million and, in 2003-04, it was actually \$794 million above the figure shown in the budget papers. That gives the government enormous flexibility. It basically means that in the last financial year \$794 million more was taken than Treasury initially said would be taken. We are not seeing the advantages of that. For a government, it means that it has \$794 million worth of flexibility to meet its predicted bottom line. That really does mean that the government can waste a lot of money and, certainly, we have not seen that extra \$794 million invested in either infrastructure or services.

On top of that, the GST windfall is well and truly starting to come our way. In 2003-04, it was about \$99 million; in 2004-05, \$160 million; and then it goes on its merry way to the outer years so that in 2009-10 we are looking at over \$400 million gain from the tax reform that this government (it must be remembered) did not want to see. The government is enjoying the benefits of two factors: one is the fact that we paid off the debt largely through the sale of the electricity assets; the other is the GST. It must be remembered that the Labor Party in South Australia opposed both those moves. Having opposed both those, it is somewhat ironic that we now see that same party enjoying the benefits of it and bragging about the fact that it is getting that money. The AAA rating would not have been at all possible without either of those moves, particularly the sale of ETSA. To hear the Treasurer constantly bragging about the AAA rating when he knows, as the rest of us do, that that was because of the actions of the previous government really does show the hypocrisy of their saying that ETSA should not have been sold.

I continue the spin on taxes. Certainly, many times we have heard the Premier and the Treasurer talk about this fanciful \$360 million cut to business taxes. What an absolute load of rubbish! This government tries to make it sound as though \$360 million relates to one year: the reality is that the \$360 million relates to four years. The other factor is that \$180 million of the \$360 million reflects the abolition of the bank accounts debits fee. That was signed off by the previous government with the federal government in a deal to get GST. This government can take absolutely no credit for the cut of that \$180 million that relates to BAD tax.

That brings us back to a so-called \$180 million cut. If you look at where that is factored in, that is absolute nonsense. The government talks about the major component as being a cut to payroll tax. Its own budget figures show—and it is always underestimating—that that is not a cut. In this year it was predicted that \$9 million more would be taken in payroll tax than in the previous financial year. I have no doubt that it will go beyond \$9 million and that there will be a bigger increase. The major component of what is held up as their tax cut was decided on, signed off and put into the forward estimates by the previous government, and the other part is really no more than smoke and mirrors, as we have seen that payroll tax has increased, not reduced.

That is an absolute con. There is no cut whatsoever: it is a thinly veiled load of rubbish to cover up the government's

embarrassment at the huge, greedy and unsustainable tax take. That is at a time when the federal government, through very good economic management, has been able to deliver to us a windfall with the GST. The ability of the government to have taken so much tax makes it really hard, even bizarre, to understand why it has put South Australians through what it has by not acting a lot more quickly on land tax. Why was the government willing to sit back for nearly three years and allow bracket creep to absolutely hurt so many good South Australians?

The total take from land tax has basically doubled over the period since this government took over. But even that doubling does not really spell out what the real impact has been. For many individuals, it was not doubled: some are paying eight, ten or 15 times what they were paying three or four years ago. There are a lot of examples, particularly coastal holiday homes, where four years ago people were paying \$200 or \$300, then \$400 or \$500, then \$2 500, and then, all of a sudden, \$7 000 or \$8 000. That has really created some enormous problems. Some of those people are on fixed incomes, and that has been a major blow to them; many of them are looking at selling. Certainly, between Christmas and New Year when I held some meetings in those places, I was approached by several people who were pensioners and who had been forced to sell. Basically, they could not afford the impost. They did not want to sell: they had been forced into that, and I just do not think that that is a fair way to reward good South Australians who have worked for this state their whole lives. All of a sudden, the one thing into which they have put their time and money over the years is going to be taken away from them.

Investment housing is the other issue. There is a real problem at the moment with investment housing. The sharp climb in land tax has created some real anomalies in relation to land tax. It is bad public policy, because it will create a real problem in relation to the stock of rental housing in South Australia. To cite an example, if one family owns four investment houses with a median value of \$250 000 each, even with the revised land tax they will need to come up with \$55 per week per house for land tax. They are competing with someone who owns one house of similar value who only has to find \$8 a week. In a competitive rental market, someone who has to find \$55 for land tax will find it incredibly hard to compete with someone who has to find \$8. This is causing major problems.

In the week before Christmas, two people, both of whom were selling four houses, came to see me. I have no doubt that those eight houses were rental houses and that at least seven or eight of them have ended up being sold to owner-occupiers, thus removing seven or eight houses from the rental housing stock. I think that will be a growing problem for the government and the rental market in this state.

There is also no doubt that there will be a flow-on of land tax on rental properties as rents are reviewed, and the supply of private properties will become tight. The public policy issue that the government has not dealt with is that we will see some major increases in rental that will need to be paid by many people who are in rental accommodation. The Treasurer says it is just a tax on wealthy people. People in rental accommodation are not wealthy; many of them are the people who can least afford it. Pensioners who are having to sell shacks are not wealthy. What they have worked for all their life is now being removed from them because, on a cash flow basis, they cannot afford to keep those properties.

What will the Liberals do? We will be looking for a system that is fairer and more sustainable. We need to look at not just thresholds but ways in which to address bracket creep and stop it from recurring. The government has wound it back a bit, but this is a very short-term measure designed to get the government past the election. Basically, it does not remove the problem that we currently have of bracket creep causing major hardship. On coming to government we will also review the system of valuation that we have in this state.

Given the huge size of the tax take that this government is now enjoying, what is amazing is the lack of investment in infrastructure and services. Times of plenty are when strategic infrastructure spending must take place. That is the time when the backlog of maintenance within instrumentalities such as SA Water needs to be addressed. When the money is coming in, that is the time to have a long-term infrastructure spend. This government has had three years of plenty and three years of doing nothing other than spending with no endpoint. Capital works budgets have been miserly, to say the least—they are lower than what we had in the later years of the previous government.

This is not good policy, because when we are taking in enormous amounts of money that is when this spend should occur. As we said the other day, one of the things that was tried last year in the capital works budget is that they realised it was pretty low, and they transferred the cost of the StateFleet into the capital works budget, which inflated it by \$111 million. Basically, that no more than propped up what looks like a very ordinary figure. Even including the \$111 million, it was far lower than what the previous government was spending in its capital works budget.

What has really stood out in this place over the last couple of weeks is the lack of knowledge of what is going on in some of the ministerial portfolios. The Minister for Infrastructure, despite being asked twice (with weeks in between), still could not name one project which has been decided on, started and will be completed by the next election. That is an indictment of the way in which this government has operated: they have not focused on infrastructure whatsoever. The infrastructure plan has been delayed and delayed. We were told in early December that it was only days away. We then asked in February what had happened, and the fires were used as an excuse. The fires did not happen in December, they happened in January.

We now understand why it was delayed. I believe it went in and out of cabinet like a yo-yo: it was sent back constantly to agencies asking them to sex it up with some more projects. What did we get? We finished up with what is a large document, but it has no substance. It is full of motherhood statements and, when it comes to projects, it is absolutely lacking in saying what the government will do as far as putting projects on the ground is concerned. The projects which were highlighted (the two tunnels and the tramline) are great, but where do they fit in?

What has become obvious in this house is that integration seems to be missing. The Minister for Transport seems to have no idea of how these projects will link into a bigger scheme. The trams sound like a good idea, but the question is: what will be the impact on traffic in King William Street and at the corner of King William Street and North Terrace, and how will running the tramline from Victoria Square to the railway station fit into any larger strategy for moving people in and out of the city? Extending the tramline down King William Street will probably mean that we will lose one lane each way. If we look at what happens in King William Street

at 5 p.m. now, we have a problem already. The government has not been able to tell us how they are going to solve this problem.

It was thrown up the other day that there will be 20 per cent fewer buses. Well, that has some problems with it, because the minister as good as admitted today that he has no idea whether they are B-line buses or where those 20 per cent of buses will come out. This government recently committed to a state strategic plan which says that they are going to double the use of public transport over the next decade. I cannot see how they will double the use of public transport if you have fewer buses running through your major thoroughfare, because you must remember that the trams only go out of the city in one direction, and that is to Glenelg. Getting people out of the city by taking them to the railway station is nothing new. That will not create extra public transport. Basically the government needs to tell us how 20 per cent of buses will disappear; what it will then do to stop additional growth; and how that tram line fits into any bigger policy than just making a big announcement on the front page of *The Advertiser*.

South Road is a similar story. Two tunnels were announced for South Road as being part of the bigger solution. However, the bigger solution is not just about getting across a couple of intersections but how you get from Darlington to Grand Junction Road. It has to be an integrated solution, which is not achieved by building a couple of tunnels. Today I was amazed that the Minister for Transport obviously did not understand the importance of doing something with the tram crossing on South Road. We are talking about \$100 million being spent on trams. If we are to spend \$100 million and not have an increase in tram traffic, then there is something wrong. If you have an increase in tram traffic, then you will have major delays at the tram crossing on South Road. The thought of having a tunnel on one side of that tram crossing and an overlay on the other, with great lines of traffic banking up is an absolute nightmare. It is not part of an integrated solution.

The other problem is that, if more traffic is using South Road, it still has to cross Richmond Road, Burbridge Road and Henley Beach Road. Sure, the underpass on Anzac Highway will bring traffic from the south-west and Port Road brings it from the north-west. However, we have seen massive development around the airport (and we have heard the government talk about the airport a lot), and consequently the growth in those western suburbs means that there will be more traffic using Burbridge, Henley Beach and Richmond roads. The problem is that the only way in which you will be able to move the traffic through those intersections on South Road is to give traffic using South Road higher priority at the lights along South Road. If you do that, you will slow down traffic coming from the western suburbs which means that we will have some major problems.

A solution is required in relation to at least one of those roads from the west—either Henley Beach Road or Burbridge Road—regarding how you get that traffic across South Road. That problem is not picked up in the strategic plan at present. We have also seen with the bridges the lack of decision making and the adhocery. The decision about the bridges was delayed for 18 months longer than it should have been. That delay was created by a political problem within the Treasurer's own electorate and the fact that the reasons for having opening bridges evaporated in front of the government's eyes. It has now made the decision to build the opening bridges. However, a very valid question has been put forward by

industry and others about how you justify the extra spend on those opening bridges, given the amount of sea traffic that will use them.

I do not think we have heard the answer to that and certainly a lot more answers need to be given about the bridges—and it will be a while before we see them operating. Overall, it appears that the plan is very much a PR exercise. It is an exercise in adhocery. It is full of motherhood statements, sexed up with a couple of unresearched headline projects. It does seem as though infrastructure plan is very much about headlines, rather than about the state's infrastructure or future. Certainly regional SA has been totally ignored. It just does not seem to be on the radar of this government. Again the Minister for Infrastructure, when asked in this house the other day to name one regional project in the plan, could not do so, which I think really shows what this government thinks about regional South Australia.

There is no doubt that regional South Australia has a huge list of needs. Housing is a huge issue, as well as water, STED schemes, roads, rail, airstrips, tourism infrastructure and other services which are absolutely vital to the growth of our economy. Housing is not really picked up in the housing plan, but the lack of housing in regional areas will see South Australia miss out on some real opportunities. Recently we asked the minister about Murray Bridge. The development board and the council feel that they have the opportunity for 3 000 or 4 000 more jobs in that area but the lack of housing will stop investors going there. That is the same in several other areas, yet this government just throws its hands in the air and says, 'That's someone else's problem.' It is not someone else's problem. It is market failure which is holding back regional development in South Australia and it does need to be addressed.

The issue of the desalination plant on Eyre Peninsula has also been raised in this house. Nearly three years ago, this government promised that it would go ahead with the desalination plant on Eyre Peninsula. What we now see is that, despite having promised it several times and despite its being in the last three capital works budgets, it seems to have backed right off. The infrastructure plan has three lines on desalination. It does not look at the challenges for extra water in this state, and certainly it appears that the government have backed right away from the desalination plant. The Minister for Administrative Services (as the minister responsible for SA Water) highlighted the fact that it is in this year's budget. The issue is that it has been in the last three budgets and still nothing has happened. I can guarantee that that money will not be spent this year.

Certainly the minister was playing for time, and I do not think that this government has any idea what it is doing with the Eyre Peninsula desalination plant at the moment. It is all right for the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Administrative Services to say, 'We are working with WMC about desalination', but what they have to realise is that Western Mining is so far from Eyre Peninsula that it is not funny. Even if they built a desalination plant at Port Augusta, what the government needs to understand is that the pipeline goes as far as Whyalla and then there is about a 100 kilometre gap. This problem would need to be solved before it could be connected into the Eyre Peninsula supply. A desalination plant for WMC does absolutely nothing for the water situation on Eyre Peninsula which is becoming increasingly desperate. There are some real problems there with the lack of supply and the quality of the water.

There is no doubt that South Australia is not receiving its rightful share of prosperity, and that is because of a lack of strategic thinking and investment in South Australia. The Howard-Costello government really has this economy ticking. The South Australian government has been receiving its extra share of revenue, but there has been a miserable lack of investment. Because of that, we are seeing a whole range of issues occur. A lack of building in infrastructure is one of the key reasons why exports have fallen by about 20 per cent in the time of this government. There has been a lot of rhetoric but no action. Time and again we have heard this government talk about tripling exports over the next decade. What a load of rubbish! We have now seen exports drop by 20 per cent. Certainly, that is going in the wrong direction.

The government seems to be all about plans and no action. I think the Thinkers in Residence program is symbolic of the way in which this government is all about talk but does not do anything. We need doers in residence, not thinkers in residence. That program has been talked about on numerous occasions, but we have seen no real outcomes from the Thinkers in Residence. While we are always conducive to outside ideas, quite frankly, the program is becoming a symbol of the fact that this government can do nothing other than think about it and talk about it. It really is not capable of doing virtually anything.

How long did we have to wait for the housing plan? And what a disappointment when it was released! It really has been a one-day wonder. I think it is already consigned to collect dust. It did not address the real issues for South Australia. The one thing it did, from a government's perspective, was to handball the responsibility for affordable housing to the private sector. Due to the government's ducking its responsibility to provide affordable housing in South Australia and giving it fair and square to the private sector, this will probably have the impact of making the private sector look elsewhere, because it will say, 'Why do we have to pick up all these responsibilities for a government which is rolling in money but which just does not want to spend any of its own?' This government is willing to penalise developers for the fact that it cannot itself do it.

The transport plan is yet again symbolic of this government, which went to the last election without a transport policy. One would think that, for any aspiring government, a transport policy would be one of its major policy announcements and one of the real strategic matters that everything else hangs off; planning and a whole range of other issues hang off transport. To cover for the fact that the government did not have a transport policy, it now says that it will have the biggest, the best, the greatest, the first—we have heard all those adjectives—transport plan that this state has ever seen. What a load of rubbish!

About two years ago we heard members of the government announce the transport plan and talk about how fantastic it would be, how vital it was and how we just could not go ahead with transport in this state without having that plan. The government released a draft plan. I think government members realised then that they had not put the work into the draft, and they took a couple of steps back. This government has been in office for over three years and we are still waiting for the transport plan. The former minister (who recently resigned) told the house at one stage that the government had decided not to have a transport plan; they were going to wind it in with the urban development policy. But then we heard, in the Premier's press release on the appointment of the new minister, that the transport policy would soon be released.

There are elements of transport within the infrastructure plan—not integrated and not many—but we still await the transport plan. Quite frankly, I am not too sure that we will get it. In three years we have had three ministers for transport and, basically, since the first of those ministers fumbled that portfolio, nothing has happened. It has sat around for months, and the government just has not been able to recover from the state of absolute dormancy that that portfolio went into. We still await the biggest, the best and the first transport plan that we have ever seen.

The other big plan that really has been a major disappointment is the State Strategic Plan. It is important that we understand what the State Strategic Plan is, because the government tends to misrepresent it. That document does not belong to the Economic Development Board. The State Strategic Plan was the government's response to the recommendations of the Economic Development Board. It was not signed off by the Economic Development Board and, certainly, as is sometimes claimed, it was not signed off by the economic summit that was held in late 2002. That summit did not sign off on anything. We have heard various ministers claim that the opposition signed off the recommendations of the EDB. That is absolute rubbish. They have forgotten their time lines. Basically, the summit was held, the EDB came down with the report some time later and the strategic plan followed that. To say that we signed off either the plan or the recommendations is an absolute rewrite of history.

The plan is a real disappointment. It is not about how one gets anywhere: it is about destinations. It has its 79 (or whatever it is) targets. However, they are only targets. If one reads what should be the guts of the plan, one will see that it does not say how we will get there. As I have said, we are failing miserably with exports. For example, if someone makes a statement such as, 'We will triple exports,' they then back it up and say how and where they will do it, which products and markets they will go into, the infrastructure and labour force that is needed to do it and whether we need to increase migration, and whatever. That is the way to set out how one will triple exports. All that is stated in the strategic plan is, 'We will triple exports.' It does not tell us how. It is like saying, 'Go to Mount Drummond' and not telling you how to get there.

The Hon. Dean Brown: Pigs might fly!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes, pigs might fly! The State Strategic Plan really does need a lot of work done on it. It has been held up as the biggest and the best—as is every plan by the government—but, basically, it is purely about destinations, not about how to get there. It is little wonder that this government is well and truly lost on the way to those destinations, and already it is pretty obvious that we will not reach a lot of those destinations.

There is also the issue of government waste and the blowouts that we have seen. When one looks at the receipts they have had versus what they have done with reinvestment in this state, one will see that, obviously, there has been a lot of waste. So, with Sturt Street Primary School, it is little wonder; the Minister for Infrastructure could not tell us of any one project that was theirs and that they had finished. Well, there is one—Sturt Street Primary School. He very carefully made sure that he did not mention that one, because it is an absolute embarrassment. That project was announced as a \$2 million project; so, what have we got? We have a \$7 million project, which is an awful lot per student. It was an unnecessary project; it is the one project that this government can claim credit for and it cost 3½ times what it said it

would. We are probably lucky that the government has not done more projects, because the average blowout at the moment for its projects is 3½ times the budgeted amount. I would hate to see this government try to build a southern expressway, a convention centre or a Berri bridge. I would hate to see it try to build the tunnel.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Thank goodness we had the airport well and truly going before they took over so that they could mess that up.

The Hon. Dean Brown: They did try to build the bridge down at Goolwa.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The government's record with bridges is not exactly fantastic. Basically, the Sturt Street Primary School probably makes us a little relieved that they have not done more, because they do not know how to manage any sort of project whatsoever, apart from waste and blowouts. The other one that is part way down the track is the trams. We have seen the trams absolutely mismanaged and, yet again, it is where their spin has got in the way of good management. No doubt about it, the new generation of trams that we needed were broad-bodied and low but, because they wanted the trams on track before the election—so the election took precedence over what they really wanted—we have seen an absolute compromise. The only reason for the compromise is to get the trams on the track before the election. What have we seen? We have seen a blowout from \$56 million to \$72 million, and let us remember that they have hardly started that project. It has blown out that much before they have done anything. I do not know what we can expect with that.

As to the *Ring Cycle*, I do not know who was keeping an eye on that, but it blew out from \$11 million to \$16 million.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: They had two ministers looking after it and it blew out from \$11 million to \$16 million. Quite frankly, if either of them had kept half an eye on it, from what I understand about the blowout, a bit of ministerial oversight would probably have avoided that actually happening. Ministerial staff, on a calculation that is being done, will cost \$16 million extra in this term. A lot of members here, particularly regional members, would love to see \$16 million spent in their electorates. You are not going to get it. You talk about waste—that really is one area where they are wasting a lot of money. Put in with that the Independent ministers' offices, an extra two ministers, at a cost of an extra \$4 million per year. Basically, that has run away with a lot of money.

Add to that the fact that the Premier was going to cut the number of fat cats by 50. What has happened to fat cats? They are up by about 35 per cent; their so-called fat cats have blown right out the window. Ministers have no idea what is going on in their departments. If the Premier was going to say, 'We are going to cut by 50', they should have talked to the chief executives and given each of them a target. What happened? Instead of that, no-one takes any notice. They make the promise but do nothing about it. The next Auditor-General's Report came out and, lo and behold, it had blown out by about 200. No-one over there was keeping an eye on that, and that is at a huge cost. When you look at the size of the Public Service, the Public Service has continued to grow, but we are not seeing where they are going, because services are not increasing. A lot fewer graduates and trainees go into the Public Service now. So, I do not know who, in the government, is keeping any control over what is going on within the Public Service.

Mr Brokenshire: And they've got two extra ministers at \$4 million a year.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: That's right. I want to touch on a little hobby horse of mine, WorkCover, where the issue has basically been that there has been virtually no oversight. It got out of control. We had a minister who was torn between philosophical views and managing what is a very important structure within this state for employers, employees and the state government, and it was just not controlled. He keeps getting up expecting people to believe that it was of the previous government's making. You go back and have a look. We actually had it fully funded, then September 11 happened, and with every one of those things there was a bit of a blip. However, because of interference, to some extent, and indecisiveness, and the fact that the minister could not agree with the board's recommendation for a CEO, we saw WorkCover go into a rudderless situation for quite a while, which caused a downward spiral. With WorkCover alone, we have seen the unfunded liability blow out to about 10 times what it was when this minister took over, and that is a huge amount of money.

When you add to that the Public Service WorkCover system which is separate from WorkCover, you basically finish up with an unfunded liability of almost \$1 billion. In a press release put out by the minister, he basically tried to say that it was not real money: if you do not pay it this year, it is not real money. If you pay it next year, you pay it in five years' time. Hang on! Does that mean that debt is not real money? The way you pay a debt is that you pay so much next year, so much the year after, so much in five years' time. So, regarding the unfunded liability, which is workers' entitlements—the money that people are going to live off—for him to say it is not real money just shows why we are in the trouble we are in. He does not understand that an unfunded liability is a liability like any debt except in this case it has to be paid to injured workers. The only difference from a debt is that you pay the debt to the bank whereas this goes to workers. For him, as a person responsible for injured workers in this state, to say that it is not real money is an absolute travesty. He just does not understand what is going on with WorkCover. We have heard the Chairman of the Board basically say that everything to do with WorkCover needs a review apart from investment.

