

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 May 2006

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to urgently improve the safety of drivers and pedestrians with the installation of traffic lights at the roundabout located adjacent to Tea Tree Plaza and Modbury Public Hospital, was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Police Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report 2004-05

Final Budget Outcome—Report 2004-05

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

Regulations under the following Act—
Harbors and Navigation—Thistle Island

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

Guardianship Board—Report 2004-05

Supreme Court, Judges of—Report 2004-05

Rules of Court—

District Court—

Criminal Asset Confiscation

Document Exchange

Magistrates Court—Criminal Asset Confiscation

Supreme Court—Document Exchange

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Central Northern Adelaide Health Service—Report 2004-05

Government's Response to Fifty Fourth Report of Environment, Resources and Development Committee—
Marine Protected Areas—January 2006

Regulations under the following Acts—

Chiropodists—Registration Fees

Chiropractic and Osteopathy Practice—Elections

Occupational Therapists—Registration Fees

Zero Waste SA—Board Appointments

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

Rules—

Fair Work Act—Unfair Dismissal Proceedings.

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report 2004-05

Rules—

Local Government—Superannuation Board—

Conditions on Withdrawals of Benefits

Miscellaneous

Payment of Deferred Benefits

Superannuation Contributions Splitting

Local Council By-Laws—

City of Holdfast Bay—

No. 1 to No. 49

Kangaroo Island Council—

No. 5—Dogs

No. 8—Cats

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. P. Caica)—

Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology,
Department of—Report 2005
Training and Skills Commission—Report 2005.

GLADSTONE EXPLOSION

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: In the past hour I have been advised by SafeWork SA of a major explosion at an explosives manufacturing facility near Gladstone. I am told that SafeWork SA was notified by police and has immediately declared the incident a major investigation. It has put together a high level team that is on its way to the site. I am advised that five people were believed to be working at the site at the time. Two of them have been located and are injured; three others are still missing. Further indications are that CFS and ambulance personnel are in attendance. I was able to advise the member for Frome before we came into question time. He is on his way up there. I will provide further information when it is available.

TERRAMIN AUSTRALIA LIMITED

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: As many members would be aware, Terramin Australia Limited is seeking to develop a zinc, lead and silver mine near Strathalbyn in the Adelaide Hills. Under the terms of South Australia's Mining Act, a rigorous assessment process is currently under way into the company's mine application. More than 100 submissions received during a comprehensive consultation period are being considered as part of the assessment process. The government indicated earlier this year that the assessment process would also include the establishment of a community consultative committee to examine the concerns raised by the local community about the mine. The establishment of the committee is an important initiative to help resolve the community concerns and provide advice to the government to ensure that appropriate conditions are applied to ensure a safe and efficient mine. The committee will involve representatives of all the major stakeholders, including the local Strathalbyn community, the local council, Terramin and government agencies. The government also promised that the committee would have an independent chairperson.

I can announce today to honourable members that former South Australian premier, Dean Brown, has been appointed by the government as the independent chair of the Community Consultative Committee. Mr Brown (whose appointment was suggested by members of the local community) will bring a wealth of knowledge and experience to the role of independent chair of the committee. As the former member for Finnis, he has a unique understanding of the issues that concern the Strathalbyn community and, as a former premier, he knows where to find and how to get answers.

Mr Brown and his committee will identify and consider the community's concerns about the mine proposal and will be asked to highlight to the government any unresolved issues. The committee will have direct access to Terramin and key government agencies including PIRSA, the Environment Protection Authority, the Department for Environment and Heritage, the Department of Health and also other agencies.

This will give Mr Brown and his committee and the Strathalbyn community unprecedented access to information about the possible operation of the mine and the opportunity for their concerns to be heard and investigated.

The Hon. Paul Holloway is expected to be in a position to name the members of the consultative committee in the near future. I am delighted that Mr Brown has agreed to take up this role, and I am certain the committee will operate professionally and with purpose under his guidance.

MURRAY RIVER WATER DONATIONS

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Today I have great pleasure in advising the house of another step forward in improving the health of the River Murray. On 19 October 2005, I publicly released a new strategy called Environmental Flows for the River Murray, which establishes a framework to manage environmental flows in South Australia, including the 500 gigalitres to be recovered for the Living Murray initiative. This strategy also provides incentives for donations for water for additional environmental projects. This is beyond the 500 gigalitres and beyond the Living Murray first step, and is working towards South Australia's long-term objective of 1 500 gigalitres back into the system.

On Friday last week, the Foster's wine group donated 1 000 million litres of water, which is enough to fill 1 000 Olympic-sized swimming pools. It was provided to us to enable the watering of the Markaranka floodplain near Morgan. This is an extremely significant donation for Foster's, as at today's trading values this water would be worth over \$400 000 as a temporary trade. Instead of trading this water, Foster's has donated it for the benefit of the environment, for the benefit of our River Murray. This is particularly exciting because a quarter (250 megalitres) of this water has been transferred from Foster's Victorian licences, which is bringing water into South Australia which would otherwise have been used interstate.

It is also significant in that it has involved the federal government, which has provided \$150 000 to fund pumping and infrastructure costs at Markaranka. This donation clearly demonstrates what can be achieved through partnerships between governments, industry and the community. South Australia has provided the lead across the Murray-Darling Basin in regard to environmental flows, including the highly successful watering projects on the Chowilla flood plain, the weir pool raisings to provide water to drought-affected flood plains and wetlands and environmental barrage releases.

Our E-Flows strategy has led to the creation of the role of the Australian River Murray Environmental Manager within the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resource Management Board. This provides a way of ensuring clear accountability for delivery of River Murray flow outcomes. The Environmental Manager will work with the community to determine priorities for environmental watering projects. The role of the Environmental Manager provides an excellent opportunity to harness the tremendous support and community goodwill towards the River Murray.

The river in South Australia has already benefited from a number of donations to environmental watering projects. Irrigators have donated water to local projects at Katarapko, Clarke's flood plain, Riversleigh and Paringa, and many

irrigators have indicated an interest in donating next year. We have also seen the establishment of strong partnerships with other organisations, notably with the New South Wales Murray Wetlands Working Group which provided 1 500 megalitres (or 1.5 gigalitres) of water to complement water made available by the South Australian government to undertake the Chowilla watering trial projects.

I look forward to strengthening these existing partnerships and building new partnerships in the future. Next week, I will be attending the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting with a package of water recovery measures to present from South Australia. I will be underscoring South Australia's commitment to the future sustainability of our great River Murray.

QUESTION TIME

CRIME RATE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Attorney-General explain his comment in the media that the reduction in the crime rate in South Australia has little to do with government policy, and how does he equate this with the Premier's statement yesterday? Yesterday, the Premier said that the rate of offending has been declining since his government came to power and adopted its tough law and order policy. On 1 July on television news, the Attorney said:

There have been reductions in the crime rate since our government came to office, but my suspicion is that does not have much to do with our policy.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The Director of the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Don Weatherburn, when speaking about the merit of criminal justice policies such as this of our government, said:

There is now plenty of evidence suggesting that punitive policies do indeed reduce or help constrain the growth in crime. In many instances they provide the only viable short-term option for dealing with it.

Charles Murray (who writes in the United Kingdom), after comparing crime trends in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, said:

Lesson 1: When crime is low and stable, it is a catastrophe to stop locking people up. . . Lesson 2: Prison can stop a rising crime rate and then begin to push it down.

Australian researchers at the Centre for Independent Studies wrote an article entitled 'Does prison work?'; and I think that the Centre for Independent Studies is a think tank that has the approval of the Liberal Party. They said:

The evidence reviewed here is consistent with Charles Murray's view that a weakening in the willingness to use prison as a punishment has been strongly associated with an explosion of crime rates.

They go on to say:

But this is not the whole story. The economic theory of crime suggests that the risk of getting caught is likely to be as, or more, important in deterring crime as the anticipated severity of the punishment.

They continue:

In Australia, it does seem that the spiralling crime rates of the 1970s and 1980s had as much to do with declining detection and conviction as with declining use of imprisonment. This suggests that penal policy is an important element in the fight against crime, but it is only part of the solution. . .

Finally, the New South Wales bureau has just published a bulletin dealing with this very topic. The covering news release, dated 10 February this year, states:

Prison is more effective in preventing crime than many people think, according to a new study by the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. The bureau estimates that the current imprisonment rate for convicted burglars prevents about 45 000 burglaries per year.

Mr Speaker, the contrast that the leader has attempted to make is infantile, and could only occur with a very small-town, reductionist mentality.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, SEVERANCE PAY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister inform the house of the outcome of the Industrial Relations Commission recent decision establishing a minimum standard of severance pay?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the member for Ashford for her question. I can advise the house that that decision was handed down on 4 May. The commission may award between four to 12 weeks' severance pay, depending on the employee's years of service with his or her employer. In addition, the decision allows for a phase-in of entitlements in circumstances where a small business is involved. This minimum standard is applicable to all South Australian employees who are covered by the state industrial relations system.

Section 72B of the Fair Work Act requires that the Full Commission introduce a minimum standard for severance payments on termination of employment. The provision was a component of the Fair Work Bill which was introduced by this government. Until now severance pay provisions for employees within the state industrial relations system have been contained in many awards and enterprise agreements, but not all. Further, there have been no statutory redundancy provisions protecting non-award employees. Now there is a minimum standard protecting some of the most vulnerable workers in South Australia. This new standard reinforces the introduction of a minimum wage in South Australia, which took effect in April of this year.

CRIME PREVENTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. If longer sentences are a deterrent to criminal activity, as claimed by the Premier yesterday and confirmed by the Attorney today, how does he explain the fact that 30 per cent of prisoners released from South Australian gaols are back in prison within two years and that more than 54 per cent of South Australian prisoners have been gaoled on at least one previous occasion?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I ask the member for Bragg whether that figure is different from any other jurisdiction or any other time in history? This is a platitude that the member for Bragg is offering the parliament—merely a platitude.

EVENTFUL ADELAIDE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Has the Eventful Adelaide marketing campaign had an appreciable impact on attendances at this year's events and festivals?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Norwood, who I know is a keen follower of tourism activities and who was very supportive of the program of events during the first three months of this year. As everyone knows, the first three months of the year saw an extraordinarily eventful program of events that included arts and sport, and a whole range of horse-racing and motor-sports events. This peaked around the March period when, as a state, we did brilliantly and demonstrated that we are still indeed the festival state.

The Eventful Adelaide program was the product of a \$1.1 million investment in marketing with a range of partners but, most particularly, with Thoroughbred Racing SA Limited, which worked to maximise attendance at every event and to encourage people to stay on for extra events, having attended one in the state. The calendar was jam-packed, including the Next Generation Clubs Australian men's hardcourt tennis; Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under; VB international cricket one-day matches; Jacob's Creek Open golf championships; the Fringe; the Adelaide Bank Festival of Arts; the Adelaide Cup carnival; WOMAD and Clipsal 500.

The line-up was supported with a 24-page brochure that was distributed throughout Australia and New Zealand, and backed up with TV commercials. I am pleased to say that the campaign paid off big time, with the Australian Hotels Association's accommodation market report demonstrating that the CBD showed a strong lift in occupancy from 2005 to 2006, demonstrating a 7 per cent increase in January and February and a massive 11 per cent jump in March over the previous year. The statistics for the 2006 March quarter with the ABS will not be due until June 2006. However, we do know that all the events had a record number of attendances.

For example, Clipsal had a 5.8 per cent growth in attendance; the Fringe celebrated a record sales period with this year having 200 000 tickets sold; the attendance at WOMAD went up to 75 000 from 65 000, which is a 15.38 per cent increase; and Adelaide Cup day drew 18 000 attendances in 2005 and this year went up to 32 119 people. That is a 77.77 per cent increase. This Eventful Adelaide campaign was brilliant. It made a distinct difference in the city and will lead to a very spectacular winter series of events, including the Australian Tourism Exchange, which will be the most significant investment in marketing and campaigning in this state and which has been the result of a \$2 million investment from the state.

RECIDIVISM

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's recent crime and justice statements as outlined to the house yesterday and reaffirmed today by the Attorney-General, will the Attorney-General clarify to the house what his government plans to do to address the recidivism rate in South Australia, as indicated by the 30 per cent of prisoners who returned to prison within two years and the more than 54 per cent that I just indicated were returning to correctional services?

Members interjecting:

Ms Chapman: What are you going to do about it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): We are going to persist with our policies, which are in accordance with the known preferences and experiences of the South Australian public. The member for Bragg is positioning the

Liberal opposition just where the former attorney-general, the Hon. Trevor Griffin (of blessed memory), positioned the Liberal government.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, the question is to relevance.

The SPEAKER: No, I do not think the Attorney is being irrelevant. The Attorney-General.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: One change that occurred in the penal system after the change of government was that, for the first time, money started to be put into some rehabilitation in our prisons. I have been to all the prisons in South Australia except the Adelaide Remand Centre, and good work is done there in education and training: bricklaying and woodwork at Port Augusta; furniture manufacturing at Mount Gambier; and horticulture at Port Lincoln. Good work is being done and we will persist. This is not an area with rapid-fire solutions.

HOUSING SUPPLY

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley): My question is to the Minister for Housing. How is the government increasing the supply of affordable housing in communities such as Campbelltown?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): I thank the honourable member for her question, and she now has the benefit of seeing a new facility, recently announced, in her electorate. It is a \$4.45 million quality aged care development of 26 two-bedroom units in the Campbelltown area. This project will form the government's first affordable housing project in the area, and we will be providing \$973 000 from the Affordable Housing Innovations Fund to the Laura and Alfred West development in Gorge Road in Campbelltown. The project involves the redevelopment of a group of cottage flats on a site owned by Laura and Alfred West to provide affordable rental accommodation to those who most need it.

This is an exciting, new partnership arrangement with Laura and Alfred West, who are a significant housing provider with—

Mrs Redmond: Provided by privatisation.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I hear the plaintive cry of privatisation from those opposite. It is a little bit of a failure to understand the history of community housing in this state, but, nevertheless, perhaps it is all we can expect from those opposite. It already has 180 independent living units housing 203 low income aged people. We are keen to engage in further partnerships with Laura and Alfred West to provide security for those who in the past may have been vulnerable to rising accommodation prices.

Since it was established six months ago, the Affordable Housing Innovations Unit has been actively working with developers, councils, government agencies and community organisations, such as Laura and Alfred West, to explore new ways of putting affordable housing on the ground. I was very pleased when the Laura and Alfred West spokesperson, Chris Charlesworth, not only welcomed the financial assistance but also committed himself to working further with the government. He made the point that, without this important funding, partnerships of this sort would have been impossible. The redevelopment at 4 Gorge Road, Campbelltown, is expected to be completed in early 2007.

REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Attorney-General outline to the house what rehabilitation programs and supports are in place for prisoners and newly released prisoners to help change their patterns of behaviour and to prevent reoffending? In his speech last week, Chief Justice Doyle said:

If we want to change the patterns of behaviour, we have to change their (offenders) way of viewing themselves and society, or re-educate them.

Then, once they are released, we must give them the appropriate support to help them change their patterns of behaviour. Unless we do this, we are unlikely to turn these people around.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): That is a matter for the Minister for Correctional Services, and I will get a report, but I find it most interesting that the members for Bragg and MacKillop are making the running on criminal justice. Where is the member for Heysen? Perhaps that is something to do with her telling the house on Wednesday 17 September 2003 that she was opposed to any gaol time for Paul Habib Nemer.

The SPEAKER: Order, the Attorney is out of order! The member for MacKillop.

PRISONERS, NUMERACY AND LITERACY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Again, my question is to the Attorney-General, and we may get an answer. Given the fact that there is a high correlation between criminal activity and a lack of education, what action is the government taking to address the fact that 60 per cent of our prison population has below functional levels in literacy and numeracy?

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What? Do you want to put teachers into prisons? We want to put them into classrooms.

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

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Again, I am getting a question that would be much better directed in the other place to the Minister for Correctional Services, but I urge the member for MacKillop to get out there and visit South Australia's prisons, because, first of all, he will see all the education and training programs that are on offer. However, of necessity, of the kind of people who are in prisons, many are intractable and not open to education or training, or, in some cases, even work.

PRISONS, DRUGS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Given the Premier's statement on crime and justice yesterday, will the Attorney-General inform the house what the government is doing to address the fact that prisoners are being released back into the community with continuing drug problems? In 2003, more than 48 per cent of prisoners reported using amphetamines at least once a week and more than 43 per cent reported that it was easier to obtain amphetamines than it had been in the previous 12 months.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): There are programs in our prisons for prisoners to try to kick their misuse of alcohol and drugs. We have programs like that in our prisons—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —but it is most difficult to persuade the kind of people who are in our prison population

to avail themselves of those programs and to embrace them and use them to their benefit.

JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Does the Attorney-General review every case determined in South Australia for which there is a written judgment?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I think the house would be surprised were I to do that.

