

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 26 May 2005

The **SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

BAROSSA WINE TRAIN

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I move:

That this house regrets the demise of the Barossa wine train and urges the government to retain the Bluebird railcars in South Australia and provide support to a private investor to recommence it as a wine tourist train.

I bring this issue to the parliament because it is extremely important. It is an issue which is important not only to me as the elected member but also to my electors, train enthusiasts, the rail movement in South Australia and the unionists who built these railcars in the first place. It is also important for the future of tourism in South Australia. The Barossa wine train was launched in May 1998, and it was instrumental in providing a unique experience en route from Adelaide to the picturesque Barossa Valley; it was extremely popular. Between 1997 and 2003 the Barossa wine train was in full swing, performing three scheduled trips a week, plus private charters, which were well patronised. On average 10 000 to 13 000 people travelled on the train each year—70 000 passengers in total. Escalating public liability insurance forced the train service off the rails in April 2003, along with all the scares, including SARS and the 11 September event.

During this time there has been continuous lobbying from three members of the community—Paul Henley, Sandra Williams and Peter Michalak—to get the train back and running. Lots of people from both within the state and overseas are asking when we will get back the wine train—because they all expected it to be back on the rails. The famous Bluebird railcar, which is the Barossa wine train, was proudly built here in South Australia in the 1950s by local rail workers; they do make a real part of history in our state. They were built here and they have been extremely strong and successful, and their years of life can go long into the future.

We stand to lose if the government does not take action soon. It will be lost to one of our neighbouring states, particularly New South Wales, or even sold to an overseas buyer. It has been sold twice before and the deals have fallen through. Even worse, it could be sold off and remodified for use as crew accommodation. Because they are so strong, they can be changed over and used as crew accommodation, which would be a pretty sad way for such a fine train to end its life. Surely, they have a better use than that. There have already been some close calls. In fact, the deals have fallen through and the train still remains here in South Australia. I saw it a couple of weeks ago. It is in excellent condition, particularly inside. They started up the train with a flick of a switch and it ran. It has been in the shed all this time. The big concern is that they are looking for space. If they push it out into the weather—and it could be within a week or two from now—not only will the weather get to it but also it will be graffitied within hours of its being put out there. Members can see what happens at the Islington rail yard: the amount of graffiti is disgusting. It will be very sad, indeed, to see these fine trains graffitied in such a way.

The venture itself is an extremely viable option and will re-create a unique way for tourists to see the Barossa—not

only the tourists but also the locals. I have made several trips on the wine train, and it was a wonderful day out. In fact, you, Madam Acting Speaker, were on the wine train when we had interstate guests here for the parliamentary bowls carnival. On the last day we took all our interstate visitors to the Barossa on the train—and what a wonderful occasion it was! Irrespective of what you do, whether sightseeing or tasting, you come home on the train safely, there is great camaraderie and you get back without any incident. It is not only good but also safe; it is brilliant. It has worked well like that.

I have been approached in the last few weeks by three separate business people, both within the Barossa and externally, who have expressed interest in the idea of re-establishing this vital transport link from the heart of Adelaide to the Barossa. While the interest from the private business people is enthusiastic and strong about purchasing the train, the concern is still the worry about insurance, not only the amount of it but also the insecurity of it. What will happen about public liability fees? That is a great concern. It is unknown and it is not bankable. The banks will always be very concerned about this component of a business venture.

I have written to the Minister for Transport seeking support from the government through a way of guarantee. I am pleased to note this matter is currently being investigated; and I note the article in today's Messenger. Things are happening. Simply by allowing the wine train to come under the banner of Transport SA's public liability arrangement—and I do not know exactly what that is—it could be brought in under that arrangement, which would greatly help the cause, as it would give guarantee regarding the track access.

The answer was quite good, but there was a problem with it when the train first started in getting access through Gawler and waiting in Gawler, but, in the end, they got that sorted out. Any business operation would have to have that insurance under control and track access guaranteed, and the thing would then be very bankable. As a businessman, the member for Napier would know that you go to a bank and put down a proposition, and you look at the purchase price. The purchase price here is not high. In fact, the trains are worth every cent they are asking. I cannot mention the figure, because that would not be professional or businesslike. I think the buyer is going to get a steal here, but they are going to have to be able to operate at a profit, and this is insurance. I am happy to tell any particular businessman, if they ring me up, what the deal is.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Hammond behind me pipes up, and, yes, I am happy to discuss it with him, too. We are not asking the government for money. All we are asking is for the government to back this in with this insurance liability, which governments are now doing in other areas of tourism railway in Australia. I do not know of any single tourism railway in Australia that is not operating under some form of government subsidy.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It does not have to. All it is asking for is that insurance guarantee. The time clock is ticking. As soon as they push these trains out into the weather, all these options will dry up. Other privately owned and operated rail services in neighbouring states all receive some kind of subsidy from their government. If the government fails to step in and provide some level of assistance, South Australia stands to lose yet another important piece of its heritage and rail history and a great tourism opportunity will be gone.

The attitude of possible investors is positive. They have done their number crunching. I spoke to one of them last night, and they have approached councils outlining their plans and are now waiting for some response from the government in terms of public liability insurance. I am not sure at this stage whether the consortium will be formed or whether the train will be run by a sole bidder. I have met them all, but I have not told them who the other bidders are. If they wish to get together as a consortium, I would be happy for that to happen; it does not worry me. But, as I have said, the first one in gets the cherry, as far as I am concerned. Whichever path is taken, at least the commitment is there. It really is amazing, when you look at all the attention this issue is receiving not only in the metropolitan media today but also the local media in the Barossa—and it is not only the newspapers but also it is being talked about on the radio. In today's edition of the *City Messenger* the headline is 'Barossa back on timetable', and on 5AA this afternoon the Barossa wine train and the Bluebirds will be part of a talkback session. Many people are treating this as two separate issues, which they are.

People realise how important a service like this is to the state. The support and the lobbying has been very widespread. People want to have the opportunity to experience the Barossa on a totally different level. The previous Liberal government worked very hard to establish the wine train in the mid-1990s, and it would be an absolute shame to see this wine train pulled from under us. The wine train was paying its way back then, and it will do so again if the impediment of public liability can be addressed. I thank and acknowledge the petition presented by the Minister for Tourism last Tuesday. I implore the Rann Labor government to take this issue seriously and help promote our tourism ventures and keep our South Australian heritage strong and support the re-establishment of the Barossa wine train. I urge the government to look into the feasibility of public liability insurance coming under Transport SA's insurance umbrella. We must act now or we stand to lose one of South Australia's most iconic passenger trains.

Finally, I have a passion for this not only as a wine train but also because when I was a student going to school in Adelaide—as the member for Hammond would also have done—I travelled on this train as a teenager. A lot of them have been scrapped.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Hammond reminds me about our behaviour. Mostly it was good, but it was not always good—school students will be school students. This train is not just part of the state's history but it is also part of our personal history, and to use it as a wine train was a great idea. Let us hope that we can get over the politics, and let us get over the finances and keep this train here in South Australia. I urge all members to support this motion.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Geraghty): I call the member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I, too, would like to—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Acting Deputy Speaker to you.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We've got the pedant of the house with us, clearly. The Attorney-General has—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kavel, will you come back to the substance of the debate please.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you for your guidance, Madam Acting Speaker. I, too, have pleasure in speaking in

support of the member for Schubert's motion to look to reinvigorate the Barossa wine train and to urge the government to support that initiative to see it literally get back on the rails. I have a very clear understanding of the member for Schubert's passion for anything concerning the railways. As the house knows, because I have spoken about this issue previously, I was employed by the member for Schubert for a number of years as one of his advisers, or whatever you want to call it, in his electorate office, and I wrote a number of speeches for him on this issue. So, I speak with some understanding of the issue the member for Schubert brings to the house.

I also enjoyed the particular trip mentioned by the member that was undertaken several years ago, when the parliamentary bowls carnival was held here in Adelaide, and I had a little to do with the organisation of that trip as well. We had a tremendous and pleasurable day travelling to and from the Barossa on the wine train, departing from the Adelaide Railway Station, as I recall, and obviously moving out through the northern suburbs and then out into the Gawler region up into the Barossa. It was great.

We called into a number of wineries, including, from memory, Chateau Tanunda. It was a really pleasant day, and it gave South Australia an excellent opportunity to showcase what an outstanding tourism industry we have here. It showed all the visitors from the other states how tremendous our tourism and associated supporting industries are. It is disappointing and unfortunate that the Barossa wine train has ceased to operate, but historic railways do play a significant role in the total tourism initiatives that we offer our visitors.

It has been unfortunate that we have seen this government not put a tremendous focus on tourism. We get the old rhetoric, the old dogma, of three or four key issues, and that is all. But the previous Liberal government had a real focus on and a financial commitment to tourism. Unfortunately, that has tailed off under the Rann Labor government.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You should be ashamed of yourselves.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We are.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That is good. The Attorney-General says that they are. That is a tremendous admission of how poorly you have handled yourselves. I am not here to be sidetracked, or railroaded, if you like, by the Attorney. I want to get my thoughts and contribution back on track. As I was saying, we have seen this Rann Labor government not provide significant, adequate and satisfactory resources to the tourism industry. Everyone should be acutely aware of the tremendous economic activity that tourism does provide to the state.

We see other iconic events, such as the V8 super cars, when literally millions of dollars worth of activity is created within the state. I must say that I am a fan of the V8 super cars. I know that some people are not, but I am. I enjoy it.

Mr Venning: You drive one.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I do not drive a super car, but I do drive something that looks a bit like one. I do plan to travel to Bathurst this year to see the race, which indicates my enthusiasm for the sport. I want to see how that event is run not just as a spectator but as a concerned and responsible South Australian member of parliament. I want to compare how that event is run with the running of the Clipsal 500 V8 super car race here in Adelaide. As I said, I commend the member for Schubert for bringing this issue to the house.

A historic railway also operates in my electorate, namely, the Steam Ranger. I know that the people who look to promote the Steam Ranger in my electorate are also keen to receive additional funding from the government. Hopefully, when the Treasurer brings down the budget this afternoon, we will see a significant increase through the tourism portfolio; and, hopefully, those funds will flow onto trains such as the Barossa wine train, the Steam Ranger and other historic railways around the state.

One only has to go to Victor Harbor in the summer holidays to see the tremendous patronage of the cockle train. That is full. Every time that train runs from Victor Harbor to Goolwa and back, it is pretty well full. When my children were little they used to love going on it. It used to be a highlight of the children's day to get on the cockle train, go to Goolwa, hop off, have a look around and then come back to Victor Harbor. You would see hundreds of mothers, fathers, children and grandparents—the whole family structure—enjoying that train in the summer months down at Victor Harbor.

As I said, the member for Schubert is correct in bringing this matter to the house. I support him in his efforts. It is an important initiative to support the Barossa, which is a very important region of our state. If we did not have the Barossa Valley—and I would like to do some research on this—there would be a significant detrimental effect on our state's domestic product. With those few words, I have pleasure in supporting the motion of the member for Schubert.

Ms BREUER secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOLD HEALTH CARD

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I move:

That this house registers its appreciation of all those medical practitioners who honour the Department of Veterans Affairs' gold health card in the treatment of our eligible ex-service men and women and war widows and calls on those practitioners who do not support the card to do so.

In moving this motion I do have to tell the house that my father was a veteran's gold health card holder. In the last 10 years of his life we went through many traumas as far as his health was concerned. Like so many old diggers, he was a real fighter. He refused to allow the three strokes he had suffered, his deteriorating mobility, reduced speech, the removal of an eye, and ever-increasing emphysema to dull his enjoyment of life. He savoured every moment secure in the knowledge that, if and when he needed medical attention, it was available, whether that be from his local GP or through more specialist services or hospitalisation. Let me say that he never felt more secure about accessing the best medical attention than when he was admitted to our Repatriation Hospital here in South Australia. I am proud of how this Rann Labor government has committed to the Repatriation Hospital. Its services are unique in every sense of the word.

My dad managed, however, to have some interesting experiences—if I can call them that—in our public health system when that now great born-again health crusader, the former Liberal minister for health and member for Finnis, was in charge of our hospitals. I well remember this 80-year-old man being left in his jarmies to wait a full day to be transferred from the privatised Modbury Hospital to the Repat in an empty ward, with no advice given to the family, and when we went looking for him we found that they had

forgotten about him. The next day they lost him, and it goes on—but I digress.

That veterans gold health card was indeed gold to my dad. He was also secure in the knowledge that, when he was no longer with us, my mum would also receive these medical benefits as a war widow. That is also a very important aspect of the gold card. Widows of eligible servicemen are provided with the health benefits of the gold card on the death of their spouse while they remain unmarried or not in a common law situation.

I want to place on the record my appreciation for all those medical practitioners who accept the veterans affairs gold health card and provide wonderful service to our eligible servicemen and women and our war widows. As I said, I know from personal experience how important the surety of that health card is to veterans and, as they age and their health deteriorates, how much they value the care that is provided to them by so many dedicated doctors and other medical practitioners. There are many services that these doctors provide. They monitor the health of a veteran or war widow; they coordinate their health services; and they conduct regular reviews of their medication and treatment. They prepare multi-disciplinary care plans, health assessments and case conferences for the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans identified as having chronic and complex conditions—and the list goes on.

I was astounded, angry and embarrassed when I was contacted by an 85-year-old war widow, Mrs Gynell, who had recently moved from Port Adelaide to Golden Grove to be nearer to her family. She was also very cross. This lady had contacted something like six doctors in her area before she found one that would accept her gold card. Very naively I had assumed that all doctors would honour the gold card, but clearly I was wrong. Mrs Gynell's husband, Stan, was a Rat of Tobruk. He served in New Guinea and he, together with six of his mates, became critically ill while in New Guinea. Five of them died, but Mr Gynell and one other were saved when they were carried out of the jungle by the fuzzy wuzzy angels. He was then hospitalised for eight to nine months.

The rejection of Mrs Gynell's gold card by these doctors occurred just as we were preparing to celebrate the 90th anniversary of the landing at Gallipoli. Great timing! Mrs Gynell's husband suffered dreadfully as a result of his war service; she lost her brother during the war and her brother-in-law; and her father was a lighthorseman in World War I. Understandably, she was angry and upset to have to suffer the embarrassment she did and to be made to feel like a beggar. Her comments to me included the suggestion that these doctors were not 'real Australians' and, quite rightly, she said that they enjoy their lucrative jobs because of people like her husband. That is true for all of us: we enjoy the lifestyle we have because of the sacrifices made by thousands of young men and women, people who sacrificed their youth, their innocence and, for far too many, their lives.

These doctors who refuse to accept the veterans gold card need to stop and think about what they are doing. They might be unhappy with what the federal government is paying them. I understand that they are getting something like 115 per cent of the scheduled fee. I accept that there may be some argy-bargy about the level of the fee and the level of service that sometimes needs to be given to these people as their health needs increase, but I say to them: take it up with the federal government. I am going to, and I will speak about that later. That will be part of a separate debate. I say to these doctors:

'Don't take your frustrations out on our diggers and their widows.'

The gold card can be used for a range of health-related services, not only GPs, but also allied health and community nursing, chiropractic services, day surgery, dental services, home and community care, specialised footwear if they need it, medical specialists, hearing services, pathology services, psychiatric care—again, the list goes on and on. They are also entitled to access hospitals (both public and private). It would seem that some GPs—I have been advised somewhere in the vicinity of 25 per cent—would rather charge these patients using their Medicare card, because if they do that they can charge a top-up fee. If they accept the gold card, the arrangements with the Department of Veterans Affairs are such that they cannot add on an extra charge.

Like I said, I can understand why they might have a gripe with the federal government—they would not be flying solo there—but that is no excuse for penalising these people who have already given so much. This year, when we have celebrated the 90th anniversary of the landing at Gallipoli and the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II and honoured the sacrifice of service personnel and their families, when we should be ensuring that our lives and actions truly honour these people and do their sacrifices justice, these doctors, who are prepared to force further sacrifice on our ex-service people and war widows should hang their heads in shame.

Like I said at the beginning, there are many GPs doing the right thing. Many go above and beyond the call of duty in caring for these people, and I have nothing but praise and admiration for them. In fact, I am now going through the process of contacting the GPs in my area and surrounding areas to confirm which doctors do the right thing. We will be compiling a list that I will make available so that no other gold card holder in my area has to go through what Mrs Gynell went through.

I suggest that is an exercise that other MPs might like to undertake. To those other mean-spirited GPs who are turning our gold card holders away, I say: think just a little bit about what Mrs Gynell said. Consider perhaps how and why you are in the position you are in today and, if you have a gripe, take it out on those who deserve it, not those who fought to protect you.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise as shadow minister for veterans to commend the honourable member for moving the motion, with which the opposition fully agrees. We understand very well her sentiments on this matter. She is quite right to share concern on behalf of her elderly constituents when they find themselves going to doctors who do not accept the veterans gold card. It is a miserable situation when, as she has pointed out, a war widow of 85 years of age can find herself having to run to five or six doctors and still be turned away. On noting the motion on the *Notice Paper*, I contacted the RSL and the Australian Medical Association, both here in South Australia and in Canberra.

I have come to the conclusion that the honourable member is not only right in respect of doctors needing to be a little more compassionate and understanding in accepting gold card veterans as their patients, but I have also come to the view, albeit perhaps surprisingly, that the federal government needs to step up to the plate here a little more effectively and ensure that there is not a financial disadvantage for doctors linked to the veterans card. The AMA explains that the gold card is issued as a consequence of negotiations that occur

through the federal government and the federal office of the AMA, which is obviously a key stakeholder. The AMA agrees that this motion shows appreciation for medical practitioners who honour the gold card but wants to explain that the reason it is not universally honoured is that indexation of the gold card, in its view, has not totally kept pace with the cost of providing health care and services to veterans.

That is the reason why some doctors do not honour it. The argument that the AMA put forward is that these are busy professionals who have a lot of customers to see, and that the financial disincentive linked to the card is such that they prioritise their patients so that they see those for whom they will receive a larger remuneration. Therefore, there are some issues that need to be taken up with the commonwealth and I will certainly be raising them with the Minister for Veterans Affairs in Canberra when I coordinate with her. I would certainly support the honourable member if she wants to join me in that or if she wants to make representation of her own to the federal minister on the basis of saying to the federal government: 'Can we make the veterans gold card work better for doctors?'

Clearly, they have to make a living. They have bills to pay, they are small businesses, they are professionals, and I can understand why some of them might favour the better paying customers, so to speak. Having said that, I think that there is a case to join the honourable member's call for doctors to consider veterans as a special group within their customer base. I had discussions recently with a dentist in my constituency, a young man who is very professional, who is running a very successful dental practice, and I raised the issue with him, noting that the honourable member's motion was coming forward. He said to me that, by and large, most dentists go out of their way to honour the gold card for dental work and to help veterans, especially, even though they do not get paid as much. He said that there is generally goodwill.

He explained, however, that in certain demographic areas where perhaps there is an older population, where there might be a confluence of veterans or widows of veterans, they can all turn up at the same dental practice, and this might also be an effect with the doctors. If, for example, as the honourable member noted, one of her constituents had to go to six doctors, there is probably a seventh doctor who is taking veterans and it may be that they all flood there and, therefore, this particular practice finds itself overwhelmed with veterans because he or she is the only professional who will see them, therefore the problem is accentuated. Such a medical professional might well have a sort of dummy spit on this and say 'That's enough: I just can't see any more; it's costing me money', and not see any more veterans.

Ms Rankine: If they all took the card, each doctor in Australia would only have to have 12 gold card holders.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Indeed. The honourable member makes a good point: if every doctor saw veterans, the load would be spread around and it would be a more reasonable outcome for all. I spoke to Jock Stratton, the President of the RSL, and he supports the motion, so I come in here in a spirit of complete bipartisanship to say that I think the house should concur in the motion in full. As the honourable member points out, these men and women and their spouses have made a special commitment to the country and to the state, and it behoves us to remember that commitment. It behoves the medical profession to do so, in particular, but I think the commonwealth also has to pull its weight.

Perhaps the honourable member can talk to the Minister for Health and the state government could write to the federal minister, if it has not already, and raise this issue with it on a government to government basis as well as whatever separate representations we might make. I urge the house to support the motion and give it swift passage.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I congratulate the member for Wright for raising this important issue in the house. It is something that had got under my radar until I made inquiries. I therefore congratulate her on her vigilance for being able to identify where these important people in our community are suffering adverse experiences. The fact that GPs would pick and choose their patients on the basis of whether or not they are veterans is quite a disgrace. My inquiries, in our area, indicated that members of the RSL of the older generation do not seem to be having the same sort of problems as Vietnam veterans do. I think we all recognise that Vietnam veterans have many complex health needs. The fact that they would still be experiencing discrimination so many years after that terrible encounter is quite sad and totally unfair.