That is the funny part, because the investment climate has been fantastic and returns over the last couple of years have been good. It is in times like that that you clear your unfunded liability. But what do we see? We see that investment returns are good but everything else has gone absolutely skew-whiff. Claims management within WorkCover is absolutely hopeless because they cannot manage their claims agents; claims agents do not get any clear messages about what the government actually wants to do. We saw them trying to play with the unfunded liability by suddenly going to the claims agents and saying, 'Go and find the lucky 40. Here is \$1 million each, go and clear a few off.' Now, from some of the stories coming back to us, that was a pretty tragic way of going about it.

There is absolutely no doubt that WorkCover is an issue about which this government should be extremely concerned, but what happens? They sit here and laugh about it—they do not see it as a real issue, they do not see it as real money. It is not on the Treasurer's direct balance sheet so he could not give a damn, but Standard and Poor's and others will be taking notice of that billion dollars sitting there as unfunded liability for workers' entitlements when they come to look at

our AAA rating in the future. It is about time the Treasurer took some responsibility for that figure. He has ignored it and laughed about it—'Ask a real question,' he says.

They should be very worried about the management of WorkCover. It is one of the few things they have left the minister in charge of the whole time: most of the other stuff has been taken off him and shuffled around. I think the problem is that no-one else will take it; and why would you? With the problem that has been created with WorkCover, why would any other minister put up their hand say, 'I will go and sort his mess out.' We saw what happened to the member for Taylor—after two years of the minister handling transport, she went in there and probably tried to micro-manage it but the backlog was so enormous that, in the end, it took its toll. Really, she took over a no-win situation.

The Hon. Dean Brown: So they gave it to Patrick who sees nothing, reads nothing, and doesn't care.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Well, that is basically it, because it did go to a new minister and that minister has shown in here that he is certainly not across it. He has told us that he has read a few things but obviously he read the wrong documents.

Many on this side have sat around a cabinet table. If people come to you with a proposal that they want to run a tram line down King William Street to the railway station, there is a range of questions you ask about traffic movements, what the impact is going to be, and whatever. From the questioning in this house it is obvious that no-one over there asked those questions—otherwise not only the Minister for Transport but every minister should know the answer to them. The necessary questions were not asked, and one even has to wonder whether those proposals even went to cabinet, otherwise those questions would have been asked. Similarly, with South Road, who asked the question about the tram line? The minister obviously knew nothing about it, although it is just down from his electorate office, I think—perhaps he has not been there for a while because he did not have any inkling whatsoever that that tram line was a potential problem.

To summarise, we have a very high taxing government—the highest this state has ever seen. They have been at the wheel during a time of enormous national prosperity, but here in South Australia we have missed a huge opportunity. With the level of receipts we have had there should have been some real strategic spending in the last couple of years in the area of infrastructure—which you invest in when you have a lot of money. This just has not happened and it is a huge missed opportunity for this state. The government has been totally negligent in not reinvesting in the infrastructure and the services that this state needs and they have not reinvested in the state's future, and over the next few years we are going to pay an enormous price for that fact.

We urge the government to stop talking and to act, to actually do something, and we urge ministers to get a grip of their portfolios. It is increasingly obvious that many ministers are not across important issues within their own areas of responsibility. Whilst we will support the Supply Bill, in doing so we do not endorse the manner in which the government is handling the budget. They have hooked on the revenue, and we are concerned at the fact that while they waste large amounts of money they are failing to wisely invest in the state's future.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to support the Supply Bill but also, as with the Leader of the Opposition, to raise some very sincere concerns about it and about the

actions of the government and the way in which they are delivering finance, advice and control to South Australians. As the Leader of the Opposition has just pointed out, this is a government of inaction. We have now seen three years of this government and what has happened? The answer is very little—lots of talk and no action. I have lost count of the number of reviews that this government has put into place, but how many results of those reviews have we seen? Very few. And what action has been taken on any of those? Very little.

The Leader of the Opposition just highlighted the fact that only a few days ago we asked the Minister for Infrastructure to name one project and he could not name one project at all that this government had actually initiated, that this government in three years—I repeat, in three years—had actually got off its tail and initiated itself. As the leader said, it is only the Sturt Street Primary School, a project that has blown out from some \$2 million to \$7 million. I am sure that other schools across South Australia have watched this budget blow-out with much interest, and wished that they could get part of the \$5 million blow-out to improve the surrounds and the infrastructure of their own schools. But that is the only project we have seen in three years. Well, if I were a teacher I would give this government about one out of 10 for their governing of this state and for actually getting on and doing something in this state, rather than just a lot of rhetoric. And that is what we received; and day by day in the Adelaide media—either in *The Advertiser* or on television—we see the spin that has been created by this government, about how much they are supposedly doing. But do we actually see it in results? The answer to that is ‘No.’ Do you remember the Drugs Summit that we had—a five day Drugs Summit—and all that was going to be done by the government? I ask you, ‘What has been done?’ I would say, ‘Very little,’ and yet there were grand promises that things were going to change in this state: this government was going to be tough on drugs; and it was going to initiate vast resources to ensure that people who were hooked on drugs were going to be supported, and so on. Well, we have seen absolutely nothing.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member for Goyder points out, the member for Schubert put up a private member’s bill in terms of blood testing for drugs on drivers, and this government rejected that—something, I would have thought, that they would have supported. But obviously, the action does not match the rhetoric. Look at the way in which the previous government had exports ticking over in this state, and the huge jump from some \$3 billion to \$9 billion in export revenue to this state. This government came out very early in its days and said that it was going to triple exports by 2013—or something like that, I cannot remember the exact date, it might have been 2010. The fact is, exports are on the way down, and dipping very sharply, and yet nothing is being done by this government. I would say again that there is a lot of rhetoric going on here but very little action.

The former department of industry and trade—where many of those officers were involved directly in terms of taking industry led tours to different markets in South East Asia, and elsewhere in that area of the world, and overseas to the states and Europe, to put the produce that is being produced in South Australia at the forefront, to take industry people over there, to develop contracts, to be able to enhance the exports of this state—much of that has fallen by the wayside and is not happening now. So, as a result of that, you

are seeing a downturn in exports, and the South East Asian region, in particular, relies on a consistent contact with their customers, and if this does not happen (the South Australian government being one of the customers) then they will wipe their hands of South Australia and say, ‘We will go some place else where we have a government that is serious about keeping dialogue with us,’ serious about exports into their countries and not just turning the tap on and off at will. About two years ago—about 12 months, maybe even less, into this government’s term—

Mr Caica interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I think I have only been going two minutes; I have hardly started.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! The member for Light has the call.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The member for Colton is very observant there, but I think he overestimates the time that I have been speaking so far. I felt sure that I had only just got to my feet. I remember the Minister for Administrative Services, the Hon. Jay Weatherill (I am sure that it was within the first 12 months of government) saying that the government was going to hold off on many of their capital projects because of the current cost of building, and because tenders were increasing by around 10 percent, and, as a result of that, the government was going to step back and wait until the market had settled down. Well, ‘Hello, hello?’ Have you ever seen building costs come down? The only time that I remember it happening was in 1962, when there was a credit squeeze on, but I have never seen them come down since. For a government to use this feeble excuse, and to say that it is going to wait until the building costs come down because of competition from the eastern states, in terms of the number of tenders that builders were applying for there, and that they would step back and wait, well that is a very neat way of delaying capital works expenditure in this state, and that is exactly what we have seen.

We have seen a huge delay of capital works expenditure, and we have only to look at the road infrastructure. The previous Liberal government had a plan in terms of (particularly, regional road infrastructure spending) which disappeared when this government came in. It absolutely disappeared. We had programs that were link roads or major freight routes, we had regional road programs, we had tourist road programs, and all of those disappeared into the ether. There is a backlog of some \$160 million in road funding that is required. That is not all this government’s fault. A lot of that has been sitting there for some time, and the previous government tried very hard to catch up on some of that with projects like the Heysen Tunnels and the realignment of the South Eastern Freeway, which was well over \$100 million; and the Southern Expressway which was a \$100 million project as well. We spent some \$10 million on the sealing of Kangaroo Island roads to ensure that tourists had better roads to travel on, and there were a number of other projects by the previous government. But all that dried up when this government came in, and it was a matter of putting capital works on hold.

I look at the infrastructure plan, and the Leader of the Opposition spoke about the transport plan. The draft transport plan that was brought out by this government is the biggest joke I have ever seen. Everything was going to be completed by 2017. There were no commitments to anything within the next five years. There was no money identified. It was all a

matter of, 'We've identified these projects and, yes, we'll have them all completed by 2017.' What a load of rubbish!

Of course, we never, ever saw another draft or the final transport plan; that also disappeared into the ether. The reason we were given by the then transport minister was that it was going to be folded into the infrastructure plan. I looked at the infrastructure plan that the minister released last week, and it is a very disappointing document. When you look at it, there is nothing there for regional South Australia. When I say nothing, that is not quite right: there is one plan there which was identified by the federal government and which links the Sturt Highway to the Port Wakefield Road to ensure a fast freight route from Port Adelaide through to the Sturt Highway. That was announced and plans were commenced by the federal government. I stand to be corrected on this, but I am pretty sure that it was back in about 1997 or 1998—somewhere around that time. It was in the federal government budget at that time; it was then put on hold for a couple of years; and it has now been resurrected.

I looked for spending on regional roads and, in discussions with truck drivers, particularly long-distance drivers, I am told that the roads in South Australia are the worst of any roads that they travel on anywhere in Australia. A huge amount of money needs to be spent on upgrading roads. On that subject, this government uses a very neat trick: one way of averting expenditure on our regional roads is to lower the speed limits. If we lower the speed limit from 110 to 100 km/h, under the national rules, we only have to have roads of a certain standard. On Yorke Peninsula, particularly in the member for Goyder's region, the speed limit on a number of roads has been reduced to 100 km/h. That means that the government does not have to spend any money on them, because it says, 'Oh well, that's not a 110 km/h road so, therefore, the specifications don't have to be as good as for a 100 km/h road', so it avoids spending. One road that the member for MacKillop often refers to in our party room is the one alongside the Coorong. Again, the speed limit on that road has been reduced from 110 km/h back to 100 km/h. Again, it is a neat little trick so that the government can say, 'Oh, well; it's only that standard; therefore, we don't have to spend any money on it.'

The infrastructure plan is what I would call a very disappointing document. I took note of education spending, having some sympathy for that area, its being my old portfolio. Again, there is really nothing there. There is a lot of rhetoric but no identification of where there will be spending. I talked to my school principals and governing councils and found that Partnerships 21, local management, as it was set up, has been wound back by the department and by the minister in terms of the control that local schools have over their own budgets. I think that is extremely disappointing, because the whole idea was to place the control and responsibility in the hands of the governing councils. The finances for that initiative have been wound back, and all the people I talk to say that they are very disappointed with the way this has gone. Of course, they fear speaking out for fear of being targeted and, as a result of that, suffer even more.

The other day, one constituent made the point that, when Partnerships 21 came in, 'that was the first time in the history of schools that we actually saw where the money went'. He said, 'We actually understood where the money went—what it cost for electricity; what it cost for water; and what it actually costs for our schools to run.' 'So,' he said, 'we could then gain an understanding of how it all worked. Therefore, we could say, right, can we save money in this area, or can

we not?' Through the original plan of P21, that money was returned to the schools so that they would be able to spend it on other projects. As I said—

Mr Scalzi: Not this government.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Not this government, as the member for Hartley says. It is again very disappointing from my point of view. I now want to turn to the housing plan for South Australia. You have to wait until page 19 in the housing plan to get past the rhetoric. It is 27 pages in length, and you get to page 19 when the rhetoric stops and something sort of tangible comes into the plan. I have been calling for the rejuvenation of Peachy Belt. It is the responsibility of not only this government but also previous governments that have not done anything for something like 20 years in terms of the many homes which were built in the 1950s, which have outlasted their use-by-date and about which nothing has been done. It is the fault of governments basically since about 1980 that this has not been done, and people have been calling for it since then. So, I thought, 'Here's a government that says it is going to help those people, and there should be something big in the housing plan.' Well, on page 19 it states, 'Urban regeneration—actions: invest an additional \$15 million to accelerate urban regeneration activities in disadvantaged areas, in particular, the Parks, Salisbury North and Playford North.' Now, the interesting thing is that this is going to be spent over 15 years until 2015. For me, that adds up to about \$1.5 million a year, which is nothing; it is pathetic, in fact.

It states that for Playford North, for example, an area close to my heart and in my electorate, there will be a 15 year project to begin in 2006. Well, hello! With \$15 million over 15 years and three projects, that is \$5 million per year. That is not going to—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I'd love more. I'll take all you can give me, but the point is that that will not do the job. There is a huge job to be done. The people in the Peachy Belt have been waiting for a long time for something tangible to happen from governments of both persuasions. Obviously, nothing is going to happen under this government.

In the couple of minutes remaining to me, I will turn to the amount of revenue this government has collected. It has had huge windfall gains. If only in the eight years when we were in government we had had these windfall gains. When we were trying to deal with the State Bank debt and get this state back on its feet, if we had had these sorts of windfall gains we could have made big inroads. We certainly would not have sat around for three years doing nothing.

It will be interesting to see what comes out of the budget in four to five weeks' time. My suspicion is that a lot has been taken out of the infrastructure plan. In the lead-up to the budget, I think they will say, 'We've worked hard for three years. You have all been terrific, you have tightened your belts. We have been good financial managers, and we can now deliver the path to Damascus. All you people have been wonderful putting up with this tightening of belts. We now have the AAA rating back, so now we can deliver.' We will wait and see what happens with the budget but, if the infrastructure plan and the housing plan and what we have seen over the last three years are any indication, I think we are going to be disappointed.

I think all this money is being salted away into an election bucket which we will see in nine or 10 months' time when the government puts out its policies and says where it is going to spend its money. I say that that is not good enough, because

the fact is that we should have been doing a lot more a lot earlier. You only have to look at the Port of Melbourne and the way that has gone ahead, the opportunities that are there. They will pinch our markets in terms of export containers coming out of Adelaide.

Time expired.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Before calling the member for Unley, I remind the member for Hartley that it is extremely unparliamentary to interject on a member of his own party.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hartley! The member for Unley.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I am pleased to follow my friend and colleague the member for Light because those who listen to him know that he always makes a very sensible and intelligent contribution, which is more than I can say for the noise that I sometimes hear coming from the government benches opposite. In talking about the appropriation of supply, it would be well to remind this house that this government bartered its way into office. It is not as though it won more than 50 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. Another party in this place quite clearly one more than 50 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, and it currently sits on the opposition benches. Why? Because we were not as good at bartering and manipulating as is the current ALP.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Colton says that we were not as good at being in government, but I ask him to listen for 20 minutes and then decide. Politics being politics, the ALP bartered a speakership and it did very well out of that.

Mrs Geraghty: What's this got to do with supply?

Mr BRINDAL: It has a lot to do with supply. I do not know whether the Government Whip is aware of this, but all the senior positions of the executive government in this place are paid for out of the public purse, which means there is a vote of supply that goes to that which makes their salaries and emoluments very germane to the Supply Bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Ministers serve at the Governor's pleasure. I ask the member to return to remarks about supply.

Mr BRINDAL: I was not aware that it was orderly for the chair to interject with comments of its own about who does or does not do what.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: The point is that in bartering its way into government, this government has thought nothing of creating additional positions in executive government, all of which come at a huge cost. Traditionally in this state for well over 100 years there were only 13 ministers. There are now 15 ministers, and they do not come from the government party; they come from anybody else whose vote may well be able to be purchased.

Mrs GERAGHTY: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I think the member for Unley has just reflected on ministers of this house.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley cannot reflect. I uphold the point of order. The member well

knows he can only reflect on members through a substantive motion. I ask him to withdraw and apologise unreservedly.

Mr BRINDAL: I said 'may'; I did not say 'did'. The record will show that no apology is necessary.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I did not hear that. Continue your remarks.

Mr BRINDAL: The fact is that there is greater cost to this government. Having said that, I am one person in this state along with many others who think that from time to time it may be necessary to change the complexion of the government. I actually believe that there are times when the sort of conservative approach represented so often by the Liberal Party is a good direction in which the state should go, but I think that when Whitlam came to power there comes a time when it is time and it is reasonable and decent to change, because the ALP brings to the government a slightly different view of the world and can make the appropriate changes that may be difficult for a Liberal government and vice versa. Imagine my shock and the shock of some members opposite when, on coming to power (by whatever means), we have sitting on the government benches an ALP government which in effect and in fact tries to out liberal the Liberal Party. If there is any difference between a conservative government on this side and a conservative government on that side of the house would someone please point it out to me?

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, the member for Hartley interjects inappropriately out of order and says, 'What about philosophy?' That probably is the only difference. This party, when it is in government, knows what it is doing; and it knows why it is doing it because it has a philosophic approach. The party opposite knows one thing and one thing alone; that is, let's win the next election. That is the only maxim held by the Labor Party: 'Let's win the next election and, when we do, we can divide the spoils more equitably among ourselves and just may be—'

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Colton says, 'If you're such a good government, how come you are so pathetic in opposition?' For exactly the reason why an opposition which was so good is so pathetic in government. There are some jobs that suit—

Mr Caica: We were an excellent opposition, that's why we're in government.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, you were an excellent opposition. You are not in government because you were an excellent opposition. The member for Colton can come back, and if I am here, he can say to me across the chamber, 'We are now in government because we won in our own right', but until the member for Colton can look me in the eye and say, 'We actually won an election,' he has no right to say, 'How come we are in government?' The Labor Party is in government because it made a deal with a number of Independents to put itself in government: it was never elected by the South Australian people.

Mr Caica: Didn't you guys strike a deal?

Mr BRINDAL: Let me tell members—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): The member for Hartley will come to order!

Mr BRINDAL: —that every single one of those Independents, save the member for Fisher I believe—and they can correct me if I am wrong—went to the election quite clearly saying that they were conservative and supported the continuation of a conservative government. The member for

Hammond, I think seven times—not once, not twice, but seven times—told everyone that if he was elected, he would support a conservative government. So do not let the member for Colton bleat that the people of South Australia knowingly and willingly elected the Rann Labor government. They did not. They elected 47 people, some of whom, after the election, changed their mind (and the courts say they are quite entitled to change their mind) and gave us the Rann Labor government.

We will see at the next election what some of their voters think about their opinion when they say seven times, ‘I am a conservative, of course I will vote conservative’ and then change their mind. We will see what their voters say at the next election because I am sure that my colleagues will be very willing to point out the number of instances where so-called conservative people have blindly voted with the government. I remember very clearly when I was sitting on a ministry bench just how much some of those same conservative members kept the conservative government to account. One day, before I leave this place, I give my word that I will tell this house a few stories about some of the conservative Independents and what they did to hold the last government to ransom, because I think South Australia deserves to know because the stories of what they did to force their opinions on the last government and on this parliament deserve telling in the light of the way in which they are voting in this parliament. The media always says that—

Mrs GERAGHTY: Mr Acting Speaker, I have a point of order. I do believe that the member for Unley is now reflecting upon some members in this house.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. It is unparliamentary to reflect on votes of the House of Assembly. The member will bring himself back to remarks about supply.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you very much.

The Hon. L. Stevens: He doesn’t have much to say!

Mr BRINDAL: Doesn’t he? Do you want to give me an hour and I will keep talking for an hour. In deploring this government on its lack of action, inefficiency and inability on supply, I refer to a letter which the Premier wrote this morning and in which he says that he has never ‘terrorised’ Mr Owens. The Premier also said:

I am not going to apologise for advocating lower power prices or for advocating tougher sentences for violent criminals and paedophiles.

And so the Premier goes on—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: In his letter he says that is his job. In this letter he says that he is a tough Premier. That is exactly the sort of thing Augustus Caesar used to say when he was sitting in the Colosseum watching the gladiators.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The Caesars used to sit in the Colosseum ‘on purple’ surrounded by their lackeys and the gladiators used to fight. Caesar, who had the power of life and death, the thumbs up or the thumbs down, would first look at the crowd because, if the crowd wanted the gladiator to live, it was a brave Caesar who gave a thumbs down; and if the crowd wanted the gladiator to die, it was a brave Caesar who gave the thumbs up. Mike Rann, the Premier, has learnt from those Caesars because this government is not about tough on law and order. This government is about cheap and petty populism. This is a government of spin and not much else. I will explain.

I can remember raising the matter of parole with the Hon. Trevor Griffin when I was Secretary to the Executive Council, because when the Parole Board makes a decision those decisions all come before cabinet and require a cabinet sign off. Some of the criminals who were released on parole in our time worried me, and I used to reserve them and raise them in the cabinet. The Hon. K.T. Griffin used to say consistently the whole time I was there, ‘You cannot make individual decisions based on your like or dislike of a particular criminal. We have, as a group called the executive government, the right to go and ask parliament to change the laws. But as we set the laws, as we set the Parole Board in place, as we appoint the judges, as we are the executive government, we cannot second guess our own decisions.’ That is what this Premier does.

This Premier appoints the Parole Board. This government appoints the judiciary. This government is in charge of law and order. This government is in charge of those matters, and then the Premier says, ‘I don’t like what is happening and I’m going to change it.’ If that is not populism, I suggest that some member opposite tells me what is. The Premier comes in with respect to particular criminals and says, ‘This is wrong, and I’m tough and I’m going to change it,’ and gets good points in the popular press for doing so. But, in fact, it is not an example of good government: it is an example of very mediocre government—it is, indeed, an example of very poor government. It is government by populism, not government by leadership, and certainly not government that requires the production of a better society. That is what disappoints me most about the ALP. The ALP previously when I was in here stood up—

Mr CAICA: Sir, I rise on a point of order. This debate is about supply, and I have not heard anything other than whingeing, carping and bagging.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The member has a degree of latitude in talking about financial matters, but he should not deviate too far from the core issue of the bill.