Mrs REDMOND: Given his response to the last question, can the Attorney explain how he decides which cases he will review?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Let's be clear where this line of questioning is going. The Liberal opposition has nailed its colours to the mast. The member for Heysen told the house on Wednesday 17 September 2003—and she does not deny it—that the then attorney-general should not have instructed the Director of Public Prosecutions to appeal against the suspended sentence on Paul Habib Nemer.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Heysen says, 'That's right.' So, that is now Liberal Party policy. What Robert Lawson says is the past. Further, the member for Heysen is now suggesting that we should not have called a royal commission into the killing on Kapunda Road.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order relating to standing order 98, the Attorney should be brought back to the relevance of the question asked. It is not for him to make a dissertation—

The SPEAKER: I have your point of order. That is all you need to say. I think the Attorney is beginning to stray into debate and he needs to return to the actual question that the member for Heysen asked.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Labor government reserves the right—and it is a right according to law—to instruct the Director of Public Prosecutions on individual cases where we believe there is a manifest injustice, and that will sometimes occur in sentencing where the sentence is manifestly inadequate. That occurred in Nemer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —and we stand by our decision in the Nemer case.

Mrs REDMOND: My question is again to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General accept that he is, by the very act of reviewing some cases but not others and/or interfering in some cases but not others, creating a system where people are not equal before the law?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, sir.

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION, YORKE PENINSULA

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Will the Minister for Housing please explain to the house why there are no supported accommodation options for people with intellectual and physical disabilities on the Yorke Peninsula? Families have advised me that Yorke Peninsula still does not have any such facilities, with some 35 people at least still being cared

for by their ageing parents who, in many cases, are in their 80s and who are now finding it very difficult just to manage to look after themselves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members on my right will come to order! I am unable to hear the question and I am sure the minister cannot either. The member for Goyder.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I have finished, sir. Do you wish me to repeat it?

The SPEAKER: No, you do not need to repeat the whole question, as long as the minister has managed to hear it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): The honourable member asked a question about the amount of supported accommodation in the Yorke Peninsula area. I freely admit that the number of supported accommodation options for people requiring supported accommodation is not adequate. That is a matter of record. Supported accommodation can exist in a number of ways. One is the capacity to maintain people in their own home. One of the first things that we did was to take advantage of a federal government scheme, which involved us having to match that scheme, to deal with the crisis end of the equation, that is, older parents who were caring for young people with intellectual disabilities. That was a respite scheme, and it involved providing a little bit of additional support to ensure that those older parents were able to cope with having sometimes quite old sons and daughters still living with them. We freely admit that that was a crisis response, but it was a necessary one to at least relieve some of the pressure on those older parents.

We do now turn to the question of supported accommodation. We made a substantial commitment at the election to increase the supply of supported accommodation, and members will have to await the budget to find out whether that has been delivered upon, but that was certainly a commitment we made during the election campaign. Before the election we set up a supported accommodation task force, which is looking at the continuum of supported accommodation across the whole of the community. It is our intention to increase the supply of that supported accommodation. I stand to be corrected, but I would be surprised if it was the case that there are no supported accommodation options in the Yorke Peninsula area. I would expect there to be packages of support provided to support people. There are certainly public housing and community housing options which do supply accommodation for people with intellectual disabilities. We do admit that there is a very large task ahead of us and a task that this government commits itself to working away at.

FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES DEPARTMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What is the total cost in terms of badging, advertising, publications, booklets and letterhead that will need to be funded as a result of the creation of the three new entities of Disability SA, Housing SA and Families SA?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): I do not have a precise dollar estimate of that, but can I say substantially less than the savings that we will make. If the honourable member had been listening to questions raised by her colleague the member for Heysen yesterday, she would have been aware that we have approximately 114 separate offices comprising the network of Department of Families and Communities offices. There are some

obvious savings in being able to rationalise those offices. It is very important that we have services that are based around the citizen and not based around the convenience of government agencies. That is why we are choosing simple names, which are capable of being understood, namely, Families SA, Disability Services SA and Housing SA. We think the benefits associated with that will be tremendous for the community. It underscores our commitment to have services which are based around the citizen and which meet their needs.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question. If it is 'substantially less than the savings that we will make', what are the savings that we will make?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The savings—

Ms Chapman: How much?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I do not have a dollar figure with me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is a very odd opposition, sir. But can I take them through the process. If you come up with a good idea about the rationalisation of services where there are projected savings, of course the end point of those savings is not capable of being quantified in year one. The process of moving from 114 separate offices to a smaller number of offices will take time. We had the unfortunate situation in Mount Gambier of having an office burn down. That provided a small opportunity to put all the offices in one place. That is our intention there, and it will be the first showcase of the new model—the three services in the one place.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We have to watch out for more fires, mate.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. We are not proposing that as a policy, but, certainly, we took advantage of an opportunity that presented itself. We will continue to take advantage of those opportunities to rationalise those services. At the end of the day it is about getting the best bang for the buck for the citizen.

At the last election we had the spectre of the opposition seeing the public sector as something which was a burden that had to be cut. Our position on the Public Service is that it is an asset which needs to have its value realised. We know that on occasions it involves investing in the asset. The crucial thing is that we do not see the Public Service as a burden. We know that lots of things need to be done to reform it and make it better, but we see it as something that can be used for the benefit of the community, and we want to realise its full potential. The savings will occur in a range of ways. First, it will reduce transaction costs not only for us but also for citizens, so they do not have to run around to find out what is available to them. Big savings do not accrue just to government: they accrue to individual citizens who are trying to access quality services.

FOOD STANDARDS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Has the state government been doing regular checking on fresh South Australian produce for the presence of chemical residues and, if not, why not? Up until 2003 Primary Industries and Resources SA held regular market basket surveys, taking a variety of products from the fresh food markets to test for residues. This was supported by industry as part of a strategy

to assure the public of its clean, green image and to complement industry's responsible chemical usage strategies. It has been claimed on Adelaide radio that no testing has taken place since 2003?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): The member for Schubert will be well aware that terminal markets are not the only way in which produce goes from the producer through to the consumer. Many products go through quality assurance programs directly to the major purchasers and wholesalers of those products, so the range of strategies now used, in terms of chemical residues and other food-safe strategies, are more diverse than in the old days. Having said that, the government has a role, and continues to play its role, in terms of guaranteeing to South Australian consumers that products available to them are safe.

RED LIGHT CAMERAS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Transport. What is the status of the government's May 2005 promise to provide \$35.6 million to purchase and install 48 new red light speed cameras to be distributed throughout South Australia? How many of the cameras have been purchased and installed and are now operating? Is the project on budget and on time?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I will refer the member's question to the Minister for Road Safety in another place. I must put on the record that I am extraordinarily disappointed that I have not yet received a question arising from Marty's excellent adventure down there in the South-East on his motor bike. I was hoping that I was going to get one then. I will obtain a report on that matter for the member for Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question is again to the Minister for Transport. How many red light camera systems have been recalled to the German manufacturer, Robot Pty Ltd, what is the size of the total contract, what is the nature of the problem, what has been the impact on road safety, and when will the contract be fully instituted?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What I will do later is get the transcript so I can read all the different questions that were asked. I will speak to the relevant people and obtain a report.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): We do not want to answer questions on speed cameras, so we will move onto stormwater management. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Is the taxpayer exposed to damages claims or associated legal action linked to claims by Burnside council that the government has failed to provide funds to clean up after last November's flooding? Burnside council has spent more than \$200 000 on post flood works, including removal of debris from First Creek, and is considering taking the state government to court over its failure to assist with the clean-up of flood damage.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): The advice I have (and, of course, I am not the responsible minister) is that their primary argument (if they have any at all) is with the Department for Environment and Heritage—

An honourable member: Just answer the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Just answer the question!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No. My advice (and I am not the minister responsible) is that the council does not have a case. So, the taxpayer is not exposed. I am completely unsurprised that, when given a choice between the taxpayer of South Australia and the toffs at Burnside council, the opposition picks the toffs. I thought they were turning over a new leaf earlier on, when they had all turned into social workers, but apparently they have gone back to their true home out there at Burnside council. Our advice is that the Burnside council does not have a case, but I will obtain a report from the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place.

WATER EFFICIENCY LABELLING AND STANDARDS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Will the Minister for the River Murray advise the house why the water efficiency labelling and standards legislation was not introduced during the term of the last government, and when will the government introduce the legislation in order to meet its COAG commitments? The water efficiency and labelling standards legislation is commonwealth legislation that commenced in March 2005 to provide for specifying products and standards to set requirements for water efficiency, performance, registration and labelling. Tasmania, Victoria and New South Wales have all enacted water efficiency labelling and standards legislation in order to meet their COAG commitments. The recently released report, the 2005 National Water Commission Policy Assessment of Water Reform Progress, states as follows:

South Australia has not yet met its COAG commitments in relation to the national water efficiency labelling and standards scheme, because the relevant legislation has not been passed.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): The water efficiency and labelling standards issues are in the jurisdiction of the Minister for Environment and Conservation, and I will certainly take the question on notice and bring back a report to the house.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): My question is to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations. What action is the government recommending to ensure that the 26 councils identified in the August 2005 report by the Financial Sustainability Review Board as being financially unsustainable are placed in an improved financial situation?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for State/Local Government Relations): In February 2005, the Local Government Association of South Australia commissioned an independent inquiry into the financial sustainability of local government in South Australia. A review board appointed to conduct the inquiry comprised Bill Cossie (chair), Juliet Brown and Mr Wayne Jackson. Access Economics was engaged by the Local Government Association to assist the board to undertake the inquiry, and 62 recommendations (which are directed at the Local Government Association or councils) were endorsed in full or in principle by the Local Government Association's State Executive Committee.

The inquiry emphasised the need to address serious shortcomings in the financial governance policies and practices and the consequences of not doing so. The state

government encourages and supports the sector to undertake these reforms. The Local Government Association has endorsed a detailed implementation plan and establishment of a task force to address the recommendations. I am told that it will also provide the necessary leadership in financial governance improvement.

At the Local Government Association's general meeting on 31 March this year, progress and implementation of the financial sustainability program (developed by the Local Government Association and endorsed by councils) was noted.

PRISONS, PORT AUGUSTA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services guarantee that drinking water from rainwater tanks in schools—and now by government requirement in all homes—will be safe for human consumption?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs PENFOLD: I have been advised that the Port Augusta Prison has disconnected its water tanks because it cannot be guaranteed that people will not drink the water, and the costs of testing the water to ensure that it is safe are too high and the risks therefore too great.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I answer this question on behalf of my colleague in the other place, the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Really, the honourable member's question is about government policy which will apply from the middle of this year and which will mean that every new house built in South Australia will be required to have a plumbed rainwater tank into the bathroom, the toilet or the laundry. However, it does not apply to schools; and, certainly, it does not apply to drinking water. The question really is about existing practice.

If any building has a rainwater tank and that water is being used for drinking purposes, the operator of the building has a duty to make sure that it is safe. Certainly, no change in government policy would see rainwater tank water being used for consumption.

Mrs PENFOLD: As a supplementary question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs PENFOLD: My question is to the Minister for Health. The Port Augusta Prison's water was not for consumption: it was to be used on the garden. It was not as if it was for drinking, it was for use on the garden. It is just that it could not be guaranteed that it would not be drunk and therefore it was a risk.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders has the call. Was there a question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the member for Flinders' question?

Mrs PENFOLD: Why then was it closed down? The Port Augusta Prison water has been disconnected when it was not for drinking: it was for the garden. So, why was it disconnected if it was not a risk? It was too dangerous for the prisoners and okay for our students.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: One thing that is very clear is that the opposition's tail is a very long one! I will get a report

from the minister responsible for prisons for the honourable member.

COMMUNITY BUILDERS PROGRAM

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Regional Development advise the house whether the successful Community Builders Program has been scrapped? I am advised that, usually, the next round of submissions to run the program would have been closed by now, but calls for submissions have not been issued at all. One of the objectives of the South Australian Strategic Plan is to increase volunteering with a priority action to remove barriers to volunteering and to promote community participation. The Community Builders Program is an effective way of undertaking this objective and complements the strategic plan.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Regional Development): I thank the member for Flinders for her question. The question involves the outcomes of the budget and I suggest that the member await those outcomes.

RAIL, OAKLANDS STATION

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Will the proposal to relocate the Oaklands Park railway station 100 or 200 metres be completed within its original \$6.8 million budget?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): As the member would well know from the long series of discussions on this project, the final nature of the project is not yet determined and will not be determined until we complete the consultation that the honourable member so earnestly urged upon us. Perhaps at the end of that I can provide better advice on what the final project will be and what it will cost.

Members interjecting:

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

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Is the minister aware of the delays in processing international inbound passengers through the new Adelaide airport terminal? If so, has she taken any actions to help rectify the delays? A constituent contacted me last week by phone and email after taking 1 hour and 55 minutes to clear the new Adelaide international terminal, and cited a number of cases where he and his family had cleared other international airports around the world in 10 to 20 minutes. He went on to say in the email that if Adelaide wished to join the real world it would certainly have to improve its airport operations.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for MacKillop for this question. I am delighted that at last someone on that side of the chamber has come up with an idea where we can act in unison and work together on a small project. This small project is quite clearly one that is in the control of the federal government, because they deal with customs and passports and a whole range of areas that, in fact, slow the processing down. Now that the member for MacKillop has become aware of this issue—and it is definitely not a new one; it has been in existence for many years—he may do what I have done,

which is lobby and write and approach the federal government and ask for help.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S TRUST ACCOUNT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given the Attorney-General's remarkable memory, demonstrated by his ability to recall the details of various polling booth results, does he now recall the date on which he first heard about the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I remember it well—it was in a little village called Paleopirgous in the central Peloponnese in Greece about late August 2004.

ELECTRICITY BLACKOUTS

Mr PISONI (Unley): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Is the minister aware that there has been an ongoing dispute within the City of Unley and ETSA over the cause of long and repeated power blackouts? If so, is the minister satisfied that my constituents in Unley will have this matter resolved by mid May this year, as claimed by the City of Unley?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): The question is whether I will guarantee that a promise made by the City of Unley will be kept. There is a dispute between the City of Unley and a private company called ETSA. Of course, we will remember that ETSA was not always a private company—

Mr Koutsantonis: Really?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No. ETSA actually used to be owned by the government.

Ms Chapman: Well, buy it back.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Buy it back, she says! Oh my goodness.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, I can explain to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition why some of the things that her colleagues did would make it a huge loss for us if we were to buy back ETSA. They actually wrote all these landmines into the deal. I will not go on with that now, because that would be responding to an interjection which, of course, is out of order. However, if certain predecessors of the member for Unley had not all put up their hand and voted for the sale of ETSA, then with more confidence I could say that there would be an early resolution of the dispute between the City of Unley and a private company, ETSA, because it would not be a private company, it would be a government authority, and we would have some influence over it. As it is, I cannot with any confidence keep the promises of the City of Unley.

Ms Chapman: Another failed Labor candidate!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Another failed Labor candidate? That is right: there was one. I remember now. Another failed Labor candidate: can you believe she said that?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: As I look around the near-empty benches on that side, I think of the failed Labor candidate. Talk about walking into one! I admit that we should have an inquiry. How did he lose? No-one else did. I think I have explained it, but I just do not want to sit down because I am looking forward to another interjection. I think I have answered the question.

SCHOOLS, FIRE ALARMS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Has the government installed monitored fire alarms in all state schools and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): We have approximately 1 000 schools and preschools and, whilst it has been our policy to introduce a whole range of school safety measures during the last four years and we have installed movement-activated lights, security cameras, fire alarms, extra fencing and trained staff, we have not, of course, installed them in all our schools. One of the issues is that you can install all these mechanical and electrical devices but they do not stop fires.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): What was the relative cost of installing monitored fire alarms and using the emergency services helicopter to monitor schools at nights?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I think this is a wonderful idea. Have I stumbled across a Liberal policy? Now we are going to have helicopters—

Dr McFETRIDGE: On a point of order, just to inform the minister, I was told by the pilots of the helicopters that they are actually out there doing it already.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister for Education has the call.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The comparative cost of having helicopters visit a thousand schools every night is clearly more expensive than installing alarms.

TUBERCULOSIS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Health. How many cases of tuberculosis are there in South Australia and what support is provided to the recent arrivals from African countries to ensure that all cases of TB come to light promptly to optimise treatment?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): The provision of health services to recent arrivals from Africa is the responsibility of the federal government, and there are a number of issues with detection of some of these diseases. The member for Enfield has raised these most recently. One of the big problems is that doctors who have been trained in South Australia do not have the skills and experience at identifying what are essentially tropical illnesses. I do not have the exact figures in front of me, but I will be happy to get a report for the honourable member.

LOTTERY TICKET PROCESSING FEES

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Gambling. Why is there a \$2 processing fee for Lotteries Commission winning tickets? One of my regular correspondents has complained that when he won about \$7 in the state lottery, he was sent that amount less GST and less a \$2 processing fee, and, of course, there was a postage stamp paid in the process. My constituent is concerned that, if he won only about \$2 or \$3 on the lottery, he would end up owing them money.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Gambling): I thank the member for Mitchell for this question, and it is—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I'm just saying I'll always remember this first time. I am aware of the issue that the member for Mitchell has raised. I have received a similar email in the last couple of days, and I do not have the information back. As soon as I do, with respect to my request about clarifying that issue, I will get back to the house.