I have spoken to a Vietnam veteran who has had to shop around for doctors. He is someone who is active in the Vietnam veterans community, and he is well aware of many Vietnam vets having to shop around because doctors simply will not see them. The reasons seem to be a bit vague. Sometimes it is that there is not enough money; sometimes it is that they have to fill in too many forms for it all. He confirms that some dentists also are not so willing to see Vietnam veterans and, again, I commend those who are seeing veterans, and I express my concern about those who are not. At the time that I spoke to this constituent, he was out at Kensington after having to make a 72 kilometre round trip to see a specialist whom he required to see because there was no-one in the South. Despite there being several practitioners of this discipline within the South, he could not find one who would see him with a Gold Card, so he had to make a trip to Kensington in order to see the particular form of medical practitioner he needed to see. I commend that person in Kensington.

Again, I express my concern about all those in the South who are not pulling their weight and enabling Vietnam veterans, and other veterans, to get the medical services that they require. Once again, my congratulations go to the member for Wright, as do my thanks to her for being vigilant and allowing me to identify the difficulty that some of my constituents are experiencing. Certainly, I am very willing to work with her and others to see that I do not have to have any more of my constituents doctor shopping, dentist shopping or practitioner shopping in this way. These people deserve the best and, if it is the case that it is a particular problem for Vietnam veterans, this is even more distressing because they have had a very rough go over the years.

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): In my normal bipartisan way, I rise to support this very important motion. Members would realise that the opposition will always support the government if the motions involved make sense, and I am pleased to say that on this occasion this motion does make sense. Nothing is more important, in my opinion, than looking after any man or woman who has represented their country in any conflict and, potentially, put the ultimate sacrifice before them in order to give us the democracy that we enjoy so freely in Australia and South Australia.

I am pleased to see that this is now becoming a public debate. Having had a father of whom I was very proud and who had a very colourful World War II history, I saw how long it took and how difficult it was for him to eventually get TPI. Sadly, it was only a few years before he passed away. I know that it has never been easy for our returned service men and women to get what they deserve. In fact, generally speaking, in the last 10 years I would think they are doing better than they were for all the years before that.

Having said that, I think this Gold Card matter is just one of a number of concerns to veterans. I want to put on the public record my particular appreciation for a man for whom I have enormous time, who has done so much for me personally as a local member of parliament for Mawson, who was responsible with some others for actually getting the Gold Card and who ran a campaign for several years. That is Mr Max Gamlin OAM. Max, with others from South Australia—and I will not mention the others because I am not aware of them all, but I know there were several— campaigned hard for the Gold Card. My mother has a Gold Card now, and she is very proud of that. It is the pride as much as anything else because they deserve that. It is disheartening that some medical practitioners do not see Gold Card patients; however, I appreciate the struggle and strain that they are under.

I travelled down to Adelaide this morning listening to the radio about the massive waiting lists for elective surgery in the state. People are waiting 43 months to see a specialist as a result of the Rann government's lack of support for health. That means that general practitioners are under enormous pressure. One gentleman said that he was living on pain-killers, and he is a carer for a lady approximately 90 years of age. I know that the general practitioners are under enormous pressure, particularly in the southern region, because we simply do not have enough general practitioners there.

Having said that, I do not think that money is the only thing to do with this because doctors, by and large, are very generous when it comes to supporting social inclusion around seeing patients. I think their workload is the problem, as sometimes is the complex nature of health matters that need attention for those people who have been in conflicts around the world representing the rest of us here in Australia and protecting our lives.

I want to highlight something about which I have a particular concern at the moment and which ties in with this, and I will be speaking more to Martin Hamilton-Smith, the shadow minister for veterans affairs, about this matter. Over the years I have spent a lot of my time in ward 17, which is the psychiatric section of the Repatriation Hospital. I know that my father would not mind me saying that he had not only serious physical injury but some serious mental health at times, and I can understand that when there are only three of you to get off the *HMAS Sydney* three days before it goes down, after going through the most intense conflict in the Mediterranean, and when they sank the *Coleoni* at Crete in July 1941. And I saw a lot of other people who had those sorts of needs.

Of course, especially now with Vietnam vets, there is enormous need to support them with their mental health. We all know that Australians did not greet and appreciate their efforts when they first came home, and that was very, very sad. Ultimately, to a degree, that has now been fixed, but it will never be completely fixed. If you are going to send men and women overseas to keep us safe and democratic, and when they come home not show the appreciation in respect

for them that they should have, then I can understand that has an enormous impact on their health and well-being. I am concerned about what I am hearing about ward 17 at the moment at the Repatriation Hospital.

I hope that this state minister goes out there and has a visit and a look around. I am also concerned that some of the psychiatrists in this state appear to not want to take on some of the more difficult cases, and these are extremely complex cases at times. I met with a constituent of mine recently, and for obvious reasons I will not name him as we stick with confidentiality. This man and his wife are a lovely couple. This man has been through enormous difficulty in his post Vietnam years, because, when I analyse it, he was never given enough support from the day he actually came home. Let's face it, if you are not well and if you have been through any sort of trauma and that support is not there for you, the situation is going to arise where it makes it even more difficult for you to get well. I admire this man. He is a good man, and he has done everything he can, but he is simply not getting the help from the psychiatric profession.

I am advised that at the repat hospital you go in there because you have a health problem, and you actually meet a psychiatrist. You have one session or, maybe, if you are very fortunate, you have two sessions. After that, the next time you go there, guess what? It is a different psychiatrist. And the next time it is another different psychiatrist. Again, the time after that, with the greatest respect, it is a psychiatrist who has just graduated, who is learning, and probably has not had the practical experience for the more complex health matters with respect to some of these veterans. I find that disgusting, and I want that looked into.

It seems that it is possibly a financial matter, because the psychiatrists who are more experienced can earn more money outside of the repat hospital. I also find it concerning that, whilst this gentleman, like many others, has an excellent local general practitioner who is concerned, it is very, very difficult for him even to get to see a private psychiatrist. And when he does, it sounds a bit like you are going through a factory, because the best you get is a 30 minute session, as I am advised, and after that it may be several months again before you can get back to see that psychiatrist. Complex matters require complex solutions at times, and that means more than a 15 to 30 minute cursory visit with a psychiatrist. I actually think that between the state and federal minister, it is time to have a very close analysis of both the physical and mental health matters associated with veterans, and to ensure that we can deliver a better service for them.

It is not satisfactory that, ultimately, you have to rely on other returned servicemen and women to go as volunteers to meet with these other returned servicemen and women to assist them through difficult times. It is not satisfactory that some of these people do not want to leave their own homes, and have problems going even to their local shopping centre because they have not been given enough support. It is certainly not satisfactory that pressure comes to bear on the spouse and the family members of that person who is unwell as a result of their commitment to our country, that they all suffer.

In summary, whether it is doctors not seeing returned veterans and members of the forces who have represented our country, whether it is that they will not see them because they are busy or because it is Gold Card, or whether they are matters to do with psychiatric or rehabilitation assistance, or even some of the more easy things to fix like giving them opportunities to access health rehab centres in their own areas

and the like and the debates that go on about accessing the therapy pools at the repat, I think it is time we did have a look at what is going on in the bureaucratic side of this health system and do the very best we can to support these wonderful men and women.

I commend the member for Wright for raising this. I intend to check with my local doctors. I have not had it raised with me, and I think our local doctors in the south would be very responsible to Gold Card holders. It would probably be more the case that we just do not have enough doctors in our areas, if they cannot get in there. But I will be following it up with psychiatrists to see why they cannot do better for these veterans.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I rise to support the motion and to briefly make some comments. I think that all of our aged citizens deserve good medical treatment, in particular, our veterans. My father-in-law is a Gold Card holder. He is 91 and doing a remarkable job caring for my mother-in-law who, regrettably, suffers from dementia. I have to say that his Gold Card is invaluable to him and to us as a family. His doctor is a wonderful, caring and very supportive fellow. He is a very conscientious doctor, so we are extremely lucky in that regard. I think that all our veterans deserve the same support and treatment from their medical practitioner, as our poppa does. They have served our country very well. Also, the wives of ex-servicemen have to be respected and thanked for the role that they played. I support the motion and I congratulate the member for Wright for bringing it to the house. I think that it is something that a number of our medical professionals should take note of.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I take this opportunity to thank those members opposite for their support of this motion. There have been some instances in the media where private members' time has been berated as a waste of time, and I think I can show some examples where when motions of this type have been supported in a bipartisan way we have been able to achieve some quite significant results, certainly in relation to the federal government, and one of those examples was when I moved the motion in relation to the pneumococcal vaccine, and had the support of the member for Morphett. As we now know that vaccine is now available free to all of our babies, and it is as a result of the campaign and the support that came out of this parliament.

I was going to leave this for another time but I feel in light of the comments made by members of the opposition that I should actually make these brief comments. I think the Gold Card system here is quite unique in the care and treatment it provides for our veterans, and in recognition of their contribution. We heard some talk about the needs for doctors to make some business decisions in relation to the services that they provide. I think it is true to say that many practitioners feel that the scheme provides them with inadequate conditions and inadequate reimbursement. There is no doubt that I think South Australian general practitioners must be encouraged to continue to support the Gold Card, despite the fact that they are having problems with the federal government—and I acknowledge that—but they must be persuaded to stay on board and continue to support our Gold Card holders.

I understand that GPs receive a veterans access fee on top of the Medicare scheduled fee for signing up as a Department of Veterans' Affairs local officer. This was introduced following the loss of something like 2 500 GPs from the

scheme back in 2003. The fee was not indexed and, in January 2005, was increased to 115 per cent of the standard Medicare-Plus incentive fee. It is felt by many in the medical fraternity that these fees still undervalue the medical services provided by those GPs. Even under the more generous arrangements of remuneration, they are not sufficient to provide the quality care and treatment to veterans—most of those whom are ageing and disabled—and I think that that is a particular issue in the areas of GP work force shortage, particularly in northern and southern metropolitan Adelaide.

I understand from a recent poll conducted by the AMA that 86 per cent of veterans have more complex needs than the other patients, and that 81 per cent of the Department of Veterans' Affairs patients required considerably more paperwork and red tape, cutting into the available time for them to service other patients. I can understand their gripe with the federal government, and it is one that I will be taking up with it. More concerning, a sample of 335 doctors who participate in the DVA local medical office scheme—that is, they recognise the Gold Card—indicated that 60 per cent of GPs are on the verge of withdrawing from the scheme if the federal government fails to act.

This is quite a critical situation, and one that I think needs to be taken very strongly to the federal government. We cannot allow these people, as all of the speakers have said, who have given so much of their lives and their families to ensure our way of life. Their health has suffered as a result of that. They cannot be left to wallow, they cannot be left behind, they cannot be left unprotected, and we have a clear responsibility to do what we can to ensure that the federal government upholds its responsibilities for our ex-servicemen, women and war widows.

Motion carried.

REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this house expresses alarm at the lack of attention being paid to regional infrastructure and support services in rural South Australia since the government took office.

It will be interesting to see what happens in today's budget. We have already heard many of the announcements—pre-announced to give the government maximum publicity—and I guess that that is a modern phenomena. One wonders why one even has to sit here and listen to it this afternoon if we know a fair bit about it already. I have been extremely concerned with the lack of attention, and the lack of money, given to regional infrastructure projects since the Labor government took office. You, Mr Speaker, and most of us, would recall the situation when the Liberal Party was in government and it sought after fixing up the majority of state's financial problems, remembering that it inherited a \$9.5 billion debt. We started to spend money in infrastructure in regional areas in a way that it had never been spent before. In fact, it resulted in enhancement of the efficiency and accessibility and safety of roads, water supply, and other infrastructure projects. In our last budget, the 2001–2002 budget, a huge \$1.7 billion was allocated to regional South Australia.

What have we seen happen since we left office? Basically, the amount given to roads has been cut. The amount given to infrastructure generally has been cut. It will not be surprising, therefore, in today's budget to see a reversal, but for three years we have had virtually nothing going on. Why did we

have to wait for that? Of course, it is obvious that there will be stuff in today's budget, because there is an election within 10 months; and the government says, 'We had better show the regional people we are really interested in them.' It is a tragedy that no interest has been shown in three years.

In that time our exports have fallen dramatically. I have last year's figures with me, and it went from \$9.1 billion when the Liberal government was in office down to \$7.4 billion. We will probably find out more about statistics on our exports later today. The Labor government wanted to treble exports, like the target we had set well before them. All that has happened is that the figure has fallen, while during our term of office it went up.

What will happen to exports if this drought continues? I hate to think. It will be catastrophic. We cannot blame the government for the drought—I acknowledge that—but other programs could have been in place well and truly before this.

If one looks at last year's budget, one sees that the government bragged about a \$950 million capital works program. It sounded good, but, when some creative accounting with the car fleet was removed, the budget actually cut capital works by \$50 million. So, there was not a \$950 million injection: it was actually a \$50 million cut. That is what hurts, and, of course, it is showing in regional areas at present. I acknowledge that at Mount Gambier the Minister for Regional Development announced how the infrastructure fund had spent money in the years 2002–03 and 2003–04. I suspect that it was designed to try to blunt my motion, because my motion was high up in the list. However, at Mount Gambier, as members would recall, we had debate on earlier motions; so we did not get to this one.

I am happy to acknowledge that \$400 000 was committed to the Port Broughton boat harbor, which used to be in my electorate but is now just out of it. But in the previous two or three years, during the term of the Liberal government, we committed significant moneys, well in excess of that, to Edithburgh, Point Turton, Port Hughes and Wallaroo jetties, to name but four. Labor has put forward one: we put forward many. Of course, it is only a small commitment in my electorate.

The minister also announced that there was an \$85 000 grant to assist with expansion of broiler farms at the Port Wakefield poultry farm. Again, this is very welcome, but our government, during the last three or four years we were in office, committed to at least two hay processors in my area, Primo Abattoirs (which required major infrastructure), at least two engineering firms and many aquaculture projects. We had projects on the go all over the place. Therefore, the announcements by the Minister for Regional Development pale into insignificance compared to what had been occurring before the Labor government took office.

I am particularly concerned about what has been happening to the roads in my area. In March and April 2004—just over a year ago—on the road from Maitland to Weetulta, the road heading north out of Maitland, shoulder sealing was occurring, and I was absolutely delighted to see that. I stopped to speak with the construction team. As it happens, I spoke to the Victorian manager, who was there looking at how the project was going. It was a magnificent finish, and I said, 'Are you about ready to seal it?' He said, 'No, unfortunately, no money has been made available to seal the shoulder. It will be left as dirt.' I said, 'That is a total waste of money. It will deteriorate within the next year or two and we will back to where we were within three or four years.' He said, 'I know.' I said, 'How much will it cost to seal the

section you have done?' At that stage they had done five kilometres and were due to do another kilometre or two. He did a quick calculation and said that it would be about \$200 000 to \$250 000. I said, 'How much is it per kilometre?' He said, 'That would mean we could not widen the next kilometre or so because that is about what it costs to do the earthworks.'

On that very day I sent an urgent letter to the then minister for transport (Hon. Trish White). That letter, of 2 April 2004, states:

... I was 'nonplussed' when told by one of the officials onsite that the widened area would not be sealed.

On further questioning it was clear continual grading and maintenance work will have to occur within 12 months or so. I then sought information from the company onsite as to how much it would cost to seal the five kilometre section and whether the seal could be laid straight over the work currently being completed. The answer was \$200-\$250 000 for the seal and yes it can be undertaken on the completed surface AS LONG AS IT IS DONE NOW.

MINISTER, I PLEAD WITH YOU TO PERSONALLY INTERVENE AND SEE THAT A SEAL IS UNDERTAKEN FORTHWITH. I would rather forgo a kilometre or two of widening to ensure the section under construction is sealed. Thank you in anticipation of using your commonsense and saving ratepayers and taxpayers many thousands of dollars in future years.

Because I put on the letter 'Urgent, minister only' and highlighted some of the statements, one expected that I would get an answer quick smart. We followed it up with three phone calls over the next few weeks and months. Five months after this urgent letter, I got a reply from the acting minister for transport (Hon. Terry Roberts). He thanked me for my letter and said as follows:

The shoulder re-sheeting works currently being undertaken on this road are designed to improve the slope of the shoulders and drop-off at the edge of the sealed carriageway. The treatment will also provide a safe area for vehicles to pull off the road and is considered appropriate for sections of road such as Maitland to Weetulla. However, the construction method used for the shoulder re-sheeting work is unsuitable for sealing. Additional material would be required and a higher compaction criteria would need to be met to enable these shoulders to be sealed.

First of all, I could not believe that they were telling me how to suck eggs, namely, that it would improve the slope of the shoulders and drop off at the edge. I do not disagree with that for one second. But the construction company manager has said, 'Yes, you can seal it straight away but it has to be done straight away,' and then I am told, 'No; additional compaction will be required.' I do not know who is boss, but I would have thought that the construction company would know better than other people.

So, I did not get anywhere. To say that I was frustrated and annoyed is an understatement. We are now 12 months down the track. I have been down that road many times, but about three weeks ago I paid particular attention to it. I remember that we had not had any rain for six months, or perhaps even longer, so the deterioration would have been minimal. It is when the rain comes and it runs off the side of the road that the road deteriorates. The potholes were starting to occur, which is what I said would happen. So, basically, it was a total waste of money in the long term, and it could all have been avoided. I cannot believe the incompetence of a government that says that it is doing something so that it can say, 'Yes, we are doing something,' but it is all for nothing in the next few years.

Earlier this week, a meeting was organised by the Central Local Government Region. Five councils were involved, including Yorke Peninsula Council and Wakefield Regional Council. The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

(Hon. Rory McEwen) was at the meeting, but no other minister attended. The former minister, Trish White, was there, but she was basically there as the member for Taylor because the Mallala area was included, and the member for Giles (Ms Lyn Breuer) was also present, along with several opposition members. I do not think any Independents were there. I was extremely disappointed that the minister did not attend. I would have thought that the Minister for Infrastructure and the minister for water resources would have attended, because it was about providing water for regional areas.

I wonder what the Central Local Government Region thought of it. It has been trying for years to get things done. It is not only this state government. The previous state government wanted to do more, but members would remember that we were limited in our finances. The present government is overflowing with money from GST revenue. It probably highlights that the state government has to get real and start doing something that will really help regional areas.

Today, I heard an announcement—and the member for Flinders will probably comment further, because it is in her area, and I apologise for albeit interfering but commenting on her area—that apparently in today's budget there is going to be an amount of \$48.5 million funding for a water pipeline from Whyalla to Kimba. I would normally say, 'Hooray! That is excellent,' but I immediately thought, 'Hang on. We are all on water restrictions across the state.' Why? Because there is not enough water in the River Murray to provide the water that is necessary, and this government is suddenly announcing that it is going to build a new water pipeline taking River Murray water to Kimba. I have no idea where they are going to get the water from, but the member for Flinders might be able to enlarge upon that.

Getting back to the issue of infrastructure, in my electorate we are being charged up to \$14 000 per residential block for a water augmentation charge because there is insufficient water. So, you would probably buy the block for \$30 000 and then you have to pay another \$14 000 for a water augmentation charge—and, if you want to build on the land, you do not have a choice. In the Copper Coast region, it has been watered down to \$6 000: the government wanted to make it \$10 000. On that occasion, I had a row with the minister in his office, and I am still not at all happy about the \$6 000. I believe that \$1 000 would probably have been acceptable, but \$10 000 is ridiculous. The \$6 000 will, of course, be indexed. Why should people in the rural areas be penalised so much when no-one down here has to pay for it? It is really disconcerting.

In conclusion, I have been pushing since April 2002 (from the time we left government) for the last bit of road between Port Wakefield and Kulpara to be reconstructed. I have almost had two accidents on that road, so please do something, Minister for Transport.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I have noted of late and while we were sitting in Mount Gambier and this week the bizarre behaviour of some of the members opposite. I think they are perhaps in panic mode. We are doing an excellent job in this state. I am particularly pleased about the notice being taken of the regions and the regional areas. I have great admiration for the member for Goyder, but I cannot support this motion. I think it is a panic motion because they are feeling very concerned about what we are doing for the state. I am delighted with what is going on in our state.

Recently, the government released the regional overview of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia. This is a companion document to the statewide component of the plan. This is the first time we have had a plan of this kind in South Australia. I believe that it is a major step forward in developing a more coordinated, efficient, sustainable and innovative approach to building our state, and I was delighted to see that plan when it was released.

The statewide component of the infrastructure plan has been well received by industry bodies such as the South Australian Freight Council, Business SA and the RAA, with Business SA stating, 'The business community applauded the government's long term view outlined in the plan.' The Economic Development Board has described the plan as a 'weighty piece of work that will resonate with communities across the state.' The board goes on to say:

It provides clear statements of the government's readiness to borrow to fund public infrastructure projects, along with a commitment to consider unsolicited bids from the private sector where targeted at meeting public infrastructure needs identified in the plan. It describes a new process for considering and prioritising the state's public infrastructure projects, and includes a first-round commitment to a selection of specific projects, and I was delighted to see what those projects were. The President of the Local Government Association, councillor John Legoe, said:

The government and, in particular, the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. Patrick Conlon) are to be congratulated on the plan.