Mr BRINDAL: The core issue of the bill, sir, is the appropriation of money. What I am bemoaning is the wrong appropriation of money on populist causes rather than upholding the law and order on which the Premier is tough. The ALP when it is in government traditionally has a social conscience: it does something for those groups that would generally in our society be called disadvantaged. It sticks up for the battlers and the like. I can remember very fine premiers and very fine ministers opposite doing just that. Often I would disagree with the appropriation made to those causes, but I acknowledge absolutely their right to have done it and their belief in the causes that they followed. But we talk now about appropriation to law and order; about being tough on law and order. How? By increasing the number of people who are jailed; by locking them up and throwing away the key. Where has there been, in three years, any education bill that supports teachers? Where has there been any bill in this place that looks at discipline? Where are the bills? What actions have been taken as a result of the Layton report?

If ever there was a government department in disorder and disarray, maybe even in chaos, it is Family and Youth Services—and it shames me that it was probably equally so in our time. If the government deserves some credit, it is for the production of the Layton report. But nothing has happened. That is about resourcing: it is about being tough on law and order. If we are to be tough on law and order, we start with our children. We start by seeing that they have a

measure of nurture and effective discipline in our schools, on our streets and, certainly, when the agencies of government deal with our kids, not this chaotic stupidity that now passes for child welfare.

We say that the child welfare department is empowered through the act to act in the interests of the child. What are the interests of the child? It is whatever a case worker feels like between coffee in the morning and chardonnay in the afternoon. It is likely to change from case worker to case worker: it is likely to change on a whim between case workers. If members do not believe that, I suggest that they go and sit in their electorates and listen. Unley is not atypical of South Australia; there are people every day—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The Government Whip interjects. If she wants to stand up and stick up for that department and tell the whole of South Australia how good it is, I invite her to do so. I invite her to correct me. I think that place needs to be sorted out: a bulldozer needs to go in on the bottom floor and come out on the top floor and, if we could, we should start again. Child welfare in this state is an abomination. Paedophiles have run rampant, and Mullighan is going to expose that. There has been physical and mental abuse, and all sorts of things, all in the name of the state of South Australia, perpetrated by people who turn around and say that they are doing the right thing; that they are the good people in this. There are a lot of fairly tawdry parents, who you and I maybe would not think are the best parents, but they are a lot better than many of the people in this state who act as social workers. We have not seen anything for schools; and we have not seen anything with respect to discipline for kids. We have seen precious little in the social welfare department. What have we seen? We have not seen public works. Public works, if anything, have gone backwards—and the chair of the Public Works Committee is now sitting there looking at the ceiling, because he can tell this place, as can I, how many weeks we do not meet simply because there are no references from the executive government. The executive government has sent us precious little in three years.

I am grateful; I will take the money, stay at home and have another cup of coffee. However, when former speaker Lewis was chair of the Public Works Committee, sometimes it met twice a week to get through the work; that is the difference. The difference is between a government that wants to be re-elected versus a government that wanted to do a job. What appals me about this four years of Labor is that they have been four wasted years—not because Labor is in power but because the ALP has done nothing. They have wasted four years. It has been four years where the rest of the world has been moving onward. If that is the proud record for those opposite, if that is what we are spending 20 per cent more on, then I will go he.

Time expired.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I listened intently to the member for Unley's so-called contribution, and I was disappointed because he is often full of promise. It is a bit like going to an expensive restaurant—it is never quite what you expect. Let us get one thing straight. The member for Unley, in his remarks, said that the Labor Party did not achieve the majority of a two-party preferred vote on 9 February 2002. That is true, but neither did the Liberal Party. The only way you can extrapolate the Liberal Party achieving the majority of a two-party preferred vote is if you count every primary vote the member for Hammond received,

every vote the member for Chaffey received and every primary vote the member for Mount Gambier received, and then distribute them as being first preference Liberal votes; then you can stand in this place and say that those three members contributed to the Liberal Party two-party preferred majority. The fact is that these members are Independents.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald: And the National Party.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry; and a National Party MP. So, the idea that you can somehow extrapolate those and claim some sort of moral authority in this place is beyond belief. The Australian Labor Party, under our current Premier, won 23 out of 47 seats. The Leader of the Opposition, the then premier, and the Liberal Party, won 20 seats. My argument would be that, if the Liberal Party wanted to govern in its own right, then it would go out into those traditionally conservative electorates, which are now inhabited by Independents and Nationals, and win them back. However, I think if they tried that—and they have tried, because Liberal candidates ran in each one of those seats—they would be, and were, unsuccessful. The Liberal Party's message in 2002 in those electorates was rejected. There was not a huge endorsement in Chaffey of the then premier or in Mount Gambier or Hammond and, in fact—

Mr Caica: Or Fisher.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Or Fisher, I should say as well; I forgot about Fisher. In the seat of Chaffey, the incumbent member won a majority of the primary vote, as the member did in Mount Gambier. Preferences were not needed. So, they should not come in here and tell us that some sort of coup went on in March 2002.

Mr Caica: Or claim those votes as their own.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Or claim those votes as their own, because we had rebels too—one Ralph Clarke. We deal with our rebels at the ballot box. We go out and sell our message, and we win. We did not come in here with 22 seats and an Independent Labor MP: we came in here with 23 rock solid ALP votes. I think that argument does not carry any water at all. All I think it shows is that, despite the member for Unley saying that the rest of the world has moved on after 2002, the only people who have not moved on are the current Liberal members who are living in denial that they are in opposition. I heard a lot of bleating opposite—carping, whingeing and whining—about our infrastructure plan. As a western suburbs MP, I am proud of the government and its infrastructure plan, because it takes into account the amenity of the western suburbs and the hardship that the people of the west have to deal with in the congestion on the roads. I doubt that members opposite really understand what a bottleneck is like on South Road, because they have probably never had to use it as they do not generally live in the western suburbs—apart from the Hon. Angus Redford, to his credit, who lives in the western suburbs, and the honourable member for Schubert who, when he is a long way from home in the Barossa Valley, lives in the western suburbs. I do not think members opposite really understand the infrastructure problems that we have had in the western suburbs for the last 30 years.

The member for Colton and I have a deep knowledge of the people we represent and their concerns and aspirations. We understand their frustration at seeing that white elephant at Hindmarsh being built, that soccer stadium, while infrastructure programs were desperately needed in the western suburbs. He also understands the frustration we both had when the Bakewell Bridge needed safety barriers put on and the Hon. Diana Laidlaw refused to act—when three young

men tragically died on the bridge at North Adelaide near the zoo, immediately that bridge was rebuilt and safety barriers put on. It was not until another fatality on the Bakewell Bridge that finally, and reluctantly, they put up ugly safety barriers, not like the beautiful safety barriers they put up on the bridge in North Adelaide to make it a heritage look. They ruined it.

Mr Caica: At least they put some barriers up; it took a few deaths.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It took a lot of deaths, but they finally acted. We have committed to the City-West connector, to the Bakewell Bridge and to extending the trams. We have committed to building underpasses at bottlenecks on South Road—something the RAA and the Freight Council both say are urgently needed upgrades. We have committed—not just announced—we have actually put the money into the QEH. I remember the former premier sitting there with a Cheshire grin on his face, because he knows that we all know what he was about. We all know what his game was. You come out, you announce it, you re-announce it over again, and you do not actually commit any money—you just re-announce things. We are the ones who finished the QEH and rebuilt the RAH. We were the ones who did work at the Flinders Medical Centre. We are the ones who guaranteed stability at the Repatriation Hospital, not members opposite. I find it astounding that members of the opposition come in here and bleat, whinge and whine about road infrastructure in regional areas. The truth is that they were in government for eight years—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BROKENSHERE: On a point of order, sir, I draw your attention to the fact that the member for West Torrens is continually turning his back on the Speaker and I thought that was unruly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member should address the chair, although traditionally there has been some tolerance here. We do not need a pirouette, but the member would recall that last week we had someone who was able to spin in the one spot. That is outside my ability, but the member should address the chair wherever possible.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I am not one to disagree with your rulings, and I address all my remarks through you no matter which way I am facing. That is what the standing order says—in fact (and I am sure the member for Mawson knows this), the standing orders actually allow for people to be seated when they speak as well, even though they are not facing the chair. The member for Mawson, being the expert that he is on all things to do with parliament and government, would know that—I am sure that he could even name the standing order.

Mr Speaker, I will go back to the point I was making before I was rudely interrupted, because I know you are listening intently to my remarks. I often hear members such as the members for Schubert and Mawson complain, whinge and whine about regional roads and regional infrastructure, and I heard the member for Light talk about the desperate need for regional road upgrades because he has spoken to a few truck drivers who have told him that South Australia has the worst roads in the country. If that statement is correct, were those roads degraded in the last three years?

Mr Brokenshire: Yes!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Mawson thinks that South Australia's roads have degraded to be the worst in the country starting 9 February 2002 until now, and that

degradation had not started in the previous eight years from 1993. At least the member for Light had the courage to get up and say that perhaps both governments were responsible, but not the member for Mawson. He can find no fault with the previous government—is that right?

Mr Brokenshire: We were a very good government.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Even though his Premier had to resign in disgrace, he still finds no fault in the previous government. Well, I can tell the member for Mawson that, if you cannot learn from your mistakes, you will never improve as a man. If you think you have never made a mistake in your life and that—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Mawson thinks there were no errors made by the previous government. I disagree with him, and I think the arrogance he is showing about the former government is probably the reason they will not win the next election. I am proud of our government because of the infrastructure we have put into the western suburbs through the budget and through other processes—something the former government would never even have contemplated. The Bakewell bridge is one piece of infrastructure that is long overdue. I remember the Hon. Diana Laidlaw asking for this bridge to be rebuilt and the answer coming back, 'No.' I am very proud of the Premier coming down to the western suburbs and announcing this. I also congratulate the Minister for Administrative Services and for Recreation, Sport and Racing, because the Thebarton Aquatic Centre is about to get a \$400 000 upgrade.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Deputy Leader calls me a joke, but I am not the one who had a 37-seat majority and then was a backbencher for a while; I am not the one who won the biggest election in Australian history and then was knocked off two or three years later. And you call me a joke? Please. I think a little respect is deserved—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens should come back to the bill.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. A little respect for the biggest failure in the parliament—I think the member for Finnis deserves that place of honour, even though I have a great deal of respect for him myself and believe that the Liberal Party made a tragic error which cost them 10 seats in the election. I think the member for Finnis has every right to be aggrieved about what happened to him, and I think the people of South Australia were not very happy with it either—and that was reflected in the election that followed in 1997. Despite what members opposite say, I think this government is doing a good job in terms of infrastructure. I am proud of what they are doing and I think—

Mr Brokenshire: You haven't delivered one project.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: We have. We have delivered the City West connector, the North Terrace upgrade, the Festival Centre. Members opposite say—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Mawson!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I find that interesting, given that the member for Mawson was a part-time member of cabinet—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member of Mawson will be missing the house shortly, if he is not careful.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I find it amazing that the member for Mawson—who was a part-time cabinet minister, a junior minister who entered cabinet only for matters regarding his police portfolio—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I was never the drinks boy, mate. I do not bring in the drinks at half-time, so do not come in here and lecture me, orange boy. The orange peels are outside; go and get the orange peels, go upstairs to your shadow cabinet.

Back to the budget and the supply debate. The government has done a good job, because not only have we achieved a AAA credit rating and restored our budget finances but we are also spending that money on infrastructure. And the infrastructure we are spending it on is vitally important to places like the western suburbs and the Mid North, where the member for Giles' seat is. I am sure she is very happy with our infrastructure plan and the money we are pouring into her electorate, as is the member for Colton. I have to say that one day I would like to see the tram going down the centre of Henley Beach Road heading towards Henley Square—to me, it is a natural point—and then perhaps linking up again with Glenelg. There would be a nice little triangle up Anzac Highway, down Henley Beach Road and back to the Bay. Not that that will ever happen in our lifetime, I am sure, but it is something that we can, perhaps, aspire to one day.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Colton says, 'At least we have some ideas.' We are not about whingeing, complaining, feeling robbed about the last election or feeling displaced. The frustrations are building in the Liberal opposition. Are they going to get wiped out: are they not going to get wiped out? The member for Bright has already called on half of them to resign because of their age, which I think is a bit unfair, given that the member for Bright—

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: They are trying to knock off the member for Unley; and they have three sitting members in the upper house who are fighting for preselection, and we are not quite sure who is going to survive. Is it the Hon. Michelle Lensink, is it the Hon. Robert Lawson, is it the Hon. Rob Lucas? Who do they keep and who do they knock off? These things are all very difficult.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Bob Randall, the current President of the Liberal Party, the former independent candidate for Henley in 1997, I think, has said some remarkable things. I was watching a videotape of the 1997 election campaign when he criticised the Liberal Party for what it had done to the Hon. Dean Brown, claiming that the disunity that the Liberal Party had shown then would ultimately see Labor return to office probably eight to 12 years earlier than it should have. I am not taking back anything that the Premier has done, but I think that when you look back at that day in 1996, or 1995, when the Hon. John Wayne Olsen took the reigns of the Liberal Party, you see that it was the beginning of the end of the Liberal Party. The member for Hartley fought bravely for his then premier, stood by him and would not be bought off, and would not be threatened or intimidated by others. He stood by the Hon. Dean Brown at the time, unlike other members who took their 30 pieces of silver. I am not sure what they were trying to do. Did they think that they could win more seats? Did they think they could increase their majority?

I am still trying to work out what they tried to achieve by taking the Hon. Dean Brown out of the office. It was a great strategy. What was the game plan? What is the long term vision: would they go to 38 seats, 39 seats or 40 seats, maybe? Maybe they thought that they could wipe us out with the Hon. John Wayne Olsen. I think that the Liberal Party should take a good, long, hard, look at itself and, rather than complain and moan about what we are doing, get on board and support us.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, sir: my understanding is that speeches on the Supply Bill are supposed to relate to the government's expenditure of money, yet the member opposite is talking about the Labor party having a good hard look at itself and the Liberal party having a good hard look at itself. What relevance has that to money?

The SPEAKER: I guess looking at oneself costs money, but it is a long bow. The member for West Torrens should come back to the Supply Bill.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I take your guidance and return to the point. I think that the Liberal opposition, rather than criticise the government's infrastructure plan, should get on board, because the RAA and the Freight Council have. The only people who do not like it are members of the Liberal opposition. And why? They do not like it because we have taken the initiative again. We dream to be bold. We are being bold. We have restored our finances and we got the AAA credit rating back. Now we have room to spend on infrastructure—real infrastructure that will help our exports, help our farmers, help our primary producers—not stadiums and wine centres, white elephants that are legacies to mismanagement and failure. I have already thought up my next election pamphlet. It is going to have a picture of the wine centre and the Hindmarsh stadium on one end, and it will say, 'Do you want to go back to spending money on this stuff?' Then I will have another picture of the Bakewell Bridge, the City-West Connector and the South Road underpasses, and I will put them in my pamphlet and say, 'This is your choice: a brand new QEH or another wine centre; a brand new underpass on South Road or a Hindmarsh soccer stadium or wine centre?' They are the contrasts—a failed legacy of a deposed leader—and they thought they could achieve a lot more with a new one. He was hopeless, and God bless him for it. And now there is the vision of our Premier, of our government, and what we are trying to achieve.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to talk about, and examine, the mental health projects within this state, because there is only one conclusion that you can come to, and that is that there is complete disarray when it comes to the mental health projects that the Rann government has been proposing. As a result of that disarray, people with very serious mental illnesses are suffering from a critical shortage of psychiatric beds and a complete breakdown in mental health services. I highlight the fact that South Australia now has the dubious honour of having the lowest per capita funding for mental health services of any state in Australia based on the current year. Under the last year of the Liberal government, we were the third highest of any state in Australia on a per capita basis, but now we are the lowest. When you look at the capital works projects that they have put forward, you understand why, with that low level of funding and the complete disarray with the projects, mental health services in this state are in a crisis and why so many people are telephoning me and other members of

parliament highlighting the critical shortage of psychiatric beds and the complete breakdown in services.

In fact, in its four-year term, the Rann government will not build and open a single mental health facility, despite mental health being the fastest growing illness within our community. So, for a four-year period we have effectively gone into a complete freeze in terms of mental health facilities within this state. All the projects that the government talks about and announces year after year have been delayed by up to four years. The redevelopment and expansion of the psychiatric facilities at the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have now been completely scrapped. I will come to that in more detail to highlight the fact that there is no budget and no money allocated at all for the Boylan Psychiatric Ward redevelopment at the Women's and Children's Hospital, nor for the proposed aged acute mental health beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Last year the Rann government failed to spend \$35 million allocated by this parliament for new hospitals. As a result of that, for hospitals it spent only \$95 million on capital works, compared to the budget under the former Liberal government of \$147 million for hospital spending in its last financial year. That is \$147 million down to \$95 million. The \$95 million represents what it actually spent. The government was allocated \$130 million by the parliament. This is now the second year in a row that the Rann government has not spent the money allocated due to the chaos of the building program within the health sector.

A couple of weeks ago, the Health Minister, Lea Stevens, announced that the government would close Glenside Hospital, a decision that, I might add, the Liberal government would reverse. We have already given that indication. We see Glenside Hospital as a centre of excellence for rehabilitation, as proposed by Dr Margaret Tobin and Dr Peter Brennan in the very, very comprehensive mental health strategy put down for this entire state; that was in June 2000. It was adopted and accepted by the then Liberal government, but it was also accepted by the entire profession and the then opposition, the now government. It is interesting that the government has scrapped that strategy of 2000 and, as a result of that, keeps throwing project after project into a tumble, none of which ever seems to come to fruition.

By early 2011—that is six years away—as a result of the closure of Glenside, there will be a reduction of 100 or more acute mental health beds in Adelaide under this Labor government. That is a reduction of where we are now. We have demand for services through the rapid increase in mental illness with our community, aided and abetted by the increase in drug psychosis, but there will be about a 100 or more acute beds less than what there currently are once it has closed Glenside. There has been a further exacerbation of that problem by the government's decision to stop using the Adelaide Clinic for public mental health patients. The Adelaide Clinic is a private facility owned by Ramsay Healthcare. Traditionally, under the Liberal government and, I think, previous governments before that, when there was an excess demand for mental health acute beds, the Adelaide Clinic was used. This government has stopped using the Adelaide Clinic, which has put even more pressure back onto the public mental health facilities.

The government's own budget papers and documents, though, show the extent to which project after project has been announced but then deferred from one year to the next. I would like to go through the government's own publications and highlight the extent to which this has been done for each

of the major mental health projects. In doing this, I am using the government's own papers. I am using the budget papers from each year where it sets out its proposed capital works program. The government lists the value of the capital works and when the project is due to be completed. I am also using some of the government's own press releases, and I am also using a paper which the Hon. Carmel Zollo was forced to table in another place. She was quoting from a paper, and the other place insisted that, seeing she was quoting from that paper, it should be tabled. She did that very reluctantly, indeed; she clearly understood. It was a detailed briefing paper that had been prepared for her as minister, and it reveals a startling extent to which projects have been delayed, priorities changed and some projects, like the Boylan Ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and the additional acute beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are being dumped altogether.

I will go through project by project and list what has occurred. Firstly, at the Flinders Medical Centre you have the Margaret Tobin Mental Health Unit. This was an announcement by the Premier and Minister for Health in about mid-2002. They claimed that a 40-bed facility would be built. Of course, they did not indicate that 20 of those beds are existing beds at the Flinders Medical Centre, and so there are only 20 new beds actually being constructed. The 2002-03 budget papers state that this Margaret Tobin facility would be finished by June 2004. One year later, the budget papers in 2003-04 show that the completion date has blown out from June 2004 to February 2005.

Again, 12 months later, the budget papers for 2004-05 show that the estimated completion date is now September 2005. In the space of just two years the completion date blew out by some 15 months—from June 2004 to September 2005. The document tabled in the upper house by Carmel Zollo on 5 April this year indicates that the contract for construction was only let in January 2005, which is well beyond the government's completion date as originally put down. A project like this will take at least two years to build from when the contract is let, and to furnish that facility and make it operational. It would be at least two years; it could run out to two and a half years or almost three years. We have seen the completion date blow out from June 2004 to some time early to mid and possibly late 2007. It is a blow out of three years in just that short period. The 2002 budget papers indicated that the estimated cost was \$10.4 million. The Zollo papers show that the cost has now blown out to \$17 million, a 70 per cent increase in just two years in the cost of building that facility. There has been no increase in the size of the facility, but there is a 70 per cent increase in the cost.

I now turn to the Women's and Children's Hospital's Boylan Ward. This project was proposed and funded in my last year as health minister. It was picked up again by the current government in its 2002-03 budget papers where it states that the redevelopment of this mental health ward for adolescents will commence in July 2002 and be completed in March 2006. The Zollo papers (dated this month) indicate that this project has now been dropped altogether. They have redirected the money elsewhere, and there is now no money and no construction time at all for this project. I highlight this, because the Boylan Ward for adolescents is one of the worst mental health facilities in this state, one which should be at the top of the list, not put forward optimistically and then completely dropped in the most recent tabled document.

The third project is the mental health unit at the Repatriation General Hospital. This is a 30 aged acute care bed

facility. This is a project that the former government put forward, and we started its design and planning. These beds were to be relocated from Glenside Hospital. The 2002-03 budget papers state that the project will commence in January 2003 and be completed in June 2003. The 2003-04 budget papers a year later show that the completion date has now blown out to June 2005. In other words, in one year, the completion date blew out by two years, which is astounding. The most recent budget papers of 2004-05 show that the estimated completion time is now September 2005. Construction has not yet commenced. Clearly, for a project of this size (30 acute beds) one would expect the construction to take 18 months and quite possibly two years before it becomes operational. As construction is about to commence shortly, one can say with absolute certainty that the completion date will be, at best, late 2006, which is a delay of 3½ years—not bad for a Labor government to be able to delay a project by 3½ years in just over a three-year period.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They're in chaos, to say the least. I now turn to the mental health facility at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The budget papers for 2004-05 show that this is a 50-bed mental health unit to be commenced in January 2005 and completed in December 2007. In April 2005 the Hon. Carmel Zollo's document reveals that it is a 65-bed facility. There are 35 new beds, as it is to take over or replace 30 existing beds. So, there are only 35 new beds, not 65 which the minister tries to claim on radio time after time, as she also does in respect of the Flinders Medical Centre. The design team for the next stage of the Lyell McEwin Hospital mental health facility has only just been appointed. They have to do the design work, the documentation, the tendering; they have to go to cabinet and public works; and they have to do the construction. This project will not be finished until late 2008 at the very earliest. It is more likely to be 2009 or even 2010. So, this 65-bed facility, of which only 35 are new beds, will not be built for a very long time indeed.