ROADS, SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Has the Minister for Transport received any report regarding the apparent failure of the second arrester bed on the South-Eastern Freeway down track? The South-Eastern Freeway, of course, has a steep descent from Crafers to the Tollgate, and adjacent to the freeway there are two arrester beds—one just above the Heysen tunnels and one not far above the Tollgate. These arrester beds are designed to bring vehicles, particularly heavy vehicles, to a rapid stop by burying the wheels in loose gravel. Recently, a truck, which was driven into the second arrester bed failed to stop and instead proceeded up a steep incline and crashed into the cliff, trapping the driver. The bed apparently failed. My question is: has there been any report on the apparent failure of that arrester bed?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): No. I can honestly say that I have not had a report on that, certainly not one that I recall. I would be amazed if I had one and did not recall it, but I will just cover myself by saying I certainly do not recall one. But I tell you what, by this time tomorrow I will know all about it.

ROADS, UNLEY

Mr PISONI (Unley): Is the Treasurer aware that Unley Road has for some time been earmarked for upgrade and that the upgrade has been delayed due to lack of funding for three years, and will the Treasurer consider allocating funding to this important project in the upcoming, delayed budget?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Thank you, sir. There's something about the member for Unley. I am very familiar with Unley Road. I travel it frequently. It is a good road.

Mr Pisoni: You're always in my street.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Apparently, I am always in the member for Unley's street. I will say publicly, sir: I did not know that.

Mr Pisoni: You're in my deli as well.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In your deli? I go to his deli as well. You've got a furniture shop, a deli?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Is he in your dreams?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I am somewhat bemused. Is the member for Unley following me around the streets of Unley? I do not know how to respond, sir. Which deli do you own? I do not make decisions about specific road upgrades. The way the process works is that the Minister for Transport will submit a number of projects for additional funding. Whether we can or cannot afford that will be decided through the course of the budget process. The Minister for Transport has an ongoing program of road funding. Whether or not Unley Road is scheduled or slated for funding in this budget I do not know. But, as you would appreciate, I am sure there

could be every member in this house rising, wanting their particular road to be upgraded. Be assured that the member for Unley would not be on his own on that. As to the member for Unley following me around delicatessens in the streets of Unley, I—

Mr Pisoni: It's my patch.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It's your patch. I have heard about ministers having to notify local members when they go into one's electorate.

Ms Chapman: All members.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All members. I am a frequent visitor to Unley for obvious reasons.

SCHOOLS, STAFFING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Why has it taken over six months to appoint a new chief executive to the Department for Education and Children's Services? Former chief executive, Steve Marshall, submitted his resignation to the minister on Wednesday 19 October 2005.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): It's an important job and we want the best person.

MURRAY MOUTH, DREDGING

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Will the Minister for the River Murray inform the house of the current situation in relation to the dredging of the Murray Mouth and its efficiency and how inadequate flows are continuing to impede the long-term condition of the Mouth? The minister recently toured the Goolwa barrage in the Murray Mouth area, along with the media circus. The ad hoc closure of the Murray Mouth to boating is continuing to cause economic loss and inconvenience to my constituents and users of the Murray Mouth area.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): It is interesting to note the way in which the member for Finniss has determined to present this question, because it is a very important question in relation to retaining the opening of the Murray Mouth, not just for the constituency of Finniss and the inconvenience that they may be experiencing, but there is also a huge inconvenience to the entire South Australian population in relation to the detrimental impact of low flows on the River Murray throughout the system. The current dredging program is scheduled to be funded through to October this year. There will be discussions at the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council to determine the future of the project.

The dredging project has been incredibly successful in achieving its objectives, which are to introduce tidal variations into the Coorong and to maintain a good exchange of sea water into the Coorong through these mechanical means. The dredging is a very expensive short-term project. It has been brought about, as a requirement to undertake the dredging, as a consequence of the fifth consecutive year of dry conditions right across the Murray-Darling Basin. So, that combined with overextraction in certain areas has meant that the Murray Mouth was in a position to close a number of years ago and a project was put in place as a short-term measure to try to resolve the issues in relation to the Coorong and what would happen if the Mouth did close.

The project is a very important one, and we have worked hard to ensure that we can accommodate the needs of the

community. We have provided boating access past the dredging project through October through to the end of the May school holidays this year. We are currently in negotiations with the Alexandrina Council to look to future openings should the dredging project continue. Of course, the real answer for the long-term sustainability of the river in its entirety, as well as the health of the Coorong and maintaining an open Murray Mouth, is more flows. That is where South Australia is directing its effort to return more water to the River Murray to ensure that we can have a healthy system.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

CRIME AND JUSTICE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise today to grieve in partial response to the extraordinary statement by the Premier yesterday entitled 'Crime and Justice'. There are so many issues arising from the Premier's statement that I certainly will not have time to get through them all, but I do want to cover as many as I can in the brief time I have available to me.

The first issue arising out of the statement is the Premier's attitude that the need for public safety must be the paramount consideration in sentencing, bail and parole decisions. No-one disputes the fact that the need for public safety is a consideration. If you talk to magistrates or judges in the magistrates, district or supreme courts in relation to sentencing of criminals once they have been found guilty, they will tell you that every consideration applies to every person who has been convicted in terms of assessing how to balance the various competing interests. Clearly, there are interests of victims and they do need to be considered. However, just as important in many cases will be the age of the offender, the circumstances in which the offending took place and the degree of remorse of the offender.

Under the Sentencing Act, they are required to consider whether there has been an early guilty plea and cooperation. They are required to consider a vast range of things and, as I said, each case is considered on its own individual circumstances. I do not think that the Premier necessarily recognises that, by saying that from now on we will make a paramount consideration the interest of the public in being protected from the nature of the crime—if that is to be the paramount consideration—then that could skew our justice system quite considerably. That is but one of the problems arising from what the Premier said yesterday. However, he does have at least one piece of this equation right; that is, the Premier in that statement recognised that, if he has a problem with it, the way to solve that problem is for him to introduce legislation and set out what he wants the law to be in respect of how the sentencing process is to operate.

If he wants to amend the sentencing act, that is fine. I have no difficulty with the idea that that is the way for him to go about it, rather than by direct interference. Of course, we have already seen from the Attorney-General's responses today that there is a complete failure to understand that, by picking out certain cases for review and reconsideration by the Attorney, you create a system where, as I said in my question, people are not equal under the law. The Chief Justice says

that longer sentences are not a particularly effective response to crime. My view is that the Chief Justice's opinion on that is probably pretty accurate. The Premier seems to then go on to say:

I am informed that the rate of offending has been declining since this government, with its tougher attitude to sentencing and law and order, came to power.

He stopped short of saying that the rate of offending has declined, but, even if it has, it has probably declined because of a whole range of other things and it is not necessarily at all because of the fact that they have had a tougher response to the length of the sentences. Indeed, as we already heard in question time as well, the Attorney-General on Channel 10 on 1 July last year said:

Yes, there have been reductions in the crime rate in South Australia since our government came to office but my suspicion is that does not have much to do with our policy.

I think the Attorney hit the nail on the head at that point of the argument. In fact, the Premier in his statement goes on to say that sentences are, on average, getting longer and the crime rate is going down. Perhaps he wants us to infer that there is some necessary connection between those two facts, but there is not any necessary connection and he fails to demonstrate any connection.

He then goes on to create a commissioner for victims' rights. I have no difficulty with the idea that we do need to support victims and, subject to seeing what the actual legislation states when he introduces presumably some legislation in due course, no difficulty with the concept of having a commissioner for victims' rights. What surprises me is that he then restricts the circumstances in which advocates will be able to appear in court to represent victims to only homicide cases and where the victim has been permanently and totally incapacitated.

Time expired.

URBAN FOREST-MILLION TREES PROGRAM

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I rise today to talk about a very important issue, namely, the government's Urban Forest-Million Trees Program; and the assistance and relationship that the government has with the Rotary clubs of South Australia to achieve this aim. I was privileged recently to be present at a tree planting ceremony at Linear Park where 100 new trees were planted. This was a particularly special day, as the President Elect of Rotary International (Mr Bill Boyd) was making an official visit to Adelaide from New Zealand on his way to the United States and then all other points on the globe. It was a very special honour to have him visit Adelaide, and many Rotarians were present to greet him. We are very privileged because Bill's son is a lecturer at Flinders University, so he will certainly be back to visit during his term of office.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the volunteers from various Rotary clubs who spend hundreds of hours each year on a variety of projects to benefit our community. Members may be aware that much of my previous working life was spent in the charity and welfare areas, and several organisations, which I have been privileged to lead, have benefited from the magnanimous support of the volunteers from Rotary. They contribute marvellously to the community of South Australia, particularly with projects for children, the disabled and, topically, the environment—which is one of their current priorities. In this particular case, Rotary International has been partnering the Rann government by

organising a number of tree planting days in both the metropolitan and some rural areas. They have organised local schools to be part of each planting exercise, and in this case we were very lucky to have students from Cora Barclay School for the Hearing Impaired to ably help us with this task.

The Million Trees Program—which, incidentally, has become the three million trees program—is a major investment in the future of the metropolitan area, and we will see the amenity of open spaces enhanced with local native trees, plants, understorey bushes, ground covers and grasses to ensure that the natural heritage of the Adelaide Plains is both conserved and reinstated. It started as a commitment to plant a tree for every person living in the city to counteract the impression of a barren, regimented urban environment. This bold initiative to improve the ecology of the Adelaide environment is part of a grander design as part of Adelaide's Metropolitan Open Space System, and, where possible, will link up with existing vegetation areas or create corridors between them.

However, this project is more than an attempt at sustainability and a greener city. It is about people and increasing the community's environmental awareness. By consciously including community and school participation in the Urban Forest-Million Trees Program, we have a fantastic opportunity to excite and educate the community and the next generation to recognise the importance of green open space in the urban environment. The volunteers from both Rotary and the Cora Barclay school certainly embraced this concept, and I commend them for their efforts.

ROADS, SOUTH-EAST

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I seek to satisfy the Minister for Transport's curiosity by telling him about my trip over the weekend to the South-East to inspect the roads, because there are a number of issues to which he needs to give his full attention. I was able to travel down the Dukes Highway on Thursday evening through to Bordertown, which is an interesting experience given the amount of semi-trailer and freight traffic on the road at that time. The Dukes Highway is in bad shape, particularly from Tintinara through Keith to Bordertown. Of course, it is the major route between Adelaide and Melbourne. I drove it over the weekend at a time when it was raining and, at times, hailing. It was windy and rough. One sees every corrugation, pothole and rough patch on the road in such conditions.

Part of the Dukes Highway, of course, is too narrow. The edges are far too soft and trees are close to the carriageway in a number of sections. It is the major route between two capital cities and it is simply in a shameful state. There are forecast projections of a considerable increase in freight traffic on this road, as rail and road rationalise in the years ahead. The Dukes Highway will need to be improved considerably if it is to sustain future workloads. Eventually, the government will have to give consideration to how the \$400 million duplication from Tailem Bend through to the border will be funded.

I know the argument is that it is an AusLink road. That is true. However, it is up to the state government to lead the charge and argue our case. Industry groups have made the point that they feel abandoned in that they are having to argue the case to the commonwealth themselves. It is really up to the state government to put our argument forward and to

champion the case for change. Otherwise, we will lose ground to other states: it is as simple as that.

The section of the Riddoch Highway from Keith to Mount Gambier is in woeful shape, and I think the section between Padthaway and Keith is particularly bad—certainly, the truck drivers to whom I have spoken have made that point. It is a small road when you look at it from the cabin of a large semitrailer, and there is a need for substantial improvement in the form of additional overtaking lanes and fixing the edges to provide protection for motorists who might veer off the road, and various other improvements to the carriageway. We travelled along quite a number of back roads that are important to primary producers and forestry, in particular, Bordertown, through Frances and Binnun, and through Hynam into Naracoorte, and but also the roads around Kalangadoo, Mount Burr, Nangwarry and Glencoe that service the timber industry.

Mr Williams: It's good country.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: It is great country, but the condition of the roads is such that it is significantly getting in the way of business and tourism and other related traffic in that area. The Princes Highway from Mount Gambier through Millicent and along the coast up to Meningie is, frankly, a death trap: the RAA rated it at 3.5 out of 10. Over 90 per cent of the route is less than the required national standard of 3.5 metres. The grassy and unsealed shoulders are lethal, and the condition of the surface is shocking. It is a dangerous goat track—that is how the locals refer to it—and it needs a considerable amount of work.

The \$200 million backlog in road maintenance is something of which the government should be ashamed, considering the exorbitant amount of money that it is raking in off motorists—\$394 million in taxes on motorists, which is up 23 per cent in the life of this government; something like 14¢ a litre. I was paying up to \$1.45 a litre for fuel in this area; 14¢ in GST. There has been over \$360 million in state government revenue from GST on fuel and \$96 million in traffic fines. If you take this money from motorists, you need to spend it back on motorists, and the South-East is a good example of where the money needs to be spent.

I urge the state government to look very carefully at the road needs of the South-East and to get on with it in the next four years, rather than continue to ignore the problem, as it has done over the last four years. It is not good enough to say that one or two of the roads require federal funding. Of course that is so, but it is up to the state government to lead the charge. The majority of these roads are state government roads, which require an investment by the state government. It should make it.

Time expired.

MINERS, RESCUE

Ms BREUER (Giles): I woke up this morning about 10 to five and switched on the radio to see whether the miners, Todd Russell and Brant Webb, had escaped from the mine and realised that they had been found and were being brought to the surface. I watched the whole event on television for the next hour and a half, and I feel a little tired now. What a wonderful thing it was to see and how wonderful it is nowadays that we can feel part of it and feel involved in the whole event.

Dr McFetridge: It was a South Australian drill.

Ms BREUER: As the member for Morphett said, it was a South Australian drill. It did particularly touch me because

of the involvement of South Australia, but also I understand the importance to a small community when something like this happens. Everyone in the town of Beaconsfield knows each other, as is the case in Whyalla. We had our airline crash a few years ago, and I understand some of the emotions that would have been going around the town. I think it was a wonderful event this morning. My heart goes out to those brave men and their families. I cannot understand how they managed to stay sane in the time they were trapped underground. I extend my sympathy to the family of Larry Knight; that was a tragedy. I come from a long line of miners. My great, great grandfather was killed in a mine in Broken Hill. I think the technology we have today is incredible, but this incident shows that the mining industry still is highly dangerous. That was an event, that was a miracle and that was something about which we can call feel happy to see happen today.

Talking of small communities, I rise today mainly to congratulate the Whyalla Singers who are singing today at Carnegie Hall, New York. About 12 months ago, I was very pleased when the Whyalla Singers approached me to say that they had been invited to go to Carnegie Hall to sing with a number of other choirs from all over the world. Initially, they were not really sure whether this invitation was for real, whether someone was trying to get money from them or whether it was just a hoax.

However, upon investigation, we found out that it was for real. Choirs from all over the world were invited to attend. Our wonderful Whyalla Singers worked very hard. We did some fundraising. They were able to raise some money, and they have sent over a good contingent. Marilyn Johns (who worked very hard towards this), Grace Isitt, Sheila Jones, Cathy Taylor, Sylvia Nelson, Cathy Stevenson and Gail Sunman were able to represent our town, our state and, I believe, our country. Unfortunately, another person, Chris Baird, became ill in Canada and had to return home.

The experience will be wonderful for them. At Carnegie Hall they are singing with the New England Symphonic Ensemble. They will be singing works by Mozart, Paul Basler, Robinson and Vivaldi. They will be joining choirs from all over the world. I send my sincere congratulations to them. Unfortunately, I cannot be with them. Originally, I said that I would try to be there. However, because of the election, I was not able to book because I did not know whether I would be back in this place. Certainly, my thoughts are with them today. I know that they have been to the Eight Mile Creek restaurant in New York in the last few days, which is run by a couple of our Whyalla boys. They went there to celebrate and to meet with them. I am hoping that they do very well. I am sure that it will be a performance to be remembered by everyone.

Recently, I attended the Whyalla Players 50th anniversary in Whyalla. It was a wonderful weekend. The Whyalla Players were formed in 1956 by founding member Don Winton, who also attended the event. It was a wonderful weekend. We had the opportunity to meet with many players from the past, the recent past and current players. Of course, I have been a member of the Whyalla Players for many years. It is very dear to my heart. We had the greatest weekend. The Whyalla Players has been the core of the arts in Whyalla and it has contributed greatly to the arts in Whyalla. It is wonderful that a society can exist for so long and do such great work, particularly for our young people. I fulfilled a dream, because I got to play the role of the princess. I have always wanted to

be the princess in the pantomime, but I was never picked. We were able to go along as the character we most wanted to be.