Councillor Legoe also states that he is keen to see the release of the supporting regional plans in the future. The Local Government Association is also delighted with what we have released in our plan. The regional overview of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan has been described by the Economic Development Board as having impressive coverage of regional infrastructure issues and priorities. I believe that it is the first time that this state has seen something like this. Along with the release of the other regional overview, we announced several priority regional infrastructure projects: first, a \$10 million component to upgrade road and rail networks and improve grain handling facilities to support the export of grain from Eyre Peninsula.

While in Mount Gambier the state government allocated \$2.3 million for the upgrade of the Penola Road entrance to Mount Gambier. Other priority regional projects announced included improving the condition of local roads in the state's road freight network and upgrading the number one berth at Port Lincoln. I have taken particular notice of what has been happening in my electorate of Giles and in the electorate of Flinders. I have been amazed at the number of announcements in recent times about infrastructure in those areas. We are upgrading roads on Kangaroo Island.

One announcement that was absolutely wonderful news for me and for the people in Andamooka was that of a pipeline to transport water from Roxby Downs to Andamooka. The people of Andamooka have been fighting for that for about 15 years. Finally, our government and our minister, Hon. Patrick Conlon, approved that. That will be wonderful for the people in those areas. Andamooka is growing. It is alongside Roxby Downs. Many residents from Roxby Downs are moving into Andamooka. They need that water supply. Andamooka always seemed like a little community, and everyone ignored it. We have done something about it, and that is wonderful.

We are also examining road and rail upgrade options to increase freight activity associated with the forest industry in

the state's South-East. Also, recently, the government committed approximately \$1.1 million to regional infrastructure projects through the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund. This is in addition to the \$1 million to upgrade boating facilities at Fitzgerald Bay, and that will be wonderful for our aquaculture industry in Fitzgerald Bay and for the rest of the Eyre Peninsula.

Also, we have committed \$400 000 to improve facilities at Port Broughton. I do not know where the member for Goyder got his stories from. We will be supporting private sector initiatives to upgrade facilities for the fishing fleet in Port Lincoln, Ceduna, Arno Bay and Cape Jaffa. In preparing the infrastructure plan, the government consulted closely with the regional development boards and the local government associations. Consultation undertaken throughout regional South Australia has highlighted several key regional issues. They require urgent attention, and we have committed to give that attention. We have produced a comprehensive region by region analysis for the state.

For each region there is a clear illustration of the current issues facing regional South Australia and suggested projects to address the current problems. This plan outlines initiatives that will build on the already significant achievements of the Labor government in delivering infrastructure projects that benefit regional South Australia.

The member for Goyder mentioned a decline in exports. I am not sure whether he is aware that at the moment we are experiencing a drought. Much of the government's recent investment in metropolitan infrastructure will bring benefit to the entire state, and particularly regional areas.

Much fuss has been made about the deepening of the Outer Harbor shipping channel, the Port River road and rail bridges and a new underpass and tunnel for South Road, but these will transform the efficiency of the state's freight transport network and benefit regional export industries. People think that because it is happening in Adelaide it will not benefit the regions, but it does. It will be an essential part for our export industries.

The government's financing package with Flinders Ports for the deepening of the Outer Harbor channel means that the private sector and other exporters of goods and services have to finance only \$15 million of a \$45 million project, and that is a great deal for regional South Australia.

In addition, the government has honoured its promise to build opening bridges. The bridges will not be tolled, as was proposed by the former Liberal government. The decision means that no additional levy per tonne of grain will be imposed to get the grain trains and trucks to Outer Harbor. The Port River Expressway bridges are part of an overall development strategy for the Outer Harbor port, which includes the proposed Sturt Highway extension, the LeFevre rail freight corridor upgrade, provision of head works at Outer Harbor, a new deep sea grain port and deepening of the Outer Harbor shipping channel.

In fact, in excess of \$400 million is being invested in upgrading Outer Harbor and transport corridors, linking directly to the port from South Road, Port Wakefield Road and the Sturt Highway, with more to come. This work clearly benefits the exports of our state's rural produce.

The government has put in place measures to upgrade the reliability of the power supplies on Kangaroo Island. We have made arrangements to fund the development of a new ferry terminal at Cape Jervis. This terminal will benefit the local business and tourism community, as well as local residents commuting to the mainland.

We are undertaking a program to replace the ferries on the River Murray, and continue to commit funding to important road safety measures on regional roads, such as overtaking lanes and shoulder sealing. Over \$20 million is allocated in the coming three years to these two projects alone. Significant works have been done by the government to protect water supplies for the whole of the state, including salt interception schemes along the River Murray, identifying appropriate locations for new irrigation schemes that will not adversely impact on the river, sand pumping at the Murray mouth and upgrades to the weirs and barrages.

Arrangements are being made to upgrade the water supply on the Eyre Peninsula, and the announcement today of the pipeline from Iron Knob to Kimba will certainly resolve issues we are having with Eyre Peninsula water supplies. We know that there are major issues there. This is amazing for the Eyre Peninsula. The member opposite asked where the water was coming from. The water will be bought. No extra water will be taken out of the River Murray.

We have talked about desalination plants on the Eyre Peninsula, and I heard the member for Flinders on the radio this week talking about this. When we get our new desalination plant (which I firmly believe will happen and which will be built near Whyalla), I believe that the water from there can serve Eyre Peninsula. It will serve Whyalla, Roxby Downs and Western Mining, or whomever takes over at Roxby Downs. That will be an amazing achievement for our part of the state where water is our biggest issue. Yet, they are saying that we are not providing any infrastructure for our state. The Minister for Tourism has announced plans for \$2.5 million to be spent on revamping tourism in outback South Australia, and already a considerable amount of work has gone into that. I have seen the facilities at Woomera and Coober Pedy for tourism. This is of major benefit for regional South Australia.

ETSA and ElectraNet are continually upgrading their networks and facilities to meet the growth in demand for new industries such as the Amcor bottling plant at Gawler, the Berringer Blass Winery in the Barossa, Big W's redevelopment at Monarto, and line upgrades at Port Neil, Bumbunga, Davenport, Baroota and Tumby Bay. A new 132 kv transmission line augmentation is under way in the Barossa and a new peaking power station has been built in that area. The sea gas pipeline and laterals are being constructed by the private sector to replace the diminishing supplies at Katnook and a new connection is being made to Naracoorte. The state government is committed to regional South Australia. We have released plans for prioritising infrastructure development throughout the state, and I look forward to further development in my part of the state.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I am delighted to support the motion of my friend, the member who represents the Yorke Peninsula district, and also to follow the contribution of the member for Giles, because that member, ever since the announcement of Tina Wakelin as the Liberal candidate for Giles, has sprung to life. It is like an infrastructure renewal. All of a sudden, she is leaping to her feet; she is the champion of regional infrastructure. We have heard the sound of snoring for three years, but all of a sudden it's go, go, go for regional South Australia.

Having said that, I think the government should welcome the fact that they have at least one rural Labor Party member in their caucus who represents regional South Australia. I think that is commendable: one Labor Party member in their entire caucus representing regional South Australia. Of

course, there are a couple of others who have been brought in, but there is only one who actually represents regional South Australia—and that is Perry Urban. Nevertheless, this is a substantial part of the state.

For the benefit of those constituents who read *Hansard*, I note that almost half the members on this side are from regional South Australia. Most of them are farmers or regional business people, most of them have come from a range of industries or local government in the regions, etc., but of course that is an important difference between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party, isn't it? The Liberal Party is broadly representative of all South Australians whereas the Labor Party is representative of Adelaide—with the odd exception.

That brings me to the point of the motion. I think the point that my friend the member for Goyder is making is that the infrastructure plans of this government very much reflect the nature of the Labor Party, which is an Adelaide based party. I am delighted to have in my hand the infrastructure plan. A cynic might argue that the government's infrastructure plan (the upgrading of Main South Road, the building of subways underneath Port Road and South Road, the establishment of bus terminals, beautiful trams running along North Terrace and through King William Street to North Adelaide to the cappuccino—set, all of which is very good for the member for Adelaide) is really a Labor Party marginal seats infrastructure plan.

Dare I be a cynic! The infrastructure developments that they have established run through the seat of West Torrens and those electorates which run along South Road from Elder through Ashford. It runs out by the time you get to the electorate of Mitchell, because the member for Mitchell decided that he did not like the Labor Party anymore and became a Green. So, somehow the money runs out when you get through the seat of Elder. It sprinkles through those other marginal seats, through the Attorney-General's seat, and then it goes up to the north. These are all those seats that the Labor Party is hoping to hang on to or win. It is pretty shallow when you look at it. The seat of Adelaide with the lovely trams, as I have mentioned; Norwood gets the Britannia Roundabout; then, out there in the regions where the rest of South Australia lives, that huge mass which is almost the size of Europe, not a great deal is to be spent.

The member for Giles talked about the very welcome announcement today of the pipeline to Kimba. I was in Kimba some time ago, and I am sure this news will be welcomed with glee, but I cannot find it in the government's infrastructure plan. I am looking at the water section (page 143) of the government's infrastructure plan and, mysteriously, the first announcement they make does not seem to be listed. I wonder whether the member for Giles saw the infrastructure plan, had a heart attack or palpitations, ran to the Premier and threw herself on the floor and said, 'My god, there's nothing in here for me. I'm a marginal seat now. Tina Wakelin's been selected. You'd better build me a pipeline to Kimba—quick!' Because somehow or other it has magically appeared, like a dove flying down from above. Suddenly, we have a pipeline to Kimba. I don't know what we will get next. We will probably have an international airport in Ceduna. Heaven knows what we will have. Suddenly the government has realised that it has to win some marginal seats, and here comes the dough.

The poor old member for Goyder, who is retiring after a very distinguished career, is in the unfortunate position of having to say to the candidate who is to replace him—

Mr Meier: Steven Griffiths.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: A very excellent candidate, the very experienced Mr Griffiths. The member for Goyder is having to say to Mr Griffiths that there is nothing in the budget for him—that the Labor government is doing nothing for him in terms of infrastructure on the Yorke Peninsula. My friend the member for Flinders, an ardent campaigner for the region, finds that, apart from this recent announcement of a pipeline to Kimba, which was not in the plan, there is not much for her, either. There is not much in regard to rail or road.

What the Labor Party does not seem to be able to do is read. It has not read the RAA's submission, it has not read the South Australian Freight Council's submission, and it has not read the Council for the Economic Development of Australia's submission about infrastructure. If it had, it would have discovered that there is a need to complete the link from the Sturt Highway to the Port River Expressway and upgrade Port Wakefield Road to freeway standard, and to fund it. It would have read that the expansion of the AusLink national network, the Riddoch Highway, requires approximately 10 overtaking lanes at a cost of \$10 million. It would have understood that, on Eyre Peninsula west of Ceduna, widening of the carriageway to 3.5-metre lane widths has with it a bill of \$25 million. It would understand that eventually we need to duplicate the Duke's Highway, at a cost of \$600 million. It would have understood that ultimately the Princes Highway will require duplication, at a cost of \$600 million.

It would have understood that the Victor Harbor road upgrade needs to be proceeded with. It would have understood all these things. It would have understood that there is a need to complete the Port River Expressway and fund it. It might have reflected on its priorities and considered whether it was more important to have opening bridges on the Port River or to do some of the things I have just noted, like upgrade our regional roads so that we do not pick up *The Advertiser* and read about kids dying at the Port Wakefield interchange because there is no effective bypass. That is on the road to the member for Giles' electorate, down which so many of her constituents travel. It has not read any of those things. It has not listened to any of those things.

It has not understood the need for South Australians living in the regions to have their roads, their rail, their water and their power infrastructure maintained. When I reached the section in the government's Infrastructure Plan that dealt with power, I noted that it has all these high-minded objectives for the establishment of power infrastructure, and after every one of them it says 'action by the private sector'. I did not see the government, which has condemned roundly the privatisation of ETSA and our power utilities, saying 'We'll build some more power generation for the South-East. They're desperately short of energy down there. We'll advance the provision of gas supplies to the South-East.' I did not see anything in there for additional power supplies on Eyre Peninsula. I note some progress has been made in regard to renewable energy on Eyre Peninsula, but it is all private sector.

It is amazing how quickly the government has got on to the idea that maybe the private sector has a role to play. As shadow minister for infrastructure, I commend the honourable member's motion. The government has neglected the regions and continues to neglect the regions. We have a little drop here and a little drop there. What we need is a vision for the regions. Country people matter. Country people count. They have a right to enjoy roads and a right to public transport. They have a right to country theatres that are upgraded so

they can enjoy some of the things that people in Adelaide enjoy.

South Australia does not stop at Gepps Cross or Port Noarlunga: it is a whole state. What the Labor government needs to do is come up with a vision for infrastructure that is for everyone. It also needs to understand that Adelaide-based people go out into the country and they also need infrastructure.

Time expired.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I totally support this motion. In an electorate like mine of 42 000 square kilometres, 10 hospitals, 72 education institutions, 60 per cent of the state's seafood and 40 per cent of the state's grain, there is a very low infrastructure input. However, today there is a big announcement. Today I am told that I am going to get \$48.5 million to provide for water that we have been trying to get for the last goodness knows how many years. It has finally been recognised as being an issue.

Mrs Geraghty: How many years? Was that when you were in government? You had been trying and you didn't get it?

Mrs PENFOLD: Yes. SA Water had not recognised that there was a problem but now it does; which is wonderful. At last there is a recognition of a problem and, instead of giving an innovative solution, they have decided to go back to old technology—and less innovative you could barely ever imagine! A \$48.5 million pipeline to bring in just over a gigalitre of water, which will not even take Eyre Peninsula off restrictions. We will still have restrictions after \$48 million. I can get five gigalitres of water, which would provide over half of the whole water requirement for Eyre Peninsula—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The member for Torrens.

Mrs PENFOLD: —for about half that price. At the moment we are using about 9.5 gigalitres of water. We have reduced it because of these stringent restrictions. It is mostly coming out of the underground basins south of Port Lincoln. These basins are overdrawn. It is expected that, if it has not already happened, there are going to be incursions of water from the sea, and that will make that water saline and we certainly will need to have a desalination plant. But we badly need to take the pressure off those underground basins immediately—not in 2007 when this so-called pipeline is going to come into production, which is going to provide us with just over a gigalitre, but right now. In 2003 we were promised a \$32 million desalination plant, and where is that? It is still a dream.

Then, of course, it is going to use water from the Murray River. We have all been paying this River Murray levy expecting that it was going to enable environmental flows down the River Murray. I think the people of South Australia are going to be furious that the River Murray levy water they have been paying is actually going to be used not for environmental flows down the River Murray but to be put into one big, long pipeline that will go from Whyalla through to Kimba. We only have a 300mm pipeline at Kimba, so how does it get to the rest of Eyre Peninsula anyway? They would need to replace most of the pipelines on Eyre Peninsula. The pipeline system on Eyre Peninsula comes from the southern basin, south of Port Lincoln, with the biggest pipelines down south. It then gets smaller and smaller as it goes up. Cowell has about the same size pipeline but Kimba is closest to

Whyalla with a 300 millimetre pipeline. There is no way we are going to be able to expand that without further expenditure, so this is a very short-term low-technology fix using old technology when we are supposed to be the innovative state.

I went to the vivasa launch last night on the economic indicators for the state which identified that the regions of South Australia produce four of the top five export commodities in the state: beverages, fish, copper, industrial seeds, grains and fruit. A lot of that comes from the Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula. Yorke Peninsula is also in desperate straits for water. What are they going to do? Add a branch off to Yorke Peninsula so that Yorke Peninsula is also going to get more water from the Murray River? We met with a delegation this week from the Yorke Peninsula desperate for more water, and here is this government where the rest of the world is embracing new technology by putting in desalination plants; the technology is improving daily. They are putting in plants. There is over 300 of the type of plant that I am proposing we should put in to Ceduna around the world already producing very good quality water. Yet, this dumb government is once again going to spend money that is not going to be income earning.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the members on my right!

Mrs PENFOLD: This will add to all the other dumb expenditures. It is not going to provide income and jobs for this state. What they really need is some business brains. Opening bridges at \$136 million—where is the gearing in that money? A Glenelg tram is another \$21 million. A bus and rail interchange is \$7 million. Here we are with a railway system on Eyre Peninsula taking a good part of the 40 per cent of the state's grain down to Port Lincoln that needs \$40 million to upgrade it. I believe it should actually be connected through to Whyalla and I would sooner the money went into connecting the railway, standardising it and putting it through so that it can link at Whyalla to their railway—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs PENFOLD: It would mean a lot more jobs and economic prosperity for this state if we linked the Eyre Peninsula railway through to Darwin than it will be to put \$48 million into a pipeline between Whyalla and Kimba for a dribble of water, less than we would need to take us off the restrictions that we already have. The Eyre Peninsula Catchment Water Management Board predicted in their last minutes that we have an increase expected on Eyre Peninsula of 5 000 new developments within the next three to five years. Part of that is a big new marina up in Ceduna—a huge marina which will be wonderful for Ceduna.

What is the water like in Ceduna? I was up there last week. The water in Ceduna, when you have a shower in it, is like a chemical bath it has so much chlorination in it. We do not know what the problems are of bathing in and drinking water with that level of chlorination. If we had a big desalination plant up there, we would be able to put that water in and that marina will have good quality water to drink. Even one of my farmers up there is just putting in \$9 000 to provide a water purifying system for his sheep because the water on Upper Eyre Peninsula is so bad. What are they going to do? They bring water in from the Murray River, deplete the Murray River further, and that water is going to have to be highly chlorinated as well. So, we are going to get a chlorinated, chemical mess on Eyre Peninsula for \$48.5 million. I cannot believe that any minister could be so silly, and it adds, just as I said before, to all the other decisions that this

government is making that I just cannot understand how they can believe that they are going to increase the prosperity of this state.

That \$122 million for a South Road tunnel—maybe we do need it one day, but perhaps we should put that money now into things which can be geared that will provide jobs and wealth for this state and not put it into something that is going to sit there and perhaps save 10 minutes of travel for the people of the city. This is a city-based government. It is a populist government. It is never going to be able to solve the issues and create the real wealth that this state needs to proceed into the future. It is a union-run government, and I do not think that we will ever be able to prosper until we get a Liberal government back in this state—the sooner the better. I am hoping that people, after this budget, will wake up to what we have—a gimmicky government. This government puts solar panels on top of schools so that the children can learn; perhaps a solar panel in the yard would be all right, but to spend millions of dollars—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mrs PENFOLD: Signs out the front of closed schools. This government sees \$20 million going to Carnegie Mellon University when we could have a little bit of that money for Marine Innovation South Australia and we would have a world-class centre of excellence in Port Lincoln for marine education, research and development. At the moment, South Australia loses its students—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the members for Wright and Torrens!

Mrs PENFOLD: —to Tasmania. Tasmania is getting students from around the world and from South Australia, and we should be getting them. I think that the minister should resign.

Time expired.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Every day you grow in wisdom in the chair like a young Obi Wan Kenobi on his path to enlightenment. I read the retired member for Goyder's motion that this house expresses alarm at the lack of attention being paid to regional infrastructure and support services in rural South Australia. It is true to say that the Liberal Party in the late eighties and early nineties had a stranglehold on regional South Australia.

Ms Chapman: It still has.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Well, the member for Bragg says it still has. I will just talk about two elections: 1997 and 2002. Regional South Australians, in my opinion, are not coming back to the Labor Party, apart from the seats of perhaps Stuart, and maybe Frome if the Leader of the Opposition was not the Leader of the Opposition; and, of course, we have a very good member of our parliament in Giles and Whyalla. They are the three regional centres. One we hold with a very good local MP; one we have made very marginal with a very good local candidate, although, to the member for Stuart's credit, he is a very good local member of parliament who would be very hard to beat, but I am sure we can; then there is Frome; and, of course, there is local loyalty for the local Leader of the Opposition. In 1997, the member for Bragg—were you president at the time?

Ms Chapman: No.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: But you would have been on the campaign committee. You were one of the geniuses on the campaign committee for the member for Waite, no doubt.

Mrs Geraghty: She was one of the number crunchers.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: How did the number crunchers go in 1997 in rural and regional South Australia? They did not win Giles; they nearly lost Stuart; they lost the safest Liberal seat in the country to a National Party member who has now formed a coalition with the Labor government; they lost Mount Gambier—the second safest Liberal seat in South Australia; and then the member for MacKillop knocked off their former leader, Dale Baker. This is regional South Australia flocking into the arms of the Liberal Party, is it? It was a great ringing endorsement of the Liberal Party. Now it has come to 2002. They will lose another regional seat—Hammond.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: my motion actually is talking about alarm at the lack of attention being paid to regional infrastructure and support services. It is nothing about what happened with the Liberal Party or anything like that. I draw your attention to the relevance, sir.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Given the debate—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Given the nature of the debate up to now, I think it would be a bit unfair if the chair started being too restrictive on what members can say in the context of the motion. So there is no point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, your Jedi-like fairness overwhelms us all.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, hang on; it is the strategic genius. I hope they put you in charge of the campaign. Can you imagine campaigning against this bloke? It would be like shooting rats in the barrel. However, they lost another regional seat—Hammond. Let us look at the total. They do not hold Giles; they got MacKillop back in a dirty deal—

Mr Williams: Dirty deal?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Dirty deal. In a dirty, dirty deal. I remember when 'switch' Williams was fiercely independent and would not be moved and could not be bought until he said he would stand up to anything but pressure. He would do anything but hurt the Liberal Party he said in a speech in the last parliament. I remember when there were votes in the last parliament when the fiercely independent Mitch Williams would only vote with us after he stood in the middle of the room and counted the house and made sure that the Premier was also going to win the vote, then he safely wandered across to vote with us to prove that he was fiercely independent. Of course, as it came closer to the election campaign, the local Liberals in MacKillop were becoming a little bit dissatisfied with his performance. He came back into the fold; they did not run against him and, of course, he was re-elected. Now they have rewarded his dirty deal with a shadow ministry, and good luck to him. I am sure that one day he will be a very good minister.