I now turn to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This was to be a 20-bed development, planned for completion in 2008. The 2004-05 budget papers show a planned cost of \$7 million for completion in 2008. So, just 10 months ago they announced this project to cost \$7 million and to be finished by 2008. The Zollo papers (tabled last week in another place) show that this new facility has now been scrapped altogether. So, they have changed their minds once again in the last 10 months.

With respect to the Royal Adelaide Hospital project, which is part of the stage 4 development—a 28 adult acute bed unit to be completed in 2011—the Zollo documents tabled last week show that there is now a revised capacity of 40 beds for completion in 2008. Of those 40 beds, 21 are existing psychiatric beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This project is in the very early design stages and is not expected to be finished until 2008 at the very earliest; it is more likely to be finished in 2009 or 2010.

Regarding the Noarlunga Hospital mental health facility, the budget papers for 2004-05 indicate a 30-bed adult acute mental health facility for completion in 2008. The Zollo papers from last week acknowledge that the design has not yet been commenced and that the cost has blown out from \$6.5 million to \$15.5 million in just 10 months. It just shows the extent to which costs are going through the roof. Projects have been changed in nature and nothing has been done at all.

No mention of the Modbury Mental Health Unit has been made in any of the budget papers for the past three years until now. However, the Zollo papers tabled last week indicate that \$7 million has been redirected from the Women's and Children's Boylan ward to the Modbury Hospital to build a 25-bed facility to replace the existing 19-bed facility and so provide an extra six beds. In March 2005, the Minister for Health admitted that the Glenside Hospital will be closed, and I highlight the fact that, as part of its 2002 election policy, Labor guaranteed that Glenside would be upgraded to become a rehabilitation centre. In a three year period, with no public explanation whatsoever, it has changed from turning Glenside into a rehabilitation centre and upgrading it to now closing it. I highlight the fact that, if you put all those projects together, there will be 100 or more fewer acute mental health beds in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The government's mental health program is in absolute disarray. Not one project has gone anywhere near being started on time. The most important and first project, the Margaret Tobin facility, is now about three or 3½ years behind schedule. The cost has blown out on all the projects. For instance, the Margaret Tobin Centre has gone from \$10 million to \$17 million. The key finding is that in the four years of the Rann government not one single mental health facility put forward by this government will be built and opened, despite the huge demand for mental health services within this state. It is a disgrace and, most importantly, it is the people with mental illnesses who are suffering as a consequence.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I will be specifically referring to my electorate in the grievance debate and talking as shadow minister in relation to the Supply Bill, although I would not describe it as a Supply Bill but an inadequate supply of goods and services and infrastructure to the community of South Australia. The amount sought this year is \$1.7 billion, which is \$200 million more than the amount sought last year, yet when you travel around the state talking to the community, you discover that there is no delivery for that extra money. The Treasurer continually says that he is not awash with money. I would like to know what the government has done with the money because, if you look at disability services, police numbers, road infrastructure, the current condition of schools, what is not happening in our export area, or wherever, there is a lack of delivery and commitment.

What we have seen from this government over the three plus years it has been in office is a lot of spin, rhetoric and talk but very little delivery. It takes a while for a community to wake up to that, particularly when a community has enjoyed successive growth in this state for seven or eight years. I will admit that this government has contributed a small amount but, by and large, it has contributed little to the strong growth in the economy. The strong growth in the economy is as a result of the previous Liberal government being committed to reducing the debt and proper infrastructure planning, including spending over \$1 billion in our last budget year, which is much more than its claim of the record amount of \$900 million plus this year. That is a furphy, anyway, because \$111 million or \$112 million of that was a paper entry swapping the State Fleet into capital works. It was just a smokescreen to try to fool the people of South Australia.

The previous Liberal government took the hard yards to reduce the debt. Initially we were paying 28.06 per cent of

gross state product in interest, but when we left office it was around about 8 per cent. It is now back to about 5 per cent. There has only been a small reduction over that period, although there has been enormous growth in rates, taxes and charges. The community is hurting because they are being bled like you would not believe as a result of paying exorbitant taxes and charges. The Rann-Foley government is the highest taxing state government in the history of this state, yet there is little to show for it.

Last week, I attended a protest meeting at Elder Park about the lack of funds in the disability budget. I heard about the funds needed for the Moving On program and so on from people who care for a loved family who suffers from a disability. Look at what is happening with mental health: it is in disarray around the state. One in five people are affected by mental health, yet there has been a cut in the delivery of services. This government had a policy to deliver 200 extra police. That is a nonsense. I remind members of the Labor Party's police policy at the last election. If members have listened to the rhetoric over the past 2½ years, they will know that it was never going to do any more than keep up with attrition. It was only the continual pressure of the police association, the community of South Australia and the opposition that forced the delivery of those 200 extra police.

The government took its eye off the ball and now it has had to recruit those extra police from overseas. The opposition welcomes those British police officers but they come at a cost to good young South Australians who missed out on becoming police officers because this government did not recruit properly over the past two years. This is an urgent catch-up so that it can go to the next election saying that it has 200 extra police compared with when we were in government. Look at taxation, whether it is land tax, stamp duty or GST windfalls: it has received an enormous amount of extra money. In fact, based on the forward estimates in our last budget papers compared with the current situation, this government has an additional revenue growth to 2004-05 (this current financial year) of \$5 017 million, yet we are not seeing anything happen.

Where would we be if we had not had seven or eight years of strong economic growth? If a government is not spending on infrastructure and the private sector starts to drop off it can cause an enormous implosion of economic activity and one starts to see a negative, downhill run with respect to employment numbers; in other words, there is an increase in unemployment. Because the government has let its infrastructure programs drift away so much I am concerned about what will happen in the next couple of years with respect to jobs. The government might go to the election with a reasonable employment situation, as is the case now, but I say to the South Australian community: wake up to the spin of the Rann government. Wake up to the rhetoric. Look behind the plastic facade, because there is no substance behind the Rann government and the Premier. His total focus is on the media; he is media driven, and the media often fall for that trap. When it gets back to the bottom line, he repeatedly puts out a slightly different aspect of the same press release and gets a run three or four times, but he does not deliver.

One only has to look at the infrastructure plan. What a joke that is. For three years members of the government have been saying that they would bring in an infrastructure plan. When it was released, we saw that it contained 150 pages, which looks impressive. But the devil is in the detail, because there is little by way of a committed infrastructure project. With respect to transport, just this week the Minister for

Infrastructure and the Minister for Transport showed that he has no idea whatsoever what will happen with traffic management and, in particular, the existing bus routes that run through King William Street. He did not seem to understand the question that I put to him today, which was a simple question. I asked, 'If you are going to bring in a new tram line, with a multi million dollar per kilometre expenditure, if you are serious about trying to free up traffic congestion, which is horrendous in Adelaide and the metropolitan area, if you are building that new tram line surely you would have overpasses at South Road, Goodwood Road and Marion Road?'

I drove from Mitsubishi at Tonsley Park today. A small amount of planning work was being carried out, and it took me 25 minutes to travel from Mitsubishi to Anzac Highway. As we were heading towards the tram line on South Road the flashing lights were activated twice, and that held up all the traffic. They have talked about putting an underpass under Anzac Highway. We support that. But if there is not an overpass for the tram, most of the money that will be spent on that will be wasted. That is what I said to the minister today: do the job properly and do it once. The ministers have said to their departments, 'This infrastructure plan is a failure. Give us some sexy projects.' People quickly ran out and said, 'For about \$20 million you can extend the tram line,' and then the announcement was made. That is just one example. Of course, it is not known how many lanes will be lost in King William Street, how the passengers will get on and off the trams or what will happen with respect to the other traffic obstacles that will occur. None of that planning has happened, and the minister has said that he will now look at that. The problem is that they are always announcing and then looking at what they should be delivering and so far, sadly, they have not delivered.

What I am concerned about (and I have said this publicly and I will continue to say it) is that in my own electorate millions of dollars is needed to be spent, which is not being spent. As I said, I support the people who want Moving On programs for their children who, sadly, have a disability, but no money is being allocated there. However, overnight we can find \$4 million every year to appoint two more ministers to shore up the Rann government. The government can find \$4 million overnight for that. We did not need those other two ministers. That \$4 million could have gone into proper support for our community. I make no apology for telling the community about that, because that \$4 million could have been much better spent. We did have a good minister in transport for a while. Whilst I acknowledge that the minister has left the front bench primarily because she wants to spend more time with her family (and I admire her for that, because this place is not easy on families), I am concerned that the minister was not being heard, because this cabinet is controlled by three ministers only. The former minister (the member for Taylor), who is an honourable person, knew that there was not enough money in the transport budget and that we were in a diabolical position. That is a statement of fact. Members can talk to any of the people in Transport SA and they will tell them that there have been cutbacks on a lot of roadworks. We have a \$160 million backlog of roadworks at the moment. We have a decaying bus situation. We have no vision for upgrading our trains. We have no integrated transport plan.

The Minister for Industrial Relations was transport minister for a while before the member for Taylor. He introduced this 'you beaut' transport plan in 2003 as a draft,

and that was supposed to be the blueprint for transport in this state. What is the situation today? That has been thrown away. We have no transport plan. We have a glossy infrastructure plan which is not a transport plan, which does not integrate into a proper visionary transport plan and which does next to nothing to fix the problems we have. We used to be a 20-minute city, but that is no longer the case. If one talks to people who pay the high tax increases for motor registration and fuel, they will tell you that they are disgusted about the lack of money being spent on our roads. In fact, on Saturday night I picked up my nephew, who lives in Sydney. We drove from the airport and we were heading into the good country of the south. We went along Brighton Road over a train line. My nephew said to me, 'Oh, we've just driven over a train line. In Sydney there is no train line within two hours of the city. They are all overpasses or underpasses.' It is the same in Western Australia, Victoria and Queensland. But where are we when it comes to a proper visionary and well funded and well delivered transport and infrastructure plan? We are down the gurgler as a state. I believe that the community will no longer fall for the tricks, the rhetoric and the smokescreens that the Rann government is continually on about.

We will proudly stack up our record at the next election against the non-delivery of this government. I would love to debate any minister in this government on what they have not delivered and what we delivered. And we did it hard. We did it with \$10 billion of core debt. We did it with a massive problem with WorkCover, and we funded it. What has happened now is that we have \$1 billion worth of WorkCover unfunded liability. We did deliver infrastructure. I know that members of the Labor Party have said to a couple of journalists, 'Have a go at Brokenshire on the Wine Centre and the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium.' Where is the Premier now, when things are going well for the Adelaide soccer club down at Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium? We do not hear him knocking it now. We paid for that. The World Police and Fire Games will be held here in 2007, and that will deliver \$30 million to this state. With that one investment, the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium will leave a positive legacy for the community. We build infrastructure, and we have a good record. Labor does not.

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

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill debate. I have just come back from the state launch of the Salvation Army Red Shield appeal in Pirie Street. When you mix with people like the Salvos, you start to realise how lucky we are to be in Australia and South Australia. As members of parliament, we are in a very privileged and powerful position, and we have a huge responsibility to make sure that we conduct ourselves in a responsible way and discharge that responsibility in a responsible way. I will digress for two seconds: the Salvation Army announced that the South Australian population had donated \$1.27 million to the Eyre Peninsula bushfire relief, and that was out of a total of \$1.32 million. So, \$1.27 million came from South Australia alone. South Australians have a big heart; they have fairly deep pockets but, unfortunately, we have a government, and a Treasurer, picking those pockets more deftly than has ever been done before by any state government. We need to look at what this government is doing, where it is going and what it is doing with the truckloads of money that it has. We have heard the figures on

many occasions in this place and, for the sake of clarity in this speech, I will repeat some of the figures that we have heard. State Treasury has truckloads of money.

We hear about the GST windfall. I quickly remind the house that the GST windfall is above the normal state allocation, which I think is about \$3.1 billion or \$3.2 billion, but I am sure that somebody in the government will correct me if I am wrong. The GST windfall is above that yearly allocation and all the GST collected by the federal government is given back to the states. Above that \$3 billion annual allocation the state is going to reap \$1.6925 billion extra between 2003 and 2010, so that is over one half billion extra. In 2004-05 the state government picked up an extra \$160 million; in 2005-06, \$160.9 million; in 2006-07, \$217.8 million. With petrol prices the way they are, the GST that the government is going to collect will be much higher, and I would imagine those figures will be inflated again, so there is a huge amount of money that is coming in from the federal government.

The Treasurer should not bleat too much about having to cut back on some of the bad taxes—taxes that were supposed to be covered under the original agreement—because the money is absolutely pouring in. Not only do we have the GST, but we only have to look back at last year's budget papers to see how much money is coming into this state. I will be very interested to see the budget papers when the budget comes down next month. In property tax alone it was over \$1 billion last year—just under \$3 million a day in property taxes. I will be very interested to see that, even though there has supposedly been a flattening off in sales of real estate in South Australia, property values have still gone up. The Valuer-General estimates an extra 25 per cent on property values in the last financial year. So, I would think that property taxes would still be over the \$1 billion mark, probably getting well over the \$3 million each and every day in property taxes.

In last year's budget, it was over \$1 million a day in stamp duty. With some of those stamp duties supposedly being repealed under the GST agreement (that may go down) that is \$1 million dollars a day. As to gaming taxes, we saw much brouhaha in this place about the reduction in the numbers of poker machines. No doubt, a section of the community is made up of problem gamblers, but the spin that was put on this move by the government is something that I am just very disappointed in because it is not just in the budget, it is also in the Auditor-General's Report that the income from poker machines was going to be an extra \$141 million. If it is not exactly that figure, it is about that figure. The income from pokies and gaming is going up over \$1 million dollars a day. I think it is about \$1.4 million a day. We have \$3 million in property taxes, \$1 million in stamp duty and \$1.4 million in gambling taxes—over \$5 million a day.

I am reliably informed that the AAA rating, that we got back after the former Labor government lost it, is worth about \$5 million a year. It will help in the future borrowings of the state. It is a bit alarming, when you see the amount of money that is coming into this state and the very little that is being spent and the very little that has been achieved by this government, that it is talking about borrowing money already. I had hoped that the new right-wing Labor had learnt something about financial management. We hope we are not going to repeat history here, but there is a truckload of money there. This government really needs to look at how it is going to use that money and make sure it is managing the economy, not just acting like a greedy banker and accumulating money

for the sake of accumulating money and saying, 'Look how good we are. Look at how big our surplus is.' The Supply Bill is a bill that is designed to allocate money for future spending. There is enormous capacity in the budget for prudential spending by this government. I will outline some of those areas a bit later in this speech.

The tax that is being levied by this government is just incredible. We should not forget the River Murray tax. We will have no new taxes but we have the River Murray tax—a very unfair tax in many ways because people are paying the tax on Kangaroo Island, the West Coast, the South-East and, so far, we have not seen much benefit; in fact, we have seen a cut back in spending on the River Murray by the Labor governments around Australia. I find that very disappointing.

Land tax—we have heard a lot about land tax, and huge amounts of land tax have been coming in. This is not a wealth tax. I had a young man come into my office. He was from a Labor electorate. He came in with his wife and two young children who were about 10 and eight years old. He works at Holden's and has a second job. He had scrimped and saved and worked his backside off to buy two other houses as an investment for his children's future but, because of the high land tax that was being levied by this government, he was forced to sell those homes. It is too late to have the reduction now, the homes have been sold and his investment is gone. He told me that he would never vote Labor again.

I had another constituent come in and query the levying of land tax on a deceased estate. That is the next thing we expect from this government (and I hope we do not ever see it): death taxes. It is fair enough to say that the former Liberal government levied this tax as well, but that does not make it right, and I for one will be making sure that I voice my opinion loud and long in our party room and in the shadow cabinet about the way we levy taxes and about the taxes we can reduce or cut because of the income coming into the state.

I think payroll tax is one of the biggest disincentives to employment in this state and, while there have been some reductions there (and they are reasonably sized reductions when lumped all together), for each individual business it is still a whack in the back of the head each time they have to sit down and work out their payroll tax. They are penalised for employing people. It is a huge disincentive and I ask governments of all persuasions to look at the taxes, like payroll tax, that are disincentives to business and to employment, that are general disincentives to work your backside off and risk your money as an owner of a business.

The other thing about land tax that we should remember is that, while we have had significant reductions of about \$200 million, we also have a 25 per cent increase in property valuations. So we are going to have bracket creep and properties are going to go straight back into that area where land tax will be levied at the higher rates, and we will find out that the state's income from land tax is going to be more than significant—it will be an absolute motser.

We have heard a bit about the infrastructure plan over the last few days in here—a lot of brouhaha, a lot of motherhood statements, unfortunately. We saw it in the State Strategic Plan and now we have it in the infrastructure plan. We also had it in the draft state transport plan, and where has that gone to? We have never seen that again. We need to make sure that it is not just plans, it is not just big ideas, not just the biggest and the best and the brightest—because it is not, unless you actually achieve something. The government has so far failed to identify any significant infrastructure project

that has been achieved other than Sturt Street Primary School, where there was a huge cost blow-out.

The trams have been held up as a sign of things to come. Now, everyone in this place and many people outside—particularly in my electorate of Morphett—know that I am a great supporter of public transport, of light rail and trams. However, under this government we have a deadline to get those trams on the rails so that the Premier can go down to the Bay and cut the ribbon when the new trams go down there. Bombardier makes very good trams but we are getting the narrow-gutted version, not the really wide-bodied low-floor ones we should be getting. The track itself will be done up but, again, on the cheap—the rail will be ground off, not replaced with new section rails. So we get an extra kilometre of tram track rather than waiting for the new trams and waiting for a bigger vision of extending light rail right around Adelaide. Sometimes you have to wait, you cannot always have a stage-managed production for the media; sometimes you have to be a little more strategic about what you are doing.

In terms of the State Strategic Plan, unfortunately the motherhood statements do not deliver on the strategies, and there is no evidence tactics are being put in place to deliver us a comprehensive transport plan. I would applaud the government if it came in here and said that there were well-worked out, detailed plans on what is going to be done with the traffic and with the buses, and with the water and sewerage underneath King William Street and North Terrace. If the government came in here with details and said, 'This is what we are going to do, this is how we are going to do it and this is what it is going to cost,' then everyone would be happy and would be very confident about what was happening. Unfortunately, we do not have that. We have some lightweight initiatives and lots of plans that have been scratched together over the last few weeks to make the new minister look like Action Man. But the gloss will wear off very quickly, because you need to produce the goods and we do not see that.

Infrastructure is a huge issue in the area of local government, one of my shadow portfolios. With stormwater infrastructure alone \$160 million was identified, with \$100 million needing to be spent almost immediately. We saw a PAR put in by the Minister for Urban Development and Planning for the Brownhill Creek/Keswick Creek area but, when you looked at the impact of that plan, it was again very ad hoc and we have now seen that plan scrapped. Unfortunately, this government is full of plans and ideas but they need to be worked out before it comes out and announces them. The government really needs to do the right thing about implementing plans: show us how and when you are going to do it and people will understand. They will understand if you are going to dig up South Road at Anzac Highway and put an underpass there if you tell them how you are going to do it, what it is going to cost and when it is going to commence—not out in the airy-fairy of never-never land in two or three or four year's time. That is what we have in the infrastructure plan.

A report—an infrastructure report card—was done for the state and federal governments in 2001. The principal project manager was the Institute of Engineers but there were a number of bodies: the Australian Local Government Association, the Australian Business Foundation, Australian Business Limited, the Australian Railway Association, Australian Ports and Marine Authorities, the Institute of Public Works, the Institute of Engineers Australia, the National Infrastructure

and Engineering Forum, and the Tourism Taskforce. They all got together and produced this infrastructure report for the whole of Australia (and I understand one has been started for South Australia, which I will be very interested to see). This is a signal to people out there that something needs to be done about infrastructure, because let us just look at the report card we have here: electricity was a B minus, gas was a C, telecommunications B, rail D minus, ports B, irrigation D minus, waste water C minus, airports were a B, roads—national C, roads—state C minus, local roads D, potable water C, and stormwater D.

Once again, that comes back to strategic planning and making sure that we put our plans into place. South Australia is a good place to live; it is a good place to work and, in that, I agree with the Economic Update that the government put out in December 2004. 'Adelaide is the best place to do business', it states on the front, and goes on with 'Adelaide's reputation as the best place in Australia to do business has been confirmed.' It continues:

With more than \$14 billion worth of major building and investment projects either underway or planned, there is plenty of evidence that the state's economy is booming.

The state's economy is booming because the federal government has worked its backside off and managed the federal economy. The state's economy is booming because for eight years the Liberal government started out with a huge debt, worked its backside off and got this state back up to where it was. Let us look at the \$14 billion worth of projects here and see whether we can find one that is put up by state government money. I think you will be very surprised.