I went along as the 16-year old princess, and I think that I convinced everyone. I found a handsome prince, but he did go home at the end of the night. It was a wonderful experience. As I say, it fulfilled all my fantasies to be this beautiful, young 16-year old princess. Everyone commented how beautiful I looked and how I fooled everyone. They really believed that I was 16. It was a great night, and we all had a lot of fun. There were many other people in costume on the night. People who did not come in costume were dressed in their finery. We were able to relive those moments which proved to be so much fun in the past, both on and off stage. My congratulations to all concerned.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Today I want to talk about the airport, and I draw the attention of the house to the lack of action by this government, as well as my concern at the trite manner in which the Minister for Tourism responded to my question in the house today. This government, and particularly the Premier, as we all know, would have South Australians believe that he built the new airport terminal single-handedly.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Until something goes wrong.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, as my colleague said, until something goes wrong. At every turn, the Premier boasted about what he was doing to promote the new airport terminal and how it was all due to his hard work. Even last year—when he was frittering away hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars in self-aggrandising advertisements just after the launch of last year's budget—the Premier had footage taken of himself on the construction site of the new Adelaide Airport terminal. However, as soon as there is a problem it is all the fault of the commonwealth government. The commonwealth has control of it. Maybe the commonwealth government was behind the new airport terminal's construction. That is not what the Premier has been saying for the last couple of years in South Australia.

I would have thought that the Minister for Tourism would be very concerned about what is going on down at our airport and that, instead of standing in this place and saying she had lobbied and lobbied, she might have actually been out there making some public comments about the airport terminal and the delays experienced there.

Last week I received a most irate phone call from one of my constituents. The member for Mount Gambier would have received a similar one if the constituent had had his mobile number; I did the right thing and did not pass it on (because I do have his mobile number), so the member for Mount Gambier owes me one there. I asked my constituent to put down on paper some notes about his experience, and I will read from that email. He said:

As you know I'm a frequent international traveller, especially to Asian countries, in the pursuit of promoting and selling our wines. I had hoped that the new Adelaide airport would become a jewel in the state's crown—after all, I didn't think that it could get any worse than the old one. I was wrong!!!

I returned from Singapore last Monday morning on SQ229. The plane was code shared with a Lufthansa flight—a very full plane—and Ros and I were flying economy class along with a large number of German tourists and a few returning Aussies. You can imagine my annoyance—and that of our fellow passengers—when it took nearly two hours to clear the Adelaide airport. The plane landed at 7.45 a.m. and we finally got into a cab at 9.40 a.m.

He goes on to quote the times it took him to get through many other international airports in recent months: Singapore 12 minutes; Hong Kong 20 minutes, Malaysia 20 minutes; Heathrow 22 minutes and 25 minutes; Dublin 25 minutes; and his son recently cleared Los Angeles in under 30 minutes.

He goes on to say, amongst other things, 'I must also comment that the staff were certainly courteous and friendly.' So he was not blaming the staff down there. He continued:

The taxi concierge was certainly trying his best under difficult circumstances. All in all it was a most unpleasant and embarrassing experience. All the passengers near me were very annoyed and upset, and I spent most of my time apologising to the overseas visitors and assuring them that the rest of Australia worked somewhat more efficiently than Adelaide airport. As a South Australian I was downright embarrassed at the whole procedure.

I'm sure third world countries treat their incoming visitors far better than Adelaide did last Monday—I know that the countries I visit on a regular basis do! When I explained the delay to our Iraqi taxi-driver as we left the airport we both agreed that it would be much quicker to get through Baghdad International—bombs and all!

He went on to say:

Something has to be done, Mitch! We can't treat incoming tourists in this way. I can't in all conscience advise friends and colleagues to use Adelaide airport as the first destination of arrival into Australia and I know I'll be using Melbourne airport for my overseas travel in the future. If Adelaide wishes to join the real world it will certainly have to improve its airport operations.

I totally agree with the sentiments expressed by my constituent both in that email and over the phone last week, and my concern is that our tourism minister does not really know what being a tourism minister is all about.

We in this state had the good fortune not that long ago to have a very effective tourism minister who did great things to promote South Australia and Adelaide. In fact, I think we are now going backwards at a rapid rate, and if the tourism minister does not do something about the airport we will continue to go backwards.

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

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, please cease interjecting across the chamber.

Mr WILLIAMS: I apologise, Madam Deputy Speaker.

INTERNATIONAL NURSES DAY AND INTERNATIONAL MIDWIVES DAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Today I rise to acknowledge International Nurses Day on 12 May and International Midwives Day on 5 May, and note the advertisement in today's *Advertiser* from the Premier and the Minister for Health regarding the awards night to be held at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre on 12 May. I commend both the Premier and the minister for their participation in this.

I particularly want to recognise the dedication, commitment and hard work provided by midwives to women-focused maternity care. Childbirth is neither normal nor abnormal; it is quite simply a journey, a unique experience for each individual woman each time she has a baby. The recognition of each woman as a distinct individual is fundamental to midwifery philosophy and the provision of women-centred care. As women are participating more and more in the work force and leaving the decision (often not by choice) to have children until late in their thirties and forties, I should mention here that the debate on paid maternity leave, which

gained momentum a year or so ago, certainly needs to do so again.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I will have one for the Prime Minister if he reverses my operation. The need and desire for maternity care relevant to women's particular needs is greater than ever and provides challenging changes. Women want models of care that are women-focused and provide them with informed choice, including continuity of carer. The most appropriate health professional to provide continuity of care, especially where risk is considered minimal in the healthy child-bearing experience, is the midwife. It is the midwife who has the complete range of skills necessary to provide the total maternity service for women and their babies. The midwife is the health professional specifically educated for this purpose and the only person who can organise her practice structure accordingly.

While midwives can and do provide this holistic service, other practitioners cannot provide a total maternity service as they rely on midwives to be part of the service they supply. Midwives can and do provide women with continuity of care from a known and trusted caregiver throughout the entire pregnancy, labour, birth and the important postnatal period. Women have come to know that there is an alternative to fragmented care from multiple caregivers who provide inconsistent and occasionally conflicting information. Every woman wants a safe arrival for her baby and a positive birth experience for herself. Midwifery is able to offer both outcomes safely and, if consumer feedback is anything to go by, with greater satisfaction and approval rating.

Midwifery encourages women to exercise greater control over the birthing experience so that they can become active participants in the event. Midwives' methods are time tested and time proven and have benefited from all the advances in modern technology. I want to return to the point about more and more women waiting longer to have babies nowadays, often only having one child and, in this older group of first-time mothers, often needing to rely on IVF treatments. We need to look at the reasons behind this trend, as another of the consequences of this is the higher rate of caesarean section. Somehow, with all our modern technology and the benefit of centuries of practice and research, while we have certainly improved the safety of childbirth for both mother and baby—and one would expect that this would or should have been an outcome in any case—we have not been able to make it a less intrusive event.

More importantly, it is often an experience that many women would choose to forget and, rather than being a totally fulfilling and happy event, it often results in lingering problems, particularly postnatal depression. There is also emerging through research the damage done to newborns following births that are difficult or stressful for whatever reason. It is clear that every child and mother deserve the best and safest birthing experience and postnatal support, in particular, that we can provide. While much is being done, we can certainly do a whole lot more, particularly at the community level, in preparing women for birthing and what used to be the lying-in period, which seems to have vanished.

Encouraging women and their newborns to leave hospital is certainly the way to go if they feel able and if there is support for them when they go home. As families are often unable to provide this care, I would also like to commend, first, the Mothercarer service and the universal home visiting program that this government has introduced. I would also like to commend all the nurses involved in caring for mothers

and newborns and acknowledge the enormous reliance we all have on nurses. Their dedication and work is the subject for another contribution, and I know that other members would join me in supporting and congratulating all midwives and nurses for the work they do in our hospitals, nursing homes and homes, of course, via the RDNS, to mention only a few of the vital contributions they make to all of us in our lives.

SESSIONAL ORDERS

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to provide that—

1. When the house sits on a Monday—
 - (a) it meets at 2 p.m.
 - (b) business proceeds in accordance with SO 78
 - (c) the motion for adjournment may be debated in accordance with SO 49 if it is moved before 10 p.m.
2. Private Members' business has precedence as follows—
 - (a) In any week in which the house sits on Monday—
 - (1) on Wednesday after Grievances until 6 p.m.—Bills Committees (including reports of Committees), Regulations; and
 - (2) on Thursday from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m.—Other Motions; and
 - (b) In any week in which the house does not sit on Monday—
 - (1) on Wednesday for one hour after Grievances—Bills Committees (including reports of committees), Regulations; and
 - (2) on Thursday from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m.—Other Motions.
3. Notices of Motion take precedence over Orders of the Day unless otherwise ordered.
4. If all business is completed before 1 p.m. on Thursdays, the sitting of the house is suspended until 2 p.m.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the house, and as an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house is not present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 May. Page 45.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Of course, the opposition will be supporting the bill, but we would like to place on the record a few observations in respect of the public accounts and the quantum and size of this bill, which at \$3 100 million is \$1 400 million more than the amount sought under last year's Supply Bill and is a very significant portion of the state's annual spend. Clearly, it is needed so that public servants can be paid and public expenditure undertaken in the period between the start of the next financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill, but regrettably this increase in quantum is attributable to this year's budget, the Appropriation Bill, not being introduced until 21 September 2006. The opposition is of the view that that need not have been the case. The government had plenty of time to go through the bilaterals and the budget planning process and should have been well sorted to have gone ahead with the budget, so that we could set out an agenda at the very

outset for the coming four years. Instead, the government has chosen to go through this exhaustive review, which is clearly designed to find cuts to government expenditure—cuts which they largely argued against during the course of the election campaign; but that is another story.

It is, indeed, the highest taxing government that we have seen in our history as a state, with the highest taxing Premier and Treasurer at the helm. State budget figures show that the Rann government is the highest taxing government we have ever seen, as I mentioned, with taxes combined with GST payments from the federal government making it the wealthiest government South Australia has ever had. Indeed, revenues and expenses need to be particularly noted by members of the house. In 2001-02, at \$8 538 million, the budget has now grown in 2005-06 to \$10 862 million, estimated. It is a massive amount of money.

Labor's first budget in 2002-03 broke a key election promise by introducing new taxes and charges and by increasing existing taxes and charges, including the introduction of the gaming machine supertax, the River Murray levy and increases in stamp duty on conveyances and regulated fees and charges. One of those initiatives, namely the gaming machine supertax, will be remembered not because it takes money from the gaming industry but because there was a written commitment from the Treasurer and the Labor government when in opposition that they would not increase these poker machine taxes. It was a promise, in effect—a promise that was instantly broken. The message it sent to business was that the government cannot be trusted.

The Rann government, as has been mentioned, is the highest taxing government in the state's history with taxes up by 34 per cent or \$740 million compared to the last year of the former Liberal government in 2001-02. That takes account of the mid-year budget review. Referring back to the period before that, to the first four years, it is clear that there have been quantum increases in taxes across the relevant categories of payroll tax, property, gaming, insurance, motor vehicle and other taxes. This government is collecting about \$2 300 million more in revenue this year than in that last year of the former Liberal government. What they have done with the extra \$2 300 million is another question or, should I say, an unanswered question. I will talk more about that later. We have not really seen \$2 300 million worth of improvements in hospitals, schools or police services and other essential services despite the government's rhetoric. What do we really have to show for it? I seek leave to insert two statistical charts that spell out the cumulative actual revenue growth since 2001-02.

Leave granted.

	Actual general government sector total revenue (\$ million)	Revenue increase over 2001-02 base (\$ million)
2001-02	\$8 538	
2002-03	\$9 346	+808
2003-04	\$9 955	+1 417
2004-05	\$10 592	+2 054
2005-06	\$10 862	+2 324
Total		+6 603

Total general government sector revenue, difference (windfall) between budget and actual (within each year)		Total general government sector revenue, difference (windfall) between budget and actual (within one year)	
Windfalls to Liberal Government		Windfalls to Labor Government	
1998-99	+\$218 million	2001-02	+\$397 million
1999-2000	+84 million	2002-03	+\$528 million
2000-01	+\$256 million	2003-04	+\$794 million
		2004-05	+\$595 million
Windfall	+\$558 million		+\$2 314 million

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The first table shows that the annual general government sector's total revenue from 2001-02 to the financial year 2005-06 has grown, as I mentioned, from \$8 538 million to \$10 862 million. This is a revenue increase upwards of \$2 324 million over the 2001-02 base, which is in 2005-06 alone. When you add up the cumulative increases over the four years that this government has had control of the Treasury benches, it is a staggering \$6.6 billion of additional revenue over and above what was available to the last Liberal government. It is a massive amount of extra money that the Treasurer has had to spend.

The Treasurer waxes lyrical about how this government is a sound economic manager. It is not hard to be a sound economic manager when you have an extra \$6.6 billion to spend. A lot of people on this side have run businesses and, therefore, they have created jobs. When the money is rolling across the counter at you and smothering you, and the revenue is just washing in the front door, it is easy to look good. You can over-hire. You can spend extra money on things you do not really need. You can cover up a mountain of woes with that money. You look fantastic and your accountant loves you—it is all hunky dory. It is when times

turn, when that cash flow dries up, that you are sorely tested. I am sure that I do not need to remind the house of the precarious situation in which the former Liberal government found itself in 1993-94 with the wreckage that was left to it by Labor through the State Bank mess. It was over \$11 billion worth of debt and a \$300 million current account deficit with declining revenues. That is when a treasurer and a premier are tested. That is when you really get sorted out, not when you are awash with cash—\$6.6 billion of additional revenue.

The second table which I have laid down provides another way of showing how the Treasurer is simply awash with money. Total general government sector revenue—that is, the windfall between budget and actual within each year—is quite striking. From 1998-99, when it was \$218 million under the former Liberal government, to an accrued total windfall, if you like, of \$558 million; compared with under Labor a windfall in total government sector revenue (when you accumulate it) of \$2.314 billion. It is almost five times more windfall gains than during the period when the Liberals were last in government. These figures ought to be drawn to the attention not only of the house but the media and the community at large. They have a right to know.

The Rann government massively underestimates its revenue collections every year and, over the past three budgets, the Rann government has collected, on average, \$640 million more per year than originally budgeted. Little wonder that people find themselves scratching their head when the Treasurer ducks and weaves on the issue of the GST revenue he is collecting, for example, on fuel—and I will talk more about that later. I now want to focus on GST; that is, GST over and above what would have been received under the original federal-state system. The Rann government is collecting an extra \$1.080 billion (\$1 080 million) in GST revenue over this six-year period from 2003-04 to 2008-09, over and above what would have been collected under the old pre-GST funding deal. Remember, the arrangements for the GST that were opposed by the Treasurer, the Premier and Labor, are now delivering massive windfall gains.

The annual GST benefit to the state budget is steadily increasing to \$249 million per year by 2008-09. All the GST collected comes back to the states. As Treasurer Costello said, 'Never get between a Premier and a bucket of GST money.' All this puts a massive lie to the spin that was being put about by the government, for example, regarding the GST that it is raising on fuel. I asked the Treasurer questions on this in the house on 3 May. He has already said publicly that every cent of GST revenue on fuel that comes directly to the states is worth \$26 million, and he did so in ruling out any Queensland style rebate on fuel. It is very simple that, fuel having risen from less than \$1 per litre to \$1.40 per litre, the government is collecting something to the tune of around 14¢ per litre in a direct payment back to the states in GST revenue. It is very simple mathematics: \$26 million a cent—14¢. It is over \$360 million—\$364 million in fact.

The Treasurer would have us believe that we are not actually getting \$364 million of GST revenue on fuel, or, when the price increased from \$1 to \$1.40, an extra 4¢ per litre, which comes in at \$104 million. In fact, he even gets frisky when the RAA says, 'Well, it is \$30 million,' which is a lot less than \$104. He says that, if they are spending more on fuel, then they are spending less on retail. I have just provided a table to the house indicating that the government has received over \$1 billion of windfall benefits in GST revenue. The government is awash with GST revenue. In fact, it has increased extraordinarily. For example, for the financial year 2003-04, from \$99.3 million to an estimate in 2008-09 of \$249 million; in 2007-08 of \$219 million. The graphs are up. There are little dips and bumps on the way, but the graph for GST revenue is upwards.

With the logic that if fuel goes up people spend less on retail, and there is only one amount of money and consumers decide where they will spend it—there is no net growth—how is it we are seeing this extraordinary increase from \$99.3 million in 2003-04 to \$249 million? The graph in GST revenue is up. It is growing. The turnover in the economy is growing. It is illogical for the Treasurer to argue that if they spend more on fuel they automatically and necessarily spend less on other things. It may come out of savings, a wage rise or any one of an array of options available to a family, but it is simplistic spin and nonsense to be running the line that the government is not getting a benefit out of increased fuel prices: it is. It is simply nonsense to say that GST revenues are looking bleak. As I have shown directly from budget figures, the government is awash with GST revenue. Let us not have any more of that nonsense.