I think the Liberal Party has a bit of soul-searching to do. Its members claim that we know nothing about the bush. I must say that I have never claimed to be an expert about what happens in regional centres. When it comes to regional centres I speak to the experts. I speak to the Hon. Graham Gunn; I speak to his brother, the Mayor of Streaky Bay; I speak to people in Port Lincoln; and I speak to people in regional centres, because I am not an expert. I do not claim to be the font of all wisdom for regional areas, but what I do

notice, Sir, because I am a student of politics, is that the Liberal party's vote is contracting at a desperate rate in regional centres, whereas John Howard's vote in regional centres is growing. But the state Liberal's vote is shrinking in regional centres. I am sure that members opposite assume that they will get the same vote that John Howard did in our regional centres, but I would say that perhaps they will not. I hope the member for Waite goes out and campaigns in regional areas. I hope he goes out and sells his bona fides in regional areas. I am sure he would be very popular. I think this motion is an absolute disgrace, and it is just a typical parting shot from someone who, I think, is just trying to get stuck into a government, without any substance. He expresses alarm at the lack of attention being paid to regional infrastructure.

Mr MEIER: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Why aren't they happy with it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: Whilst I think we appreciate that the member speaking has no appreciation of rural areas, I would like to ask him when he was last out in the northern regional areas.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Perhaps the member for West Torrens might direct his comments to infrastructure and support services.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, you bring new wisdom to the Jedi council, and I again bow my head to you. I do not agree with this motion. I think this government has shown a commitment to regional people, and we expect nothing in return. When I have travelled in regional areas, I have heard that people have been overwhelmed with the response to the Eyre Peninsula fires. I do not think that the government is doing that because we expect to win those seats; we do it because we think it is the right thing to do.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Bragg, in her cynicism, thinks that we are helping struggling farmers because of a good media stunt. Would she say that about John Howard and his pitiful drought relief package to New South Wales farmers? No, she would not have said that. But when the Labor Party does something for regional people, it is a media stunt. When the Liberals do it, they are deeply concerned. I reject this, and the member for Flinders should go and speak to her local constituents and see Labor's commitment to a region that we are never going to win—never—and look at our commitment because it is the right thing to do. We are the ones upgrading Port Lincoln Airport, we are the ones investing in infrastructure, not our opponents opposite. They had 8½ years governing South Australia from a base of regional South Australia, and regional South Australians rejected them.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I rise to support the motion. Before I talk to the motion, I want to put on the record a response to some of the comments made by the previous speaker when he talked about my role and the role of MacKillop. I put on the record that when I rejoined the Liberal Party, back in 1999, I made a statement that the reason I was doing that was because the people who put me into this place were conservatives and wanted a Liberal government to continue to be in power in South Australia. I made the comment then that the Independents in the house at that time were undermining that—which I believe was probably the wish of the people in, at least, the seats of

Chaffey and Mount Gambier—and that by sitting on the cross-benches we were undermining that situation, and history has proved me to be correct. So, I put that on the record: there was no deal, let alone a ‘dirty deal’.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The poor old member for West Torrens. Let me come to the point of the motion. Over the last three years infrastructure right across South Australia has languished. I had the pleasure of serving on the parliamentary Public Works Committee in the last parliament and it was a very busy committee. The member for Reynell served on the committee with me and she would know how busy the committee was. It sat virtually every Wednesday of the year; we managed to get a couple of days off over the Christmas break, but I do not remember one year that we did not actually come back for at least one Wednesday in January to sit, because the committee was so darn busy. Why were we busy? Because there were projects happening all over the state, left, right and centre. Anybody can go onto the parliamentary web site and look it up, and you will see the projects that went through that committee over that four-year period, and then compare that with what has happened during the last three years.

It is absolutely stark—what has happened in this state in the last three years—so much so, that the government only recently put out a press release saying that they are spending nearly a billion dollars on infrastructure, on capital works. Included in that, \$111 million is being spent on motor cars because we have changed the system going from leasing motor cars to owning them, and the government has put that down as capital works.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: It is a capital con. Let us say we put another \$100 million into creating some new assets in the state. There has been no change for that \$111 million and it has not delivered one more asset for the economy of South Australia. That is why we are debating this motion because of that sort of snake oil salesman trick from this government. Go out and drive around rural South Australia and see what is happening, and you will soon understand. Fifty per cent of the exports sent out of this state are derived from rural South Australia. When we were in government—and a few of the members of the government say, ‘We would like to compare what you did with what we are doing.’ I am more than happy to do that. In the eight years that we were in government, the exports out of South Australia virtually trebled.

Mr Koutsantonis: You were not in government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: In the eight years that the Liberal Party was in government, South Australia was lucky enough to have the exports out of this state virtually treble. It peaked at just over \$9 billion for the final year that we were in government—and they have now fallen, and they are still below \$8 billion—yet the Premier and his senior ministers say that they are going to, again, treble exports by 2010 from the \$9 billion starting-off point that they inherited. Sir, it ain’t going to happen. Even if the government could do something to get the economy going, the infrastructure in rural South Australia has been allowed to fall into such disrepair that we could not even truck the damn stuff out of the state.

The roads are a mess, and they are falling apart. Just go down to Taillem Bend—ask any member here—it is not very far from Adelaide, you can probably find your way there. You go up Glen Osmond Road, past the Toll Gate, keep driving, and you will get to Taillem Bend—it is not that hard

to get there—turn around and drive out of Taillem Bend towards Murray Bridge on the highway, one of the main arterial roads into South Australia and into Adelaide, and the road is literally falling apart. It is almost bumper to bumper trucks on that road, semi-trailers and B-doubles, but the road is just falling apart. We need things like an extension of that road all the way to the border; a dual lane freeway all the way to the border. It is incredibly important but this government has done nothing to help promote that, and that road between Taillem Bend and Murray Bridge is falling apart. We were here into the early hours of this morning talking about road trauma, and this is the sort of thing that is happening.

There is a whole range of things that I could talk to—and I probably will not get time in the limited time—but we have had an Economic Development Board in South Australia, and we have produced a State Strategic Plan, and I have argued plenty of times that it neither develops strategies, nor is it a plan. It is a series of boxes with a wish list of where we might get to in out years, not even the foreseeable future.

The target for the state population plan is the year 2050. I suggest that most of us will be well and truly buried by then. If we are going to have a state population plan for South Australia, surely it should say something about regional South Australia, from which we derive 50 per cent of our exports. Surely, we would have a plan to deal with the reason why we are running out of room in Adelaide and because the infrastructure is collapsing—and it is indeed overloaded in Adelaide. We should have a plan to ensure that any growth in population in South Australia occurred in some of those areas where we have jobs and huge potential. What we need is some infrastructure to make it happen. We need some roads, better power sources and water reticulation.

I would like to spend a little time to talk about water, because I agree with everything that the member for Flinders has said. Here in South Australia we rely virtually 100 per cent on the River Murray. Have members opposite missed the debate that is going on across this nation about the River Murray? We will spend \$48 million building a tiny pipeline to Whyalla to take another few buckets out of the River Murray to support the West Coast. I do not think there is any future in that. We would like to think that we are the innovative state and that we can educate our young South Australians and keep them here in South Australia. We will spend \$20 million bringing another foreign university here, putting another foreign university in Victoria Square, to train a few bureaucrats. Yet, the best thinking we can get about water infrastructure in South Australia is to take more water from the River Murray and transport it via pipeline hundreds of miles. Where is the smart thinking? It certainly is not on the benches of this government. We have huge problems.

The member for Giles mentioned a list of things that the government has achieved. Basically, it was a list of things that private enterprise has done in this state in spite of this government. There are plenty of them in my electorate; for example, the SEA Gas pipeline. Not one dollar of taxpayers’ money went into the SEA Gas pipeline. The SEA Gas pipeline project started years before 2002. The only thing that the Labor Party has done to support the SEA Gas pipeline was to sell SAGASCO. These anti-privatisation people sold SAGASCO—and that did encourage private investors to look into gas reticulation in South Australia. I congratulate them for that little bit of foresight—but they have railed against it ever since.

I fully support the fine motion brought before the house by the member for Goyder. I urge the senior ministers in the

government to have a hard look at rural South Australia because that is the generator of the economic wealth of this state.

Time expired.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (19)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Hanna, K.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J. (teller)
Penfold, E. M.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

NOES (20)

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

PAIR(S)

Gunn, G. M.	Foley, K. O.
Hall, J. L.	Stevens, L.
McFetridge, D.	Weatherill, J. W.

Majority of 1 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

MOUNT GAMBIER, UNIVERSITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): I move:

That this house encourages the government to support the establishment of a university on an independent site at Mount Gambier.

I have pleasure in moving this motion. In 1996, we had a change of federal government. Initially, under the administration of Senator Amanda Vanstone, as minister for further education, we saw a drive for regional universities in this country. One which had an enormous impact on New South Wales was the Charles Sturt University, which set up a campus for wine research in significant rural and regional areas of New South Wales, and this had a flow-on impact on rural economies.

The federal government has continued with its mandate. I recall that the then minister for health, the Hon. Michael Wooldridge, required that universities include medical training in their campuses in regional parts of the state. In more recent years, the Hon. Dr Brendan Nelson, the now Minister for Further Education at the federal level, has secured, ensured, supported and advanced the establishment of regional university campuses.

In South Australia, the University of South Australia has a campus at Whyalla, and also has places in Mount Gambier. The University of Adelaide has campuses at North Terrace, West Thebarton and Waite and also at Roseworthy, which is in the Gawler area and which is a regional campus of that university. As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, there are university campuses in regional towns right across Australia, and I will name a few: Armidale, Launceston,

Mount Isa, Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, Sippy Downs, Horsham, Ballarat, Lismore, Rockingham, Hervey Bay, Geraldton, Albany, Mildura, Wodonga, Northam, Toowoomba, Bunbury, Shepparton, Bendigo, Gattton, Dookie, Orange and Gippsland. Need I go on? We have universities with campuses in regional areas all across the country. Through the University of South Australia, South Australia has a campus at Whyalla, which has places for university training in Mount Gambier. Those students operate from and are trained at the site of the TAFE college in Mount Gambier. That is an excellent facility, and I make no criticism of it. In the absence of any other facility in which they can operate, the extra funding provided by Dr Brendan Nelson in the last 12 months has meant that there are now 40 extra places at the TAFE campus. Why? Because they do not have their own university?

Why do I particularly single out in this motion a proposal that an independent regional site should have some priority in the Mount Gambier region? The answer is very simple: Mount Gambier is the biggest single metropolitan area outside of Adelaide in the state. It has a population of 23 000 and a further 7 5000 people reside outside the area; and the total region, which is supported by the Mount Gambier township as a regional city, has some 30 000 people. It is commensurate with many other regions in South Australia which have their independent sites, but this one does not. However, it does have the beginning of a structure, by university places, camped on site at the site of the TAFE university. It does not have an independent site. There is an existing structure, operation and population to support this on any commensurate reference around the country and, accordingly, I identify the site for this motion.

It may be that there are more powerful reasons and more persuasive arguments to put for campuses in other regional locations. We have one in Whyalla. We do not have anything in Port Augusta. We do not have provision, for example, in Port Lincoln at that level. We do not have anything in the Riverland at that level. No doubt, members in this house will come forward and say, 'We would argue that if there is a regional placement of a university or support for the birth and development of a university in this state, it ought to be in those regional centres,' and they may be right.

But, let me say this: at the moment we do not have anywhere for that site. What we have is a Premier who, in the last week, announced that his development of higher education at the university level will be to give \$20 million to Pennsylvania. The government will give \$20 million to the Carnegie Mellon University for the John Hines School to establish a campus which 75 students will attend, apparently, to be trained principally in a degree in public education, public management. This is a school for public servants, and that is great. But what better place could there have been to train them, what better place to give them some idea of what is happening in this state, than to place it in regional South Australia?

I suggest to this house that one of the best things we could do to help educate those who will hold senior public service positions in this state is give them a taste of living for a couple of years in regional South Australia so that they understand where the wealth of this state is. That is where the production of this state is, and that is where a third of the population of this state reside and of whom they ought to have some appreciation if, ultimately, they are to be advising ministers of governments as to the direction of this state.

We are extending an invitation to a university to come to this country when, at this stage, we have nothing but a price tag out there—a little incentive payment by this government to an overseas university to come and set up here. We have three public universities in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, all of which provide the courses provided by that university and none of which receive the sort of money that this university has received. They do receive some state grants; let me place that on the record. For example, I think that one university gets about \$23 million. Of course, it pays back something like \$22.5 million in payroll tax to the state. So, the net benefit from the state government is pretty much zip.

I say that if the government was serious about regional South Australia and about advancing higher education for people in this state, it would think about how it could best meet that objective, rather than lining the pockets of a Pennsylvania board, which has the ownership of this university. In my view, that does not serve the interests of South Australia; and, of course, we still have to work out how Carnegie Mellon will fit into the infrastructure of the Higher Education Council. We have not seen any legislation on that yet, so it is a lucky dip.

We have the Premier announcing the \$20 million, but we do not have any of the process. All we have is the announcement of the money without having any idea whatsoever as to how it will fit in. If, of course, the Premier had announced that the \$20 million would bring a university of international standard (which, clearly, it is) to South Australia to provide a service that our universities cannot or will not provide, it is a different matter. If the government were to say, 'It is necessary to have this course because of a massive skill shortage in an area of medicine, construction or mining'—I could, of course, go on in this house about the importance and need to have a skilled work force for the mining development of this state.

We have had questions about that to the Premier in this house, etc. But if there was a proposal by this government to fill a gap, to make provision for skills that we need into the future of this state, again, that would be a basis upon which the government could successfully argue that this was money necessarily to be spent in the interests of this state. All we have is the \$20 million in the can: 'You can come here to Torrens Building in Victoria Square.' The \$20 million is in the infrastructure. Some of it is in subsidies, and the like, but these students will pay full tote odds to an institution that has its base in another country.

It will provide a service that we already have. It will pick up some money along the way and be placed in a region that is of no strategic benefit to this state. I ask the government, when it is concluding its negotiations with Carnegie Mellon, that, at the very least (seeing that this is the first proposal), either with this proposal or the question mark of a fifth university (which it proposes to negotiate), it get smart and look at the benefits of allowing those operations to be established in regional parts of South Australia. Mount Gambier, the Riverland and Port Lincoln are a few booming areas which could offer a benefit service not only to future populations but also to regional people generally.

There is one other point I wish to make in relation to the Mount Gambier proposal. I have raised this matter over a period of time. In fact, last year I raised my concern that there seemed to be no impetus from the state, not even from the local member, the Hon. Rory McEwen, for having an independent site.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Of course, he is an ex-TAFE teacher. Let us understand the priorities. We are seeking an independent site. What does the local member want? The local member—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: Brendan Nelson doesn't support it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I met with Brendan about this two weeks ago. Have you met with him since then? The local member says that they will have the places available at Mount Gambier on the TAFE site.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I will come to that in a minute. They will have that on the TAFE site, and that is where they will operate from. Why is it that the students training in forestry through the degree courses that are being offered in Mount Gambier do not deserve to have an independent site? We got some inkling of this when we visited Mount Gambier. The Minister for Families and Communities explained that the reason he had not rebuilt the accommodation for the departments in Mount Gambier which had burnt down nearly a year earlier was because he wanted to collocate a whole lot of services on one site. Why is it that the people of Mount Gambier or any regional town in South Australia, for that matter, should have to put up with that kind of second-rate provision? It is not acceptable.

There is one other thing that I want to say about the Carnegie Mellon proposal, on which the government is clearly negotiating, and that is that it is not new to invite Carnegie Mellon to come to South Australia. Already there are students in South Australia who undertake these courses. Under the previous government in October 2001 under the regime of premier Olsen, minister Buckley announced funding of \$1.8 million to train 300 South Australians students in degrees through Carnegie Mellon, here in South Australia. I do not know what happened to that project, I do not know whether it is dead and buried, but instead of paying \$20 million to the people in Pennsylvania, \$1.8 million was to be paid over for the benefit of 300 students.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: The minister says that it is in TAFE, so I assume it is continuing to operate. Their expertise was brought over to deal with this area of demand, because in 2001 we still had a massive shortage of skilled people in the IT industry. If the minister is indicating—and I think she is—that it is operating in TAFE, I am very pleased about that, that is terrific. For this Premier to pretend that this is something new is a nonsense.

Time expired.

Ms BREUER (Giles): Once again, I think the member for Bragg has missed the point completely, which she is known to do on many issues. I oppose this motion because when I was in Mount Gambier with the parliament I visited the Mount Gambier campus of TAFE and met with Cathy Hughes, an old friend of mine from my Whyalla days when she worked with me at TAFE—in fact, she was my boss at one stage. She went from Whyalla to the university and has done an incredible job setting up what is happening in Mount Gambier for the University of South Australia and, of course, Professor Len Pullin from Whyalla has been very much involved in this.

I was very pleased with what I saw there. At the moment they have 80 students. When they initially got permission, they thought they would start with 40, but they have 80 students studying in a range of areas including: nursing,

social work, business management and information services. It is an excellent model. They fly their lecturers in and out from Whyalla and, I believe, some from Adelaide. They use local tutors for much of their work, and they use audiovisual aids, etc.. It is based on the TAFE campus, and it is working extremely well. The TAFE campus has extra room, and they are very happy with it.

One of the great things about this is that TAFE students are actually seeing a transition from TAFE to university and they are building on that. They are saving on administration costs and all sorts of things. I think the way it is working at present is wonderful. There is room for expansion, and I have no doubt that the program will expand. We do not need to build a new building or put in a new area or separate the university from TAFE, because when we start looking at the tertiary sector we have to look at issues such as this. We have to look at this particularly in our country regions, because realistically we cannot afford to build brand new edifices. We cannot afford to set up new universities in our regional areas; it is just not possible.

However, our regional students are very much entitled to a service, and I believe they have an excellent service there. I am glad the member for Bragg mentioned the Carnegie Mellon and the \$20 million that is going into those courses, because if we were looking at putting in a new campus at Mount Gambier, the money would go to that, and to me that would be a total waste. We have an excellent system which is working well, and I am sure the local member would agree with that.

If we have that sort of money, I would like to see it go into teaching at the Whyalla campus. I have brought this subject up ad nauseam—I constantly beat the minister around the head about this subject—but, if we look at the model that is working in Mount Gambier, I see no valid argument for not putting teaching into the Whyalla campus. The lecturers are flying in and out of Mount Gambier, as I said, and they are using local tutors and audiovisual aids. All of the arguments that I have heard in the past about why we cannot put teachers into the Whyalla campus I think collapse in a heap.

There is a huge shortage of teachers in country regions. Over and over again, schools come to me and all their country members trying to get teachers into their schools. If we train them in the country we can keep them in the country. I have no doubt about that, because we do that with nurses and social workers. So, if we are talking about money going into setting up a new campus for the university, I say that we should not do that, that we should set up teaching at Whyalla. Most country parents are finding it very difficult nowadays to send their students to university in Adelaide. If they can train locally, then it is much more affordable for the parents and much more likely that the students will go on to university. A lot of our country students do not go on to university, and financial implications are very much the main reason for that.

If we put teaching into the Whyalla campus it can then be extended into the Mount Gambier area so that we are covering both the northern and the southern parts of the state. To me, this makes far more sense than building some brand-new edifice somewhere. It might satisfy a few egos, but it will not serve the community well. I am sure that the communities themselves would rather see the existing infrastructure being used—and used very well. They are very happy with it. The comments I have heard from people in the community are that they are extremely happy with the way things are running there. I think they have some excellent

staff working from there—the increase in the number of students certainly indicates this—and I congratulate all who have been involved in it. Now let us extend that and put teaching into the Whyalla campus and into Mount Gambier also.

Debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY PRACTICE BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

Mr BRINDAL: I want to raise with you as a point of order a matter that has been drawn to my attention and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair cannot hear. If the Minister for Transport, the member for West Torrens, Minister for Agriculture and the member for Mawson would like to take their seat, there is one available for them.

Mr BRINDAL: —concerns many members of this house. There have appeared lately on the internet at least two sites that mention me and other members of parliament in a way that may be of interest to you and this house. I ask if you are aware of those sites and if anything can be done about them. They include things like extracts from *Hansard* which, as far as I can see, are not of themselves entirely inaccurate but they have comment added to them and they report the proceedings of this parliament, and I think reflect on members of this parliament, in a way that I do not think is conducive to the good running of this house. I wonder if you are aware of it, sir.