I will go to the first one: major projects, communications and information technology, project description: broadband infrastructure rollout, \$3 million; broadband Yorke Peninsula, \$1.3 million; EduConnect, \$20 million; South Australian Broadband Research and Education Network, \$9 million; South Australian Computer Aid Despatch, \$33 million; and Agile Communications with broadband infrastructure rollout—that is a private company. I will go through some others: the rollout on Yorke Peninsula—that was managed by local government, the District Council of Yorke Peninsula; Department of Education and Children's Services put up \$20 million for EduConnect, its status is in progress, and we are not sure when it is going to finish—to be honest with you, I am not sure that it has been started; the South Australian Consortium for Information, Technology and Communications was putting in a plan for broadband—\$9.2 million with CSIRO, DSTO, the University of Adelaide, SABRENet Partners—and the South Australia government put a tiny bit in there—there is another huge expenditure that has been put into that \$14 billion. But let us have a look at it: Port Wakefield Ammunition Facility, \$9 million; RAAF Base Edinburgh, \$20 million; RAAF Base redevelopment, \$41.5 million; RAAF Base redevelopment stage two, \$50 million—all of that is federal government money. There is very little state money.

We can keep going through this whole portfolio of major projects. This one is a beauty with a total of five projects to the value of \$795 million (\$0.8 billion): AMCOR expansion of the Gawler wine bottle plant, \$125 million; Berringer Blass bottling facility, \$40 million; cockpit for Mitsubishi, \$10 million; Mitsubishi plant upgrade, \$600 million; photovoltaic panel manufacturing plant, \$20 million. There is no state government money there. We go on and on, and there is just a dribble of state government money being put in there. This government moans and groans about corporate

welfare, but there is an ability to strategically assist companies. We are seeing the ship building at Port Adelaide and hearing talk of a huge ship lift down there. I hope with all my heart that South Australia gets that. Every time I see my federal colleagues, I lobby quite heavily for South Australia to get that ship building project, because it is worth a lot and it means a lot to the state.

This government is rolling in money and should start spending some of it in a strategic, measured way. I do not think that the people in government are idiots but I think that there is a philosophy over there, a state of mind, that, unfortunately, will not let them think outside the square. It will not let them look at the money that they have in the state government coffers or look at the forward income that is coming in from the GST and the projections from state taxation. You need to look at that; you can project ahead. It is not like the funny money, the not real money, that is the WorkCover blowout, according to the minister. This is real income that you can expect. Like running any business, you can project your income, you can do your cash flow budgets, and you can work out what you are going to spend that money on.

I ask this Treasurer to look at that strategically. I am looking forward to a great budget in May that is going to give back to the people of South Australia some of their hard earned money so that their sweat and toil is going to be rewarded, and the pain that this government has put them through is going to be rewarded.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): It is my pleasure also to rise to support the Supply Bill. It always strikes me as odd that this has to be one of the shortest bills that we deal with, and we deal with it every year, of course. The purpose of this bill, in a nutshell, is to place the sum of \$1 700 million—to appropriate it from the consolidated account for the public service of the state for the financial year ending June next year—and that is about all the bill says. It always strikes me as odd that we have so many contributions on this bill, but it is an important opportunity for the parliament to reflect on what it is going to do with the money. As the member for Morphett has already indicated, and as a number of other speakers before that have indicated, this government is probably the wealthiest government that this state has ever seen, both in the actual absolute dollars that it has at its disposal and in real terms comparing like with like from previous years.

The previous Liberal government had to manage this state and, in managing it, it had not just to try to keep all the money and pay off the debt but to manage it in a way that kept it moving forward, to invest in infrastructure, and to try to get things happening. It had to do that as well as reduce a massive debt that was at that stage costing the state something in the order of \$2 million per day, just to pay the interest. By comparison, the current government not only has a vastly reduced debt—and I am glad that it has at least kept that going in the right direction since taking over as government—but, in addition to that, it has had absolutely galloping increases in the valuation of land and, therefore, in the property taxes that it is accumulating, and also huge windfalls in the GST. I think others have already mentioned the sorts of revenue windfalls that are estimated to be something in the order of \$5 billion in the last five years, over and above what was estimated when the Liberals were last in power. So, given those circumstances, I would have expected a Labor government to be actually splashing out and spending

on some infrastructure, and making up for a lot of the areas where—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: I will come to the Minister for Infrastructure's statement. I would have expected that the government could afford to do a lot of the things that many previous governments would have wanted to do, but have not had the opportunity because of their debt situation and the very dire financial situation that this state was placed in. Instead of that, this government has really not spent the money to address the needs of the state. I remember that I was a backbench member when the economic development summit was originally held and I was lucky enough to be invited as one of very few members of parliament invited to attend. It was clear from that that people felt and recognised that it was necessary to actually spend money to run a government. It is not running the economy effectively to simply stop spending money, and that seemed to be what the Treasurer of this state wanted to do. In his zeal to obtain that AAA rating, he was forgetting that running the state involves a lot more. In particular, of course, in my portfolio areas, the social justice areas of families, communities, disability services and housing, are three areas which all have incredible needs.

I have said in this place before that the area of need, in disability particularly, is a generational one, which I think we are going to have to address. I know that on the radio this morning they were talking about generational change because of our ageing population. I have recognised that for a considerable time as well, and I do think that we need to address the issues relating to the ageing of our population. But, also, specifically in the area of disability, we need to address this generational change, because up until the past 50 years or so people did not bring home from institutions their profoundly disabled children.

In the last little while that is what we have been doing, and the result is that now we have these profoundly disabled adults whose parents have an absolute crying need to have the issue addressed as to what is going to happen to their children once they become too frail, elderly, too ill, or simply die, and can no longer look after their children. It is a generational issue that our generation is going to have to deal with and, largely, that is going to require us to do some things in the area of infrastructure for that sector.

I know that many of you would be familiar with the campaign that has been run by the Dignity for the Disabled group. I have attended a number of functions in support of that group. The group started out, of course, simply looking at the area of the Moving On funding, that is, the funding to continue to pay for the care and costs involved in providing activities and support for young people who have a disability, who have finished their formal schooling and thereafter are not actually able to go to work, even in a sheltered workshop. Sometimes they might manage a little bit of work in a sheltered workshop but, basically, if they do not have that Moving On program, they cannot do anything for their days and days at home. They lose a lot of what they have learnt at school; they lose a lot of their skills; and they lose their peer group and support from being stuck just at home.

The added consequence of that equation is that the parents of those people often end up having to give up their employment. From speaking to them, it is often employment that is actually not so much for the financial benefit that it brings, but because it gives the parents a chance to get out and experience something of life further to looking after their

child. Many of these children are so profoundly disabled that they are really a 24 hour day job, and these parents are often at their wits' end. In fact, in the past few months, I have spoken to mothers who have told me that they have considered murder/suicide because they are so drained by looking after a profoundly disabled child. I cannot imagine what it must be like to be woken 20 times a night to have to turn a child over, to have to change your 20 year-old son's nappies, or to do all of the things that all of these parents do.

In my view, as a society we should be thinking these people for the gift for they give their children, and it is a gift to our society as well, because if they were not looking after them at home those children would be institutionalised, and that would be at an enormous cost to the state. Therefore, in my view, we should be looking to say a very big thank you to them when they get to the point where they can no longer manage it. Indeed, more than one of them has actually said to me, 'We would just like to retire.' These parents will go on caring for their children until the day they die, or can simply no longer physically manage it.

There are enormous needs in all of these sectors of the portfolios for which I have a shadow responsibility. These areas need to be addressed. I have parents in my electorate who have fostered profoundly disabled children, and when the mother has become ill and the father is ageing, the department has simply refused to do anything to assist the parents to look after these children who they have had their foster care for many years because the department has simply become reliant on them having the care of the children. The Dignity for the Disabled group has actually prepared a list of the sort of amount of funding which would be required to address the major shortfalls in the funding of just the disability in the state.

It comes to not much short of \$100 million including: addressing urgent residential care for 260 people on the waiting list—\$22 million; early intervention for four and five year olds—there are 100 on the waiting list, and it is another \$2.2 million; and Moving On alone is \$3.2 million. Highlighting that issue of Moving On, I know that the minister made an announcement about providing Moving On for the current school leavers but that, again, does not address the issue. It does not provide the full Moving On service that is needed by those who have already left school and have an unmet need. And nor does it address the ongoing need for the next year and the year after that. For respite care there are 1 000 on the waiting list at a cost of \$6.8 million.

Respite care is something that we do not even begin to comprehend how needed it is. As I said, I cannot imagine having to look after even one, let alone more than one, of these profoundly disabled children, and doing it day in and day out. Often these children have been fostered because their own birth parents have simply said they cannot manage it, and these incredibly caring people take on the long-term care of these children. But then, when they do something as simple as saying, 'Look, we'd like a week off,' they cannot find places to put them in respite.

On one occasion they were asked to pay \$1 000 to put their two children into respite so that they could go to Sydney to visit their fully functional natural born child whom they had raised earlier. I am pleased to say that when the Hon. Steph Key was the minister she addressed that issue following an approach from me, but it is simply not good enough if the system requires people to go begging to their MP who in turn has to go begging to the relevant minister in order to get an issue addressed.

Elderly and aged disability care has 300 people on the waiting list, and a further \$4.6 million is needed; community care—300 on the waiting list and \$2.8 million needed; family care—140 on the waiting list and \$2.1 million needed. I will not go right through the list, but I will point out some of the bigger ones. Physical disability services need another \$8.5 million, and autism needs a further \$7.2 million. The Autism Association has spoken to me and no doubt to other members of this place about their needs, because it is clear that, if one can identify autism early enough, early intervention programs can make a significant difference to the outcomes for those children. This applies to a whole range of other disability areas as well, but in particular autism needs a lot more funding than it is getting at the moment. A whole series of these is listed by Dignity for the Disabled, totalling, as I said, \$97.4 million—and that is just in the area of funding needs for specific organisational areas within the disability sector.

I was puzzled when I opened up the infrastructure plan last week to the section on community services and housing, because it tries to link it to South Australia's strategic plan objectives. The first thing I read was the strategic plan objective of increasing investment in strategic areas of infrastructure such as transport, ports and energy. I am sure that all those people who have a child in a wheelchair who needs respite care or special attention will be very impressed with that particular objective. It goes no way towards addressing the issues.

As I think the Leader of the Opposition said when he was talking about the infrastructure plan, it is full of motherhood statements. It makes all sorts of comments about what the needs are likely to be, and it goes on to give some strategic priorities. In the area of disability, for instance, the only strategic priority listed (page 120) is to complete the transition from institutional to community-based housing facilities providing residential care for people with mental illness and disabilities. When one reads further through the community services and housing section, that turns out to be the only thing for which some money is specified in the infrastructure plan.

It refers to the need to rebuild the Strathmont Centre and provide community accommodation for the 150 people who currently reside there. I want to say a couple of things about that. First, I agree there needs to be community housing for a number of people, but it must be remembered that not every person is appropriate to be moved from the institutional care in Strathmont to community housing. I have been approached by a number of people who have family members (mostly their own children) living in Strathmont. They have lived there for a number of years, and these people are very concerned about the idea that their family members might be forced to move into community housing, because they are simply not capable of coping with that sort of structure. They think we should rethink some of our priorities. I gather from the infrastructure plan that the intention is to move everybody out into community housing.

There are some areas where I think there should be some movement, such as a replacement facility for the Magill Training Centre. As a member of the juvenile justice select committee I have visited Magill with the committee, and I cannot stress strongly enough the urgent need to replace this centre. I take my hat off to the people who work there who do their very best with an institution that is so far outdated that it deserves to be pulled down immediately. My recollection is that it was due to be replaced some little time ago. In

fact, money was supposedly set aside for it in earlier budgets, yet it appears in the infrastructure plan as simply a priority 2 (not a priority 1) and, even then, all that is said is that they will investigate a replacement facility for the Magill Training Centre. That seems to me to be way too slow in coming, and it really does not address this urgent need when the government has money to do so.

One other thing that I want to mention quickly is the issue of wastage of this government's money. Members will be aware that at the end of March the Australians Aiding Children Adoption Agency closed down. I went to the wake that was held on the last day (31 March) at the premises. I wish the minister had been there to see it, because literally hundreds of people, very satisfied customers of that agency, turned up. We were the only state that had a private agency running our overseas adoption services and, by all accounts, they did it very well. What is more, they did it at very little cost to the government. It was costing the government about \$43 000 a year to support the agency, and the agency ran the entire regime, dealing with all these satisfied parents with their beautiful adopted children, for about another \$650 000 a year, which they generated themselves through fees, etc. They would have been more than happy if that agency had continued but, instead of that, the minister decided, for reasons best known to the minister but which, apparently, at the end of the day, had more to do with his philosophy about institutions versus agencies, that this agency had to close down.

Rather than the private sector managing our overseas adoptions at very little cost, it will now be done within a government department and at a much higher cost. I have heard estimates as high as \$1.5 million for this government to run what was costing it only \$43 000 until now. That seems to me to be a nonsensical move on the part of a government and one which is very wasteful of money that could well be spent more effectively in some of the areas of need that I mentioned earlier.

One of the other things I mention before finishing my comments is that another significant area of wastage is the amount of money that this government has spent on ministerial staff and in appointing an extra two ministers. The figure that I have usually heard is that it has cost about \$2 million for each of those ministers. That is \$4 million that we could have spent much more effectively in providing some assistance in the disability sector. Similarly, regarding the number of people employed as ministerial staff and, indeed, as I think the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, the number of so-called fat cats—the people on salaries over \$100 000 within the public sector—those monies could much more readily have been spent to benefit the people in the development of assistance in the disability sector.

Lastly, I comment briefly on the transport area as it relates to my portfolio—that is, the issue of Access Cabs. The transport area should do much more to address this issue. It is a crying need within the disability sector—

Mr Koutsantonis: Access Cabs are doing a great job.

Mrs REDMOND: Access Cabs, as the member for West Torrens says, do an absolutely superb job, but they are stretched beyond the limit of what they can reasonably manage—

Mr Koutsantonis: What is the solution?

Mrs REDMOND: The solution would be more cabs in the system, and I would like to see such an improvement.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. The member for Stuart.

Ms Breuer: Good member. This will be the highlight of the night.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is out of order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Tomorrow on the 10-minute one. I support the Supply Bill, which is to appropriate money for the general services of the people of South Australia. It is important that those services are fairly and evenly spread across the state. There is a need in my constituency for continuing expenditure on road construction, whether it be the road between Blanchetown and Morgan or whether it be the road from Lyndhurst to Marree. Some real consideration needs to be given to starting to seal the road to Moomba, which is one of the most important roads in the state. That area of expenditure, in my view, is exceptionally important and I want to see money spent on it.

There is a need to ensure that people living in isolated parts of the state receive a fair and adequate education and have access to educational facilities for their children. There is also a need for good health services. One of the great challenges both state and federal governments will have to face is the provision of services for the aged and the elderly. There will be a need to spend more state and federal money in this area. It will be something which will not happen slowly: it will descend upon us very quickly. People are entitled to live the last part of their life in their own localities and with their friends and relatives. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that those services be provided. It is a good thing for those communities as well, because it also creates employment opportunities, and therefore the need to make an investment in that area is long overdue.

There is an ongoing need to continue to improve other infrastructure, particularly in the area of tourism, which is very important in my electorate. There is a need to upgrade transport systems so that the products we produce are quickly and efficiently taken to the ports. Obviously there is a need to improve our ports in this state. As one of those people who, at the time, had a little to do with the privatisation of Ports Corporation and ensuring that an adequate facility was built, my actions did not endear me to certain of my colleagues; however, I did what I believed—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not always do that. I believed that it was in the interests of the people of South Australia to ensure that money was invested, because we need to export our motor cars, wheat, wool and so forth on a competitive basis. It is terribly important if we are to have employment opportunities for the next generation of South Australians. I believe that we need to encourage mineral exploration across the state. We also have to look at desalination of our water supply. I really do believe that we have to increase and to assist people as they are doing in Western Australia. There is a program operating in Western Australia under which, if people replace diesel water pumps with solar pumps, they get some assistance from the state government. I think it is a very good scheme, because solar pumps are certainly being used across the northern parts of the state.

As one pastoralist said to me a few weeks ago, 'We have plenty of blue sky here', and therefore solar technology should be advanced. It is just as cheap to put in a solar pump as it is to put in a windmill today. Therefore, we need to encourage it and we need to ensure that the technology continues to be advanced because, hopefully, we can use it in other areas. These systems actually follow the sun and, if members have not seen these particular facilities, they are

worth looking at. The technology is advancing so quickly. It is similar to the technology that is now used to monitor pumps and to turn them on and off remotely by using UHF radios. It is great technology and much of it has been developed in South Australia. We need to encourage and enhance it, because we can then ensure that our operators are as efficient as anyone in the world.

I do not want to say any more this evening. I think it is very important that the revenue the state government has is wisely invested. I am very pleased about these large amounts of money coming back to South Australia from the GST revenue. It is a guaranteed source of funding, which I believe all state governments require, because the general purpose and role of state governments is as a provider of services. To provide those services they have to have an adequate source of revenue. We will probably argue about how we collect it and where we put it but, at the end of the day, there are basic services that must be supplied—whether it is in education, health, transport or whatever—which no-one else can supply if the state government does not do so. Therefore, as a group that is in pretty close contact with the people, we know where it should be spent. I encourage the government to do so.

The other important element is that, no matter how often ministers criticise the previous government, it left the state's finances in a sound position. I suggest to them, when they criticise the previous state government, that they should have a look at the last budget papers and the graph contained therein and see what the debt was going to be in a couple of years. I support the measure. I hope that the money is well invested and will provide badly needed services across the whole of the state.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I also rise to support the Supply Bill. I would like to reflect on this government's three years of stewardship over the South Australian economy. In less than a few months' time the Rann Labor government will present its last budget before the 18 March 2006 election. We all know that March will be a very busy period, but I trust that the people of South Australia will reflect on the lack of delivery by the Rann Labor government and how it has not kept its promises. Now is the appropriate time to reflect upon and assess this minority government's performance and whether it has delivered on its promises and properly responded to the needs of South Australians and the South Australian economy.

It is worth comparing this government's three years with the previous three years of the federal government. We know that in October the Australian electorate once again entrusted the Howard government with another three-year term. It did so because of the government's stewardship over the economy. During the previous three years the Howard government presided over a highly successful national economy, with solid employment and export growth. In South Australia, the last three years should have been a time of maximising opportunities, delivering services and restructuring for the future. Instead, the Rann government has presided over increasing costs for power and essential services, unmet needs in health and education, divisive debate on our legal system and soaring property-based state taxes. Even with the tough stand on law and order, people feel less secure in the community—

Mr Koutsantonis: Crime is down, at 7 per cent across the state.

Mr SCALZI: The member for West Torrens said that crime is down—

Mr Koutsantonis: And 200 more police.

Mr SCALZI: Try telling that to the community. Latest export figures show that South Australia's performance is the worst of all states, including Tasmania. Over the last three years, South Australia's exports fell by 15 per cent, despite national growth. Likewise, the boasts of the Rann government over budget surpluses and AAA ratings leave a sour taste with a community bearing the brunt of increasing costs, alarming levels of school absenteeism and lengthening hospital waiting lists.

I have an ageing electorate. There are now 6 300 people waiting for orthopaedic surgery in South Australia. Another area of concern is skill shortages. Although the federal government is responding with funding for technical colleges and a range of incentives, we in South Australia must remember that the main responsibility for training and further education—as with hospitals and schools—lies with the Rann state government. With record windfalls in GST revenue and land tax collections this year of \$282 million, which is over double the land tax collection just three years ago, the government has no excuses for inaction.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

Mr SCALZI: I think the member for West Torrens protesteth too much. Again, if we look at that pledge card by Premier Rann, the education premier—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The member for Hartley is being discourteous by using the Premier's name rather than his position or his seat.

The SPEAKER: As I heard it, he was saying 'Premier Rann'.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That is out of order.

The SPEAKER: It is borderline. The member for Hartley should refer to the electorate or the title. It is one of those grey areas. The member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI: I think everyone in South Australia knows that we are talking about the Rann government.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Colton interjects, and I must say—

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley knows that interjections are out of order, so he should not respond to them.

Mr SCALZI: We were supposed to have a family friendly government and, since we are still here in the evening, I think the interjections from the government at times do help to—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: But when we think of this government, it is a win-win-win situation. It is a win for the left, the centre left, the right; it is a win for the Independent member for Mount Gambier; it is a win for the member for Chaffey: but it is a pity that it is a loss for the community and the economy of South Australia. This is a government, and a Premier, for all factions. As I said, the left wins, the right wins, the centre left wins but, unfortunately, the community of South Australia loses. That is the win-win that I was talking about, and the member for West Torrens should know, because he is one of the losers. He should know because he is still at the back.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley needs to come back to the substance of the Supply Bill. I think he is getting a bit outside the scope of the bill.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Enfield has a point of order.

Mr RAU: I think this is a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think the member for Hartley was not reflecting fairly on the member for West Torrens because the member for West Torrens is, in fact, in the middle; I am actually at the back along with the member for Colton. I think he is pushing—

The SPEAKER: Order! Some members will be in the 'left right out' faction if they are not careful. The member for Hartley has the call. That was not a point of order: that was just a point of interruption.

Mr SCALZI: Maybe the member for Enfield has a point, because with this government it does not matter whether you are at the back or in the middle, you will never be put in the front unless it suits the government. This is a government that cannot rule from within the Labor Party; it cannot rule within itself. It is a minority government that did not get over 50 per cent of the votes. It could not get 50 per cent of the members in this chamber and had to make arrangements with the factions—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is still straying from the bill. It is the Supply Bill. I remind all members that this is the Supply Bill: it is not a grievance debate. Members should talk about supply and related matters.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order regarding tedious repetition.

The SPEAKER: Order! Repetition is not uncommon in this place, but it is not to be encouraged.

Mr SCALZI: As a teacher, I think that repetition is a prerequisite to learning depending on the students, and I have assessed my class well.

Mr Rau: Your next point is?

Mr SCALZI: My next point is that there would be no Supply Bill if it were not for the support of the factions and the Independents coming together to form a government to allow this government to continue.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is out of order.