I now refer to taxes on motorists, and I seek leave to incorporate a third table which is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

State Taxation—South Australia 2001-02 to 2005-06 (\$ million)⁴

	2001-02 (Estimated result)	2002-03 (Estimated result)	2003-04 (Estimated result)	2004-05 (Estimated result)	2005-06 (Budget)	% Increase Under Labor
Employer payroll tax	591.3	645.1	712.1	740.6	776.9	31.4
Taxes on property	727.5	795.1	1 046.4	1 104.6	989.9	36.1
Taxes on gambling	307.9	335.3	377.1	400.9	413.6	34.3
Taxes on insurance	224.8	253.2	2773.3	281.8	282.5	25.7
Motor vehicle taxes	320.5	340.0	369.2	383.0	393.9	22.9
Other taxes	0.7	3.8	4.6	5.4	5.4	671.4
Total taxation	2 172.8	2 372.5	2 782.7	2 916.2	2 862.2	31.7

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The table clearly shows that taxes on motorists, quite apart from the additional GST the government is receiving on fuel, have gone through the roof. In the first four years that this Treasurer and this government had control of the Treasury benches, taxes on motor vehicles went up by \$394 million—an increase of nearly 23 per cent. It is an absolutely striking figure in terms of the increased burden upon motorists. In addition, drivers' licence fees raised \$21.7 million, and drivers' licence holders now pay up to \$240 for a 10 year licence. Of course, there are compulsory third party charges, and I think we are one of the states with the highest third party charges at \$341. There are also vehicle registration fees. Of course, in relation to motor traffic infringement fines alone, \$96 million is projected to be raised in 2005-06.

When one adds together all this money, an extraordinary amount of money is being burdened upon motorists. Where

is it being spent? I can tell members where it is not being spent. It is not being spent on roads and improved public transport. It is being spent on the government's priorities, which, we are told, are health, education and police. Actually, when one looks at the facts, the size of government has grown and the number of public servants has grown. Government has got fat with this money—and I will talk more about that later.

The money has also come from property taxes. The Rann government is the first government in South Australia's history to collect more than \$1 billion in property taxes. In fact, it collected \$1.121 billion in 2004-05, despite the 2005 land tax changes that the Rann government keeps describing as 'tax cuts'. I would like to understand the logic, given the picture I have painted, of how the government, with any credibility at all, can say that it is delivering tax cuts. It is awash with tax revenue. Despite the so-called changes, the

Rann government in 2005-06 is expecting to collect \$295 million in land tax, which is more than double the \$140 million collected by the last Liberal government in 2001-02. It is cutting land tax so well that it is growing from \$140 million to \$295 million. Well, thank you very much for that tax cut. We have gone from \$140 million to \$295 million, but we all should be thankful that this is a tax cut. What a load of bunkum. It is total rubbish. Land tax collections in 2005-06 will be \$39 million more than last year's collections.

This is a government that claims it is delivering tax cuts. What a load of nonsense! Where is it being spent? It is being spent on a range of blow-outs and wasteful undertakings. I will give some examples of the lack of financial discipline becoming evident. There is the \$257 million blow-out in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment; \$42 million blow-out anticipated on the Port River Expressway; \$15.5 million blow-out in the Lyell McEwen Hospital Redevelopment; \$5 million blow-out on the Sturt Street Primary School; \$51 million earmarked to extend tram lines down King William Street through the city to North Adelaide; \$6.4 million per annum wasted on two extra Labor ministers and 76 ministerial staff over and above what the Liberals had in order to buy in the members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey.

As I mentioned, between 8 000 to 9 000 extra public servants were employed during the first term of Labor. It is a curious figure. Labor governments tax and spend and they fatten up government. They grow the size of government, supposedly while delivering an array of services, but, in fact, one silo is bouncing off the other. The size of government has grown exponentially. Frankly, this is where most of the money has gone. It is not 8 000 to 9 000 extra teachers, nurses or police. That is a very small figure. Where have they come from? What are the other 8 000 to 9 000 extra public servants doing? That is the question the government needs to answer. Of course, there is the \$70 million to \$100 million wasted on opening bridges in the Treasurer's own electorate.

The budget papers show that the former Liberal government reduced the debt, which Mr Rann and Mr Foley left us with when they were last involved in government back in the days of the State Bank, from \$11.6 billion in 1993 to \$3.2 billion in 2001. Non-financial public sector debt in June 2005 is \$2.1 billion and general government debt is \$144 million. We have the former Liberal government to thank for that, not the current government. Most of the hard work was done by us, not them.

With respect to WorkCover, under the Liberals, the unfunded liability was reduced to \$84 million in March 2002. Under Labor, it has blown out to \$647 million. That is about \$430 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. South Australian levy rates are still higher than is the case in Victoria, and we are now seeing employers pay increasingly large amounts of money to exit the scheme. Unfunded superannuation liabilities in the general government unfunded sector, in accordance with the budget papers, are shown to stand at about \$3.2 billion as at June 2001. Under Labor, the unfunded superannuation liability has blown out to \$7.2 billion, and is still rising.

In credit rating terms, it was the former Liberal government, not Labor, that ensured that the AAA rating was within reach. We did that through debt reduction and negotiation of the GST deal, which is providing such an abundant quantum of revenue to the state and which is growing and providing increased financial flexibility to the

government of the day. This Supply Bill reflects years and years of recovery from the period 1993 to 2002, which was orchestrated and organised by the former Liberal government, and it reflects, flowing from that hard work, a degree of spending by this Labor government since it has been in office.

I have already provided information to the house on how that money is being misspent and how it could be better spent. These are the votes that the opposition will pick up in the weeks, months and indeed the four years ahead. As I mentioned, the opposition supports the Supply Bill as a matter of course, but we wanted to place on the record the many points that I have made about how we have arrived at this point in May 2006 and how we need to go forward from here. The opposition gives the bill its full assent and looks forward to its quick passage through the house.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): The Supply Bill this year is for an extraordinary amount of money. As clause 3 states, the sum of \$3 100 million is appropriated from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of this state for the financial year ending 30 June 2007, which is in the next financial year. I would have thought that we would have a budget presented to us before we were ready to approve money to be spent in the next financial year. I realise that most of this money is to pay public servants. How many public servants we will have by then I am not really sure: the number is growing by the day.

I need to emphasise the point that it is an extraordinarily unusual position to be put in to be debating money to be spent in the next financial year without having seen the budget. There was a new Labor government when I first came into this place, and I believe the budget was delayed by a month or so. Why, in this circumstance, do we have a bill being introduced here for \$3 100 million to be approved by this house, most of which is to be spent in the next financial year, when we have not seen the budget? It is just bizarre. I do not know what is happening in Treasury, but I think that there needs to be some rethink about accountability to the people of South Australia and, more importantly in many ways, to this house, so we can then relay our thoughts and opinions to our constituents, the people of South Australia.

The Supply Bill is a very important piece of legislation, which always seems to attract a lot of discussion on both sides of the house, because when one is spending this sort of money one wants to be very aware of what the money is being spent on. The reason why we need to examine and criticise—constructive criticism in some cases and asking questions in others—the issues with respect to the Supply Bill stems from some of the promises that were made during the election. There is a list a mile long here, and one can see why the budget of this state has blown out when one looks at the election promises.

I think it was labelled 'black hole Thursday' by the shadow treasurer, Rob Lucas, in his press release on 16 March. He pointed out that there was \$1.3 billion in promises. I can see why the appropriation in this Supply Bill is approaching \$3.1 billion, because the whole budget of this state is just blowing out. Money is coming in, though: we should not forget that. This is a time of record taxation take by both the state and the federal government—and, hopefully, we will see a reduction in tax in tonight's federal budget for most Australians. I hope that South Australians are right there in the federal Treasurer's thoughts: if the government has a

\$14 billion surplus, I hope it uses it as wisely as it has in the past and assists all South Australians.

The surpluses we have had in our South Australian budgets have been much smaller, although the total budget has increased dramatically. I think that, comparing the size of the last Liberal government budget compared with the size of the last Labor government budget, the difference is about \$3 billion, in proportion, which is significantly greater than we have ever seen before. As I said, the spending seems to be keeping up with the income that this Labor government promises. The emergency department was to receive an extra \$67 million. Children's literacy skills (and no-one would argue with that one, nor the emergency department's receiving \$67 million) was to receive \$35 million extra. Home and community care was to receive \$13.3 million in funding.

Certainly, it needs that. People would have heard me on the radio or seen me on the television talking about the inappropriate housing of some of my most vulnerable constituents in my electorate of Morphett. The government does need to spend that extra money, and I would encourage that area of expenditure to be locked into place. The list of election promises by the Labor government continues. There is to be \$1 million for local sports groups. That is a terrific input to local sports groups. I presented the opposition's sports policies at Sports SA before the election. That body had talked to me about some of its issues around sporting infrastructure.

About \$100 million of sporting infrastructure is on its wish list. I thought that it was rather cruel that, on the same day that it was talking to me about some of its infrastructure requirements, the Premier announced, without any pre-announcement (which is unusual, because normally this government announces things two or three times), that \$142 million was to be spent on the underpass at South Road. Surely we have some money to put into sporting infrastructure. The World Police and Fire Games (the world's third largest sporting event) will be held in South Australia next year, yet there is not a cent in real terms for new sporting infrastructure in South Australia.

It is quite disheartening for all the volunteers who are making up the majority of people who organise sporting clubs and groups. The ten \$1 000 scholarships for female coaches is an election promise that is nothing new. That was started by the Liberal government. It is great to see that the Labor government is continuing that. We see \$9.2 million for the upgrade of public transport security. It is amazing that the government intends to spend \$9.2 million upgrading public transport, yet one of the most well-used public transport hubs in South Australia—the Glenelg tram terminus at Moseley Square—will get no assistance to install closed circuit television.

The wiring will be provided by the City of Holdfast Bay and one of the local hotels is assisting with some CCTV. The state government intends to put some money into the tram terminus, which is great, fantastic, but it is not putting any money into the actual security system. As we heard the Premier say when he came back from COAG last year, CCTV is not only recognised by COAG but also by the Premier as one of the key parts of his integrated security system for public transport. So, why not down at Moseley Square? Why not at the tram terminus? Some of that \$9.2 million should go into that.

The government has promised \$500 000 for gravity surveys of the Gawler Craton, which is a very small part of

the huge mineral exploration incentives in South Australia, and I support the government for doing that. I encourage the need to continue to explore and exploit the mineral reserves in South Australia. Private investment in that respect needs to be recognised, and the government needs to make sure that it is keeping up with the private sector and not holding it back. I congratulate the government when it does things to benefit South Australia; it is money well spent.

Certainly, it is the opposition's job to identify when money is not being well spent. There are a number of areas in which money has been promised and which will account for some of the \$3 100 million in the Appropriation Bill. The list of promises continues on. We have \$1 billion for the northern facelift. We are not sure of the exact detail of that, but I assume that it relates to the Peachey belt redevelopment, the redevelopment within the Penfield area and Edinburgh Park. I hope that it is part of that because \$1 billion needs to be spent on infrastructure in that area.

There are plans for a multinodal terminus, as they are called, which integrates both rail and road. Also, I have heard that a private cargo terminal at the Edinburgh Air Force Base could be included in this \$1 billion for this northern facelift. I hope that is the case. I hope that will be seen in the budget, which, unfortunately, we will not see until September this year. The money coming into the South Australian coffers from GST probably will be revealed even more clearly tonight in the federal budget. There is a recognition not only by members in this place but also by people in the electorate that this government is awash with money.

It is great to see that we are getting everything from rural health scholarships funded at \$465 000 through to 10 new medical places at the University of Adelaide. I wonder whether, if we get a private medical school in South Australia, the state government will fund medical places with scholarships in exactly the same way as it is funding public service scholarships at the new Carnegie Mellon university that is coming to South Australia. Although Carnegie Mellon is a private university, it is good to see the education sector benefiting from yet another international entrant into the education sector of South Australia.

The big issue which has been floating around in this state for many years and which has been approached and examined by this government is that of child welfare. Child safety in this state is an issue on which the government and the opposition will be at one. It is good to see that, in its list of promises, the government intends to spend money on further enhancement of Keeping our Children Safe, and no-one would disagree with that. Certainly, it is good to see that our children are in the minds of many members on the other side of the chamber. The Healthy Young Minds program is to receive \$10.5 million, and that particular program was identified in the government's election promises. Whether we will see the extra 100 teachers, I am not so sure. It is a \$28 million program over four years. I strongly support the government's efforts to get extra teachers into our schools, not only making the junior classes smaller but also making the whole of the R to grade 12 classes much smaller, so that every student who goes into our state education system—which is a fantastic system—will have maximum benefit.

An amount of \$55 million has been put aside to implement, over the next four years, the SACE review that is going through at the moment, and some interesting questions will be raised by that—I know that a number of academics are approaching me at the moment with their concerns about the current recommendations in the SACE review. I note that in

the house the other day the minister said that the SACE review was in preliminary stages and that a number of recommendations would be examined and possibly changed, and I would be more than happy to work with the minister to give South Australian education the best possible result.

The money coming into South Australia at the moment has never been greater; unfortunately, the priorities this government has set are not quite what everyone would like to see. While I have said, in this place, that I am a fan of light rail I would also be the first to say that I think there are priorities higher than the extension to the South Australian light rail system that should be put on the list. I think there is a need to put in about \$160 million in the metropolitan area and about another \$40 million in the rural and regional areas to cope with immediate stormwater problems—and that is just the money that needs to be spent today to ameliorate stormwater issues. About \$400 million also needs to be spent today on upgrading rural and regional roads and, certainly, metropolitan roads. One only has to drive down Oaklands Road in my electorate to know how undulating and bumpy that is, and that is nowhere near the worst road in the metropolitan area.

However, if funds do avail themselves I would be the first to champion the introduction of a light rail network in Adelaide—but one that is properly thought out and planned, and one that comes in on time and on budget. Certainly, I will be watching what the government does very carefully, not only in terms of purchasing more trams but also in terms of building the extension of the light rail network out to North Terrace, because it had better come in on time and on budget. I do not think the planning has been done there, and I will be very surprised if this government is able to manage a project like that on time and on budget. I will be delighted if that is the case; however, I am very scared that if they stuff that up it will stuff up the expansion of the light rail network in South Australia.

I was very disturbed to hear that the 400 police we will be getting will be expected to come out of the current police budgets; they cannot even get safe firearms and ammunition yet are expected to get an extra 400 police. I do not know where they are going to come from, but I hope that the police look at local recruits. You do not have to be able to type at a million words per minute on a computer to be a competent police officer, and I think there needs to be some reassessment of what a front-line police officer has to do nowadays. Far be it for me to tell the police what their recruits are required to do but, as an outsider, I think that perhaps there are some ways we could look at getting some home-grown police recruits. I know that on one or two occasions people who have appeared to have both the intellect and the ability to serve as fine police officers in this state have been knocked back, and I hope commonsense does prevail.

A lot of the expenditure of \$3 100 million will be spent on arts and tourism, and I think arts and tourism will be a huge part of the future of South Australia. When manufacturing in South Australia, and in Australia generally, declines because of global forces (I cannot see us competing with \$1.95 a day on Chinese motor vehicle lines, unfortunately) people will come to South Australia to look at it, to dig it up, to think about it, or we will have grown it here. Arts and tourism will be huge part of the future for South Australia, so I look forward to the spending on arts and tourism. An amount of \$2.2 million will be spent on the Fringe over the next four years and, while I have some concerns about having the Fringe every year, it will be interesting to see what happens

there—I hope there will be the money to support it and maintain the standards. I certainly support \$8 million for the upgrade of the Dunstan Playhouse, and I also strongly encourage spending money on rural and regional tourism—the money is obviously there.

The budget will be coming down in September and I look forward to seeing what is actually in the budget. I also look forward to estimates, so that we can question the actual expenditure; however, I am still continually amazed that we have to wait as long as we do to see what we are actually going to get. We have to stand here today and approve a Supply Bill for \$3 100 million, which will be right out to June 2007.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): In rising to speak on the Supply Bill I must say that I am amazed at this government and at the fact that we are being asked, by this bill, to approve expenditure for, effectively, one third of the year. We are all used to a Supply Bill being necessary from time to time, indeed fairly regularly, so that people in the public service can continue to be paid while the terms of the budget are finalised; however, to think that we are not going to actually see or pass our budget until September this year at the earliest is just extraordinary.

The election was on 18 March; that left a little bit of time, at the very least, before 30 June. However, what I find most extraordinary is the fact that this was the first government in the history of this state to actually have the benefit of knowing, for years in advance, that our election was going to be on 18 March. Up until the last election, elections were called, sometimes at the drop of a hat, by a Premier. I think that the very first discussion I ever had with John Olsen was about the fact that in my view we should move to a fixed-term election. That is the one thing that I would take out of the American political system generally. The fixed-term election is a great thing and I welcome it. It is going to be a real benefit for us all to know four years in advance when the election date will be. Some people criticise it on the basis that it means that you are electioneering for four years, but the reality of modern election to office is that, if you expect to get re-elected, you had better be working pretty hard for your whole four years. In my view, that is the best electioneering you can do.

It seems to me preposterous for this government to be saying to us, after knowing for four years in advance that the election would be on 18 March and that the financial year would end, as it always does, on 30 June, that it is not in a position to tell us until September what the budget position will be and what will happen. We know that this government has been expert at spending money when it wants to. It has been probably the wealthiest government ever to be in power in this state, with something like a billion dollars in property taxes being put into its coffers by virtue of the increase in values of property, and so on. The taxes that are related to the value of property, combined with the GST (which is flowing through in its entirety from the federal government), mean that we have an enormous amount of extra money, so this government has been in a position, if it wanted to, to achieve a lot more than any previous government.