The SPEAKER: The chair is not aware of them but, if the honourable member provides some details, we will certainly look at the matter. The reason why the chair cannot take a point of order or any other matter when the mace is off the hooks is that the chair is not functioning in the usual manner, so it is inappropriate to seek a point of order when the mace is not in place.

Mr BRINDAL: I did not know that, and you have taught me something.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. Members have a big day and they should not get overexcited at this stage.

GAWLER HEALTH SERVICE

A petition signed by 5 253 electors of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to renew Dr Rattray's and Dr Cave's contracts when they expire in December 2005, to enable the continuance of obstetric and gynaecological services to the Gawler Health Service, was presented by the Hon. M.R. Buckby.

Petition received.

McLAREN VALE, AMBULANCE STATION

A petition signed by 1 299 members of the South Australian community, requesting the house to urge the government to construct an ambulance station at McLaren Vale immediately to reduce response times and help prevent the potential loss of life, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

HOSPITALS, NOARLUNGA

A petition signed by 135 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to provide intensive care facilities at Noarlunga Hospital, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will he confirm to the house that the DPP's office will only receive an extra \$300 000 from this budget—not enough to cover inflation and not \$1.2 million as promoted by the government? It has been widely reported that the government is giving the DPP's office an extra \$1.2 million this year. The government has said that the DPP should be grateful and stop whingeing. A joint government news release issued yesterday by the Treasurer and the Attorney-General states:

\$1.2 million extra over four years for extra prosecution staff for the Office of the DPP.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I have the figures for the DPP's budget over the last nine years, concluding with 2005-06. I will give you some highlights.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: A point of order: I did not ask for the last 150 years' history.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The office has not been going that long.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I actually asked about whether it is true that there is only an extra \$300 000 this year.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney should focus on the key element of the question, but he is allowed some room to explain his answer.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In the year 2000-01, the budget of the DPP was \$6.039 million, and I am advised that that was a 6 per cent cut in funding to the DPP.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am referring to the year 2001. The Leader of the Opposition interjects that that cut was because the then Liberal government had crime under control. I suggest he check the crime statistics for that period.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On a point of order: the Attorney is already debating the issue. The question was quite simple. Will he or will he not confirm this year's budget?

The SPEAKER: Can the Attorney focus on the question?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, I can. When we came to office, in our first budget, the budget for the Office of the DPP was \$7.501 million.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: A point of order, sir. The question was clearly about the funding for the next year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has made his point. The Attorney should focus quickly on the key element.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: You only need three more figures. In 2003-04, the budget was \$9.158 million; in 2004-05, the budget was \$10.591 million; in 2005-06, the budget estimate is \$11.450 million. That is, the 2004-05 budget for the Office of the DPP was \$10.591 million, and in 2005-06, the budget—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: A point of order: the Attorney is testing all of our patience. The question was not about the level of—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Relevance, sir. The question was about the increase in funding for this next year.

The SPEAKER: The Attorney should wind up his answer.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes; I have just given the budget increases. If you could calculate, you would find out what they were, but I am advised that that is a further 6 per cent increase in the budget of the DPP. That is an increase of over \$1 million from 2004-05 to 2005-06. So, all in all, the office has received \$4.4 million in extra funding since we came to office in March 2002. This is an increase of 63 per cent in nominal terms. In real terms, that is, accounting for the consumer price index, the increase is about 44 per cent. I do not know of any other government agency that has had an increase of that size. If there is one agency the Leader of the Opposition should not be asking questions about in question time it is the Office of the DPP. It is the worst agency for the Liberal Party to choose. And the Leader admits that his government slashed—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Davenport!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The leader admits that his government slashed funding to the Office of the DPP.

EMPLOYMENT, SOUTHERN SUBURBS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Can the Minister for the Southern Suburbs outline any initiatives to deliver new employment opportunities in the southern suburbs?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the Southern Suburbs): I am delighted by the question from the member for Reynell. Indeed, I am pleased to assist the member for Reynell in answering the question. I am pleased to advise that there will be 140 new permanent jobs created in her electorate in the seat of Reynell in the Lonsdale area as a result of fibreglass pipe manufacturer Fibre Logic announcing a \$22 million expansion project on its Lonsdale factory site. This will increase the Fibre Logic work force from 25 to 165. This project will also create temporary jobs during the construction process. Expansion is helped by a \$5.9 million grant from the state and federal government's \$45 million Structural Adjustment Fund. The member for Kingston, Mr Richardson, and I celebrated this announcement with the proprietor of Fibre Logic on the site last week.

The Structural Adjustment Fund was set up in the wake of Mitsubishi's decision to close its Lonsdale engine plant, as members would know. The new factory will develop high tech fibre glass pipes for use in the water industry. These pipes will be used to provide more efficient irrigation systems, potentially leading to huge water savings. The project is a vote of confidence in the South, and it shows that the South is a great place in which to do business. Already, redundant Mitsubishi workers have applied for jobs out at the

new plant. Fibre Logic Managing Director Martyn Manuel has signalled that he is very interested in hiring qualified former Mitsubishi workers, and I congratulate him on that.

The announcement follows the decision by Cubic Pacific to expand its South Australian operations by investing at least \$10 million on a new car components plant. This plant, which will be at Edinburgh Park, will create up to 75 jobs, and is supported by almost \$1 million from the Structural Adjustment Fund. The state and federal governments are working closely to create jobs in the South, and this is a good outcome, and we need more to follow.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary question. Is it true, minister, that more than 80 per cent of the funding that Fibre Logic received actually came from the federal Liberal government?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As the member knows, the Structural Adjustment Fund was established with some of—

Mr Brokenshire: Yes or no?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is hard to answer that question other than in the way I am about to answer it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not at all embarrassed. I said in my answer—

The SPEAKER: The member will his resume seat. The house will come to order. The minister has been asked a question, and then people try to shout him down. The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Sir, it is disappointing that the opposition decided to point score on this, because I was saying that it is a bipartisan thing. The state and federal governments are working together. The \$45 million has been put in the fund—\$5 million by the state government and \$40 million by the federal government. Whether the \$5.9 million came out of the federal or the state component, I cannot tell you. The \$5.9 million from both federal and state sources was put into this project.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): How many additional legal staff will the extra allocation of \$300 000 to the DPP's office employ, and has the impact inflation will have on annual increases in salary costs been taken into account? This morning the Treasurer said each legal officer in the DPP's office would cost \$60 000 to \$70 000. The Attorney then said that they would be paid a lot more than that. A later caller pointed out that legal officers started at \$44 000, raising concerns as to whether the Treasurer or the Attorney had any idea how much impact the \$300 000 per year funding increase would have on staffing in the DPP's office.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The point is that the Liberal government ran an axe through the office of the DPP in the midst of a crime wave. Fortunately, with a change of government, the DPP has had an increase in real funding greater than any other agency in government that I know of.

Mrs REDMOND: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the question from the Leader was clearly about how many staff would the extra money provide, not about what level of increase of funding there was.

The SPEAKER: I think the Attorney should conclude his answer.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The question of how the Director of Public Prosecutions spends the massive increase in funding to his office is a matter for him, and if I were telling the Director of Public Prosecutions how many barristers to employ, how many solicitors to employ, how many clerks to employ, then the opposition would be outraged that I were undermining his independence. I just give him more money in real terms, and he decides how to spend it because he is independent and that is the way that he should be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the government doing to ensure that we have comprehensive early childhood services?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Enfield for his question. I know that he has been a great advocate for early childhood development and good parenting skills within the community. The government is committed to early childhood development and services for families, and has a commitment to making South Australia a child and family friendly state. This commitment is evident not only in the Department of Education and Children's Services but also within families and communities, and health. The portfolios have worked together in a way that has never occurred before so that we have tried to align our strategies and services in a way that produces the best impact for families.

This week the Minister for Families and Communities, the Minister for Health, and myself, launched a package that signals the government's intention to focus on this area of development in young children by announcing 10 pilot early childhood service centres. These three centres are part of a \$8.1 million package which is the initial response to our inquiry into early childhood services, which relate to children between the ages of 0 and 8, but build on the work by the Minister for Health in her Every Chance for Every Child strategy, and the progressive work of the Minister for Families and Communities in making every environment a child safe environment within our state. This is the first time that the three portfolios have worked together to recognise that education, health, mental health, housing, family and youth services need to work together to support families.

I am pleased to inform the house that under this initiative, \$1.9 million is being invested in creating two centres in metropolitan Adelaide offering a one-stop-shop for child care, pre-school, child health and family support services. We opened one of these centres this week in the member for Enfield's constituency—Cafe Enfield—which has been completely rebuilt, and will be integrated with a child care service within the next few months. In addition, we are investing \$2 million in integrating pre-school and child care services at eight locations so that there is a true continuity of care for parents with young families, and better opportunities for their children. In addition, \$4.2 million will be spent over four years in supporting five existing early intervention programs, which have proved successful and are working well in integrating the services from the three departments. We believe that this method of working together will not only

assist children but also allow TAFE training to be integrated into those services; and many of the young mothers in them already have certificate 2 and certificate 3 child-care accreditation, which will allow them to take up jobs in the near future.

This announcement is important because it is part of our inquiry response, which has received cabinet approval, which is being printed and which will be released in the next month under the title, 'Our children, the future conference' to be held in Adelaide. I thank the parliamentary secretary the member for Wright for her work in this area, because she has driven this reform in an active way and played a central role in the inquiry; I acknowledge that.

Getting it right in a child's early years is really crucial. If young children do not have the best start and good parenting they will never achieve their full potential; they are more likely to drop out of school; undoubtedly, they will have lower literacy and numeracy levels; and they may well be in the juvenile justice system. Every dollar spent early is a dollar well spent because it saves money into the future.

I think the idea of integrated services, early intervention and collocation resonates with families in South Australia because, even if, previously, government has not understood this situation, every parent understands this is the only way in which to get it right for young children.

OUTPATIENTS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): When the Minister for Health yesterday announced an extra 25 000 outpatients per year as part of the budget initiatives, why did she not reveal that the Labor government had cut outpatients by 45 000 a year and, in fact, 20 000 fewer outpatients would be treated compared with the former Liberal government? The latest annual report of the department shows that since 2001-02 the number of outpatients has been cut by 44 718 a year, still leaving a shortfall of 20 000 a year—even with the extra funding.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The deputy leader cannot get over the fact that the Rann Labor Government continues to pour record amounts of money into health services in this state. The deputy leader cannot get over the fact that as a health minister he cut elective surgery year after year during his term.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The deputy leader completely missed his opportunity when he was minister and now, all of a sudden, he becomes an expert on everything that anyone else does. I stand by the announcements made yesterday. Today's budget will bring down an extra \$201 million to be spent on health services over the next four years. It will lift the total annual health budget to a record \$2.71 billion. And, it will have \$51.8 million directed to increased hospital activity, which will include outpatient appointments.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister confirm that, even if the government achieves its target of an extra 25 000 outpatients per year, it will still be 20 000 fewer than what the Liberal government delivered in 2001-02?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: What I will say is that our outpatient appointments lead to elective surgery. This government will continue to increase the amount of elective

surgery in the way in which we have every year since we have been in government.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order, sir. As we have seen all week, the minister is debating the question. It is an easy answer to give.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. I know people are getting excited, but the member for Mawson has the call.

DOUBLE DEMERIT POINTS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Transport. Given that the minister says that he does not have a copy of the Road Safety Advisory Council's report on double demerit points—and has refused to provide a copy of the report to me—will he provide me with a copy of the Transport SA discussion paper on double demerit points which—he told the house yesterday—he does have. Will we get a copy?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I stress again the point that I made to the member for Mawson last night—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: How did he vote? He voted for double demerit points in terms of the bill before the house. He made so much noise about it that I told him to assume that the Transport Safety Council opposed double demerit points and then decide how to vote, and he still voted for the bill. I note that, despite the cooperation of the member for Mawson, I am now faced with the proposition from his colleagues in the upper house that they declined to deal with the bill today; they are too busy with other things, which is extremely disappointing.

In terms of the document he is talking about, we will certainly see what the practice was under the previous government. They have great pride in themselves, so I am sure that, if I adopt the same practice they adopted, the member for Mawson will be entirely happy. So, I will check the practice of the previous government in relation to documents such as this, and I will act upon what I am sure is a less than noble precedent.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your guidance, sir. Given that the minister did say in the house that he would give us all the available information, and the fact that he has acknowledged that he has that information, I seek a ruling from you, sir, as head of this house, as to how we can receive that piece of paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair cannot order the minister to hand over a departmental report, but he has indicated he will check it out. It is up to the minister whether he does that.

POLICE, LOXTON STATION

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is to either the Premier or the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Police. Given the very large public meeting at Loxton and the petition carrying 2 000 signatures from the community of Loxton calling for the Loxton Police Station to remain at its existing location and that it be upgraded to a similar standard of the Berri Police Station and others, has the

minister decided to listen to the calls of the great Loxton community and leave the station where it is and to refurbish it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): My understanding of the circumstances there is that the government has provided better facilities with a better service, with more police and open more often. I understand that there has been a campaign, which the opposition has launched into, to try to misrepresent the circumstances up there, and that has had some consequences. I point out that, when it comes to regional services, this government has provided more in extra regional police stations and extra regional courthouses. In this term of government, we will do more than the previous government did in 8½ years by a factor of five. It was the shadow minister who actually reduced the level of policing in Loxton—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport will resume his seat, and the house will come to order. The minister should address the chair; it is discourteous for the minister to have his back to the chair. Members will listen to the Minister for Transport, who is now concluding his answer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will address the needs of the Loxton community, just as we have in those five regional centres where we are building new police stations, including for the churlish member for Flinders, who today suggested that we have done nothing for the Eyre Peninsula. We are building a new police station and courthouse, and have put \$6 million or \$7 million into drought relief and \$10 million into roads and rail. But, of course, I would not expect it to be recognised by the sour member for Flinders. However, we will continue to take into account the needs of regional South Australians, as we have done so well.

MOUNT GAMBIER, RAILWAY LAND

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Mawson.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Thank you very much, sir. I cannot quite hear, because I think the member for Mount Gambier is acknowledging the good police station we built for him and his people when we were in government. My very important question is again for the Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport is out of order.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Has the commercial value of the rail land given to the Mount Gambier council on 2 May 2005 been, first, determined and, secondly, will the minister ensure that an amount equal to the value is credited to the Rail Facilitation Fund so that it can continue to invest in other rail projects? The opposition has been advised that the gift of rail land to the Mount Gambier council (which the opposition supports) is worth approximately \$1 million. However, there is concern that the agreements with the Rail Facilitation Fund for the sale of all rail corridor land to be reinvested in rail in South Australia has not and, indeed, will not be credited with the equivalent value of the gift of this land.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Members opposite support the gift of land to Mount Gambier. You would be very hard pressed to tell that, wouldn't you? I will tell members this: we have gifted that land to the people of Mount Gambier—to the council of Mount Gambier—which is now talking to the people of Mount Gambier about

how it will use that land. It will have a strong community purpose. It has been done entirely lawfully and entirely openly, and I can tell members that we will look at other areas where government land such as this can benefit the community.

I think that the member for Mawson needs to talk to the member for MacKillop to see whether he quibbles about these sorts of things or whether he would like us to do the same sort of thing. The last thing I heard was that the member for MacKillop was very keen on our doing something similar in Naracoorte. I guarantee members that we have dealt with it entirely lawfully. I will give the honourable member the full details, but he needs to check with the member for MacKillop about whether he thinks what we have done is a good thing and whether we should do it again; because, as I understand it, that is what he was saying to us. I stand by this government's decision to hand over that land to the council of Mount Gambier, and therefore the people of Mount Gambier, to be used for the community of Mount Gambier.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My point of order relates to relevance. That was not an answer to my question. The specific question was: the opposition is delighted with the transfer of the land—

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: However, the longstanding Rail Facilitation Fund agreement says that the equivalent amount of funds for sale or gift must be put into the fund for other upgrades. That is the question.

The SPEAKER: That sounds like another question. I think that the minister—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have assured the honourable member that it was done entirely lawfully.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson has the call.

SCHOOLS, CHRISTIES BEACH HIGH

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I will go to a minister who might give me an answer. My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

Mr Williams interjecting:

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Will the minister agree to support the formation of an urgent working group comprised in a bipartisan manner of the following members of parliament: the members for Mawson, Reynell and Kaurana and the federal member for Kingston, together with representatives from the City of Onkaparinga and relevant government agencies, to undertake an urgent bipartisan assessment of the local needs and opportunities for redeveloping the Christies Beach High School West Campus, and will the minister ensure that no sale of any of the property or, indeed, demolition of the building works occur before a report has been completed by this bipartisan working group?

The members for Reynell and Kaurana are on the public record as saying that those facilities must be preserved for open space and the betterment of the community. The western campus has suffered considerable serious damage and is now currently in a trash situation. However, the community request is that these facilities be upgraded and that the open space be kept. I seek an answer on this bipartisan working group.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The explanation is by way of leave. It is a courtesy of the house; it should not be abused. The Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Mawson for his question. I think that it is an extraordinary question because, in fact, this site has received the most committed and focused attention of perhaps any in the southern suburbs. What has happened is that the Office for the Southern Suburbs and the local council—and I have had discussions with the mayor—have worked very hard over the site.

As the honourable member will know, although I do not believe it is in his electorate, the land is currently surplus to our requirements. The building in question has, indeed, been trashed, and it would have been demolished, but we received a very substantial request to preserve the building pending the outcome of the request to make it an Australian technical school. Those applications are currently being assessed. Much as the member for Mawson might like to demolish that building, I think the people—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Heritage listed. I am not prepared to make a decision about that building until I know the outcome of the Australian government's deliberations. If the member for Mawson wants to move a motion to that effect, I would like to hear it in private members' time.

ICT SERVICES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. How many delays—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —have occurred in the outsourcing procurement timetable—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite! The member might need some hearing assistance, or he might need some other assistance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member does not have the call yet. I want the house to come to order. This business of people just jumping up is completely discourteous to the chair and leads to discourteous behaviour. The member for Waite has the call now.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Sir, you had already called me. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. How many delays have occurred in the outsourcing procurement timetable for future ICT service arrangements, on how many occasions has the process been restructured, and when does the government expect it to be completed?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): Infrastructure. Well—

Mr Scalzi: He's not travelling well.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Since Joe's moved forward, he has got cocky, hasn't he? He strides around the chamber these days, draws himself up to his full 4 foot 11 and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will address the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It's great, and I'm not travelling well!

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is debating the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Oh sir, it's very silly.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will have another try with another question. My question is again to the Minister for Infrastructure. How has the government modelled the comparison of costs associated with a single ICT service provider compared with the breaking up of the contract, and is the government concerned that its plans may now result in a substantial cost blow-out to taxpayers?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Certainly not, and I will explain. This is one of the most complex areas of procurement and one of the most expensive. We are talking about a procurement, which, in total, will cost over \$600 million and, depending on what you put in there over a period of time, a billion dollars. Can I go on the record as saying that I think the former deputy leader of the Liberal party, Stephen Baker, with the EDS contract—while he did some things that we did not like—did a number of things which were entirely appropriate for the time and the place in which South Australia was situated.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Who is that a photo of?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson knows that no displays are allowed.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think the member for Mawson has mistaken me for one of his relatives. I can understand why he would want to claim some relationship with me, no matter how distant, because I have often fallen victim to my own fatal char, but let me return to this very serious subject. The introduction of the EDS contract at that time was appropriate. What we have done within government with the next tranche of contracting—and you must remember that this is an area that is, above all, known for the speed of change in technology and equipment—is assembled some very senior people who have been in government for a very long time such as Ian Kowalick, the Under Treasurer, and Paul Case.

What we have also done is examine as best we can best practice in other agencies. We are in the process of obtaining a chief information officer for this government, and I hope to be able to make an announcement on that soon. We have examined the best way forward for the government. It is a different approach to that adopted for the EDS which involved major industry development aspects. This tranche of procurement is about how those services work for government.

It is very much focused on those services to government, how it makes government more efficient and practical. The view of that team we have put together is that we have tried to find an architecture that works across government in which individual players can provide modules. The chief information officer is essential to us in identifying what we do across government. This has been the approach adopted by most major corporations and in Victoria. It is a very difficult and complex area. Undoubtedly, it is one where the speed of change is so great that down the track people will come back and say we could have done it better. It is very difficult procurement to do: you have to procure for a number of years products and technology that change dramatically.

I congratulate again Stephen Baker, the fellow who was not good enough to be kept on as their Deputy Premier. He was replaced by Graham Ingerson and I have to say: Ingo—Stephen Baker—I don't know! But it was the right contract for the time. This is the right approach for the future. I point out that when we first drew up the EDS contract we did not have an internet. That is how much has changed in that period. We now have people running about with their

blackberries and a number of hand-held things. Communication and information technology have flowed together, become smaller and more wireless. We are procuring in that environment and we are procuring by the best advice of the best people we can put together in government.