Mr SCALZI: What concerns me is this: I do not doubt that, on the night of the election, this government might have had good intentions, but it has been very shallow in its delivery. Whenever it is put under pressure, it resorts to the past and tells us how terrible the privatisation of ETSA was, how it found the economy in disarray and how it has put things together again to make sure that things are really moving along. When we go behind the hype and the spin, we find that very little has been done. We have the Minister for Infrastructure, and I am sure that there is a hole in the ground where he stands because of his continuous spin and weight. I am sure it must have put a hole in the platform. The government takes credit for the state of the economy, the AAA rating and the low level of unemployment when, in reality, it is piggy-backing on the federal government's success over the last three years. Now that we are going into difficult unchartered waters, it cannot piggy-back any longer and will have to start making some decisions of its own. This will be the telling point for this minority, coalition government that has put everything together in a win-win situation for all the factions in the Labor Party and for the Independents who support it.

I am sure that when they face the Ides of March next year, on 18 March, when they know that they are here because of the arrangements that were made to enable them to govern, when they are like a soccer team that has won the World Cup

because of a controversial decision by the referee giving them a penalty, when they know about the rematch on 18 March and they know that they do not have—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley seems to be taking somewhat of a gypsy approach to the bill. He seems to be wandering. He needs to come back and talk about supply, and not worry about the World Cup or FIFA or anything else like that.

Mr SCALZI: I am responding to the member for—

The SPEAKER: Well, the member for Hartley should not respond to anyone.

Mr SCALZI: I am really concerned about what this has cost the South Australian people in non-deliveries in health, education or law and order. We are in such difficulty that we are still having problems getting the 200 police, and we have had to go overseas.

But I will go back to taxes, health, police and schools. The benefits to South Australia from the GST deal of 2003-04, 2007-08 is \$860 million. Land tax collection this year is \$282 million—over double the land tax collected just three years ago. According to Treasury figures, the Rann government—and it is the Rann government, the member for West Torrens is confusing me about whether I can use the word 'Rann', but I am sure he prides himself on that—is now the highest taxing government in the history of South Australia.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Every government is.

Mr SCALZI: Every government is, the Treasurer says—at least he admits it. So, why do we have the highest rate of unplanned readmissions in our hospitals and the worst emergency department waiting times of all Australian states (and that is from Productivity Commission Report on Government Services 2005)? Why do we have the planned closure of Glenside mental health facility against the recommendation of the Margaret Tobin review, and why do we have the lowest amount of money spent per head on police in Australia (just \$230 compared with the national average of \$259)?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

Mr SCALZI: Why do we have retention rates for year 10 to 12 students in government schools still below 2002 levels, and statewide delays and deferrals of maintenance and capital works projects in schools? As a former member of the Public Works Committee, I know how many times we met with the previous chair and speaker—

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I had a good attendance. With all this money, the lack of projects now is a pity. In the past we had a little and did a lot: the problem with this government is that it has a lot but is doing a little. There is little to support this government trying to tell us that its priorities are health and education. It has not delivered on that card, that pledge, that went out before the last election.

There are skills shortages, especially in the trades, and with an ageing population and a projection of as few as three workers for each retired person by 2025 it is vital that we look at initiatives that encourage the retention of older workers in the work force, skilled immigration and, most importantly, training for our own young people in South Australia. I have been trying to highlight the problem of a shortage in courses in South Australia, where our young people have to go interstate to complete, for example, their locksmith training. Only tonight I was talking on the phone

to a young 20-year old who told me that it cost him \$700 for the two week block, which he has to pay up front and then he gets \$240 back from the government—even the fares they only get back when they return. And this is a government that says it will support young people and wants them to come back, yet they have to go interstate and they are getting half the rate of support that they get in Tasmania! This calls for a reconsideration of priorities.

Regarding traineeships and apprenticeships commencements, I will read from the annual report tabled by the minister today:

In the year to 30 June 2004, the department approved 20 400 contracts of training for trainees and apprentices. This is 400 fewer than the number approved in the year ending 30 June 2003.

Although there is an increase in the traditional trades, it is still 400 less than the year ended 30 June 2003. This is their commitment to young people.

When the government finds itself in trouble, and can no longer depend on the former speaker, it panics. We all know about the bill that we had to have, the bill that we did not have, and the bill that (thank God) we do not have to pay for—the parliamentary privileges bill. That would have gone down the gurgler if it had been supported.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for West Torrens might want to read Professor Dean Jaensch's article of Thursday 7 April on parliamentary privilege.

Mr Koutsantonis: Is he a locksmith?

Mr SCALZI: He might not be a locksmith but he might unlock your memory—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CAICA (Colton): I find the supply debate very interesting. I have sat through a couple now, and it seems to me that all I have heard from the opposition is whingeing, whining and carping. I have never heard what the opposition of this moment can put forward—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr CAICA: As the honourable member interjects, I can only talk about this parliament—it is the only one that I have been in. The only witness and experience that I have is the whingeing and carping opposition. From the South Australian electors' perspective, they are definitely being let down by an opposition that purports to be an alternative government. It is not putting up any alternative at all. All we hear is complaints. For goodness sake, at least tell us, or tell the people of South Australia, what you are going to do. Even the leader tonight talked about land tax and another couple of issues. What did he talk about?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: No, the Leader of the Opposition. He said, 'What will we do if we get elected? We will have a review.' There is one candidate that is running for the opposition who, seemingly, has some ideas. Talk to Nigel Smart, the candidate for Norwood; he says, 'I can fix land tax. That is simple. I can fix electricity but I won't let the answer out yet. I will wait until I am elected. No, I won't say anything now. Wait until I'm elected.' So, maybe he should be at the front bench now, because at least he says that he has some ideas. We have not heard them. He is an example of what the opposition is like at the moment. They do not have an idea about any-

thing—whingeing, whining, carping, complaining. What is your policy? You are a policy free zone.

I could stand here and continue in the same vein as the opposition, that is, whine and whinge and carp about them, but I am much more positive than that. I will not focus whining and whingeing about what a terrible and pathetic opposition they are. What do they want us to do? They want us to spend more money but they have no ideas of their own. They say only that we should be spending more money in this area or that area. They will not tell us what their ideas are: they are only telling us that our ideas are bad. At least we have some ideas. For goodness sake, how are you going to pay for all the promises that you make? I cannot wait—bring on the election—. There is a policy free zone. The opposition has no ideas, it has no vision, and it certainly has no leadership. I am not going to be sucked in by the opposition on this occasion. I am not going to focus on the negativity that they are trying to engender in this chamber. I am going to focus on some of the many positives that the people of South Australia can see with our government.

Mr Williams: Tell us about it.

Mr CAICA: I am about to.

Mr Williams: You have done nothing but whinge, whine and carp.

Mr CAICA: I have not. I will start with health.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr CAICA: It is one of the very important issues that underpin the difference between us and the opposition, that is, our commitment to health and our commitment to education. They are fundamental differences, and the people of South Australia will realise that at the time of the next election. They will be able to see the differences between our government and that which purports to be an opposition and an alternative. Look at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a hospital near and dear to my heart, where I was born almost 48 years ago; it is very sad to say that that was 48 years ago but it is a fact. It is an outstanding hospital in the western suburbs. What was it that the opposition wanted to do to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? There was promise, promise, promise, redevelopment, renovation—seven promises. Seven times they promised to fix the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and what did we see? Eventually we saw a bit of petty cash go through to, perhaps, renovate that hospital.

What was the vision of the opposition? That vision was to transform that hospital into a community hospital—to do away with the tertiary teaching in that hospital, to do away with the excellent services that it provides to the people of the west and, in fact, to the people of South Australia. It was absolutely shameful. What has the government done? It has not only committed to stages two and three with respect to the redevelopment of that hospital but it has put in \$120 million extra to ensure that that hospital is brought back to a standard that is appropriate, not simply to serve the people of the western suburbs but to serve the people of South Australia. We have a vision with respect to health—the Generational Health Review. We have a vision, and that hospital will be returned to its glory, unlike what the opposition wanted to do with it, that is, to transform it into a community hospital—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: That is right; mainly a car park. We are going to ensure that the hospital has teaching facilities, has a full range of services, focuses on its area of speciality and, indeed, continues to ensure that there is first class research at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. But it will not only be the Queen Elizabeth Hospital because you cannot talk about the

Queen Elizabeth Hospital in isolation: you have to look at the health system as a whole, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be a component of the overall delivery of health services in this state. It is part of the tapestry. I will focus quickly on mental health. We look at what the previous government did with respect to mental health. It de-institutionalised mental health without ensuring that there were support services out there to support them. We inherited a nightmare with respect to mental health—an absolute nightmare. We are committed to fixing it, and we will.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Because of what we were left with, it is going to take a long time. There is no doubt about that, and I thank the member for Bragg for her interjection. It will take us a long time, but we do not underestimate the work in front of us for a variety of reasons, not the least being what we were left with by the previous government. It is going to take some effort but we are committed to doing it. When we talk about public works, we have seen the Margaret Tobin mental health facility come before us, and we have seen a whole host of issues relating to mental health, which we are committed to fixing. It is not an easy task, and it will not be an easy task, and it is best that we confront that challenge with the support of the opposition, not with the whingeing and carping that has been evident since it has been in opposition.

I will refer now briefly to transport. We heard my colleague the member for West Torrens talk about the infrastructure plan and its relationship to transport to which this government has committed. More importantly, he was correct in what he said. We look at the CityWest connector road, and we look at the work that is being done with respect to freeing up the bottlenecks that occur on South Road. For seven or eight years of the Liberal government, what did the people of the western suburbs get with respect to their transport needs?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr CAICA: They got Steve Condous; they got a member who was going to cross the floor, and lay in front of the trucks before they built the boat harbour. That is what they got. With respect to their infrastructure and transport needs, what did they get? Diddly-squat. We have a plan, and the plan is about how we are going to improve the lot, not only for the people of the western suburbs, but the people of South Australia with respect to their transport needs. Nothing happened in the previous eight years. We have a vision with respect to South Road; we have a commitment to fix the Bakewell Bridge; and we have a commitment to the CityWest connector. We have a commitment to make things better.

I do not know how often the member for Bragg actually travels to the western suburbs, but she should go down past Bunnings and have a look at what is happening down there. It is something that would never ever have happened under her government previously, and it would not happen if she were in government today. It is a Labor government that has been able to deliver that.

One of the things I find very interesting about the opposition's comments in relation to our commitment to infrastructure was its slagging of everything that we have done. I am pretty sure that we committed to the deepening of the Port, and we have committed to the bridges—we have a plan. I find it very interesting that, at the time of the sale of the Ports Corp in 2001, there was—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr CAICA: No. Well, I will tell you about it. In fact, I have not got to education yet, but I will get to that in a

minute, and that will give us another shameful example of the inability of the previous government to do anything on behalf of the people of the western suburbs. I will get to that. I thank you, but I will get to that in a minute. With respect to the sale of the Ports Corp in November 2001, there was some discussion about the depth of the Port. At that stage, there was no decision to increase the depth. In fact, there was a decision in June 2002, that is, seven months later to deepen the Port.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Well, it was us; and we made the decision to deepen the Port. Thank you very much for that interjection. Back in November 2001, who was in government?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr CAICA: It was the current opposition in its rightful place today. In November 2001, the sale of the Ports Corp occurred, and there was seemingly no decision to deepen the Port at that particular stage. Seven months later, in June 2002, there was a decision to do it, and what we have seen—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr CAICA: The point is that I am not quite sure that the previous government undertook due diligence with respect to a lot of matters related to the deepening of the Port and other issues associated with the future success of the Port at the time of the sale. I cannot quite work out what occurred in seven months that did not make the deepening of the Port necessary in November 2001, but made it necessary in June 2002. At that stage there were a whole host of issues that were associated with the Port that would optimise benefit of the relating infrastructure, such as the Port River Expressway. Interestingly, though, the expressway was independently conceived and justified before the need to deepen the channel, when they are all supposed to be linked. So, I am not quite sure where the opposition was at. I am not quite sure—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: No; it was not. It only became an expressway since we have been in government. I am not quite convinced that they had their head around what the Port was actually about, and whether, indeed, they had a vision. That is the point that I have been trying to make. There has been no vision; there has been no foresight whatsoever. I am very proud of this government's commitment, and the commitments we have made with respect to infrastructure projects in this state, not the least of which is that which relates to the Port of Adelaide.

I will move on and talk briefly about the environment. It was only this government that committed to the marine parks, and they are ongoing. We know that the first one is about to be proclaimed.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Well, you committed to a lot of things. You committed to the future redevelopment of the QEH, but what did we get? We got zip. You committed to Henley High School's redevelopment on four, five, six occasions. What did we get? We got zip. We did not get anything at Henley High School from the previous government with respect to—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Well, you will be invited well before 2008. In fact, if you would like—I think the member for Bragg is the shadow minister for education, so she should have her head around it—I can organise a visit to Henley High School to allow you to see what is going on, it would be my pleasure to do that, then you can come before this house and say—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Well, only if the electors for Bragg decide, but I am not quite sure you will. The member for Bragg did talk about education. I am very proud of the fact that we reduced class sizes from reception through to year three, and that we are working very hard towards the retention rates of schools. I think that we are doing a very good job. Everything I say when I say we are doing a good job—my mum used to say self praise is no recommendation, and she is absolutely correct—in regard to the job we are doing, I always look at it and say, 'We can do better.' I know that we have a vision and a plan that will enable us to do better; it is better, and it is a work in progress. With respect to Henley High School, come down and talk to the people at Henley High School. They are very pleased that, after successive promises from the previous government, it was the Labor government that finally committed to a redevelopment of Henley High School. We are very pleased and proud of the fact. It will not—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Well, the previous member could not do it, but I am happy to say that I played a part in delivering that. We can talk about law and order. We put money into law and order with 200 new police officers, the introduction of hoon legislation, and we are keeping known criminals in gaol longer, and it is more appropriate that we do so. The opposition talked about land tax. We have heard through Nigel Smart that it has a plan about land tax, and it is easily fixed. I have not heard anything come from the mouths opposite.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: At least we have made a difference with respect to land tax in this state, and all we hear from the other side is rhetoric. I will conclude my remarks shortly.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: That is an interesting comment that I think the others should pick up. Twenty minutes is the maximum time. That does not mean that you have to speak for that length of time. Quite a few people ring my office. I conduct a number of community meetings, I interact with my electorate very well, I think I am closely connected with my community—and I am sure they will vouch for that. What I hear is that the Labor government is doing a good job. I know you hate to hear that, but that is what I hear: the Labor government is doing a good job. I am assuming that that is reflected elsewhere, and I am sure that members of the opposition are probably getting calls like that, because I do not get any calls saying, 'You're doing a horrible job, we want you out.'

I get people saying, 'It's a breath of fresh air to have a government that is actually trying to make a difference.' More than trying to make a difference, we are making a difference. We have runs on the board, and that will show up at the next election. Some of the people I meet suggest that we are doing an excellent job, not just a good job—and I am pleased to hear that. As I said earlier, we have plans in progress, and I know those plans will result in our doing an even better job. I do not need to speak for 20 minutes, and I advise others that they do not have to either.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Mr Deputy Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your elevation to your position. I rise to support the Supply Bill.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I can say one thing to the member for West Torrens: my speech will be a lot more positive and to the point than his. This afternoon I had the unfortunate experience of sitting upstairs in my office with the speaker

going—I should have turned it off earlier—and I heard the contribution of the member for West Torrens. If it wasn't for the fact that he speaks often, I could honestly say that I have not heard a worse speech.

In supporting this Supply Bill for which \$1.7 billion has been appropriated, I point out that that is \$200 million more than was appropriated in the same piece of legislation 12 months ago. That is a 12 per cent increase.

Mr Koutsantonis: A growing economy.

Mr WILLIAMS: 'A growing economy', says the member for West Torrens. I wish! And I bet he wishes too! The reality is that we do not enjoy a growing economy in South Australia in the way that we should.

Mr Koutsantonis: Tell that to Nick Minchin. He disagrees with you.

Mr WILLIAMS: Just listen to what I say. I did the honourable thing, I sat and listened to as much of your speech as I could stomach in my office.

Mr Koutsantonis: I will sit here and interject.

Mr WILLIAMS: Sit there and interject all you like, you won't put me off telling the truth. I said that the economy is not growing the way it should be. We enjoyed a very robust economy, which was growing very strongly, a few years ago but unfortunately that has turned around.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I will probably use most of my 20 minutes. Most members of the government have been whingeing, whining and carping for the last three years. In fact, they have been so busy whingeing, whining and carping that they have not got on with the business of the government. I want to bring to the attention of the house some of the opportunities that have been lost in South Australia over the last three years, but before I do that I want to correct a couple of things that members such as the member for West Torrens and the member for Colton have talked about: that is, the lack of public works infrastructure built in the western suburbs over the time of the previous government.

I invite any member to have a look at the parliamentary standing committee web site and look up the Public Works Committee, because every project that is worth more than \$4 million that is built by the government of South Australia has to go through the Public Works Committee, and they are listed on this web site. Members will see that from the time of the 1997 election to the change of government in early 2002, no fewer than 114 reports emanated from the Public Works Committee.

Mr Koutsantonis: How many in the western suburbs?

Mr WILLIAMS: I will come to that. There were 114 over that four-year period. I happened to be a member of the Public Works Committee during that period, as was the Minister for Health, so she will know what I am talking about and how busy that committee was. Members of my party who have been on that committee for the last three years have lamented that the committee does not meet all the time and that, when it does, it does not have much to do. Why would that be? Well, there are 37 numbered reports, and there are a further 11 which I presume are in the melting pot. That brings the number to 48 over the last three years compared with 114 reports in the four years previous to that. Of those 48 projects, most (not all) were initiated by the previous government.

When we asked the Minister for Infrastructure to name one infrastructure project which was initiated, paid for and completed by this government, he could not name one.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No, he could not name one, because he was too embarrassed. What he did name was the Adelaide Airport. The Adelaide Airport does not appear in the Public Works Committee documentation because it is not a government project. In fact, the only reference to the Adelaide Airport appearing in the Public Works Committee record of the projects that have been looked into is the runway extension, and that was done under the previous Liberal government. That is why we now have a reasonable international airport in Adelaide and why we are now building a new airport terminal: because we started the project. I visited the project about a fortnight ago and I made some comment to the people who were showing us around the new building and they said that it is laughable the way this government talks about when the project started, because it started in 1993, they said.

Out of the 114 projects which are listed in the Public Works documentation, I will mention a few in the western suburbs: the Mile End rail yards development, Queen Elizabeth Hospital psychiatric unit, Mile End Athletics Stadium, West Beach Recreation Reserve, Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrade, Mile End Netball Stadium, Port Road-Thebarton widening; Adelaide International Airport runway extension; Burbridge Road widening and streetscaping; Centre for Performing and Visual Arts; West Beach boating facility, Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium stage 2; Education Development Centre; Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment; Queen Elizabeth Hospital intensive care redevelopment; Islington landfill and remediation; Pelican Point Power Station; Barcoo Outlet; Netley Police complex; Regency Park, TAFE hotel school; Queensbury waste water diversion; Football Park grandstand; Coopers Brewery relocation; Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment; Torrens Road upgrade; Glenelg waste water treatment plant; Bionomics Ltd, new research facility and office facilities; BresaGen Ltd, new laboratory and office facilities; Port River Expressway stage 1; and TransAdelaide resleepering program. To my knowledge, all those projects were in the western suburbs.

In fact, I am a little surprised how well the western suburbs did under the previous Liberal government, because anyone listening to the whingeing, whining and carping coming from the government benches might be mistaken in believing that nothing happened. The Liberal government was very active in the western suburbs, but that was because the Liberal government was very active across the state. The Liberal government built infrastructure from one end of the state to the other. We recognised that there was a need for infrastructure outside the metropolitan area. We recognised that about 25 per cent of the state's population lived and worked outside metropolitan Adelaide; and, what is more, we recognised that they produce about 50 per cent of the export dollars. The previous government recognised that 50 per cent of the state's exports came from regional areas.

This government says that it wants to treble exports over the next 10 years. That is just not possible, unless it supports those industries which produce exports and those industries operate outside metropolitan Adelaide and that is where they will grow. This is not an infrastructure program for the next 12 or 18 months: this is a 10-year program which does not look beyond the boundaries of metropolitan Adelaide—50 per cent of our exports are produced outside metropolitan Adelaide and the government says it wants to treble that. How can the government expect industry and producers of agricultural products and the people responsible for value adding to those products and new industry to develop in

South Australia when the most likely place they will come to develop their products is in regional South Australia when it spends no money on infrastructure?

For the past three years, we have seen a serious deterioration of the existing infrastructure in regional South Australia. Everyone knows—it is common knowledge—that the maintenance program on our roads has declined seriously. Thank God we have a federal government which is committed to our major highways because at least our major highways are doing reasonably well. However, the feeder roads, the arterial roads and the local roads in country areas are deteriorating rapidly; and local councils which are responsible for many of those minor roads and feeder roads just cannot keep up because the state government has dropped the ball.

In fact, we have already seen exports out of South Australia seriously decline. The excuses given in the first 12 months of this government were the drought, the change in the value of the dollar, global warming and all sorts of nonsense. The reality is that, three years down the track, South Australia is still struggling to export, whereas the rest of the nation is doing very well, thank you very much. That is not luck: it is poor administration. As I said in my opening remarks, there is an extra \$200 million in this Supply Bill but we are getting very poor value for it. Before I go off the theme of a whingeing, whining, carping government, a letter from the Premier came to my attention this morning when reading *The Advertiser*. I presume it is from the Premier as it is signed 'Mike Rann, Premier, Adelaide'. Amongst other things he says:

... I have made my views known about why the Liberal ETSA's privatisation was a disaster and why we need to put pressure on power companies to keep prices down.

Again the government cannot stop itself from whingeing, whining and carping when it was within its own grasp to do something about it.

If it seriously thought that privatisation was the root of all evil with regard to power prices in South Australia, it should buy it back. As recently as 27 February an article appeared in *The Independent Weekly* under the heading 'Power Assets Back On The Market'. The article stated that Torrens Island Power Station was up for a sale and a third share in the SEA Gas pipeline and Singapore Power had gone to market wanting to sell their assets. We know that Flinders Power, the owner of the power station at Port Augusta and the Leigh Creek coalfields, has been on the market. Virtually all the power generating assets which were sold by the previous government have been on the market. If the government seriously thought that the selling of those assets was what caused our problems, it could have bought them back. Why—because we put the money in the bank, unlike what this government is doing. That is why South Australia now enjoys a AAA rating.