Instead of that, we find a government that has persistently delayed finishing projects that it should have got on with and pushing out year by year various projects, such as the Strathmont Centre, if I could talk for a moment about that. The redevelopment of Strathmont Centre, which is under my shadow portfolio of disability, has been funded and has been

appearing in budgets for years, as well as in some other portfolios that I can think of. Numerous budgets have indicated that the Magill Training Centre will be redeveloped, yet this government pushes out and deliberately delays actually proceeding with the work in so many of these cases.

I had occasion to visit Magill Training Centre as part of the work of the juvenile justice select committee, and I was appalled at the way that place looks and is, in terms of the facilities. The staff there do a pretty terrific job in difficult circumstances but, if you are hoping to actually make a difference to the lives of these young people who have obviously gone off the rails and need a fair bit of attention, as you would no doubt recall, Madam Deputy Speaker, the kids who go into Magill, being at the younger end of the offenders' scale, are placed in facilities that are just appalling. They have rooms that have no decoration on the walls and that have newspaper plastered to the windows because they cannot have curtains, because they may be so psychologically at risk that they might hang themselves if there were curtains there.

They have plastic chairs instead of lounge chairs to sit on, and a television is put up out of reach. I am not suggesting for a minute that we want to make a juvenile detention facility into a luxury resort, but it seems to me that one must reach a balance in how we deal with issues such as the treatment of young offenders, and the aim must be to return those young offenders to the community to become reasonable members of society. It seems to me that the way to achieve that is not by placing them in something which I would have thought had disappeared in the time of Dickens but which we find still exists to this day

As I said, what appals me most of all is that the government has known about it and has indeed put the figures in the budget year after year for the Magill Training Centre, yet nothing happens. I do not know whether it is just too hard: I suspect that that might be the case. However, it would seem to me that, if the government were to make a decision, it could consider some other possibility, such as completely removing the Magill Training Centre and starting all over again with a fresh facility. Whatever the case, there is an enormous gulf between the nature of that facility and the nature of the Cavan facility that the older juvenile offenders are taken to.

There are numerous examples that I can cite to the parliament about where this government has failed to spend money: Strathmont and the Magill Training Centre being but two of them. In my own electorate, for instance, we have the local ambulance. Prior to standing for election to this place in 2002 I was a member of the ambulance board and, while I was on that board, we had been proceeding with the establishment of a new ambulance station at the Crafers freeway interchange. That would replace the station that is currently at Aldgate, next to the bus depot.

There were various reasons why it was considered that placement at the Crafers freeway interchange would be a good move, amongst which was the fact that the government owned the land within the interchange area but, more importantly, that placing it there gave quick access in four major directions: one down the freeway to the Heysen Tunnels and beyond; one up the freeway towards Murray Bridge and to all points accessible from the freeway, such as Hahndorf etc; and the other two going up to Mount Lofty summit and north through the Hills and, alternatively, down the Upper Sturt Road and continuing through to Belair, and so on.

There were good reasons for relocating it, and my understanding was that that had been budgeted, but we find that there has been absolutely no progress and my last inquiries indicated that there is not even a plan on the board for relocation to that site to continue. On the other hand, the government has not proceeded with resolving the issue of the Stirling CFS. In my view, that is another issue at which we need to look very carefully. The Stirling CFS, of course, is located in the heart of Stirling. At this stage, the government wants to move it up to the site at the Crafers interchange. The brigade has informed the government that it will take twice as long for many members to get to that location, and, obviously, minutes count a lot in a fire or a major accident. They have also informed the government that the design only allows for three appliances, when the Stirling CFS actually has five appliances. Notwithstanding that, the government seems intent on pressing on with a most stupid decision to move the Stirling CFS to a new location, instead of negotiating to keep it where it is.

On the other hand, in the case of the Aldgate CFS, it is another CFS station that is really badly in need of redevelopment. It has been talked about for a number of years. I think the last I heard was that it may be on the books. It sits at the corner of the main road to Strathalbyn and the Aldgate Valley Road. There is not a lot of land available, but there is sufficient land for it to be redeveloped. Quite frankly, the facilities in that station are well below any acceptable standard even for a group of volunteers. I personally do not think volunteers should have any less a standard than anyone else, but, I know that, from dealing with volunteers and being a volunteer myself for many years, many volunteers do work in standards and conditions that others might not find acceptable. Notwithstanding that, it is clear, when one visits that CFS station, that it is simply in desperate need of redevelopment. In fact, my recollection is that there are not even proper toilet facilities, and so on, for any female members of the CFS. The kitchen is inadequate, and, indeed, the whole thing is inadequate. The only adequate thing about the Aldgate CFS is the volunteers who service our community.

Here we have a government which has consistently failed, year after year. I remember looking through the budget papers last year and seeing that a number of redevelopment proposals, such as the Strathmont Centre, showed the amount having been allocated, and showed that it was going to take some years to complete. But, indeed, after the first year of its budget allocation, how much had been spent? Nothing, or very little. This government's whole attitude to managing the economy seems to be that, on the part of Treasurer Foley, we should grab all the money, spend nothing, notwithstanding any need for services, and simply keep the money in the coffers so that we can keep the AAA rating.

One of the first things to come out of the very first economic development summit—and I was pleased to be one of the very few (particularly backbench) MPs invited to attend that summit, and I did attend it—was a recommendation that we get past this idea that we must not spend money. There is nothing wrong with spending money, particularly on infrastructure. I hate to think what would have happened in years gone by in this state, or in other states, if governments of previous days had taken the attitude of our current Treasurer to the spending of money, because the reality is that we would have nothing. We would not have a Sydney Harbour Bridge; we would not have a Sydney Opera House; we would not have the train going up to Darwin; and we

would not have the Festival Theatre. There are so many things that are major infrastructure projects. The government needs to recognise that, in fact, sometimes, spending money, particularly on infrastructure projects, can mean an improvement in the economy.

More money is circulating; people are being employed; tradesmen are coming into the state; and people are being trained in the trades. There is a future because things are happening. We seem to have gone for a long time with a very static skyline. We do have, I think, one development going on at the moment, and we do have some apartment blocks going up, but they involve private developers. The government has been, for the longest time, taking the attitude that it must not spend any real money for fear that it might jeopardise the precious AAA credit rating. Well, at the end of the day, that attitude will not wash, and we will lose the AAA credit rating unless we make this state perform with a viable economy.

Part of achieving that is actually making sure that infrastructure is developed—appropriate, well-planned infrastructure. When I talk about well-planned infrastructure, I am certainly not talking about the appalling decision to try to run a tram down from Victoria Square to the Adelaide Railway Station. That is unplanned and a complete waste of money, in my view, and will do nothing but create an eyesore and a disruption to the free flow of traffic. I cannot think why the government would want to proceed with that.

As well as developing infrastructure, I think this government has a responsibility to those in the community who are its most vulnerable. As members would be aware, for the past couple of years I have been the shadow minister for families and communities, for disability and for housing, and, more recently, shadow minister for ageing, and, of course, I have kept the portfolios of disability and ageing, along with my other new portfolios. There is nothing clearer, in talking to the communities involved in those portfolios, than the massive need for spending of money to assist those in the community who simply cannot do any more to assist themselves. In particular, people in the disability community really need a massive injection of money for accommodation, respite and travel, in particular. I must say, it is an issue for whichever side is in government.

The reality is that, up until about 50 years ago, if people had a profoundly disabled child, they were encouraged to leave that child in institution. But, over the last 50 years, or thereabouts, the people who once would have left their child in an institution have been encouraged to take their child home if that life is viable. Whilst that often means a better life for that baby (and that child, in due course), it can mean an extremely difficult case for the parents. I cannot imagine what it must be like to be woken 19 or 20 times a night because your child cannot turn himself over. I cannot imagine what it would be like if I still had to change the nappies of my sons at the ages of 25 and 22. I cannot imagine what their lives are like, and many of them go for up to six weeks without even getting one night of respite—one night in six weeks off. It is just totally unacceptable.

It is no-one's fault in particular; it is a generational change, and we need to start to address it in a big way because, in my view, it is a tidal wave that is going to hit us. Until we have some successive years of significant funding to deal with it, we are simply going to find that, as has happened over the past several years, people get to the end of their rope. I have spoken to mothers who have said that they have considered murder/suicide because they are so

desperate about the situation. In fact, as the member for Goyder mentioned in his question today, many of these parents were young people when they had these babies 50 years ago, and those babies are now middle-aged, and their parents are too afraid to die.

I heard of a 93 year old man on Yorke Peninsula who was too afraid to die because he did not know what was going to happen to his 70 year old son. The system did not even know that they existed because 70 years ago, when that child was born, no-one actually recognised the issues involving disability. Consequently, this child—now a 70 year old man himself—has not been educated, has not become part of any sort of system, and is someone whom people did not know existed. We have a problem with this group of parents who really need all the support we can give them, because the reality is that every day that they have spent looking after their child, not leaving that child in the care of the state, has saved this state money. In my view, we as a community owe it to these people to do the right thing, because the one thing they will tell you is that from the moment they bring that child home from the hospital as a newborn baby, their primary concern is: what will happen when I am too old or frail to look after this child any more?

Some of them even dare to say that they would just like to retire. The rest of us get to think about and plan for retirement. You cannot imagine what it must be like to grow increasingly tired, facing an ever more difficult future, with a child that you want to be independent, settled and secure. It is a situation where you cannot impose it onto the siblings because that is unfair. It is a situation where often the families themselves have broken up or become fragmented due to looking after the disabled child, and it is a situation which leads, in this state, to about 40 people a year abandoning their child, when the child is taken for respite, by their simply not turning up to collect their adult child at the end of the respite period.

As I said, it is an issue which I believe both sides and the Independents need to think about from a community's perspective and recognise that it is a generational change. We need to address this issue and, in my view, governments should start their strategic planning with that sort of issue so that when you are thinking about your strategic plan, instead of having all this nonsense about what you will achieve in 10 years' time, the government should be saying, 'This year we will make this much of an inroad.' The trouble with the way the government has structured its strategic plan is that it has lots of airy fairy goals but it does not actually give any markers by which to assess the achievement of them. For instance, even though they have said that they want to halve homelessness by 2013, or whatever it is, they do not say that they will actually reduce it by 50 per cent by the next election.

They did have a policy of doing that but they changed the goalposts when they recognised that they could not actually achieve it. So, in typical fashion, this government simply rewrites its documents so that things look a bit better than they really are. The reality is that we need to invest in infrastructure and in the future, particularly for our most vulnerable.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I am pleased to make a few comments in relation to this bill which sets out to appropriate some \$3 100 million. I hope that some of these moneys are appropriately spent in my electorate, in particular, to honour some of the promises made during the election

campaign. These were promises made with gusto by the Premier when he was tracking around my electorate. He came to Port Augusta on one occasion and promised \$1.5 million to rejuvenate the town hall. At the same time, he got the ire of the mayor of that fine city in relation to certain land matters, and we are looking forward to resolving those issues. The Premier also promised to seal the road between Wilpena and Blinman, and I am looking forward to a timetable for that road's works. I want to know whether the money is new state money or whether it is Roads to Recovery money because, if it is Roads to Recovery money, that means that no extra money will come from the state coffers. Of course, a number of other promises were made, and we intend to detail each one.

There appears to be some intrigue in the Premier's office. I do not know whether they are completely confused or do not know the difference between a member of parliament and a candidate, but on 3 May my office at Port Augusta received the following letter—and I hope members take note—from the Premier's office. It is addressed to the Hon. Graham Gunn, member for Stuart, Shop 2, 5 Young Street, Port Augusta SA 5700. It lists my fax number and email address, and then it begins, 'Dear Mr Jarvis'. The letter states:

It would be appreciated if you could arrange for a congratulatory message to be sent to the following people.

I will not mention who they are. The letter is signed 'Protocol Unit'. I want to know exactly what is going on because it raises a number of interesting questions, Madam Deputy Speaker. You, as one of the protectors of members' rights, are there to ensure that those rights are not impeded by others. I want to know whether the correspondence between the government and me was intercepted by this special office or whether copies of correspondence between the government and me were sent to the Labor candidate. They are the two questions that need to be answered. When my secretary got this letter, she thought I would be amused. That is putting it mildly. I think we are entitled to a simple response from the Premier because how could you be so foolish as to address the letter to me and then begin with 'Dear Mr Jarvis'? It is an interesting question that needs to be addressed.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: I've got no idea. I wasn't listening to him.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We know that the minister is easily annoyed.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: No, I'm not annoyed at all. I am very pleased with you. The member for Torrens just asked what the question was and I said, 'I'm sorry.' I wasn't listening to you—I was distracted.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will explain it again because I think it is important that the member clearly understands so that she gets the full import of this particular matter and therefore will not be under any misapprehension about the seriousness of the matter. It is a letter from the Premier's office addressed to me, yet it starts off, 'Dear Mr Jarvis'—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: You're easily mistaken for a younger man, Graham.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You thought that many years ago when you tried to set me up at Peterborough and you ran second. I am always grateful to the honourable member for putting together a meeting, getting them all stirred up and giving me the platform so that I could have a field day. I will never forget that. I do thank her and I would be grateful if she would organise another meeting.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: I think your recollections are a bit different from everyone else's.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The minister is out of her place.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I know the minister is pleased to have me back.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: I am pleased to have you back.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I know the minister did visit my electorate during the election. She was one of those who helped me to keep my vote in Port Augusta, and I thank her for it. I did not want to say a lot today—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: As the honourable member knows, I am a person of few words and it takes a fair bit to get me on my feet. These interjections put me off completely. There are two issues which have been of some interest. I gather by recent press reports that I have inflamed and stirred up somewhat the pro corella movement. Some of them were quite uncharitable about me.

Mrs Geraghty: I quite like cockies.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Some of them were quite uncharitable. One particular lady—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: We thought you represented the cockies.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I told members how to deal with them and I do not need to repeat it. I put it on the record.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right; it is, too. If members wanted I could give a couple more recipes. The point is that it is not an option not to do anything about these confounded corellas. They are an absolute nuisance. They are causing considerable damage across wide areas of the state and the government needs to take some action to reduce their numbers as a matter of urgency. Get rid of the jolly things and—

Mrs Geraghty: They are native birds.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes; and they are in plague proportions because we have created the perfect environment for them to breed. We need to create the circumstances to reduce the numbers. I have told members the way to do it, but people are terribly timid about it. Some have become timid; others have become quite excited, but, at the end of the day, we have to do something about it. Some have reflected upon me—

Mrs Geraghty: Sterilise them all.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will put salt on their tails. That is about as useless as what the minister wants to do. The second issue is that band of people who have a dislike for volunteers and a dislike for people running rodeos, picnic race meetings and gymkhanas and who have worked themselves up into a considerable lather. I am in this chamber and I will stick up for these people. They are good, hardworking, decent South Australians. One of them has been the victim of a grave miscarriage of justice by the action of the RSPCA. What I want to know from the Treasurer is: how much money—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: If the Government Whip wants to get on her feet, she can. She can stick up for the RSPCA. I want to know how much money from this particular appropriation will go to the RSPCA. If they are to receive money, will they prosecute more decent people who have not done anything wrong? If they are, then it is a scandal.

Mrs Geraghty: One was very bad and you know it.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, the secretary of the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, the secretary of the Marrabel Rodeo Club—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will members on my right please—

The Hon. G.M. GUNN:—has done nothing wrong.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart will resume his seat for a minute while I ask members on my right to stop interjecting and allow the member for Stuart to be heard in silence.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. They are really putting me off, too, because I have lost my train of thought. Nevertheless, I want to come back to rodeos. A small group of people have taken it upon themselves to publicly denigrate those hardworking citizens of this state who run rodeos and picnic race meetings—and there are many of them. They are trying to create so much mischief by disrupting them and making life so difficult for them that they will give up and will not do it. The RSPCA has been quite foolish and wrong in its escapade in prosecuting the secretary of the Marrabel Rodeo. He now has two criminal convictions for doing nothing wrong. It is a public outrage. Channel 7 and its henchmen can run me day and night on the television, but I will lose no sleep over it. They can have all their little activists ringing members of parliament and trying to frighten new members. I have not lost one wink of sleep or one vote over it—not one—because my people will not put up—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I don't reckon that horse will vote for you.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: All I say to you, Patrick, is that I want you to honour the promises that your Premier made about sealing a number of roads in my constituency. You have made a lot of promises—

Mrs Geraghty: Your constituency: you have some of the best roads in South Australia.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is because they have the best member of parliament; that is why they re-elected him. Doesn't the member understand?

Mrs Geraghty: Six cars a week use a \$57 million road.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member does not understand that many of her constituents want to visit that fine electorate, therefore they need decent roads on which to drive. That is why the roads need to be sealed. People such as the honourable member want to go there and spend their money and be welcomed. We welcome their going up there. Do not try to stop other people from having any enjoyment. We want to extend the road network. That is why there is a need for the Minister for Transport to honour the undertaking made by his Premier.