That advice is for a service-based procurement across government architecture where a number of competitive bidders supply modules to fit into that architecture. We believe that is the right way to go. There is no doubt that, with the difficulty of this environment, people will be able to make criticisms, but I hope we get bipartisan support for what is one of the most expensive and important procurements for government.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: As a supplementary question, given the scope of the outsourcing and its uncertain nature, how will the government guarantee its expectation that integration, operational relationships and associated cooperation will be established between the ICT providers at no cost? The government's tender documentation states that there is an expectation that the ICT providers must facilitate effective integration which 'will not be chargeable activities' for a successful respondent.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: How do you guarantee it? What you do is do what we have done. You put together the best team of people, get a chief information officer who actually tells you what to do across government. The honourable member would be surprised to find how many corporations and governments in the world, not just this government, do not actually know what they are doing with ICT across the whole structure. You put together the best people you have. You get a chief information officer to find out exactly what you are doing and then you contract properly.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'It's not new,' the member for Newland says.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland is warned.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They complain that they do not get answers—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland will be named in a minute.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: When you try to provide them with information, they indicate that they do not want to hear it. I cannot guarantee that we will get everything right, because it is a very difficult environment. What I can guarantee is that we have put together the best people in government to do it. We have them working together across government. We are employing a chief information officer to see what we do in government. We have an intelligent, coherent plan for that. We intend to contract to achieve the matters raised by the member for Waite.

It is good to see him back on the floor: he has done his time. Good to see him back. At the end of the day, can we guarantee it in this environment? We deal with the Microsofts, with large companies and small, and we deal in a constantly changing environment. All we can do is the very best we can with the resources available to government. That is what we are doing.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS, LAFFERS ROAD

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Will the government install traffic lights at the junction of Laffers Road and Main Road, Glenalta? The government recently announced—without public consultation—the proposal to ban right-hand turns into and out of Rosella Avenue, Glenalta, where it joins Main Road. As there was no public consultation, I wrote to around 800 homes seeking feedback. The feedback from my constituents is that, if there is to be change, they would prefer lights at the Laffers Road, Main Road intersection. If the minister agrees today, we are happy to offer him naming rights: the Pat Conlon lights!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Gomer Pyle over there is calling me Billy Bunter. This is a man who is trained to kill with his bare hands. He has all the qualifications of Rambo. How come he reminds me of Gomer Pyle? I do not get it. It may be breaking news to the member for Davenport but my approach as the Minister for Transport is not to make the decision on every right turn or lane or traffic light in South Australia. That is something that is done further down in the department. I have to tell him that it is not my intention to become personally involved in every such decision. However, because I have such a high regard for the member for Davenport—a fine fellow, intelligent, should be leader in due course, and I am sure he shares that view himself, although I am sure Martin does not; he has taken a few steps backwards lately—I will have a look at this one personally. I will get the people in and ask them why they did it and whether lights would be better. We will make a judgment on priorities, and, although I am not promising anything, if they do come up with it, I am prepared to share the glory and call them the Evans-Conlon lights.

METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE PLANNING STRATEGY

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Unley.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I rise on a matter of privilege, sir.

Mr Brindal: You wouldn't know a matter of privilege if you fell over it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Unley have a question?

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Yes; I do. My question is, thankfully, to one of the better people, the Minister for Environment and Conservation. He is not quite as crass as some of the rest of the front bench.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is comment.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise, sir. Will the minister explain why Planning SA is again attempting to seize control of the land of thousands of homeowners under the guise of the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Strategy?

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I heard the member for Adelaide groan. I would be careful about groaning about people having their property seized. In February this year the government was forced to rescind the interim Brown Hill Creek and Keswick Creek flood plain PAR following a massive backlash from the public—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes—when it was discovered that the PAR sought to seize control of 10 metres of land from all those people living along these creeks. I am now advised that, through the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Strategy and Parklands 2036 Strategy, the government is trying once again to seize private land through the implementation of the Metropolitan Open Space Scheme (known by the government as MOSS). The MOSS scheme was developed many years ago as a regional network of parks and open space throughout Adelaide and some of the waterways traversing the metropolitan area. An enhanced MOSS plan has now been included as a key plank in the MAPS scheme. The enhancements are inclusions of creeks not included in the original MOSS plan and the introduction, as the member for West Torrens would like to know, of the 50-metre zone alongside these creeks. The 50-metre figure is not mentioned in MAPS or in Parklands 2036 Strategy, but I am reliably informed that it does appear in Planning SA's internal documentation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order before the minister answers.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for his question and his charming commentary about me. It tempts me to say something unfriendly about him just to get him to put me on an even footing with my colleagues. The question the member asks is in fact a question to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning, who resides not in this chamber but in another place. I am happy to refer his question to him. However, I will make a couple of comments about stormwater management and flooding in Adelaide.

Yesterday, or the day before, the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, the LGA and I released a report which describes how state and local government will work on stormwater management and flood mitigation into the future. As the member would know, there is possibly \$10 million to \$160 million worth of works that need to be done to correct the problems. We have a fund which we pay to deal with these issues. Local government puts in a similar amount of money but, unfortunately, in the past, that money has been applied in an ad hoc way—a piecemeal approach—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member says Hear, hear! because he understands very well what the problems are. That means that the citizens and the councils at the lower end of the catchment basically deal with all the problems, and those further up the catchment, who may be responsible for creating the problems, kind of wash their hands of it. Fortunately, all of the Adelaide local government authorities have agreed to cooperate on a catchment-wide approach. With the release of the report the other day, we will move to a legal entity of some sort which will be run primarily through local government but with state government assistance to develop a whole-of-catchment approach to dealing with flood mitigation and stormwater management. Over time, that will seriously address the issues about which the member is expressing concerns. We will be able to apply the funds that the state puts in, the local councils put in, and funding which may be available through the new NRM arrangements to address this ongoing set of problems. Over a middle term (maybe five to ten years) I think we will be seriously able to address a lot of these issues, which will take the pressure of the planning process to deal with them. That is really what we have to do, because we have to do something. But I will happily get the minister responsible for planning to give you

a detailed assessment. I think it would be unfair to say that the state government is attempting to confiscate property in the Adelaide area, or indeed in any other area.

MANNINNIE DAM

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. Were the potential water requirements for a mine at Manninnie Dam, some 50 kilometres north of Kimba, taken into account before the government announced this morning a \$48.5 million project to annually extract another 1 400 megalitres of water a year from the River Murray and pipe it to Kimba on the Eyre Peninsula? The proposed mine at Manninnie Dam, some 50 kilometres north of Kimba, is the site of the largest lead, zinc and silver deposit in South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the member for his question. The government has examined all options with regard to the needs of the Eyre Peninsula. We have announced a \$48 million infrastructure project. This will be a new pipeline that will run between Iron Knob and Kimba, some 90 kilometres. We want to get water to the people of the Eyre Peninsula. We have looked at all the options. This keeps alive the option of a desalination project for the future. The government is working with Western Mining in regard to that. We have delivered a project for the people on the Eyre Peninsula. It is a project that the former Liberal government could never do. This is another demonstration—

Mr WILLIAMS: My point of order is standing order number 98: relevance and debate. The minister is debating—

The SPEAKER: The minister is debating it, yes.

Mr WILLIAMS: —something which is not even an answer to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order has been made. The minister is debating the issue.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister may want to be reminded of the question, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop needs to take his seat. I have already ruled that the minister is debating the question. I do not know why people in here have to repeat things three or four times, but it is not necessary. The minister needs to focus on the answer. Has he concluded his answer?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Sir, I have.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Supplementary question: given the minister's answer, why has the government announced in each of the last three budgets the building of a desalination plants on Eyre Peninsula, and all of this year the minister reiterated to this house that it was in this year's budget?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I know the Leader of the Opposition is under a lot of pressure. There is no doubt that he has had a very bad political week.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order: we appreciate the fact that this is a very sensitive issue in relation to misinformation given to this house, but we ask the minister to stick to answering the question, under standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: The minister needs to answer the question.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I already said in my earlier answer that the government has examined all options. One of the options was a desalination plant at the Tod, and what has come onto the table—and I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has missed this: I am very sorry that he is not

aware of it—is that Western Mining has come forward with a very strong proposal for a desalination plant near Whyalla, and the government is working with Western Mining to look at that as a realistic option. It is a pity that the leader has missed that. We need to deliver water now to the Eyre Peninsula, and that is just what we are going to do.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader takes a point of order because he believes someone is breaching the standing orders, then he breaches them himself. It is not acceptable.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I apologise, sir. I will try to make future questions to the Minister for Administrative Services multiple choice just to help him.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): What do we do with them, sir?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HANNA: My question is to the Minister for Health. What work has been done to assess the feasibility and cost of collocating the Inner Southern Community Health Service with the local mental health services for adults, children and adolescents, together with the Marion Youth Service, on the Marion Domain site? The Inner Southern Community Health Service is located among a number of old disconnected premises on South Road; Adult Mental Health Services is amongst industrial premises on Marion Road; CAMS is in the Westfield office tower; and the youth service is on yet another site. I know that the minister supports integrated health services.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I am very pleased to answer the question. One of the most important recommendations of the government's Generational Health Review was to strengthen primary health care services right across the state, and this objective was carried through into the state's infrastructure plan, whereby the government has committed to build over time 10 primary health care centres across the state. We are investigating the very services that the member for Mitchell is referring to through the Southern Adelaide Health Service. As well as that, the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service is looking for opportunities to strengthen primary health care in the form of these new centres in the northern area.

In the central northern area we have already completed the Playford Health Village, in the member for Napier's electorate. It is going ahead extraordinarily well with a range of initiatives, including an MOU signed with other health services, and with the University of South Australia in terms of the placement of clinical graduates. The member's question is important. The proposed primary health care arrangements in the Southern Adelaide Health Service are very important. I look forward to informing him with some more details about precisely where is it up to, but we are working on such a proposal.

ROADS, HAMILTON STATION TO DALHOUSIE SPRINGS

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): My question is to the Minister for Transport, who appears to be in good fettle today—in a good mood—so obviously it is the right time to ask him a question. My question concerns the condition of the tourist road from Hamilton Station to Dalhousie Springs.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am sure you do. It has been brought to my attention by the pastoralists at Hamilton Station that Tourism SA has been promoting Dalhousie Springs as a tourist destination. However, the condition of the road that passes through Hamilton Station is deplorable. The Department of Transport and SA Tourism have not provided any funds to upgrade the road, and the pastoralists have been involved in helping tourists and attempting to maintain the road. Will the minister take immediate action to resolve these difficulties?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Stuart for his question. I know both he and I share a great joy in travelling our wonderful Outback and getting in touch with nature. We enjoy seeing that balance between flora and fauna that must be, as Graham knows, kept in balance—as he tells us so often in this place. I understand that the member for Stuart does love our flora and fauna so much and loves to preserve the balance—as he sees the correct balance.

I will take the question on notice. I do not quite understand the honourable member's question, but I think he is suggesting that Tourism wants to spend money and I will not allow it. That is news to me, but I will check the details and get back to the honourable member. Graham, what do you use that road for? I hope it is not simply for the purpose of keeping the flora and fauna in balance! But I will look at it.

ROADS, PORT WAKEFIELD TO KULPARA

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is to the Minister for Transport. What is the latest estimate for the completion date of the reconstruction of the Port Wakefield to Kulpara road? For three years my constituents and I have been lobbying respective transport ministers to have the last section of road between Port Wakefield and Kulpara replaced, after most of the road was reconstructed under the previous Liberal government. On 7 January this year the acting minister for transport advised that reconstruction of this section of road would be completed by 30 June 2005—that is 35 days away. This road is 5.2 kilometres long and, as yet, no reconstruction work has commenced.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I know that I am going to be embarrassed to say this, but I will have to check that answer. I will have to get the details for the honourable member.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I know I should get on top of my portfolio. I should know every 5.2 kilometre stretch of road in South Australia; I should know it on a first name basis.

An honourable member: And the traffic lights.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And the traffic lights, the right turns and the bus stops! I do know that the member for Goyder is a very genuine fellow. I will be sorry to see him go when he leaves the parliament. He is a great champion for his people. I will take the question with due seriousness and bring back an answer for him.

SOUTHERN CROSS REPLICA AIRCRAFT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. Has the government's deal to transfer the Southern Cross replica aircraft to the New South Wales based Historical Aircraft Restoration Society fallen through or encountered significant difficulties

and, if so, what is going on with the process? The government established a process for disposal of the aircraft by Arts SA. It has been the subject of public criticism and review by the Auditor-General.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On 11 November the minister advised the house that—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Schubert!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:—the aircraft would be transferred to HARS, which he said was ‘the best place to repair, manage and operate the aircraft’. But the aircraft remains in a hangar at Parafield Airport at a cost to the taxpayer of \$862 a month, with apparently little or no progress made in respect of the government’s undertaking.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I am pleased that the member for Waite has spent his time in Coventry doing this kind of important policy work. The Southern Cross aircraft is obviously the most important thing on his agenda. I assure the honourable member that the government is taking this matter very seriously indeed. We have been working tirelessly for months, if not years, to get this matter resolved, and I can assure the honourable member that it is getting closer every day.

DRUG AFFECTED DRIVERS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): My question is to the Minister for Police. In lieu of a published statistical list of fatalities on South Australia’s roads involving alcohol-affected drivers appearing in last Monday’s *Advertiser*, will the minister advise whether the Police Commissioner can, or will, make available a similar statistical list of accidents and fatalities involving drug-affected drivers?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I will refer that question to the Minister for Police, who will ask the Commissioner of Police.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw member’s attention to the fact that we have visiting from Indonesia 18 senior finance personnel who, as part of a training program, are here today especially to see the budget handed down. I acknowledge their leader, BPak Mr Barry, and I welcome them to South Australia and to the parliament.

MEDIA, ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATION

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Not only have I been misrepresented but I will subsequently need leave on the next day of sitting to deal with that misrepresentation in precis form, but sufficiently detailed to be valid and relevant. I will have to do it then because I am not emotionally or physiologically able to do it now. I have been misrepresented in the media reports of my remarks at the Press Club last Friday and by some mischief which has arisen in consequence of a decision taken

by police after I had discussions with a police officer following my address to that luncheon, in which he told me that he had no reason to believe that I had done or said anything wrong or requiring further investigation but which has resulted in the police raid on the ABC yesterday.

These matters arise from the reported activities of paedophiles made to my office by people who were victims or who claimed knowledge of such activities. The reason for my brittleness and rage now is that one of those people who made calls to me personally during the last year and who, in the course of those conversations in confidence, told me of his recent acquaintance and friendship with others who claimed knowledge and/or claimed to be victims of the activities of an MP paedophile and are now dead, have been joined by him. He, too, has just been murdered today.

I have not had conversations with him for six months or so, but I have tried to make contact with him again lately to encourage him to take courage and to give statements of his knowledge to police. I have had conversations with still others, such as members of the Aboriginal sobriety group, who like him are victims and have been threatened with murder in the past. I have never been distressed in this fashion on news of a death, not even the death of either of my parents, nor when facing death or torture myself, to the extent that I am now.

I say now to the house that there is a stench of the most heinous kind arising from these crimes and associated activities which comes right into this place and into the frontbench, and in other high places also, which cannot be solved by Ted Mullighan’s work and anything else on foot in South Australia at the moment. The ambit of the inquiries—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is going beyond a personal explanation.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS:—and the power to make them is not there. May God rest the souls of those who have been murdered and may God forgive those in this place who could have prevented it had they dealt honestly, frankly and sincerely—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is going beyond a personal explanation. Leave will be withdrawn.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS:—in the public interest and have chosen to put their self interest and survival ahead of the lives of those—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. This is clearly going beyond a personal explanation, sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is going beyond a personal explanation, which must refer to an aggrieved situation involving himself. I think the honourable member has made that point.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Mr Speaker, we need a royal commission in South Australia, and we need it now.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a personal explanation. I understand the honourable member’s personal situation, but I think he has had the opportunity to explain how he may have been aggrieved. However, he should not go beyond that.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Earlier in question time, the Leader of the Opposition asked how many staff would be appointed to the office of the DPP as a result of additional money for the financial year 2005-06. The answer is: 11, 6.3 legal officers; 1.75 witness assistance officers and three administrative support staff.

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I lay on the table the following budget papers: Budget Overview (Building South Australia) 2005-06; Budget Paper No. 1; Budget Speech 2005-06; Budget Paper No. 2; Budget Statement 2005-06; Budget Paper No. 3; Portfolio Statements 2005-06, Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4; Budget Paper No. 4; Capital Investment Statement 2005-06; Budget Paper No. 5; Regional Statement 2005-06; Budget Paper No. 6; and I move:

That the Portfolio Statements, Budget Statement and Capital Investment Statement be published.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 2006, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr Speaker,

The South Australia of today is a confident, vibrant and optimistic State.

And today's Budget reflects—and builds on—the economic and social wealth we enjoy in 2005.

It is a Budget that makes a statement about the type of State we all want to live in.

It is a budget of social justice, yet it is a budget that locks in this Government's proud record as a rigorous and responsible financial manager.

It is a Budget that delivers tax cuts not just for today but until the end of the decade.

No other Government in recent memory has been as committed as this Government to cutting taxes.

Today we can announce that tax cuts worth \$836 million will be delivered by this Government to South Australian families and businesses over the next five years.

Since coming to office, tax cuts implemented by this Government total \$1.5 billion.

At the same time Mr Speaker, we are committed to helping the most vulnerable in our community.

Through strong economic and financial management, the benefits of our State's economic boom will be shared with those most in need.

Almost \$40 million will be returned to 255 000 South Australians this year in a one-off \$150 energy rebate.

Once-off injections of \$25 million each will be delivered to the mental health and disability sectors to meet ever-increasing demand.

A further \$201 million in this budget will be dedicated to our hospitals together with \$92 million for the disabled and their families.

The priorities of this Government are laid down in *South Australia's Strategic Plan* and the 2005-06 Budget takes us

another step closer to achieving its targets. Mr Speaker, this Budget delivers:

- Another substantial upgrade of health and community services;
- More tax cuts for families and businesses;
- Improvements to our Education system;
- A comprehensive infrastructure plan for our State;
- Increased funding for the environment;
- Increased efforts to reduce the road toll; and
- Further measures to improve law and order.

And we deliver all of this while maintaining budget surpluses, both this year and across the life of the Budget.

Mr Speaker, that is good economic management for the State. Budget surpluses also represent good economic policy in a time of uncertainty in equity markets, a softening in the housing market and the ever-present danger of drought.

Consistent with our fiscal targets, the Budget achieves a net operating surplus in every year.

This Budget will deliver a net operating surplus of \$51 million in 2005-06, \$78 million in 2006-07, \$109 million 2007-08 and \$75 million in 2008-09.

These results extend our proud record of economic and financial management.

That means four Labor Budgets have delivered Budget surpluses.

Four Labor Budgets have reduced State Debt.

Four Labor Budgets have increased spending in Health, Education and Police.

Four Labor Budgets have put more South Australians in work than ever before.

Four Labor Budgets have delivered a Triple-A credit rating. And after four Labor Budgets we have implemented \$1.5 billion in tax cuts.

Mr Speaker, for the first time in decades, our State is consistently living within its means.

And Mr Speaker that is good economic management of our State.

Mr Speaker,

Our economy is in excellent shape.

The evidence for this is compelling.

More South Australians are working than at any time in our history.

And at 5.2 per cent, our unemployment rate is the lowest since official records were kept.

Between April 2004 and April 2005, 20 700 jobs were created in South Australia.

This brings the total number of jobs created since this Government came to office to 46 000.

Over the coming years, employment growth is forecast to remain solid, growing by 1.25 per cent.

And South Australia's Gross State Product is expected to grow at 2.5 per cent in 2005-06 and 2.75 per cent thereafter. But Mr Speaker, there are more reasons for optimism and confidence.

Levels of housing and business investment are strong.

Consumer spending is healthy.

Our companies are the most innovative in Australia and with the tax cuts announced today will remain amongst the nations most competitive.

Mineral exploration is at an 18-year high and the potential of our State's mineral wealth is regarded as one of the great untapped resources in the world.

And in South Australia, there are a large number of big, wealth generating projects across many industry sectors either in progress or about to begin.

Last year KPMG found Adelaide to be the most competitive place to do business in the Asia-Pacific region and we continue to receive valuable, independent endorsements.

Just recently, the nation's peak industry body, the Australian Industry Group, declared Adelaide the most competitive capital city for manufacturing.

The Institute of Chartered Accountants, in a recent survey of small to medium businesses, found South Australian businesses to be the most confident and optimistic in the nation.

And Mr Speaker, with the tax cuts announced today, South Australian business has every reason to feel optimistic and confident about their future.

And, in 2004, international credit-rating agencies, Moodys and Standard and Poors, recognised our sound management of the economy by restoring after 14 years South Australia's Triple-A credit rating.

This meant we had achieved one of the most important targets set down in *South Australia's Strategic Plan*—and that we had done so two years ahead of schedule.

The *Strategic Plan* is living up to its promise of inspiring action and providing the State with a blueprint to achieve the goals we need to reach to ensure South Australia continues to grow and prosper.