Mr Caica: That is a nonsense argument.

Mr WILLIAMS: No, it is not, because there is another reason why it enjoys a AAA rating: it is called GST. Both policies—one by the state Liberal government in South Australia and one by the federal Liberal government in Canberra—that delivered a AAA rating to South Australia were strongly and vehemently opposed by the Labor Party at both a state and federal level. I have never seen a government that whinged, whined and carped so much. If this government had spent the last three years concentrating on moving the economy of South Australia forward, we would be in a significantly better place than we are now. Unfortunately, we

find ourselves falling further behind Western Australia and Queensland, and we are very quickly finding ourselves on the same rung as Tasmania. South Australia used to have a proud record in this nation, and that did not come about by luck. It came about by good management by governments over many years which had a vision, which could see ahead of the game and which did the right thing by the people of South Australia. We have just seen—

An honourable member: Tell us your vision.

Mr WILLIAMS: We are talking about the government's Supply Bill. I would love to tell the member about what I would like to do, but I would be ruled out of order by the Speaker. The government has just released its infrastructure plan, and we saw in the house during question time today that the Minister for Transport (because the infrastructure plan is mainly around transport) has no idea of what he has released. He does not understand. We have had the members from the western suburbs talk about freeing up transport hold-ups and black spots on South Road. That is a great idea: I love it. I fully support it. But there is no integrated plan.

This is supposed to be a 10-year plan. Why do they not say, 'We will do the job on Anzac Highway this year, then we will be working on Port Road, then we will do Burbridge Road and Henley Beach Road, and we will make this a thoroughfare all the way through.' But that was not the case. They said, 'We will have a little project here and one there, and we will make the tram run all the way down King William Street. We will get rid of 20 per cent of the buses.' That is a fascinating one. The people who catch the bus to travel to the northern suburbs will have to go out to North Adelaide to catch it. The minister in the house today had no idea where they would catch the bus. In fact, the bus that I catch (and I do not use it very often) on North-East Road goes through the city and down to Glenelg. I am most concerned, because I think that I will have to catch the bus and when I reach the city I will have to get off at North Terrace, get on the tram, go down to Victoria Square, hop off the tram and hop back on the bus to go to Glenelg, because the minister said that the bus will not run down King William Street between Victoria Square and North Terrace. I have not worked it out, and I am sure that the people in the northern suburbs—and that is from the north-western suburbs to the north-eastern suburbs—have not yet worked it out either.

I note that my time is quickly running out. It is surprising how fast 20 minutes goes when one has a lot of very important things to say. This government has had a policy of bringing in so-called thinkers in residence. Having thinkers in residence—full-time professional thinkers, world experts—one would think that they would come up with some good ideas—

Ms Chapman: We pay them to come here and tell us what we already know.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes. One would think that they would come up with some good ideas, but I have not seen one good idea come out of this government: in fact, it has not delivered what it promised before it came to office. I well remember the Minister for Health, when in opposition, during the 2002 election campaign, saying, 'We will have more hospital beds.' Lo and behold, we have fewer hospital beds today than we had in 2002, and the minister knows it. The government said that it would increase the retention rate in year 12. Lo and behold, quite recently, the government changed the way it is counted, because it knows full well that it has not increased retention rates: in fact, they have decreased.

Why do we have a skills shortage in South Australia today? It is because our public school system is letting down our young people. That is not a new thing, and it is not unique to South Australia, but the government has not taken up the issue, it has not done anything about it, and that is sad. I worry for the young people of South Australia today, because I would not like to be in their boots at the moment in the public school system.

The member for Colton just said, 'We have increased police numbers by 200.' That is typical of this government; there is plenty of rhetoric. That story has been around for a couple of years now: 'We will increase it by 200.' When the official figures came out on 30 June last year, we know that police numbers had decreased, and they have been going down ever since. We have brought in a few recruits from Great Britain, and the numbers have probably increased a little, but I guarantee that, come 30 June this year, there will be nowhere near 200 more uniformed police officers than when this government came to power.

This goes through the whole gamut of government services. They have stalled. We are going nowhere in South Australia, and we have lost the opportunity to use this huge windfall of about \$1.5 billion a year more in revenue than we had predicted before this government came to power. We have lost the opportunity to put that \$1.5 billion extra in revenue to good use and to good purpose to build South Australia for the future. As any businessman knows, when you have good times you put money away in investments for the bad times.

Time expired.

Mr RAU (Enfield): Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not think I have congratulated you on your elevation, and I would like to join with other members in doing so. I am very pleased that you are occupying that important role. I will try to elevate things a bit this evening, because it has become a little untidy. There has been a bit of whining and carping. I will try to lift the debate up to what I think Churchill described as the 'broad, sunlit uplands' and be a bit more positive about things. I heard the member for Hartley's contribution, which I recognise as a fairly withering critique of the government. However, it seemed to me that, after I had carefully listened to everything he had to say, his main point was that locksmiths hold the key to our future. I really do not think that he has actually captured the whole breadth and depth of the Supply Bill. I urge him to have another look at it and perhaps he might be able to broaden his thoughts a little.

The other thing was the contrast between the contribution of the honourable member for Hartley and my colleague the honourable member for Colton, because what he brought to us was information with a positive front foot attitude, the sort of thing that the people of Colton obviously respect and admire. That is why they have elected him, and I am sure that is why they will elect him again. He has done a magnificent job for those electors in his seat. I know that he is highly respected in the area because of his positive, can do attitude. I am not going to repeat all the great achievements of this government that he drew to our attention because I do not want to be repetitive.

I would like to say a couple of very brief things about where the government is going with the Supply Bill. Number one, the government's priorities are clear. Those priorities are health, education and police. What more important priorities could we possibly have for a state government? They are magnificent priorities that are well addressed by a hard-

working ministry, totally supported by all of us who sit back here. We love the way things are going. We are really impressed with what is happening. We are impressed with the vision and direction. All of us represent people who are going to find themselves much better off in the years to come than they have been in years gone by.

A number of the points that were raised, I think both by the member for MacKillop and by the member for Hartley, revolve around the question of training. They have a point. Training is a problem. They should perhaps ask themselves why it is that we have such a shortage of people who are willing to train young people. Where has all the training gone? Unfortunately, the answer is not one that I suspect members opposite would like to hear, because the problem is that all the privatised businesses that you are responsible for used to train lots of young people. They used to have apprentices. What has happened? All of these have been privatised. They are all working on the quick dollar and they are mining all of the expertise that has been built up over many generations and many decades of training. They are mining all of that for all it is worth and now these people are turning 40, 50 and 60 and soon they going to be out of the work force. We do have a problem, and it is going to be a very big problem to fix; but it is one that at least we are facing up to and we did not contribute to.

The other thing is that this government has the finances right, and what an achievement that is. The Treasurer has achieved a AAA rating for South Australia—magnificent, absolutely magnificent! I have friends who ring me from interstate and say, 'Is that right? You have a AAA credit rating.' I say, 'That's right.' They say, 'It is fantastic, because you are now right up there at the cutting edge of government finance, you characters in South Australia. You are really making the grade.' It has made a big impression interstate and overseas and, of course, that means that we can get money more cheaply than we used to be able to. This is already resulting in benefits for our community—more money for hospitals, schools and police. The brave decision by the government to do something about the problem with land tax was addressed in a timely and courageous fashion, but it had to be done, and the government seized it and did it. That is the sort of decisive attitude that this government has been demonstrating. While all this is going on, your colleagues in Canberra are beating up on all state governments, including this one. Your colleagues in Canberra are trying to whip \$200 million out of our pockets, and that is going to be \$200 million that is not spent on police, hospitals or schools. And your colleagues in Canberra are trying to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I assure the member for Enfield that they are not my colleagues.

Mr RAU: I beg your pardon. They are not; point well taken. Members of the opposition's colleagues in Canberra should be getting phone calls from members of the opposition saying, 'Please don't take all the money from our children at schools. Don't close our hospitals down. Don't stop us employing more police officers. We need that money.' While they are at it, members opposite could actually ring their colleagues in Canberra and say, 'And you can stop beating up on us with your National Competition Policy as well. Stop penalising us.'

The last couple of things I would like to say—because, like the member for Colton, I do not think that I have to speak for 20 minutes: it is a maximum and I think that, if you cannot say what you want to say in a few words, perhaps you should not be saying it—relate to electricity. Everyone talks

about electricity. It is a favourite topic in here. I give the members of the opposition 10 out of 10 for front.

Mr Caica: More front than Myer.

Mr RAU: More front than Myer. Somebody who is prepared to make a mess like that and come in here week in, week out and talk about the mess—

Mr Caica: The poeey nappy.

Mr RAU: I have already talked about the poeey nappy; I am not going to do it again. I have to say that they have a lot of front. I paid tribute to the member for Bright the other day for the fact that he brazenly stands there week in, week out asking questions about electricity. He does not appear to be embarrassed; he has a hide like a rhinoceros. There he is asking these questions as if he had nothing to do with it—it is quite amazing. I gave members of the opposition some advice last week, which they did not take, but I will offer it again. There is an old song: I cannot remember how it goes, and I do not have a good singing voice so I will not attempt to sing it, but it is an old song from the Mississippi Delta which says, *Fess up when you mess up*. Members of the opposition really did mess up on electricity. They have managed to take a government enterprise, over which the government had some control; they have handed over what amounts to a private monopoly to private industry and—surprise, surprise—they are gouging every cracker they can out of it. Children at kindergarten learn about this. They learn about it when they are picking up Play-Doh and painting with their fingers. It is around the same level of sophistication.

If you have a monopoly and you hand it over to private enterprise, they make the most they can out of that, and that is exactly what is going on now. All of these problems are their own, and the electricity consumers of South Australia are being burdened with the consequences of the former government's crazy decisions. Members of the opposition should again hit the phones, because their colleagues in Canberra are proposing to do exactly the same thing with Telstra. Members of the opposition who represent country electorates, in particular, should be very worried indeed about what privatisation of Telstra is going to mean for their electors, because you can bet your bottom dollar that the individuals who wind up owning Telstra are going to be a lot more interested in the bottom line and the profit to directors and shareholders than they are in supplying services to rural and regional communities—they could not give a toss.

So, back to the sunlit uplands where I began. This government has been doing a marvellous job; it is focused on priorities. Some time has been taken to calmly and reflectively examine all the things the state requires, the reviews have been undertaken, and now the policy is rolling out—a steamroller of policy. This Supply Bill is another great plank in that roll-out of policy, and in the next few months we are going to see the most dramatic uplift in the spirit of South Australians as they start to confront the exciting things that are going to happen.

This Supply Bill is all about the future, it is all about building a better South Australia, and I am very pleased indeed to see that, in spite of some of their whingeing, the members opposite are joining us in supporting the Supply Bill. I commend them for that, because deep down—even though they like to have a whinge about it—they do admire this government's tenacity and the fact that it is getting out there and doing the job, and they do support what the government is doing. I realise that they have a job to do, they have to criticise—and I know that they have to rummage around to find something to criticise and they have done their

best, including the member for Hartley, who I pay tribute to again on the locksmith point—but the fact is that this is an exciting development on the road to the future. I think this should just be carried by acclamation, I do not think anyone else needs to speak on it now. It should just sail through here and through the upper house and everyone should just stand and applaud.

It is an exciting time to be alive and it is an exciting time to be in South Australia; we have to be exciting and positive, and we have to be on the front foot. Let us have no more of the whingeing—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RAU: I am sorry, I cannot sing *Fess up when you mess up* but I will try to get the words for those opposite if they are interested.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): The one reservation I have in supporting the Supply Bill for \$1.7 billion to be allocated and approved for spending is that in relation to infrastructure, regrettably, the government fails to actually spend it. I can say, on the question of allocating these funds, that in relation to the state assets that are owned by the people of South Australia—and, in particular, in our schools in South Australia—we had non-current land and improvement assets in 2002-03 of \$1.583 billion. In the financial year ending 2003-04 it dropped to \$1.559 billion and in this most recent financial year of 2004-05 there is an estimated asset pool of \$1.558 billion.

It is interesting to note that when the government published their infrastructure strategic plan this last week they quoted the 2002-03 financial year—even though in their own documents they have the material for the current year—and one might ask why. Possibly, the depressing answer is because there has been a staggering multi-million dollar reduction in the value of state assets in education in land and improvements. Why would that be? Obviously, one has to account for depreciation but one also has to account for the appreciation of the value of this land and, together with that, the improvements that ought to have been done on them for the purpose of maintaining and, indeed, improving their value. That is a very disappointing statistic, to find that our state assets have plummeted multi-millions of dollars and, when they produced their infrastructure report this week, they only disclosed the 2002-03 figures.

Of the capital works that we have had in the 2004-05 year, I want to highlight the inconsistency of the government in what they say they are going to do and what they have actually done and, in particular, to highlight what they are capable of doing if they want to advance a project. Of the \$58.2 million for capital works that were allocated for this financial year there have been significant slippages, but we will not know the exact extent of that, of course, until the end of the financial year. Let me give you two examples. The Kingscote Area School was a \$4.9 million project, of which \$350 000 was to be spent in the first year. It is a project of rebuilding that school that is not even out to tender and, from a visit there recently, is not expected to be until the latter part of this year. How can the government possibly hope to have that school completed by December 2006? It would take a miracle.

The Port Elliot Primary School is a project that had been announced under the previous government and that this government ultimately agreed to continue. It was to relocate and rebuild the school, and is due for opening in March 2006. I can tell the house that a few weeks ago they had not even

settled on the purchase of the land for the new school site. That is the staggering reality of what happens with the management of capital works.

Let us contrast that with the Sturt Street Primary School, the school which is clearly the golden child of this government. It is the only project I know of that they have dreamt up, got through the Public Works Committee, actually built, and opened for business within 18 months. And what did they do? They opened a school for 19 children. I am pleased to say that, when it had its official opening recently by the Premier, it has actually improved and I think there are now some 65 children at the school. Here is a situation where, when the government puts its mind to it, and it will spend whatever it takes, it can have a project initiated, built and open for business in 18 months. So, why is it, then, that it should drag its feet so appallingly in relation to other projects that are not in key political seats and are not within the metropolitan area of South Australia?

In relation to schools, I will take this opportunity, particularly as it is a major responsibility of the government in relation to our public schools, to point out that our education facilities are depreciating in value. Clearly, the primary purpose of our schools is to educate our children, and I am going to refer particularly to the four to 19 year olds, although the legal commencement and leaving ages are six and 16 years. There is also the zero to four year olds, thus the question of funding for child care and that industry. Although Children's Services is nearer in responsibility in this state for the regulation thereof, it is primarily a funding responsibility of the government. There are other aspects of that which are very important, because I see in the new plan that they are proposing to get into the child care industry themselves and spend money which should be available for the public schools of South Australia instead of ensuring that those developments are in a format which will attract commonwealth funding. That is a despicable act in relation to depriving our schools in South Australia of funding.

It is also a primary area of responsibility in those schools that we maintain and ensure the provision of energy and water to these premises: it is a self insurance process. For best utilisation of those premises we should have optimum use, and clearly that relates to the questions of time and utilisation, which can be covered by other agencies. I will quickly address the question of time. For 25 per cent of the day our schools are open and, obviously, for 75 per cent of the day they are closed for the provision of education services. Then there is the question of the use of the school by other entities. Currently, that can involve a local government contribution towards the building of a community library on a school site; the provision and use of computer services; and sports, music and drama clubs. This issue of the multi-use of those sites was expanded under the previous government.

We also have other educational services, whether in vocational education or training, as an example. Currently, public schools operate from 8.45 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. It is important to note that division 3, regulation 65, of the Education Regulations 1977, provides that the school year shall be divided into periods commencing and ending on dates which are determined by the minister. Under regulation 66, schools have to be open from Monday to Friday, with exemption for public holidays and school vacations. Regulation 69 provides that not less than 40 minutes is to be set aside for luncheon on each school day. There is provision for morning and afternoon sessions, and at least 5¼ hours, and not more than 5½ hours, is to be set aside on each school day

for instruction exclusive of lunch and recess intervals. There is a special provision for an hour fewer if children are under the age of six years.

The director has the power, if reasonable cause exists, to permit a school day to be organised in another manner. I raise this, because clearly—

Mrs GERAGHTY: On a point of order, sir: I am having trouble understanding the member's contribution in relation to the relevance to the Supply Bill. She seems to be waddling off somewhere, well away from supply.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The chair, over the course of the debate, has taken a fairly liberal view towards contributions. I think rather than getting bogged down every time someone raises an issue as to how it relates to supply, the chair has taken the view that members on both sides have given fairly wide-ranging speeches. I have not been paying strict attention to the comments of the member for Bragg. I will listen to her contribution, but I will not rule her out of order at this stage.

Ms CHAPMAN: For your benefit, sir, I am referring to the maintenance and utilisation of \$1.558 billion worth of assets. So, utilisation is confined by the regulations to which I have referred in terms of use of the school for educational purposes. But the question of work, family and lifestyle has to be considered in relation to the use of these assets if we are to better use them. Clearly, generations X and Y, unlike our own, are not going to put up with sacrificing family and lifestyle for long periods of employment. They are looking for ways in which they can have serious support to ensure the opportunity of having families themselves. If we as a parliament, and if the government that has direct responsibility for funding and policy implementation, are serious about supporting families, we need to provide the services, for which the government is responsible, to give that assistance. That does not mean direct assistance: it is not always necessary to make a direct financial payment, a rebate or an exemption for the purposes of giving that support. But, clearly, it is important that we look at operating our school sites in harmony with the work and lifestyle arrangements of modern families.

There are independent schools that have done this already. One example in my own electorate is Seymour College, which operates from 8.00 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. every day of the week. In terms of school hours and, indeed, the strict vacation requirements under the regulations, I believe that school hours are old fashioned and need to be reformed. The extension of school hours and after school programs, including during vacation periods, is clearly necessary to better serve the needs and lifestyles of modern families. The current 8.45 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. day is outdated and anachronistic.

Closing of school sites during school vacation periods is a senseless waste of the resource, the funding for which we are currently approving. We need to be innovative in the delivery of education in our schools, and opening hours need to better serve the needs and lifestyles of modern families. It is commonsense when, for 1.2 million of Australia's 2 million two-parent families with dependent children, both parents work, and thousands more come from single-parent families. Schools represent multimillion-dollar capital assets which should be used as an after school resource offering supervision, home work incentives and sports programs.

With rising concerns about childhood obesity, it would clearly be beneficial to have children involved in sport instead of watching television or playing computer games

unsupervised. The federal government is on record for supporting school hours reform and could provide additional funding to the states for its implementation. The first initiative of the state government could be to negotiate with the federal government for the transfer of the funding it currently provides, and to provide that for the states to administer this service or, indeed, to the parents to pay for those services, that is already currently provided on an ad hoc basis through the state system; that is, some schools have those after hours services and some do not.

There are many schools in the independent sector which for years have offered a one-stop shop before school hours care from 7 a.m. to after school hours care until 6 p.m. It is time that the public sector was more creative and recognised the huge demand for outside school hours care. I make the point that, in fact, we have a situation where that can be accommodated without any extension of the working day for our professional teaching workforce. The Liberal government and the state government here pioneered this type of reform, and I will give you a few examples. There is the Gilles Plains School which operates from 8.30 to 4.30 for 4 days a week and then has one full day a week available for vocational (VET) training. So, there is clearly able to be flexibility when it suits the school community.

Let me give you an example of the Labor government trying to accommodate the school community. Let me just give you the Eastern Fleurieu School which moved late last year to send children home an hour early on one day a week during this year. It was a move that has outraged parents. I have been advised that more than 300 petitioners oppose the move because of the lack of confrontation consultation before the school approved the early dismissal for staff training purposes. Parents are particularly concerned about students being left stranded at Milang, Ashbourne and Langhorne Creek campuses because the three campuses have no childcare facilities. Parents are also concerned about the financial burden on families forced to reschedule work or pay for extra child care. Parents are concerned about students being forced to wait at school after activities such as sport, and the safety of students being forced to wait unsupervised before being picked up from school. This is what the department's chief executive, Mr Steve Marshall, advised a parent in writing in December last year. He stated:

The organisation of the school day is covered in the Education Regulations 69, and provides authority for the Chief Executive to vary the school day. I can inform you that I have received a request from the school principal seeking my approval to vary the school day. I have approved the request that the school day at the Eastern Fleurieu be varied to allow the school to dismiss students one hour early on Wednesday for semester one, 2005.

That is the government's answer to flexibility of school hours—cut back the school day for one hour; that is its answer. What has happened to the people who work in a main industry in Strathalbyn? I can tell you what has happened. They now have the school close at 2.30; they have to wait around for an hour to pick up their children at the kindergarten because, of course, that does not finish until an hour later. Notwithstanding the fact that the local industry has actually planned its work day to fit in with the school day finishing at 3.30 the government has just decided that it is going to reduce this. Why? Because the teaching staff want to get together and have an extra hour's involvement during the school day. That is the government's approach to dealing with this issue. It is important that the government appreciate the importance of recognising the work, family and lifestyle commitments

of parents and actually take some lesson and make the public schools up to a standard of providing a service that truly serves the parents and families of this state.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I think that it is important in debate over the budget to remind the taxpayers of South Australia of the remarkable total revenue growth that has occurred in recent years. We know that the government is awash with cash. In fact, we know that the Treasurer and Treasury are enjoying an additional \$5 billion in revenue over and above what was estimated just before the last election. In fact, so much revenue is coming in that the government must be wondering how on earth it could have been as fortunate as it has been to inherit such buoyant economic circumstances after almost a decade of recovery and the catastrophe of the State Bank, the almost \$10 billion of debt that Labor left the state and \$300 million of the current annual deficit that it left in the books of account.