It is far better to seal the roads than put trams down King William Street. There is only one thing about which I am sorry; that is, they did not start digging up the street before the election. I say to the Minister for Transport—who is a jolly fellow—that I am looking forward to his dealing with irate people when they put the bulldozers in King William Street. I understand that, on occasions, he is known to have a fairly short fuse, so I am looking forward to the letters starting to roll in. This measure is important so that we can maintain the services of the state. My large electorate has a number of important issues—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They want William Creek bituminised.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, we want the main street bituminised. Some years ago we used to be able to taxi the

aeroplanes in the main street. We have stopped doing that. We used to taxi up to the front of the pub and turn around, but we cannot do that now. What they need at William Creek is a sealed airstrip.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: That is what they said: not a sealed road.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: But they want the road sealed to Marree. Nevertheless, it was an issue at the last election. I made it an issue.

Mr Rau: What about corellas?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I have spoken already about corellas. I have upset the government whip and I would not want to do that, because she is a nice person. In conclusion, I hope that the government is forthright in honouring the commitments it made during the election campaign, particularly in relation to school buses and all those important issues. I have all the pieces of paper that were circulated around the electorate, and during budget estimates I intend to go through each one with the minister. A lot of them have beaming photos of the Premier meeting selected Labor Party stalwarts. I have thanked already the minister in charge of SA Water for his help during the election, but I will raise that issue again, because he and his department did not know what the Premier was saying and they contradicted each other—and it was helpful. I have enjoyed these 13 minutes and I look forward to the passage of the legislation so the services of the state can continue.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am speaking in relation to the proposal to extend further moneys to government so that it can govern past 30 June this year, until the next budget is brought in. I will focus on one particular budget item, which is of great concern to thousands of constituents in the electorate of Mitchell. I refer to the Oaklands Railway Station and the Oaklands crossing intersection. The intersection to which I refer is at the junction of Diagonal Road, Morphett Road and the Noarlunga railway line. The area is especially in the thoughts of the public at present because of the impending state aquatic centre to be built at the corner of Diagonal Road and Morphett Road, Oaklands Park, and another major, welcomed development in my area, that is, a community health centre to be situated next to the state aquatic centre. Of course, these developments will bring a huge amount of additional traffic to those particular roads.

I go back a little with the history in relation to the funding of this project. It goes back literally as far as 1975 when a Labor government promised at that time to improve this intersection. Other railway intersections were given higher priority over the years and there was always some good reason to delay expenditure on this intersection. I go back to 1990, when the matter was further considered. We had a Labor government at the time. I am glad to say that people have provided me with some figures which were current then for the necessary improvement of that intersection; namely, a rail/road separation. At that time it was estimated that to have the road going over the rail line would cost about \$10.4 million, about \$9 million to have the railway go under the roads, and about \$8 million for the rail to go over the roads. It is interesting to bear those figures in mind when we consider the current debate about how money should be spent on that intersection.

I also refer to a period in 1996 when I first became active in advocating for major improvements to that intersection. At that time I was a Labor candidate for election. After making inquiries, I was given a figure of \$15 million to provide the

rail over road option. In other words, in six years the estimate had doubled. Now, 8½ years later, I have brought another petition from local residents to parliament. Of course, in 1996 I had to pass on the petition that I had collected from residents to a sitting member. I am glad to be the sitting member who lodged a significant petition to the parliament this time.

The latest turn of events in terms of funding this major infrastructure improvement is that the government has decided to fund a relocation of the Oaklands railway station. The community believes this defies commonsense. We are talking about spending \$6.8 million—and that was included in the state budget last year—for the relocation of the Oaklands station, 100 to 200 metres closer to this major problematic intersection. In other words, if we are going to then spend the money to do the job properly and create a road/rail separation, we will be throwing that \$6.8 million down the drain. That is just repulsive to members of the community who are very mindful of where their taxpayer dollars are going.

Another development that has brought the need for major spending on this intersection into view is the Labor proposal, prior to the election, to fund a major development at the intersection of South Road and Sturt Road. Yes, it is a busy intersection and I acknowledge it is a busier intersection than the intersection of Diagonal Road with Morphett Road, but it is nowhere near comparable in terms of congestion and danger. We have had a couple of deaths at the Oaklands crossing intersection in the time that I have been a member of parliament; two separate pedestrian deaths—one just last year.

This is in comparison to the South Road/Sturt Road intersection, where although it is a busy intersection, there is better traffic flow at peak times. I acknowledge that there is congestion there as well, but to spend perhaps \$140 million on a huge construction project to have Sturt Road going over South Road at that point is really questionable when less than half that amount could be spent to solve the problem at the most problematic intersection in my electorate at Oaklands crossing.

The Minister for Transport at a public meeting last year suggested that the current figure to fix the problem would be around \$60 million. Despite my best efforts to seek documentation under freedom of information legislation, I have battled with the agency holding the documents to obtain clarification on that figure. I have done so unsuccessfully. So, the best estimate that is in the public arena for fixing the intersection at present is that figure of \$60 million.

I come back to the fundamental point that concerns the local community: why would you spend \$6.8 million to move a railway station—admittedly, to have a nice new railway station—when that money could be completely wasted if the most sensible and optimal solution is then adopted of creating road/rail separation at that point? If you are going to shift the railway to either go over or under the road, obviously, there will be a certain gradient for the railway, whether it is going up or going down, and at that point the railway station needs to be moved, either vertically or horizontally: in other words, you either need to move it to the same spot, level with the track, or you need to create a new railway station farther along the flat part of the track closer to the city. It really makes no sense to spend a huge amount of money to upgrade a railway station which, in the eyes of the community, should be moved, anyway, as part of a major infrastructure project, and I will continue to campaign for that.

Mr PISONI (Unley): I would like to express my concerns about the issue of child obesity and the need for governments to consider funding to address this issue, and the apparent leisurely approach by governments and the community to tackle this epidemic for fear of offending those who should know better, or the ever increasing food processing sector. I acknowledge that Australia is one of only five net food exporters in the world, and food production is a major source of export income and employment. However, so is our wine industry, and it must work within Australian regulations as well as those of its export customers.

Recently there has been much discussion about the issue of childhood obesity, including the merits of restricting the amount of junk food advertising and the availability of soft drinks and foods high in sugar, fat and salt in our school canteens. The rationale for my argument is multifaceted and raises the responsibility of government to protect those who are not in a position to make their own informed choices. The prevalence of overweight and obese children in Australia is one of the highest in the world: it is estimated to be 30 per cent of children between the ages of seven and 15 years, in comparison with 10 per cent of children in the mid 1980s. That is quite shocking.

What children eat will have a long and lasting effect on their health. Being overweight and obese is a rapidly increasing epidemic. It leads to many chronic health diseases and is attributed to 5 per cent of health care costs—diseases such as type 2 diabetes, heart disease and stroke, hypertension, arthritis, liver and gall bladder disease, asthma, menstrual problems and even some types of cancer, and the list goes on. There are also the general health consequences of childhood obesity; for example, dental health. Larger amounts of sugar intake relate directly to an increase in cavities, and the consumption of acidic, sugary soft drinks is the biggest risk factor for tooth decay in children. Another example is bone health. Replacing milk with soft drinks may result in low bone density and less calcium in the diet. If these drinks contain caffeine the problem becomes worse, because caffeine increases calcium excretion. All this could result in social isolation, discrimination, poor self-esteem, depression and learning difficulties, which lead to poorer social and economic success in the longer term.

So, members can see why I have taken issue with an article that appeared in *The Advertiser* on 27 April, whose author claimed that we cannot legislate to force people to lose weight, and that we should not, as has been done in Victoria, ban the sale of sugary soft drinks at state schools. In my opinion we have a duty to protect children from potential harm and it is also up to us to use all means at our disposal to minimise children's exposure to messages that may adversely affect their health, whether those messages involve drugs, tobacco, alcohol or, in this case, inappropriate food consumption.

I refer the parliament to a *Sydney Morning Herald* article published on 24 April this year. In article, Dr Michael Booth from the University of Sydney used sponsorship of junior sport by fast food companies as an example when he said:

This was particularly invidious because in children's minds McDonald's is then associated with a healthy lifestyle.

This is not about legislating to compel but more about leading by example. I believe the issue of childhood obesity is all about leading by example as there can be no doubt that food promotion, whether in advertising on television or education

in our schools or at home, has an effect on children's food preferences and consumption.

I agree with the federal health minister, Mr Abbott, when he suggests that it is not only governments but parents, schools and individuals who have a role to play in fighting childhood obesity. I believe the government role, particularly in education, is crucial. By way of background, I refer to a recent study in New South Wales of 5 400 students from 90 public schools. The study totally contradicts the urban myth that childhood obesity is caused by inactivity and pastimes such as computer games replacing sport. It showed, on the contrary, that children are in fact more active now than they were 10 years ago, but that the consumption of high calorie foods and drinks, with limited nutritional value, meant they were still gaining weight. The calorie intake of these children rose by weight 5 per cent in the 10 years from 1985, and current available data suggests this trend has continued.

The study also suggests that soft drink was a major culprit. A briefing paper by the Coalition on Food Advertising to Children strongly suggests that current volumes of food advertising aimed at children are excessive and tend to give the impression that the consumption of these highly advertised, energy-dense foods and drinks is normal and socially desirable. That is not a balanced message.

A South Australian study found that 76 per cent of advertisements in the 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. timeslot were for food that fell into the category that reasonable dietary guidelines recommend for consumption only occasionally and in small amounts. Of additional concern is the use of popular identifiable personalities to promote unhealthy food products within peak children's television viewing times. Here, again, we return to the issue of a sense of responsibility and example.

We should address educating our children and their parents about the consumption of inappropriate food in the same way we would their consumption of alcohol and tobacco. To put this in context, the health cost burden, including the psychological and dental health costs of obesity in Australia, is four times the health cost burden of illicit drugs and unsafe sex combined. We are not talking of prohibition here, where informed adults may be denied choice, but more about ensuring that in their formative years children should be given the best health opportunities and messages to give them a healthy start until they are in a position to make their own informed choices on their calorie intake.

In the same way that advertising of fast food chains emphasises fun, happiness and excitement, the counter argument is that we should emphasise the risk of eating 'sometimes' foods all the time. Even if we are not in a position to legislate against bad food messages being given to the young, we should at least ensure that our message promoting more positive and healthy choices is loud enough to compete. This means the government being more proactive in the messages delivered to our children in the media, classroom and canteen, to lead by example in our community, which is battling the epidemic that childhood obesity has become.

I strongly believe this is our responsibility to our children. I commend this government for its decision to ban junk food from schools, but that in itself is not enough. By simply telling kids that they cannot have something, without educating them as to the reasons why, will only work while the children are supervised. This government banning junk food in schools in isolation is simply another reaction to a

situation, as there is no plan to take this innovation beyond that of the nanny state.

I suspect that would cost money, and we know how tight the Treasurer is. He knows that, as every day goes by, the blow-outs on the Premier's tram extensions are getting bigger. Don Dunstan is remembered by the Dunstan Playhouse, thanks to this Premier—

Mr Koutsantonis: No, it's not.

Mr PISONI: The Dunstan Playhouse is a memorial to Don Dunstan.

Mr Koutsantonis: No.

Mr PISONI: The Premier named it the Dunstan Playhouse.

Mr Koutsantonis: He wasn't in government, you idiot.

Mr PISONI: The Premier named the Dunstan Playhouse as one of his first acts upon being elected Premier.

Mr Koutsantonis: No. That's all right, you're a genius.

Mr PISONI: The Premier feels that he is just as worthy of his own naming rights on a permanent piece of South Australian infrastructure. Perhaps we can call it the 'Rann Extension' or the 'Mike Rann Increase', then the name would describe both the physical and fiscal aspects of the project. The Treasurer does not like spending money because he does not want to lose the AAA credit rating, which the leasing of ETSA delivered to this state by saving \$2 million a day in interest. The Labor State Bank disaster was costing this state \$2 million a day in interest alone.

The Treasurer is saving his pennies because he knows that the tram extension has already blown out from \$21 million to \$30 million, and it has not even been started yet—not a single turn of soil and already the project has blown out by 50 per cent. This memorial to the Premier has already run off the rails.

An honourable member: He's not dead yet.

Mr PISONI: It's Rann off the rails!

An honourable member: He's not dead!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Let me get back to the subject of childhood obesity. If the government can spend \$2 million of taxpayers' money in the lead-up to an election telling us how well—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr PISONI: The member for West Torrens—the little man with the big voice. We can always hear him. The little man with the big voice. You can see his attraction to the honourable member in the other place. You can see why they are mates. The big man with the little voice and the little man with the big voice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will not respond to interjections.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will hear the member for Unley's speech in silence.

Mr PISONI: They make a real impact when they walk into a room together: the big man with the little voice and the little man with the big voice. If the government can spend \$2 million of taxpayers' money in the lead-up to an election telling us how well we are doing, then I think that it can afford an awareness and education program for the sake of our children's health and wellbeing. Banning junk food in schools is not enough. You see, cigarettes were never sold in school canteens, but, in fact, they were advertised everywhere. It was more common than not in school to take up smoking as an adolescent in my day.

Let us look at what is different now to then. The difference is advertising. In 1973 the federal government and the

Australian Broadcasting Commission created a program aimed at phasing out or banning the advertising of tobacco products on broadcast media. Before the end of 1976 Australia had completed the process of banning all electronic media advertising of tobacco products, along with the extension of the ban to include newspapers, magazines in 1989 and billboard advertising in 1993. In fact, today you cannot even advertise cigarettes at the point of sale.

This immediately led to a drop in the uptake of smoking. The Quit Smoking campaign and later the very graphic anti-smoking campaigns, combined with student education units visiting our schools and restrictions on where one could smoke, have seen smoking, which was once accepted as a habit of the majority, become socially unacceptable amongst the general community. Not allowing cigarettes to be sold in schools may not have encouraged children to smoke, but banning advertising and a campaign of education and awareness has had life-changing results for a whole generation.

This state used to be known for doing things first and for being innovative and progressive: first votes for women; first to decriminalise homosexuality; and even the first to have a nudist beach, and such innovations as the stobie pole and the Hills hoist, to name a few. By being progressive and innovative, South Australia used to punch well above its weight. Today, this Premier and his ministers are more focused on punching below the belt for cheap political effect than they are on being progressive and innovative. By tackling childhood obesity, we can lead the nation once more. We can make a small investment in state spending for a profitable return for our children and their future wellbeing.

In Australia, junk food advertising has created an 'obesogenic' environment. Studies carried out in 13 OECD countries show that Australia has the highest number of TV food advertisements, with 12 advertisements per hour—greater than even the US or UK, which run 11 or 10 per hour, and they, too, have high levels of childhood obesity. In Australia, the proportion of ads for food is consistently higher in timeslots when children are likely to be viewing. Six out of 10 of Australia's television advertising companies, in terms of dollars spent, advertise food products. Food advertising is consistently represented in the top 10 of revenue raisers for commercial TV stations.

Advertising techniques trick young viewers. Children are a naive audience and an easy target for advertisers. Children under eight years, for example, do not understand persuasive intent, and various techniques are used to attract their attention such as giveaways, competitions and prizes, jingles and cartoon characters and emphasis on fun, happiness and excitement, implying that the product makes them special. TV commercials link food to emotions, conveying covert messages about wellbeing and health by using attractive, energetic and happy-looking people. Overweight children are especially vulnerable to this type of imagery, as they are most likely to have low esteem in relation to their physical appearance, making them more likely to be interested in the message.

In 1980, Quebec Province in Canada restricted all commercial ads for toys and certain types of sweets and sugary foods directed at children under the age of 13 years. This resulted in a reduction in the recognition of toys and fewer sugary breakfast cereals in homes, and no reduction in diversity or quality of children's television programming—in fact, there was an increase. Childhood obesity is not a lot different in Quebec than in the rest of Canada, but it is

unrealistic to expect that just one single measure would have an impact that would be life-changing, just as the government's plan to ban junk food in canteens would have little or no effect without a multi-faceted approach that includes funding to counter advertising and education.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I rise in support of the Supply Bill and wish its speedy passage through the house in both chambers so the government can get on with governing.

I support the government's ban on junk food in schools, and I also support any measures we can take to stop childhood obesity, because being obese obviously is very unhealthy and does a lot to people's self-esteem, and I think it is becoming unfortunately socially unacceptable like smoking. I can foresee the day when somebody lighting a cigarette in a restaurant will have people jumping on them telling them it is a filthy habit. Perhaps one day when you order junk food in a restaurant, or something fatty, the person next to you will be yelling out abuse about what you are eating because it is costing our health care system.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am not a reformed smoker, no. Unfortunately, I am an unreformed smoker. I wish I was a reformed smoker.