Mr Speaker, the initiatives I present to the House today are designed to meet the objectives set down in *South Australia's Strategic Plan*.

Recent economic gains have been substantial.

In recognition of this, the Government is sharing the gains of today with South Australians today.

Over the past six months the Government has returned the following dividends to the South Australian community:

- \$25 million for the School Pride program to accelerate the maintenance program of our public schools;
- \$30 million to provide affordable housing options for those on low to moderate incomes;
- \$20 million for land taxpayers to reflect the broad based relief that was announced by the Government in February; and
- \$25 million was allocated to our hospitals and health system to improve elective surgery and dental waiting times and for the purchase of important biomedical equipment.

Mr Speaker, this Budget builds on these earlier bonuses by returning to the community an additional \$90 million in one-off Triple-A dividends.

\$50 million in one-off grant funding will be made available to non-government organisations in each of the mental health and disabilities sectors.

Minda and Orana will receive \$17.1 million to help the disabled move back into the community and to also establish an aged care facility.

\$1.6 million will be spent purchasing 25 buses for day care to help the disabled and their families in our community.

\$19.3 million will be provided to organisations such as Uniting Care Wesley, Helping Hand, CentreCare, the Mental Health Fellowship and Beyond Blue to name a few.

This funding will be spent on programs to enable people with a mental illness to maintain their independence while receiving the necessary support from carers and family members.

Mr Speaker, \$34 million will be returned to 225 000 pensioners and self-funded retirees by way of a one-off cash bonus of \$150.

And in a further move to help those in our community most in need, the Government has extended the existing annual energy concession of \$120 to 30 000 South Australians previously overlooked at a cost of \$4 million per year.

As a further bonus these South Australians will also receive the one off \$150 energy rebate.

Mr Speaker, this Government last year increased energy concessions from \$70 to \$120.

This further one-off \$150 rebate shares the benefits of our recent economic success with those in our community who are most in need.

Mr Speaker,

This Government has the record as a tax cutter.

The tax cuts already introduced by this Government—together with the tax cuts I will now outline—will return \$1.5 billion to South Australian taxpayers by 2010-11.

This is an impressive record by any standards.

The tax cuts announced in last year's Budget alone delivered more than \$360 million over four years to South Australian families and businesses.

Mr Speaker, in line with the Government's tax cutting agenda, a comprehensive land-tax relief package was announced in February.

Beginning on 1 July 2005 and cutting \$234 million over four years, this represents the first cut in land tax for decades.

This Budget builds on the land tax cuts announced in February:

- The tax-free threshold will be further increased from \$100 000 to \$110 000 to ensure that 45 000 land taxpayers will become exempt from land tax.
- An option to pay land tax bills in interest free quarterly instalments from the 2005-06 assessment year will be introduced.
- Land tax exemptions will be available to Supported Residential Facilities that are incorporated under the *Supported Residential Facilities Act*.

These tax cuts will now rise to \$244 million over four years.

Mr Speaker, in the face of rising fees from banks, this Budget provides tax cuts to thousands of South Australian families and businesses with the abolition of bank debits tax from 1 July 2005—a tax cut worth over \$60 million a year.

In a further move to reduce the burden on South Australian families and businesses, this Budget contains a schedule to cut and abolish an extensive range of State taxes.

The Government has previously announced it would abolish mortgage duty on owner-occupied residential loans and refinancing from 1 January 2006.

Mr Speaker, I am pleased to announce that this Budget abolishes this tax six months earlier to take effect from 1 July 2005.

This tax cut is worth \$24 million in 2005-06 and will assist South Australian families buying or refinancing a home.

This delivers to families the equivalent of an interest rate reduction of 0.35 per cent in the first year of a new home loan.

The schedule to cut stamp duty on other mortgages will commence from 1 July 2007 and be complete by 1 July 2009.

The phased abolition of rental duty will also commence from 1 July 2007 and be complete by 1 July 2009.

Rental duty is charged on businesses that hire goods ranging from cement mixers, machinery hire, party equipment, houseboats, cars, videos and DVDs.

A schedule of further major tax cuts for both large and small business will commence over a two-year period beginning on 1 July 2009.

This includes stamp duty on goodwill on the sale of a business, considered by many as an unfair tax when buying a business.

These cuts will also abolish stamp duty when trading tax licences, fishing licences, water licences, unlisted shares and a number of other business transactions.

Mr Speaker, the burden of tax and red tape will be lifted from thousands of businesses in South Australia so that business in our State can be more competitive.

Once these taxes have been abolished, tax cuts worth more than \$836 million will have been delivered to South Australian families and businesses.

Mr Speaker, this will bring the total tax cuts delivered by this Government to \$1.5 billion by 2010-11.

This program of tax cuts will sustain the momentum of economic growth in South Australia, reduce the burden on business and families, and create an even more competitive business environment in South Australia.

Mr Speaker,

The Government is committed to infrastructure spending as an essential foundation for economic growth.

This commitment is reflected in our allocation of more than \$1 billion in the coming financial year in support of the priorities outlined in our recently released *State Infrastructure Plan*.

As part of this Budget, funding has been allocated for the following projects:

- \$140 million for the ship lift, dredging and construction of the maritime precinct;
- \$175 million for the Port River Expressway project;
- \$121.7 million to construct a tunnel longer than the Adelaide Hills Heysen Tunnel on South Road beneath Port and Grange roads and the Outer Harbour railway line;
- \$64.9 million to construct underpasses on South Road, beneath Anzac Highway;
- \$51 million to extend the tram line from Victoria Square to the Adelaide Railway Station and on to North Adelaide;
- \$48.5 million for the upgrade of the Eyre Peninsula water supply;
- \$5.7 million to upgrade Eyre Peninsula road and rail infrastructure—a move designed to improve efficiency in this critical grain-exporting region;
- \$4 million to upgrade the Pt Lincoln airport; and
- \$6.8 million for the redevelopment of the Oaklands Park Interchange.

Mr Speaker, this Government is also committed to supporting small business.

We will provide an additional \$4.2 million over four years to upgrade the skills and services of the Business Enterprise Centre network—the frontline support service for small business in South Australia.

\$1 million will be provided to support seminars and workshops for small business in metropolitan and regional South Australia.

Mr Speaker,

The Government's main priority is to continually improve and upgrade our health system.

Over the next four years, this Budget provides an additional \$201 million for South Australia's hospitals and health services to meet increasing demand.

Mr Speaker, since coming to office, this Government has spent an additional \$912 million on South Australian hospitals.

This has resulted in an increase of 3158 elective surgery procedures per year when compared to 2001-02.

And we have committed \$501 million on capital works projects for our hospitals.

Today's Budget also provides a huge boost for mental health services in this State with a \$25 million, one-off, Triple-A dividend and a further \$20 million in funding over the next four years.

In addition to this funding, other key health measures in this Budget include:

- \$131.6 million in additional funding for our health system;
- \$22 million to increase the number of available places for transition care—offering intermediate care for people who would otherwise stay in hospital;
- \$13.1 million to employ additional agency nursing staff to help provide high-quality patient care in public hospitals;
- \$4.4 million for increased resources at the Tregenza Aged Care Service, which delivers health care to one of the most vulnerable sections of our community;
- \$3 million for the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme; and
- an extra \$750 000 for the implementation of a new elective surgery management strategy to reduce waiting times.

Mr Speaker,

The Government regards the safety of South Australians on our roads and highways as paramount.

As the road toll has reduced in recent years, the tragedy of this year's road toll should serve as a wake-up call to all of us. As of yesterday there have been 64 road deaths in just the first five months of the year—12 more than at the same time last year.

\$22 million will be spent over the next three years on the Long Life Roads program to improve the condition of the State's roads.

In an effort to combat excessive speeding—which is the biggest cause of deaths and accidents on our roads—we will introduce an extra 48 speed and red light cameras, at a capital cost of \$9.5 million.

Other road safety initiatives to be delivered include:

- \$4.3 million to implement a package of measures aimed at curbing the incidence of driving under the influence of drugs;
- \$3 million to expand the existing Rural Overtaking Lane program;
- \$2.9 million for further rail safety-related upgrades at level crossings;
- \$2.6 million for a heavy-vehicle compliance program; and
- \$1.4 million to combat speeding on rural highways.

In addition, 300 new breathalyser units, 37 hand-held laser guns for use in country areas and 16 sets of road spikes will be purchased to reduce the incidence of speed and alcohol-related trauma on our roads.

Mr Speaker,

In preparing this Budget, the Government has listened to the calls of the most vulnerable in our community.

In response, the Government will provide more than \$139 million of additional funding for South Australian families and community services over the next four years.

Key funding measures included in the Budget are:

- \$27.5 million in State contributions to match Commonwealth funding of the Home and Community Care Program;
- \$25 million in one-off, Triple-A dividends to non-government organisations in the disability services sector;
- \$20.2 million to expand the Moving On program;

- \$18.3 million to improve the provision of accommodation support for those with a mental disability;
- \$9.7 million toward individual packages of care and alternative care services for children with intensive needs; and
- \$3.5 million to expand eligibility under the existing Transport Subsidy Scheme.

Mr Speaker,

School education is a critical part of *South Australia's Strategic Plan*, and the *Plan* contains a number of goals relating to literacy and numeracy.

In pursuit of these goals, since coming to office, this Government has increased spending on each child in our schools from \$7598 to \$9614.

This represents a funding increase of 26.5 per cent or over \$2000 more for every child since coming to office.

Mr Speaker, over the next four years, we will provide \$35.2 million of extra funding for education and children's services, including:

- \$22.1 million to support students with special needs;
- \$4.2 million to continue the Learning Together program; and
- \$3.5 million over four years for the Access Assistant.

Mr Speaker, the Government has been overwhelmed by the success of the Premier's Reading Challenge.

To build on that success, we will now allocate another \$1.2 million over four years to extend our target to 75 per cent of schools in 2005.

We are also budgeting for substantial improvements to the TAFE system, with an additional \$8.3 million to increase training programs by up to 150 000 hours a year.

Recognising the training needs of the Aboriginal community, we will spend \$1.7 million to support Aboriginal training programs on the APY lands.

Mr Speaker, the Government is currently in the process of negotiating with teachers and lecturers whose enterprise bargaining agreement expired in March 2005.

The Government expects negotiations will deliver a fair wage increase to teachers and lecturers and additional resources for our schools.

The Government has made an appropriate provision in this Budget, the size of which is held in contingencies and is not specifically referred to in the budget papers to ensure the negotiation process is not compromised.

Mr Speaker,

This Budget reinforces the Government's continued commitment to environmental sustainability.

Our goal is for South Australia to be known the world over as a clean, green and sustainable place to live and work.

Building upon the Government's efforts to fix the River Murray, an additional \$2.4 million will be spent over four years to fund the operation and maintenance of the salt interception schemes along the river.

An extra \$1.4 million will fund the newly established Natural Resource Management Boards.

Recognising the crisis facing Kangaroo Island with increasing koala numbers, the Government has allocated \$4 million over four years to accelerate the successful sterilisation and relocation program.

To maintain our metropolitan beaches for the enjoyment of all South Australians, an additional \$6.2 million will be allocated to sand management activities at Glenelg and West Beach.

Mr Speaker, the Government has taken decisive action to protect the State's valuable marine scalefish fishery and ensure the ongoing sustainability of stock.

We have implemented a one-off buyback scheme targeting commercial licence holders with net endorsements as the first step in a long-term sustainability strategy.

Funding of \$6.0 million has been provided in 2004-05 for the buy-back, with an additional allocation of \$1.0 million in 2005-06.

Mr Speaker,

Fostering creativity—in all its forms—is one of the six pillars of *South Australia's Strategic Plan*.

And the Government recognises its responsibility to create an environment conducive to creativity in sectors ranging from manufacturing to arts.

In line with this, the 2005-06 Budget contains funding for a number of new initiatives, including:

- \$9.5 million for the Wine Innovation Cluster;
- \$8 million over four years for the Mawson Institute of Advanced Manufacturing;
- \$4.7 million to establish a Defence Systems Integration Centre;
- \$2.5 million for the Australian Mineral Research Scientific Institute;
- \$1 million over four years for the State Library;
- \$1 million for the South Australian Museum in order for it to refurbish the Pacific Cultures Gallery; and
- \$650 000 in extra funding for the Adelaide Fringe Festival.

Our commitments to the arts will also deliver an additional \$2.1 million to support the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra.

Mr Speaker,

Every South Australian family should feel safe in their own home.

South Australia's Strategic Plan contains targets to drastically reduce crime rates in our State.

And recent statistics shows the Government's policies have had a substantial impact on crime.

Crime in South Australia has fallen 6.5 per cent during the period April 2004 to April 2005 with offences committed against a person falling 9.6 per cent.

By mid 2006, 200 new recruits will be on the beat and, at 4000 officers, the size of our police force will be the largest in our State's history.

Mr Speaker, this Government is now spending an extra \$57 million per year on our Police force than when we came to office.

This represents a 13 per cent real increase in operational expenditure.

This Budget contains funding to further support our police and emergency services, and includes:

- \$8.6 million in additional operational funding for South Australian Police;
- \$5.2 million to implement a licensing regime aimed at controlling access to ammonium nitrate within the State;
- \$4.7 million for the purchase of a new police aircraft;
- \$4.3 million to complete the third stage of the Christies Beach Police Complex;
- \$4.1 million for additional resources in the offices of the Director of Public Prosecution and the State Coroner;
- \$3.6 million to enforce the new *Criminal Assets Confiscation Act*; and
- \$2.4 million to increase the State's aerial fire-fighting capacity.

Mr Speaker,

I today present to the House a rigorous and comprehensive Budget—the result of outstanding work by my Ministerial colleagues, their Chief Executives and their staff.

I would also like to place on record my thanks to the Under Treasurer, the Department of Treasury and Finance, and my personal staff for their efforts.

This Budget tells the story of a buoyant and structurally sound economy—an economy of growth, an economy of substance and an economy with a future.

It also tells the story of a Government doing the basics well and delivering on its promises.

It tells a story—a Labor story.

A story that Labor can be proud of.

A story of our Government delivering for all.

Delivering increased spending on health, education and police.

Delivering care to the most vulnerable.

Delivering jobs in record numbers.

Delivering tax cuts.

Delivering balanced budgets.

Delivering low levels of debt.

Delivering a Triple-A credit rating.

And delivering confidence and optimism for all South Australians.

Mr Speaker, we are a Government prepared to challenge, we are a Government prepared to reform, we are a Government that can deliver, we are a Government that governs for all.

Mr Speaker, I commend this Budget to the House.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2005. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation provided by the *Supply Act*.

Clause 3: interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

Clause 4: Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in the schedule to the Bill. Subsection (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act* is superseded by the Bill.

Clause 5: Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

Clause 6: Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

Clause 7: Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament, except, of course, in the *Supply Act*.

Clause 8: Overdraft limit

This sets a limit of \$50 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2005) BILL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Land Tax Act 1936 and the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill amends the *Land Tax Act 1936* and the *Stamp Duties Act 1923*.

In recent years, South Australia has experienced a strong uplift in property values following an extended period of real term stability.

To address the impact of this increase in land values on land tax liabilities and to reduce bracket creep effects, the land tax threshold and rate structure will be adjusted to provide broad-based relief.

In addition, specific amendments will be introduced to provide additional relief to:

- property owners conducting a business from their principal place of residence, in particular operators of bed and breakfast accommodation;
- land used for caravan parks, residential parks and supported residential facilities;
- land used for primary production in designated rural areas (close to Adelaide and Mount Gambier);
- persons holding land by way of moiety titles.

The following land tax structure is to apply from the 2005-06 assessment year.

For site values:

- below \$110 000 no tax will be payable;
- between \$110 001 and \$350 000 taxable land ownerships will be taxed at 0.3% on the excess above \$110 000;
- between \$350 001 and \$550 000 taxable ownerships will be taxed at \$720 plus 0.7% on the excess above \$350 000;
- between \$550 001 and \$750 000 taxable ownerships will be taxed at \$2 120 plus 1.65% on the excess above \$550 000;
- between \$750 001 and \$1 000 000 taxable ownerships will be taxed at \$5 420 plus 2.4% on the excess above \$750 000; and
- above \$1 000 000 taxable ownerships will be taxed at \$11 420 plus 3.7% on the excess above \$1 000 000.

The maximum benefit is a \$2 880 reduction in tax liability for site values between \$550 000 and \$750 000.

In relation to businesses operating from a principal place of residence, the requirement for the business to occupy no more than 28 square metres in order to retain eligibility for a principal place of residence exemption will be removed.

Effective from the 2005-06 assessment year, a full exemption will be available if the home business activity occupies less than 25% of the floor area of all buildings on the land that must have a predominantly residential character and a part exemption will apply to home business activities that occupy between 25% and 75% of that area based on a sliding scale that moves in 5% increments. No relief will be provided where the home business activity occupies more than 75% of the floor area of all buildings on the land.

These amendments will provide significant relief to bed and breakfast operations undertaken from a principal place of residence as well as other home based business activities.

In addition, a land tax exemption will be introduced for residential parks predominantly used by retired persons over the age of 55 years and retired from full-time employment, who lease land under residential site agreements for the purpose of locating owner occupied transportable homes on that land.

This will deliver similar land tax treatment to that provided to retirement villages where the retired occupants do not own the land on which the retirement units are located but the property is effectively their principal place of residence.

Supported residential facilities licensed under the *Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992* will also be exempted from land tax. Residents of these facilities often have impaired cognitive ability, limited ability to choose where or how they live and limited financial resources. The provision of a land tax exemption will improve the viability of supported residential facilities.

Caravan parks will also be exempt from land tax to encourage the continued availability of low cost holiday options for families.

In relation to primary producers, criteria for determining eligibility for a primary production exemption for owners of land located in "defined rural areas" (close to Adelaide and Mount Gambier) will be amended to broaden eligibility.

For example, previously, in defined rural areas, all owners of primary production land had to demonstrate that their principal business was primary production (by showing that the income derived from the primary production activity was their principal source of income and/or they spent a significant proportion of their working week working on the land). Under the proposals, if a co-owning relative is deriving significant income from other sources (eg, a spouse working as a teacher or nurse), this will not prevent a primary production exemption.

Previously, if a natural person owned primary production land in a defined rural area and was working the land but the primary production business was owned by a company controlled by that person, a primary production exemption was denied. An exemption will now be available in this circumstance.

The proposals contained in the Bill deal with a range of further ownership arrangements that will now receive the benefit of the exemption including, for example, where an owner of the land has retired and a close relative is now substantially engaged in the primary production activity conducted on the land.

A further amendment is made in the Bill in relation to moiety titles.

Undivided share titles (commonly referred to as moiety titles) were often utilised prior to the introduction in the 1960s of the strata titles amendment to the *Real Property Act 1886*.

In an undivided share title ownership, each owner registered on the Lands Titles Office certificate of title owns an undivided share in the whole of the allotment. The land tax liability is currently calculated on the whole non-exempt portions of the allotment. The land tax assessed is then apportioned between the number of undivided share title owners who do not qualify for a principal place of residence exemption.

The current approach is difficult to justify when taxpayers have no effective interest in the other portions of the property and have no rights of occupation, yet their land tax liability is affected by the value of those other parcels.

It is therefore proposed to amend the Act to recognise individual undivided share title owners as owners of their portion of the land for land tax assessment purposes. In this way land tax liabilities will only be based on the value of their particular portion of the property.

Changes to the *Land Tax Act 1923* have an estimated revenue cost of \$58 million in 2005-06 and \$244 million over the four years from 2005-06 to 2008-09.

Various stamp duty reforms arising from commitments made under the *Intergovernmental Agreement on the Reform of Commonwealth-State Financial Relations* (IGA), signed in 1999 by the Prime Minister and all State and Territory Leaders, will also be given effect through the *Statutes Amendment (Budget 2005) Bill 2005*.

One of the undertakings contained in the Intergovernmental Agreement was that the Ministerial Council for Commonwealth-State Financial Relations would, by 2005, review the need for the retention of stamp duty on:

Non-residential conveyances

- Leases
- Mortgages, debentures, bonds and other loan securities
- Credit arrangements, instalment purchase arrangements and rental arrangements
- Cheques, bills of exchange and promissory notes, and
- Non-quoted marketable securities.

South Australia took action on some of these stamp duties ahead of the scheduled time frame when it abolished cheque and lease duty in the 2004-05 Budget.

Action is now being taken to implement the phasing out of mortgage and rental duty with full abolition of both duties by 1 July 2009. The opportunity will also be taken to abolish a number of minor stamp duties.

Mortgage duty will be abolished in four stages.

From 1 July 2005, stamp duty will be abolished on residential loans for owner occupation, on all forms of loan refinancing, and on mortgage discharges.

Residential loans for owner occupation, including refinancing of such loans, currently attract a stamp duty rate of 35 cents per \$100. A higher duty rate of 45 cents per \$100 applies to loan refinancing (other than refinancing of residential loans for owner occupation). A fixed \$10 charge applies to the discharge of a mortgage.