When one examines the budget in more detail, one sees benefits of the GST. In fact, the GST, which the Labor Party opposed, was already taking root before the last state election. In fact, there was an increase in total general government revenue between what was budgeted and what was actually received up until the last state election of \$558 million. But, of course, since the last election, we have found that figure almost triple to \$1.719 billion of, in effect, revenue windfalls to government. The latest figures released by the federal government show that the total GST windfall to South Australia is now \$1.7 billion over the seven years of 2009-10. This is the environment in which this state Labor government finds itself, and I think it is one that would be the envy of almost any state government anywhere, particularly in recent times.

Of course, this glowing revenue picture is not the only story. Total government revenue has increased from about \$8.538 billion in 2001-02 to \$10.302 billion: an increase since this government came to office of 20.66 per cent—say, 20 per cent or one-fifth—a startling increase over barely three budgets. This government, apart from being the highest taxing government this state has ever seen, is also the highest spending government. Total government expenditure has increased from \$8.713 billion in 2001-02 to \$10.118 billion in 2004-05—an increase of just over 16 per cent. So, we have had increased revenue of 20 per cent and increased expenditure of 16 per cent. The Treasurer claims that in his budget he has been frugal, almost miserly, that he has exercised great restraint and kept spending under control. However, as the budget figures show, spending has increased by 16 per cent.

It is a fact that because so much tax revenue and unexpected windfalls have come in, with a 20 per cent increase in revenue of course they can look good and say that they are running a balanced set of accounts. The real test of the government is when the revenue dries up. The only government of recent times that has been through that ordeal was the Brown government with treasurer Baker and, later, the Olsen government with treasurer Lucas. Those governments had to manage the state economy with dwindling, diminishing and challenged revenue sources and with costs difficult to control.

A range of economies were made in that time and a number of things had to be done in order for the state to survive and get back on its feet. Amongst the things that needed to be done was the sale of assets, particularly our power generation assets. That raised between \$5 billion and \$6 billion, and it meant that, when this government came to office following two successive Liberal governments which

sorted out the mess they had created, they inherited a set of accounts with a virtually eliminated debt book and a balanced annual budget.

I do not see the Treasurer in this budget scampering to repurchase those assets and unscramble the egg. I do not see in the infrastructure plan that I have in my hand any bold measures to repurchase power stations or poles and wire or to rectify what the Labor Party claims was a big mistake. I do not see the massive investment of hundreds of millions of dollars on the building of new power or gas generation infrastructure. In fact, they ascribe all that in their infrastructure plan to the private sector. They seem quite happy to enjoy the rewards of privatisation and to escape the financial burden of being responsible for power provision themselves whilst criticising us for making the brave decision that our inheritance of their debt forced upon the taxpayers of South Australia. I will move on from that point.

It is simply a fallacy for the Treasurer to claim that he is a sound and responsible fiscal manager when he is the greatest spending treasurer this state has ever seen. We need to look at what he has been spending the money on. My colleagues have talked about some of the massive examples of waste on little things such as the Sturt Street Primary School—a blowout from \$2 million to \$7 million. Wasn't that essential? The Labor Party is quite happy to close schools when it suits them but does not want to open schools that question their priorities. I put it to the house that the Minister for Education is obviously so awash with cash that she has money to throw away. The Glenelg tramline project, Wagner's *Ring Cycle* which blew out by millions, millions spent on creating extra ministers—

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will tell you what we did. We sorted out the economy that you wrecked. There are Housing Trust rentals outstanding of \$10 million. Expenditure has been wasted on things such as opening bridges and the Port River Expressway. We are not opposed to those things, but it points to this government's priorities. I am yet to see any key performance indicators which show that our health system or our education system is vastly superior to that of any other state. They are not. In fact, the tangible gains in health, education and policing have been quite marginal in the last three years. We heard from my colleague the member for Finnis about waiting lists and a range of other problems within health, and we heard from the member for Bragg about a host of problems within the education system. These problems are not being simply waved away with a magic wand despite this massive increase in expenditure.

We know from the budget papers that 25 per cent of the budget is being spent on education; 27 per cent on health; and 10 per cent on public order and safety. We know that housing

and communications are receiving 7 per cent and that only 6 per cent is going towards economic affairs. We need to tease these figures out further to see where the money is being spent. Before I do that, I want to talk about another little key performance indicator that this government does not seem to care much about: take-home wages.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: If the cacophony of squirrels opposite would like to continue, perhaps I will draw to their attention ABS statistics which show that during the two terms of the Liberal government, total earnings—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: What a joke!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: There is only one joke in the chamber right now, member for Adelaide, and it is not on this side of the chamber. The total earnings under the Liberal government increased by 35 per cent. Total earnings since the member for Adelaide has been in government have increased by 2.4 per cent. That is what you have delivered, member for Adelaide—2.4 per cent of increased wages. Not only that but full-time ordinary earnings are extraordinarily low and full-time adult earnings are equally bad.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Deputy Speaker, with your approval, I seek to table—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite will resume his seat. The member for Torrens has a point of order.

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Hartley, on occasions this evening, has been displaying material in the chamber which he knows is against standing orders. I have let it go before, but if he continues, I will raise it elsewhere.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not seen the member for Hartley do it, but if the member for Hartley has been—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! While the Speaker is giving a ruling, members should be silent. I have not seen the member for Hartley doing it, but if the member for Hartley is doing so, he knows it is against standing orders and he is to desist. I also suggest that we allow the member for Waite to give his contribution without the constant heckling and interjecting from members on both sides of the chamber.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will try not to inflame members opposite. With your leave, I seek to insert a statistical table.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I have the assurance of the member for Waite that it is statistical?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, it is.

Ms Rankine: Look, he's doing it again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Leave granted.

Average weekly earnings South Australia

	Feb. 1993	Feb. 2002	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change
Males						
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	610.80	827.90	35.54	827.90	935.60	13.01
Full time adult total earnings	647.40	892.40	37.84	892.40	985.90	10.48
Total earnings	556.70	774.00	39.03	774.00	783.30	1.20
Females						
Full time adult ordinary time	536.40	737.60	37.51	737.60	848.70	15.06
Full time adult total earnings	548.30	750.90	36.95	750.90	863.50	15.00
Total earnings	381.00	505.00	32.55	505.00	520.80	3.13

Average weekly earnings South Australia

	Feb. 1993	Feb. 2002	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change
Persons						
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	586.30	798.20	36.14	798.20	907.60	13.71
Full time adult total earnings	614.80	846.20	37.64	846.20	945.70	11.76
Total earnings	475.60	643.50	35.30	643.50	659.20	2.44

Source: Abs: 6302.0 Average weekly earnings, Australia (24/2/05)
Table 11D. Average weekly earnings, South Australia
(Dollars)—Trend

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: An examination of the chart demonstrates the performance in regard to wages during the period of the Liberal government compared to the performance under this government since February 2002. The real story is when one compares wages growth in South Australia

with other states. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your leave to insert a second statistical chart which is a comparison between South Australia and the other states.

Leave granted.

Average weekly earnings—State comparisons

	South Australia			ACT			NSW			NT		
	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change
Males												
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	827.90	935.60	13.01	1 008.30	1 193.70	18.39	966.00	1 051.90	8.89	897.60	1 050.00	16.98
Full time adult total earnings	892.40	985.90	10.48	1 036.30	1 215.70	17.31	1 016.70	1 120.60	10.22	943.80	1 109.90	17.60
Total earnings	774.00	783.30	1.20	851.70	1 054.60	23.82	864.60	921.90	6.63	780.20	867.60	11.20
Females												
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	737.60	848.70	15.06	871.10	1 008.30	15.75	798.60	919.70	15.16	754.40	902.70	19.66
Full time adult total earnings	750.90	863.50	15.00	878.90	1 014.70	15.45	811.50	935.20	15.24	767.70	919.30	19.75
Total earnings	505.00	520.80	3.13	641.40	775.80	20.95	570.20	658.30	15.45	575.90	644.30	11.88
Persons												
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	798.20	907.60	13.71	948.00	1 109.00	16.98	904.10	1 002.50	10.88	835.10	983.70	17.79
Full time adult total earnings	846.20	945.70	11.76	967.30	1 122.90	16.09	940.70	1 051.80	11.81	867.00	1 024.70	18.19
Total earnings	643.50	659.20	2.44	743.30	903.20	21.51	723.00	800.40	10.71	677.30	751.80	11.00

Source: ABS: 6302.0 Average weekly earnings, Australia (24/2/05)

Average weekly earnings—State comparisons

	QLD.			Tas.			Vic.			WA		
	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change	Feb. 2002	Nov. 2004	% Change
Males												
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	843.80	966.50	14.54	822.70	931.40	13.21	895.40	1 048.80	17.13	928.50	1 071.80	15.43
Full time adult total earnings	892.90	1 030.80	15.44	860.60	986.10	14.58	947.30	1 124.10	18.66	982.40	1 137.10	15.75
Total earnings	769.00	858.30	11.61	712.30	831.20	16.69	815.40	954.90	17.11	827.50	962.70	16.34
Females												
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	721.40	814.30	12.88	717.50	798.30	11.26	779.90	875.80	12.30	736.00	805.90	9.50
Full time adult total earnings	732.40	827.10	12.93	734.50	807.60	10.03	792.90	892.30	12.54	745.40	819.40	9.93
Total earnings	520.80	581.10	11.58	454.70	566.40	24.57	534.40	594.00	11.15	498.20	545.80	9.55
Persons												
Full time adult ordinary time earnings	799.10	910.00	13.88	785.30	885.70	12.78	856.00	992.10	15.90	860.60	982.50	14.16
Full time adult total earnings	834.00	954.90	14.50	815.80	923.70	13.23	894.60	1 048.60	17.21	898.70	1 031.30	14.75
Total earnings	647.70	724.00	11.78	580.40	703.40	21.19	680.50	782.70	15.02	667.10	764.60	14.62

Source: ABS: 6302.0 Average weekly earnings, Australia (24/2/05)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: An examination of this chart demonstrates that, in regard to total earnings (that is, the take home wage for your average South Australian worker), South Australians receive the absolute rock bottom lowest of any state in the country, including Tasmania. That figure is \$659.20. Not only that, but as I mentioned earlier, the rate of

increase in total earnings has simply been 2.4 per cent. However, full-time adult total earnings have only increased by 11.76 per cent, and again are the lowest in the country. Even full-time adult ordinary earnings are at \$907.60, which I think are the second lowest on the mainland. These figures warrant close scrutiny.

While in this budget the government is claiming to have achieved great things, when one looks at what your average South Australian taxpayer is taking home in their pocket, we are at the bottom of the ladder. I would have thought that a Labor government would be taking the issue of wages very much to heart. Of course, it is not hard to see why this has occurred. When one looks at industry and trade and the cuts this government has inflicted in that portfolio area, it is quite startling. In the 2001-02 budget, the former Liberal government invested \$192 million in industry/trade, industry development and policy advice, including infrastructure major projects. Of that amount, \$91.4 million alone was spent on infrastructure development or major project facilitation. When one compares that with what this government has spent, one sees that, in total terms, it actually spent \$122.3 million in 2002-03; had an estimated result of \$109.2 million in 2003-04; and a budget of \$83.8 million in 2004-05. What that simply means—

Debate adjourned.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

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

Motion carried.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council appointed the Hon. N. Xenophon to fill the vacancy on the committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. I. Gilfillan.

OATHS (ABOLITION OF PROCLAIMED MANAGERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

SUPPLY BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): The cuts outlined above indicate that, since this government's coming to office, it has cut in the order of \$262 million from the area of industry/trade, industry development and major project facilitation. That is an extraordinary amount of money. It is not hard to see how that would affect the economy. The government has restructured and reorganised this department three times and moved the money around and reformatted the budget papers making it difficult to pin down precisely the amount, but it is in that order.

In regard to major project facilitations, about \$111 million at least has been cut. It is a startling amount of money. Of course, we have seen outcomes from that. The number of companies which have left South Australia or which have cut back significantly is growing. They include: Hensley Foundry, Aunde Trim, Pilkington, Mobil Oil Port Stanvac, Sheridan Australia, Sabco, Fletcher Jones, Levi Strauss, JP Morgan, Ion Automotive, Allied Engineering, News Corporation, Tilbrook's Brake Service and BTH Industries. Companies that have downsized include: Southcorp, Motorola, EDS, Berri, Santos, Sola Optical, Electrolux, Mitsubishi,

Normandy Mining, Bresagen, Fauldings, Kangara Foods, Chubb Security, Peter Lehmann Wines, Balfours, Clipsal and BRL Hardy. And, of course, that is in addition to the companies that South Australia lost in the aftermath of the State Bank, such as Delfin, Laubman & Pank, John Martins, R.M. Williams, Petaluma Wines, Orlando Wyndham, Norman Wines, Banksia Wines and others.

This has been glossed over to a degree by the boom in housing and credit-fuelled retail. I draw members' attention to the BankSA reports of late last year and other promulgations from it early this year, and the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies' economic briefing reports in November and other outputs from it in more recent times where it points out that final demand, although strong, has been driven by household consumption, dwelling investment and government consumption. I made the point earlier that, if people are not taking home more wages (and we are the lowest paid state in the nation), how are they paying for retail? How are they paying for housing? Are they borrowing? Is it a credit-fuelled economy? I put to the house that that may well be the case. Indeed, Access Economics in its most recent report in March 2005 reinforced these points and sounded a number of alarm bells in regard to supply weakness and the bursting of the housing price bubble. In fact, it made the point, whilst indicating some positive signals for the state, that there were many challenges ahead for us to face. Job gains in 2004, as Access Economics pointed out, were driven by earlier strength in the economy and renewed falls in the relative cost of hiring labour.

We face significant challenges. Access Economics points out that engineering construction seems to be slowing and that, although South Australia has recovered from the trauma of recession in the early 1990s delivered to us by Labor, it faces new challenges with respect to population and in a range of other areas. Exports are fairly flat, and industrial production is challenged. We will be supporting the budget but, when one takes away the spin and the gloss, there are some challenges ahead. Has this government been making hay while the economic sun has been shining? Have we been benefiting, as have other states, from the sound national economic times? I put to the house that wage earners have not and the state has not and that more needs to be done.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am also pleased to make some comments tonight in support of the Supply Bill. It is obviously very important legislation to ensure that the funding of the state's requirements and its services and the like are adequately resourced to maintain its operation until the budget is delivered. Obviously, it is a very important piece of legislation so that the financial affairs and requirements of the state are met. This evening other speakers on this side of the house have highlighted—and I join with them—some of the real deficiencies for which this government has become well known over the last three or so years. We have about 11 months until the next state election, which will be on 18 March next year. I think that the South Australian community is becoming increasingly aware that this government is not honouring its commitments. At the time of the last state election, the then leader of the opposition (Hon. Mike Rann) signed a pledge highlighting six initiatives to which he put his name. It is a measure of any person's, any organisation's or any government's worth as to how they honour their commitments, and the government has failed on every count.

I would like to run through a number of them. The then leader of the opposition signed a pledge card headed 'My pledge to you.' As I said previously, he made six commitments and signed and underlined it and said, 'Keep this card as a check that I keep my pledges.' Well, the Liberal Opposition certainly has done so. The current Premier spoke about fixing our electricity system and building an interconnector to New South Wales that would bring in cheaper power. What we have seen is the exact reverse of that. The power has not got cheaper: it has become considerably more expensive. So, on the first point, they get a tick or a cross; on this they get a cross—a fail. The government has not honoured that commitment.

The second one merely states, 'Better schools and more teachers.' That is a pretty subjective sort of comment. 'Better schools and more teachers', this pledge says. We have heard from the member for Bragg, the shadow minister for education and children's services, who eruditely and succinctly has shown that pledge to be a fallacy. The next pledge we come to is 'Better hospitals and more beds.' You only have to pick up the newspaper every other day to read a prominent story exposing the ever increasing crisis that our health services are in. Our deputy leader does an outstanding job in an effort to make the health minister accountable but, unfortunately, I think the more that the opposition spokesman on health tries, the worse the Minister for Health's performance is.

I do not want to spend any more time on this particular pledge card, because we can see that the commitments have not been honoured and, unfortunately, it is a real disappointment for the community here in this state. This government came into office as a minority government which needed the support of Independents to cobble together a makeshift setup. They were grasping at straws and they made a commitment to the South Australian people but, unfortunately, they have not honoured those commitments. It is disappointing for the people of this state. They were promised a lot, but they have received very little.

I would like to continue to highlight some other issues. We have seen this government regain the AAA-rating for the state's finances which was lost as a consequence of their disastrous mismanagement, and we are very concerned that, with the evident mismanagement of WorkCover, we are heading down the same track. We cannot get any concrete figures or even a skerrick of information from the minister who is responsible for WorkCover, the Minister for Industrial Relations. He has been questioned over the last two days in the house about the WorkCover issues and he continually refuses to give any decent response. We are very concerned about this and, no doubt, some members in the government would be equally concerned, but either they are being silenced within their Caucus meetings or, obviously, silenced outside. This is an extremely serious issue and, if the Premier does not take corrective action, this state's finances are heading in the same direction as they were heading some 10 or so years ago. However, given the enormous windfall of taxation derived from the federal government's distribution of the GST and the property-based taxes that have seen a tremendous amount of money go into the Treasury, that may be the only saving grace from financial disaster for the state. If it is not managed correctly, we are certainly in for a difficult time.

The government has been critical of our land tax policy. We have stated previously that we do not have access to Treasury figures, so it is difficult for us to come out with a specific policy on land tax in terms of exact percentages,

exact thresholds and the like. However, our broad policy is that we will raise the threshold and lower the rates. Until we receive the budget, there is not a lot more we can do about them. However, come election time next year, our policy on a whole range of state taxation issues is going to completely blow the government out of the water. The government might tinker around the edges, chop a bit off here and there, but I can tell them, when we get into the election campaign with our state taxation policy, the government will be completely blown out of the water.

I heard the Treasurer commenting about our leader's statements on land tax, and the Treasurer said, 'Give us your policy. We will test the funding for you.' As if! You have to be joking. Why would any opposition give the government their policy? That is just an absolute nonsense. There are so many more issues that we can certainly raise. We look at the infrastructure plan that the minister released the other day. It is all about ad hoc headline projects. They are going to build the two bridges. The bridge project was under consideration when the Liberal Party was still in government. This Labor government prevaricated for years on whether they would be opening or closing bridges. The Treasurer, because it was a very sensitive issue in his electorate, went to a public meeting and proclaimed they would be opening bridges but, no doubt, there was some very heated debate about this within cabinet. Finally, to save face, the government is looking to spend tens upon tens of millions of dollars in additional funding to make them opening bridges.

We have also seen the announcement of two underpasses on South Road under Anzac Highway and Port Road. That will, undoubtedly, help the traffic flow in that section of South Road but, as the leader pointed out earlier, what happens when cars get to the traffic lights further on? It is going to cause extreme congestion further along South Road: it is not actually going to alleviate the problems with the volume of traffic that currently uses that road.

We have also witnessed the Minister for Infrastructure's announcement of the dollar amount of his plan, but what has actually occurred is that \$110 million of that forms part of the purchase of what used to be referred to as Fleet SA. When the minister was interviewed on radio he basically said that he did not care about the money, that it did not worry him and that he was not interested in the money. That completely astounded me. He sits at the number three position in this government and he says publicly that he is not interested in the money. That must ring huge alarm bells out there in the broader community. If you have the number three in the government saying that he does not care about an issue involving \$110 million, then that speaks for itself. I believe the government is really having serious problems if their third person comes out with public statements such as that.

We have seen other areas that exhibit financial mismanagement and waste and I guess one of the most glaring recent examples of that is having to take the parliament to Mount Gambier. At the end of this sitting week there will, no doubt, be a motion to adjourn the house to sit at Mount Gambier on 3 May, I understand. The latest figure I heard is that it will cost over \$300 000 to take 47 of us as well as staff, parliamentary officers, Hansard reporters and associated people. I can tell the house that I could in an instant, a microsecond, find a need within my electorate of Kavel where \$300 000 could readily be required—in fact, I could instantly find where \$3 million could be spent.

Mrs Geraghty: Don't you think it is a good idea that other people in this state have an opportunity to see parlia-

ment?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Torrens interjects. If she wants to make a contribution I certainly encourage her to do so; if she wants to get up and speak on the Supply Bill I encourage her to stand up and say what she wants to say—and not interject. Instead of interjecting with inane, unimportant matters, the member should get up and have her say. She has 20 minutes—

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY:—and the member for Wright also has 20 minutes. They should get up and say something about it. But the honourable member will not, because she has nothing good at all to say about her side.

To continue my remarks, we have other examples of waste within the government. We have two new ministers who have been recently appointed. I remember the Treasurer—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Well, if you do not know, you need to have a serious look at yourself. We have seen these two ministerial positions created. I remember, when the Deputy Premier was debating this legislation, probably two years ago, that the member for Mitchell asked him a question about the 15th ministerial position created as a consequence of that legislation.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Hartley is quite right. The Deputy Premier said, ‘No, that is an oversight. It will never be used.’ Well, 12 months down the track we have not only one new minister but two, at a cost of \$4 million per year. A couple of minutes ago I spoke about where I could

spend at least \$300 000 in my electorate at the click of my fingers; the 47 members here would be able to highlight 10 areas of need in their electorates which would certainly absorb that and more.

Ms RANKINE: On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker: the member for Kavel is bleating on about two new ministers. He fails to recall that when the previous government appointed five junior ministers, it assured us that that would be at no extra cost, and I well remember the junior minister for disability services spending nearly \$400 000 on his office suite alone.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Thompson): The member for Wright was moving into debate, and there is no point of order.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you for that ruling, Madam Acting Speaker. It was a very poor point of order because the member for Wright did not quote any standing orders, and she was certainly debating the issue—but we do not expect much more from the member for Wright. There are many other issues that we need to highlight: there is a real need for improvement in the way that we care for our youth, particularly in the Adelaide Hills, and there is a real need for improving the delivery of services, homelessness, assaults, and lack of police.

Time expired.

Mr VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.25 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 13 April at 2 p.m.