Mr Pengilly: It stunts your growth, Tom.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, it does stunt your growth. In terms of the sponsorship aspect, there are some companies who do wonderful work and sell products not sold to minors, and one of those companies that does wonderful work for regional and local clubs is Lion Nathan (West End Draught). West End Draught is the backbone of amateur sport and football in this state and, dare I say, without its sponsorship and recognition of the importance of sports, a lot of those small clubs would disappear very quickly. So I congratulate them. I do not encourage younger people to drink beer—I do not think they should—and I think people should only drink in moderation, but if we took the member for Unley's approach of legislating to stop that sort of endorsement, what would happen to those small country clubs that rely on the sponsorship of Lion Nathan, or to the local pub? What would happen to those small community clubs and RSLs that rely on getting those beverages that they enjoy in moderation?

I think the member for Unley needs to go back and think about what he is saying. Although I believe his intentions are good and are well placed, perhaps his implementation is a bit misguided. I also do not like the idea of McDonald's being sold in schools, and I do not think the government is looking at anything like that. I believe that people who eat McDonald's regularly are doing their health a great deal of harm—but, of course, anything in moderation is acceptable. McDonald's is a business and we are not a country that regulates what sort of food people can eat; as long as it is not going to kill you immediately, you can have it.

I am always surprised to hear members opposite claim to be in favour of the free market—unless, of course, they are from a regional seat. Then they are in favour of the free market in the city but not back home where they come from; there they are all for subsidies and a single desk, they are all for a bit of socialism locally but not for the rest of us. When talking about restrictions on trademarks, imagine if we told Coca-Cola that it could not advertise its drinks because they are sugary and there are links to diabetes, and caffeine does all sorts of things to people, and that, therefore, we are taking away its trademark and it cannot advertise Coca-Cola, the

most recognised symbol in the world. The member for Unley, who is in the party of the free market and the party of small business, is telling a major company in South Australia that its trademark should, perhaps, be restricted—and members opposite wonder why the business community in South Australia has no confidence in them!

McDonald's is another recognisable trademark, and the company spends a lot of its money advertising that trademark—as it should and as is its right. It is a private company and it can do whatever it likes, so long as it is legal. The real issue here is what parents do. Televisions can be turned off—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that that is easier said than done, and I do not claim to be an expert on this.

Mr Pisoni: You're not; I'm a parent.

An honourable member: Parenthood does not guarantee being an expert.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly. I can tell that some people are, perhaps, experts on everything, and I am quickly coming to realise that the member for Unley is an expert on everything. It is amazing that someone of his genius has so long been denied this place; I am surprised he was not here earlier. Two weeks and he is already expressing his genius to us—I cannot wait to hear more of this genius, from the notes prepared for him by others. I am sure that there will be many occasions when the member for Unley will get up and expose his genius to all of us. I am happy to learn; I am a student and am always learning, and I am happy to learn from the member for Unley. I am sure he can teach me many things about life and I look forward—

An honourable member: A Jedi master.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, he is the new Jedi master of the parliament, and I look forward to learning so much from him. Perhaps he can teach us all a thing or two—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot wait; I look forward to it. I think a lot of this comes down to parental responsibility. Alcohol was introduced to me by my parents, not by my friends or at the pub when I turned 18. Drinking wine with dinner or at an event was part of my family's culture, so I was introduced to alcohol at a fairly early age and I think I learnt to use it responsibly. Obviously there are lapses in people's judgment and they make mistakes but, ultimately, the government can only do so much. Where we can control it we do our best, and in taking junk food out of primary school canteens—where parents cannot regulate what children eat, where they do not have the ability to regulate their children's choices—the government is making the right decision. To say that it does nothing to help childhood obesity is just wrong, because kids are exposed to all these temptations at primary school which they may not get at home, where parents can regulate what their children can and cannot have. They often use McDonald's, other takeaway food or soft drinks as a treat but, ultimately, parents are the ones who do the shopping and stock the fridge; however, at the local school canteen parents have very little say. This regulation will go a very long way, and rather than using it to score a cheap political point, I think—in my humble way, teaching the Jedi master how to do things—that this is the first step in a long process of educating parents and children how to properly feed their children.

Mr Rau: They need to feel the force.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, need to feel the force. I have been very impressed with home visits. A lot of people in my electorate tell me how helpful they found home visits

after their child was born. Often new parents do not know what they have to do, and it is good to have someone who knows what they are doing to tell them a few of the basics and to ask a few basic questions. Perhaps the government might consider, later on in the process of a young person's life, opening up—maybe through the school curriculum or in day care centres or in a kindergarten—some sort of nutritional program as well to help parents better understand what nutrition does to a child's development. However, it is wrong and irresponsible to make the blanket statement that what the government is doing will have no impact. I think it was a bipartisan approach that changed the way in which we approach our schools and, had the Liberal opposition been successful at the election, probably a lot of its members would have supported banning junk food in primary schools. It is not fair to say that members opposite do not support it—I think they do—and this is a first step.

Another issue in my electorate that is dear to my heart is the issue of stormwater. I am very concerned—as are other members—about getting this authority up and running as quickly as possible. I want to see a solution for the five councils that are the most affected by stormwater and stormwater run-off and the way in which we use it. Unfortunately for me and the members for Colton and Unley, a lot of the problems created by rain events are not caused in our electorates but end up in our electorates. In the past, the approach by governments—both Labor and Liberal—has been to allow individual councils to try to deal with the problem, which I think is very unfair. It is very unfair to ask the electors of West Torrens to pay for stormwater upgrades that have been caused by run-offs in Burnside, the ranges or the hills coming down into our electorate. It is very unfair and a burden that those constituents cannot bear on their own.

What the government is trying to do is to create this authority where we guarantee a certain level of funding per annum. This authority can then borrow from that funding to do large capital works quickly, and I think that is a very good idea. I understand that the way in which the process will work is that councils can nominate works which they think are urgent to be done immediately. These works are important to engineers, but they are also very important to people like me who live in flood plains. I live in a flood plain, as do most of my electors. The idea that I could be a metre deep in a river of stormwater flowing at about 50 km/h is pretty scary. From what I know about stormwater mapping, there is not only concern about damage to property but also a great deal of concern about danger to human life and personal injury. During these flash floods, you can imagine people walking home, or children walking home from school, getting caught in a torrent of water, which could be very dangerous.

In the time remaining I also want to add my concerns about an issue raised yesterday by the member for Schubert in a grievance debate, that is, the airport and Ikea. While I think that Ikea and the development there is very good for the state—opening up competition to people who want to buy furniture (not everyone can afford to shop at the member for Unley's store)—I also have concerns about the way in which the development approval process is put in place. The way in which it is put in place is that the airport's master plan is put out for consultation, and it then goes to the federal minister for approval. The federal minister says yes or no and, if it is approved, that's it; state planning laws are not taken into consideration. You can't really blame the airport.

It is a business. When the airport was privatised by the Howard government it was sold to a private company, and

that private company is there to make money. It is diversifying the use of its airport land in ways that will maximise the return to its shareholders. We should not be surprised that it is trying to do this, but what happens to us in return is that we are stuck with the infrastructure problems with planning that is not undertaken with a coordinated approach. It is not the airport's fault: it is the government's fault, pure and simple. You cannot blame a business for utilising its land and making a return, but you can blame those who are there to regulate. And I do blame the federal government and the minister for what has happened at the airport.

The member for Schubert does not like that dirty great Ikea sign standing there, which I think is visible from the moon, along with the Great Wall of China and other man-made objects. This sign is so large that I think it is visible from almost every part of the western suburbs. Of course, Ikea has done that for a reason: it wants to let people know that it is there. And good luck to it. But it is bad luck for me and my local residents, because the federal minister does not want to abide by local planning laws. What can we do? We do not control the Senate, we do not control the House of Representatives and we cannot change the law. That is why the local federal member of parliament (Steve Georganas) wants to set up an airport ombudsman's authority where people can take their complaints about airport development.

I will say this in defence of the airport. The member for Schubert talked about its stormwater runoff. The airport quite proudly boasts that all its runoff is dealt with on site. That is, it releases nothing from its development onto the stormwater system that is causing problems. In fact, from my understanding, although I could be wrong, the airport is working very closely with the council to make sure that its stormwater upgrades are benefiting. The only downside for us in terms of stormwater is that we cannot use that vacant land that was once there as a ponding basin to slow down the flow of the water that is the problem in the western suburbs, because it is being used for development. Again, it is not the airport's fault but the federal government's fault.

When the federal government approves a place such as Ikea, the only planning tools that we have at our disposal are entry and access points on our major roads. This is the absurd position that the state government is put in. The federal government and the airport get together through a master plan and develop the airport site. It is massive and employs 300 people, and it then says, 'We have car parking for 400 people: we want an entry point off Sir Donald Bradman Drive.' If the state government says no, we risk that investment in our state being lost to somewhere else or, even worse, not being made at all. Basically, we have a gun to our heads, and the people who suffer are the local residents.

While I understand the member for Schubert's frustration, I think that he would be better off calling his colleagues in Canberra and speaking to them about the way the airport is given approval by the federal minister. The federal minister has the power to say no. There is no appeal to that refusal—it is final—in the same way that there is no appeal to that approval, because it is federal land. The only tools that we have are access points through our transport plan. I will suggest this: I do think that we have to look at an alternative entry point into the airport.

I know that the local council was talking about the end of Morphett Road perhaps being an entry point into the airport. Others are talking about the end of Richmond Road being an entry into the airport. I am not sure about the pros and cons of either of those suggestions. The airport is saying that there

are security issues with having multiple entry points into the airport. I am not sure that that would be a big problem. I think that the ultimate deciding factor would be the cost, but something must be done about Sir Donald Bradman Drive. The intersection at the corner of Airport Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive cannot remain. It is in need of urgent upgrade, because the delays that have been caused there are unacceptable to our commuters, to our industry and the airport.

I think it is important that we note that, when interstate visitors land at the airport now, and they look around and they see our new terminal, and they see IKEA, and they see the development, even though it does have a negative impact on the local residents around there, it does give a sense that South Australia is not the same place it was four years ago. It does give a sense that South Australia is more confident with itself than it was four years ago. It does give a sense that South Australia is not a backwater, and, indeed, is punching above its weight, that we are not afraid of competition, that we are not a small, regional market garden town. We are, in fact, a robust, proud state and a proud capital city that is doing lots to encourage investment, especially in mining, and is doing lots to encourage South Australians to stay here rather than migrate interstate. We are doing lots to encourage our younger people to get a decent education.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I support the member for West Torrens' comments about the South Australian economy. I believe in it very strongly. Thank you, sir, for the opportunity to briefly comment on the Supply Bill. Hopefully, some of my comments will not be contentious to members on the other side of the house. Whilst I am only a new member to this house, and thus I have no historical knowledge about the process of presenting, questioning and adopting the state budget, I have had an opportunity to briefly review the very large set of documents that was tabled by the Treasurer for the 2005-06 budget. I do have some experience in determination of budgets in local government, but only up to a value of \$20 million. I certainly recognise that the scope of the budget, which incorporates over \$10 billion in expenditure, is truly amazing.

We all know that the resources available to government, no matter at what level, are insufficient to carry out all that is desired by our communities. We must also recognise that this is not our money; it is the money of the 1.5 million people who reside in South Australia. As such, we must ensure that, for every dollar that we spend, we get the greatest possible return. Whilst my more experienced colleagues will focus on specific areas of the budget, there are just a few issues that I would briefly like to discuss today.

The fact that the unfunded superannuation liability has risen from \$3.2 billion in 2001 to \$7.2 billion now is beyond belief to me. Between June 2004 and June 2005 alone, the level of unfunded liability rose by \$836 million. One can only wonder at the impact of the 8 000 additional public servants over the past four years, who have been employed by the state government, when less than 700, I believe, were actually supported as part of the budgets adopted for each of these years, and has resulted in this figure. Even more interesting is that a plan adopted in 1994 by the then Liberal government, when South Australia was in the worst possible financial position following the State Bank collapse due to Labor mismanagement, which provided for this superannuation liability to be fully funded by 2034, has not been reviewed. That is 40 years. It is amazing that it will take that long for

the state to be responsible for its superannuation, but it has not been reviewed, given our state's much improved financial situation.

Under the stewardship of the Labor government, the unfunded liability for WorkCover has blown out to nearly \$650 million, or \$430 for every man, woman and child. That has resulted in the WorkCover levy for South Australian employers being higher than Victoria, which, in turn, makes it more difficult for our state to be nationally competitive. While I am proud to declare that I am a product of the public school system, as are my two children who attend Maitland Area School—

Mr Koutsantonis: Hear, hear!

Mr GRIFFITHS:—thank you—a briefing provided to me by the principals of the eight private Christian schools in the Goyder electorate prior to the election alarmed me. Apparently, the level of financial support provided by the state government to private schools is, per student, some \$192 below the national average. Whilst I am not qualified to discuss the financial position of the well-known private schools in Adelaide, which is commonly used as a counter argument to the efforts of the private school system to attract additional financial support from federal and state governments, I am aware that the eight private Christian schools in Goyder are struggling financially. Families in increasing numbers are making the decision to use the schools, and the schools are developing more facilities to cater for the increased numbers, but to do so they are increasingly calling upon the financial support of parents.

Many of these people are struggling financially, but they are committed to providing the best possible level of education they can for their children, and have chosen the private system to provide this. I would encourage the state government to reconsider its position on this matter and bring the level of support up to that of the national average. During the election campaign, I know that the Liberal Party was prepared to commit \$8 million per year to meet that national average, so I would hope that the Labor government would consider this also.

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Lots of information there, Tom. My comments regarding the needs of the eight private Christian schools in my electorate do not in any way detract from the fantastic work being done by the public education system. Clearly, the need to ensure that every level of educational opportunity in South Australia is provided, with the financial support necessary, must be a priority of government.

One of the main reasons why I sought the opportunity to be elected to parliament was the desperate need for infrastructure investment to occur in the regions. Regional South Australia is crying out for the recognition of its needs, and this must take place to ensure that the future is a positive one. Investment in roads, water, electricity, telecommunications, education, hospitals, aged care, social services, and supported accommodation for the intellectually and physically disabled, are all vitally required if the future of the regions is to be a positive one.

Our road network is simply falling apart, with the lack of commitment to road maintenance translating into an additional 200 kilometres of Transport SA controlled roads falling into disrepair each year. I am advised that the prediction is that transport movements will increase by 40 per cent over the next 20 years; for regional South Australia, this means road transport. A few years ago, there was a lot of frustration in regional South Australia when the minister decreed that,

in relation to some 1 100 kilometres of Transport SA controlled roads, the speed limit would decrease from 110 to 100 km/h. Within the Yorke Peninsula region, 523 kilometres of roads were affected.

While frustrated with the decision, the communities I spoke to supported it because they hoped it would be a stimulus for additional investment in road infrastructure to occur. This has happened to some degree, with over \$1.5 million being spent on the Ardrossan to Port Wakefield road. The road has improved tremendously, but the speed limit remains at 100 km/h. The minister has considered a request but has made the judgment that, in a continued effort to try to decrease our road toll, the speed limit will not be increased. However, additional dollars must be committed, and I hope that this will be a feature of the next government. We must ensure that the roads are kept up to a good standard.

Water supplies in regional communities cannot meet the needs of developing areas or, in some cases, at peak holiday times. I am aware of situations when, during such periods, when all the properties are occupied, farmers in adjoining areas suddenly find that they have no water for sheep and cattle as the SA Water system of supply to their properties suddenly drops off to nil because all the water is being consumed in the coastal communities. These people are being forced to invest in holding tanks, spending up to \$10 000 per property to ensure that they have water for their stock. Where is the commitment from SA Water to guarantee supply to existing customers? As a state, we must invest in the use of alternative technology to provide potable water. Desalination technology is used on Kangaroo Island, so why not on Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula, or even in metropolitan Adelaide? I hope that this technology will be a feature of the next budget.

Broadband internet access is not just a desire but a requirement in regional areas. The current South Australian broadband fund is a vital component of community-based applications being lodged with the Australian government. As a resident of a region that has benefited from both these funding options, and also being aware that many other regions are desperately in need of funding support from these programs to make their vision of up-to-date telecommunications technology become a reality, I hope that the government continues to provide dollars in this area. Broadband is a frustrating issue for many people. I know that I previously represented an area where Telstra refused to have any involvement in broadband. It recognised that there may be a demand, but it came down to a simple matter of dollars.

Telstra did not believe that, if it invested the required money to upgrade its exchanges, it would get the number of users. It is only when creative communities go out and stimulate private companies to be involved (and the Yorke Peninsula solution has involved Agile/Internode) that you suddenly have a lot of suppliers who want to make things happen. The state government has an important role to play, and I hope that it will invest the dollars.

The presentation of a Supply Bill that commits one quarter of the state budget is difficult to imagine. One can only ask how this will impact upon the financial review the Treasurer mentions so often because, with the commitment of such a large amount of recurrent and programmed costs, how is it possible to create the efficiencies at the level of 4 per cent we have heard about that have apparently been demanded? In presenting the budget last year, the Treasurer commented that it was a rigorous and comprehensive budget—a result of outstanding work by his ministerial colleagues, their chief

executives and their staff. If this statement was correct, though, why does Treasury need to conduct a thorough review this year? Shouldn't that occur as a matter of course every year?

Mr Koutsantonis: We're prudent managers.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I understand, but it should be ongoing, every year. I support the motion.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.56 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 10 May at 2 p.m.