Remaining mortgage documents will continue to attract stamp duty at a rate of 45 cents per \$100 until 1 July 2007 when the rate of duty will be cut by a third to 30 cents per \$100. The rate of duty will further reduce to 15 cents per \$100 from 1 July 2008 and will be abolished entirely from 1 July 2009.

Rental duty will also be phased out between 1 July 2007 and 1 July 2009.

The hire of goods under equipment finance arrangements currently attracts duty at a rate of 0.75% of rental income. This duty rate will reduce in three stages to 0.5% from 1 July 2007, to 0.25% from 1 July 2008 and will be abolished entirely from 1 July 2009.

All other rental business attracts duty at a rate of 1.8% on rental income in excess of \$6 000 per month. This duty rate will also reduce in three stages to 1.2% from 1 July 2007, to 0.6% from 1 July 2008 and will be abolished entirely from 1 July 2009.

A number of minor stamp duty charges will also be abolished from 1 July 2006 including stamp duty on deeds, caveats, changes to trustee appointments and other conveyances that currently attract a fixed \$10 stamp duty.

These stamp duty changes have an estimated revenue cost of \$24 million in 2005-06 and \$180 million over the four years from 2005-06 to 2008-09.

In addition, the Commonwealth Government has been advised that South Australia will abolish stamp duty on non-realty property transfers and non-quoted marketable securities commencing from 1 July 2009, with complete abolition by 1 July 2010. A separate Bill will be introduced at a later date to implement these initiatives.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The Act will come into operation at midnight on 30 June 2005. (Section 4 of the *Land Tax Act 1936* provides that taxes imposed for a particular financial year will be calculated as at midnight on 30 June immediately preceding that financial year on the basis of circumstances then existing.) However, Part 4 will come into operation on 1 July 2006; Part 5 will come into operation on 1 July 2007; Part 6 will come into operation on 1 July 2008; and Part 7 will come into operation on 1 July 2009.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Land Tax Act 1936*

4—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

Clause 4 amends the interpretation section of the *Land Tax Act 1936* by substituting a new definition of **land used for primary production**. According to the new definition, this term means land of not less than 0.8 hectares in area as to which the Commissioner is satisfied that the land is used wholly or mainly for the business of primary production.

This clause also inserts a new subsection into section 2. Proposed subsection (3) relates to land that is held under a tenancy in common. If the land is divided into separate portions, and the owner of each undivided share in the land is entitled under a lease registered over the title to the land to occupy a particular portion of the land, then the land will not be treated as a single parcel of land in multiple ownership. Instead, each owner of an undivided share in the land will be regarded as the owner of the portion of the land that he or she is entitled to occupy under the lease.

5—Amendment of section 4—Imposition of land tax

Section 4 lists a number of exceptions to the general rule that taxes are imposed on all land in the State. The exception relating to land used for primary production is amended by this clause so that the exception does not include land that is situated in a defined rural area.

6—Substitution of section 5

The exemptions listed in section 4 include "land that is exempt from land tax under section 5". This clause substitutes a new section 5. Proposed new section 5 provides

for the exemption or partial exemption of land from land tax.

Land is wholly or partially exempt from land tax under the section if proper grounds for the exemption exist and the exemption has been granted and remains in force. An owner of land may apply for an exemption, and the Commissioner may, whether or not such an application has been made, wholly or partially exempt land from land tax.

Land that is owned by a natural person and constitutes his or her principal place of residence (whether or not he or she is the sole owner of the land) may be wholly exempted from land tax if the buildings on the land have a predominantly residential character and no part of the land is used for a business or commercial purpose (other than the business of primary production), or the part of the land so used is less than 25% of the total floor area of all buildings on the land.

Land may be partially exempted from land tax by reducing its taxable value in accordance with the scale prescribed in subsection (12) if the land is owned by a natural person and constitutes his or her principal place of residence (whether or not he or she is the sole owner of the land) and the buildings on the land have a predominantly residential character. A part of the land of 25% or more but not more than 75% of the total floor area of all buildings on the land may be used for a business or commercial purpose.

Land within a retirement village may be exempted from land tax if the land constitutes a residential unit occupied by a natural person as his or her principal place of residence or available for occupation by a natural person as his or her principal place of residence and likely to be so occupied at some time during the ensuing 12 months. Land appurtenant to such a residential unit, and land used as a facility provided under the retirement village scheme for the exclusive use of residents (and their guests), may also be exempted from land tax.

Land may be wholly exempted from land tax if the land is a supported residential facility.

Land that constitutes a caravan park may be wholly exempted from land tax.

Land within a retired persons' relocatable home park may be exempted from land tax if the land constitutes the site for a relocatable home occupied, under a lease or licence, by a natural person as his or her principal place of residence. Alternatively, such land may be exempted if it is likely that within the ensuing 12 months there will be a relocatable home on the site owned by a natural person and occupied by the person as his or her principal place of residence. Land that is appurtenant to such a site, or land that is a facility provided by the owner of the land for the exclusive use of residents (and their guests), may also be exempted from land tax.

There are various circumstances in which land used for primary production that is situated within a defined rural area may be wholly exempted from land tax. First, the land may be exempted if the sole owner of the land is a natural person engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business.

Second, such land may be wholly exempted if it is owned jointly or in common by two or more natural persons at least one of whom is engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business. Any other owner of the land who is not so engaged must be a relative of an owner so engaged.

Third, the land may be exempted if it is owned solely, jointly or in common by a retired person and three conditions are satisfied. Those conditions are as follows:

- the retired person must have been, prior to his or her retirement, engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business; and
- the co-owner or co-owners of the land (if any) must be relatives of the retired person; and
- a close relative of the retired person must be currently engaged on a substantially full-time basis

(either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business.

Fourth, the land may be exempted if it is owned solely or by tenancy in common by the executor of the will, or the administrator of the estate, of a deceased person. The following conditions must also be satisfied:

- the deceased person must have been, prior to his or her death, engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business; and
- the co-owner or co-owners of the land (if any) must be relatives of the deceased person; and
- a close relative of the deceased person must be currently engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business.

Fifth, the land may be exempted if it is owned by a company, or by two or more companies, or by a company or companies and one or more natural persons. The main business of each owner must be a relevant business.

Sixth, the land may be exempted if it is owned by a company and one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- a natural person must own a majority of the issued shares of the company and be engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business;
- two or more natural persons own in aggregate a majority of the issued shares of the company and each of them is engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business;
- two or more natural persons who are relatives must own in aggregate a majority of the issued shares of the company and at least one of them must be engaged on a substantially full-time basis (either on his or her own behalf or as an employee) in a relevant business.

A business is a *relevant business* in relation to land used for primary production that is situated within a defined rural area if —

- the business is a business of primary production of the type for which the land is used or a business of processing or marketing primary produce; or
- the land or produce of the land is used to a significant extent for the purposes of that business.

Proposed subsection (11) provides that the regulations may prescribe additional criteria that must be satisfied if land is to be eligible to be exempted wholly or partially from land tax.

Proposed subsection (12) includes a table comprising a scale for determining a partial exemption to land tax.

Proposed subsection (13) lists some definitions necessary for the purposes of new section 5.

7—Amendment of section 8—Scale of land tax

This clause amends section 8 by substituting a new table comprising a scale for determining land tax.

Part 3—Amendment of Stamp Duties Act 1923 that takes effect at midnight on 30 June 2005

8—Amendment of section 76—Interpretation

The definitions of *home* and *home mortgage* are deleted. These definitions are redundant because of amendments made by clause 12 to clause 11 of Schedule 2. Of particular relevance is the introduction into Schedule 2 of a definition of *home acquisition or improvement*.

9—Amendment of section 79—Mortgage securing future and contingent liabilities

Section 79(2) of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* describes how duty is chargeable on a mortgage that extends to future or contingent liabilities and is not limited to a particular amount. Paragraph (b) of subsection (2) prescribes the method for determining duty if the amount of the liability secured by the mortgage exceeds the amount for which the mortgage has been previously stamped.

The subsection currently includes two exceptions. This clause adds additional exceptions. The first proposed new exception applies if a mortgage becomes chargeable with further duty under paragraph (b) and the rate of duty payable on the mortgage has decreased since it was

previously stamped. In this case, the further duty is to be calculated by subtracting from the amount of duty calculated under paragraph (b)(ii) the amount that would have been already paid if duty had then been calculated and paid at the lower rate.

The second proposed exception applies where a further advance is made under a mortgage that is (until the further advance) wholly exempt from duty or a mortgage that would have been wholly exempt from duty if it had been submitted for stamping immediately before the further advance. The exception applies if, in consequence of the further advance, the mortgage ceases to be of a type that is, or has become, wholly exempt from duty. In this case, duty, or further duty, is calculated on the mortgage as if it secured only the further advance. If duty was paid before the exemption took effect, duty is calculated as if no such payment has been made.

10—Repeal of sections 81D and 81E

Sections 81D (Refinancing of primary producer's loans) and 81E (Refinancing of loan due to rural branch closure) are repealed. The sections are redundant as a consequence of amendments made to Schedule 2 by clause 12, which have the effect of providing an exemption or partial exemption from duty in respect of loans to be applied for refinancing purposes.

11—Repeal of section 83

Section 83 is repealed. The section is unnecessary because of the amendments made to Schedule 2 by clause 12, which have the effect of providing an exemption, or partial exemption, for mortgages securing loans to be used wholly or partially for home acquisition or improvement.

12—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

This clause amends Schedule 2 of the Act, which prescribes rates of duty and exemptions. Clause 11 of Schedule 2 deals with mortgages and other documents. This clause amends clause 11 by removing the reference to duty payable on a home mortgage. This clause also adds the following to the list of exemptions in clause 11:

- a mortgage securing a loan that has been, or is to be, applied wholly for home acquisition or improvement;
- a mortgage to secure a loan that has been, or is to be, applied wholly for refinancing purposes.

A mortgage securing a loan to be applied in part for home acquisition or improvement and in part for other purposes is to be liable to duty as if it secured only so much of the loan as is to be applied for the other purposes.

A mortgage securing a loan to be applied in part for refinancing purposes and in part for other purposes is liable to duty as if it secured only so much of the loan as is to be applied for the other purposes.

Definitions of *home acquisition or improvement* and *refinancing purposes* are also inserted.

A new item is also added to the list of general exemptions appearing in Part 2 of Schedule 2. As a consequence of this amendment, an instrument of discharge or partial discharge of a mortgage or charge is exempt from stamp duty.

Part 4—Amendment of Stamp Duties Act 1923 that takes effect on 1 July 2006

13—Amendment of section 71B—Partition or division of property

Clause 13 amends section 71B, which applies only in relation to a conveyance for the partition or division of property between members of a family group (as defined in section 71(15)). The section provides that if, on the partition or division of any property, consideration exceeding \$200 in amount or value is given for equality, the instrument by which the division or partition is effected will be charged with duty as if it were a conveyance on sale and the consideration equal to the value of the property.

The section is amended by the insertion of a new subsection. Proposed new subsection (2) provides that if the consideration for equality is (in amount or value) two hundred dollars or less, the instrument by which the

partition or division is effected is entirely exempt from duty.

14—Amendment of section 82—Unregistered mortgages protected by caveats

Proposed new subsection (1) provides that a caveat under the *Real Property Act 1886* to protect an interest arising under an unregistered mortgage is liable to stamp duty if the unregistered mortgage is liable to stamp duty and has not been produced for stamping.

Under proposed new subsection (2), the amount of duty chargeable on a caveat to which subsection (1) applies is the same as would be payable on the mortgage if produced for stamping.

15—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

This clause makes a number of amendments to Schedule 2.

A new exemption from the component of stamp duty payable in respect of registration of a motor vehicle is inserted. This exemption provides that an application to register a motor vehicle in, or to transfer the registration of a motor vehicle into, the name of a beneficiary of the estate of a deceased person in order to give effect to the provisions of a will or the rules of intestacy is exempt.

This clause also deletes clauses 5 to 9 of Schedule 2. Those clauses prescribe the amounts of duty payable on the following:

- a conveyance for partition or division of property;
- a conveyance for appointment of a new trustee or retirement of a trustee;
- a conveyance of a kind not otherwise charged;
- a deed or transfer not otherwise specified in the Schedule;
- an instrument discharging a mortgage or charge over land.

The following exemptions are also added to the list of general exemptions in Part 2 of the Schedule:

- a conveyance (other than a conveyance operating as a voluntary disposition *inter vivos*) for effectuating the appointment of a new trustee or the retirement of a trustee;
- a conveyance of a kind for which no specific charge, or basis for charging duty, is fixed by the Schedule;
- a deed or transfer of a kind for which no specific charge, or basis for charging duty, is fixed by the Schedule.

Part 5—Amendment of Stamp Duties Act 1923 that takes effect on 1 July 2007

16—Amendment of section 31F—Lodgement of statement and payment of duty

The amendments made to section 31F by clause 16 provide for new rates of duty payable in respect of dutiable rental business from 1 July 2007. The amount payable will depend on whether the agreement or contract was entered into before 1 October 2003, after that date but before 1 July 2007, or on or after 1 July 2007.

17—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

The amendment made by this clause has the effect of reducing the amount of duty payable on mortgages and certain other documents from 1 July 2007.

Part 6—Amendment of Stamp Duties Act 1923 that takes effect on 1 July 2008

18—Amendment of section 31B—Interpretation

As a consequence of this amendment, the definition of *dutiable rental business* will not include business arising from contracts, agreements or arrangements entered into on or after 1 July 2009.

19—Amendment of section 31F—Lodgement of statement and payment of duty

The amendments made to section 31F by clause 19 provide for new rates of duty payable in respect of dutiable rental business from 1 July 2008. The amount payable will depend on whether the agreement or arrangement was entered into before 1 October 2003, on or after that date but before 1 July 2007, on or after 1 July 2007 but before 1 July 2008, or on or after 1 July 2008.

20—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

The amendment made by this clause has the effect of reducing the amount of duty payable on mortgages and certain other documents from 1 July 2008.

Part 7—Amendment of Stamp Duties Act 1923 that takes effect on 1 July 2009**21—Repeal of section 81A**

The repeal of section 81A by this clause is consequential on the amendments made by clause 22.

22—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

This clause removes clause 11 of Schedule 2, which prescribes the rates of duty payable on mortgages, bonds, debentures, covenants and warrants of attorney. The clause also adds these to the list of general exemptions in Part 2 of the Schedule.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAW REFORM (CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE AND APPORTIONMENT OF LIABILITY) (PROPORTIONATE LIABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill, with the following amendment, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Clause 11 (new section 10), page 9, line 4—

After 'must' insert:

, as soon as practicable,

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, LEADERSHIP

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Is there an adjournment debate?

The SPEAKER: If the member wishes. We are just checking: it is not the tradition, but that is not a reason for not doing it. I am sure that members will be delighted to hear the member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I wish the minister well, and I know that he is pleased that the Speaker has granted me the opportunity just to say a couple of things. We have listened for the last 30 or 40 minutes to the Treasurer and to the cheering from the backbench. One of the things that the government failed to mention once was that the benefit of this budget is a direct result of the outstanding leadership in government and financial management of the John Howard federal government. Fifty-two per cent—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, given that the member for Stuart has been a stickler for his own rights, is he not now addressing a matter before the house?

The SPEAKER: No; it is a grievance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart cannot debate the bill—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Certainly not.

The SPEAKER: However, he can talk about matters generally.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I know that. It's all right. I am delighted that the government does not want to mention, acknowledge or even accept the fine management which the commonwealth government has provided to the people of this country. It is unfortunate that it has taken such an uncharitable attitude, because the great benefits which are going to flow to this country in the next 12 months can be sheeted back to strong management and the revenue from the GST. The GST money is flowing—and rightly so. The states require a growth tax and sufficient funds to provide for their services that the people of South Australia and the rest of Australia want and deserve.

For the first time in the history of this great commonwealth we have in place a system which is going to provide the states with that basic revenue so that they can look after education, health and those other things. The answer to the health problems is not to hand the hospitals over to the commonwealth government. I put it to the house: what sort of services do you think a national minister in charge of hospitals, who lived in Queensland, would provide? Would they want to visit the hospital at Oodnadatta, Ororoo, Peterborough, Millicent or Glenelg? I think not. Therefore, the system we have in place, coupled with the sound decisions taken by the Olsen-Brown government—a government, Mr Speaker, of which you were then keen to be a member—made the framework to reduce the debt in this state. I am looking forward to this government's providing financial assistance to my constituents.

The matter I raised in question time today in relation to the roads in the Outback and the Far North of South Australia is exceptionally important, but I want the government to provide some funds quickly to upgrade the road to Dalhousie. The tourism department is encouraging South Australians, interstate and overseas visitors to visit Dalhousie's hot springs. It is promoting it, but people have to get there. Most of them want to go in their four-wheel drives, but the condition of the road is deplorable. I call on the minister and his department to provide funds to upgrade that road quickly, efficiently and permanently, because there is nothing worse than getting a group of tourists into an area and then they cannot get out. If that happened, the damage done to the industry would be horrendous. I wanted to use that opportunity briefly to raise those matters today.

On an important occasion like this we should not overlook why the government is in such a financial position. It cannot claim credit for the GST; it cannot claim credit for the debt reduction. The government voted against the sale of ETSAs; it voted against those other privatisation measures which have created a strong viable future for every citizen in the state. I wanted to make those points, and I am sure that everybody now wants to go to their offices and study the budget, and have a good weekend. I am delighted to have been given a chance to speak, and I will not abuse the privilege by speaking for an extra six minutes.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I just want to amplify my statement giving the Leader of the Opposition a detailed reply to his first question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Point of order. Can I clarify whether this is a grievance or a ministerial statement?

The SPEAKER: It is part of an adjournment debate.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Leader of the Opposition came in here and suggested that the extra funding that we

were giving the Office of the DPP was much less than in fact it was, and he suggested to the house that no extra staff could be employed. As is usual, the innuendo of the question was false.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have information from the finance section of the Attorney-General's Department, an estimate from them, that the extra money for the DPP for the financial year 2005-06 can lead to the employment of 11 extra staff, if the office of the DPP chooses to spend the money that way. It is, of course, statutorily independent. The additional money for 2005-06 is \$1.207 million, not what the Leader of the Opposition told us in question time, and not what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition still told us. Of course, when members of the opposition get it wrong, as they habitually do, we do not have privileges committees and they do not resign. Indeed, on Radio 5AA yesterday the shadow attorney, the Hon. R.D. Lawson, managed to overestimate by a factor of 10 the number of cars stolen in South Australia each day. When will he apologise for providing incorrect information to the public?

It is \$1.207 million extra money to the DPP in 2005-06. That is made up this way: additional untied, \$300 000; additional for pre-1982 sex offences, \$700 000; and confiscation of assets, \$207 000. I am advised by the finance section of the Attorney-General's Department that 11 extra staff—that is their estimate—can be employed. The total legal officers are: 6.3 full-time equivalent; witness assistance officers, 1.75 full-time equivalent; and administration support officers, 3 full-time equivalent. It is breaking down in the following three categories: additional untied, 2 legal officers—a ½ witness assistance officer and 1 full-time equivalent administrative support officer; pre-1982 sex offences increase, 3.3 legal officers—1.25 witness assistance officers, and a ½ admin support; and confiscation of assets, 1 full-time equivalent legal officer and 1½ full-time administration support.

For the information of the opposition, the salaries and costs of officers are as follows: LEC1, \$58 182; LEC3, \$84 731; LEC5—horror of horrors according to the Leader of the Opposition—\$120 321. They are the people who do the hackwork in the office of the DPP, and they should not be characterised by the Leader of the Opposition in the Liberal Party as fat cats.

HAMMOND, MEMBER FOR

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Last evening during the

debate on the Motor Vehicles (Double Demerit Points) Amendment Bill—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, sir, is this a personal explanation?

The SPEAKER: No, under standing orders the member is using the remainder of the 10 minutes.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The debate goes for 10 minutes either side.

Mr MEIER: Thank you.

Ms Chapman: How much time is left?

The SPEAKER: The remainder of the time—whatever it was—four minutes.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Vickie, please, this is hard enough for me, so please let this go. During the debate on the bill, the member for Hammond said:

The honourable member for Torrens does not mind, though; she will not mind if it is her husband who dies and the car gets wrecked—

He was challenged on that statement, so he clarified it and said, 'I said that you won't mind.' I was extremely upset and angry about that, and I thank my colleagues on this side of the house who came to my defence, in particular, the Minister for Environment and Conservation, the Minister for Families and Communities, my colleague the member for Giles, and others. The member for Hammond owes me an apology, and I will be expecting that apology from him.

I make this comment about the member for Hammond because I am still angry and rather distressed about that comment. I note these days that most of his contributions in this house are peppered with sexual connotations. No matter what the debate—on demerit points, for instance; and I will not use the terms that he used—he brings in anything that relates to some sort of sexual activity. I suggest that he has a think about it and, perhaps, gets some advice and assistance.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Therapy.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, perhaps some therapy, because a lot of members in this house are finding that his comments are particularly rude and vile. Last night I told him that he is an appalling individual, and I stand by that. His comment to me was totally offensive, and he owes me an apology.

Motion carried.

At 4.03 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 30 May at 2 p.m.

