

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 20 June 2007

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

HEALTH PRACTITIONERS

The **Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor)**: I move:

That the Social Development Committee investigate and report upon the issue of bogus, unregistered and deregistered health practitioners in South Australia and, in particular:

- (a) their prevalence in South Australia;
- (b) the practices they use, and associated health and safety risks;
- (c) the methods they use to promote their services and the risks of exploitation of sick and vulnerable people;
- (d) the measures, regulatory and otherwise, that can be taken to better protect the public; and
- (e) any other related matter.

The purpose of this motion for the house is to discover the extent and impact in South Australia of bogus health practitioners by means of a reference to the parliament's Social Development Committee. There is an enormous number of health services provided by people who are not covered by a registration scheme. I believe that the majority of the people concerned are honest and competent. However, we do know that there are at least some who are anything but that and who care for nothing but making money out of vulnerable patients. While there has not been a large number of cases that have made the newspapers in South Australia, the fact is that we really do not know the extent of the problem but have had enough anecdotal suggestion of untoward operators here, as well as confirmed cases interstate and overseas, to warrant investigation of the situation here in South Australia.

When patients seek health services, I think that they presume to be protected from the shonks and rip-off merchants who peddle false hope. People battling serious or terminal illnesses can be desperate and will sometimes hand over large amounts of money for quite useless treatments. They may also be influenced to forgo proven medical treatments. We would like to think that the public is protected from such charlatans. Indeed, New South Wales has recently become the first jurisdiction in Australia to introduce legislation to attempt to deal with the problem it has identified within its borders.

Late last year, in suggesting that the Social Development Committee might investigate this matter, the South Australian Minister for Health raised the example of a health practitioner who, due to serious misconduct or incompetence, had been deregistered as a dentist but who, nonetheless, continued to practise in an unregistered field, still calling himself a doctor and dispensing bogus and, quite clearly, outrageous sexual treatments as supposed cures to serious illnesses such as cancer. Desperate patients are, indeed, more vulnerable to false, misleading or deceptive claims by such practitioners, who seek to create an unjustified expectation of beneficial treatment. Typically, there is no proof offered that the treatment actually works: just one or more testimonials from supposedly happy customers. I might add that it is not only dubious treatments for serious illnesses that are of concern; what about the practitioner who diagnoses illnesses that are just not there in order to extract money for treatment or miracle cures? There are some really subtle forces that can

lead intelligent people—both patients and therapists—to think that a treatment has helped someone when it really has not.

There is a very interesting website called 'quackwatch', which contains some interesting information from interstate and overseas on people doing just this. Many dubious methods remain on the market, primarily because satisfied customers offer testimonials to the work of such people. Essentially, these people say, 'I tried this; it worked. I got better, so it must be effective.' The electronic print media typically portray testimonials as valid evidence, but without proper testing, so people do get swayed. In an article by Dr Barry Beyerstein, entitled 'Why bogus therapies often seem to work', he provides seven reasons why people may erroneously conclude that an ineffective therapy works, as follows:

1. The disease may have run its natural course in any event.
2. Many diseases are cyclical. Conditions such as arthritis, multiple sclerosis, allergies and gastrointestinal problems normally have ups and downs so, naturally, sufferers tend to think the therapy that they are using at the time has been effective if they see an improvement.
3. The placebo effect may be responsible.
4. People who hedge their bets credit the wrong thing.
5. The original diagnosis or prognosis may have been incorrect.
6. Temporary mood improvement can be confused with cure.
7. Psychological needs can distort what people perceive and do.

The most obvious examples of this kind of practice concern deregistered medical practitioners, dentists, or psychologists who set themselves up to practise under titles such as 'psychotherapist' or 'counsellor', for which there is no formal registration. Other discredited physiotherapists, chiropractors and osteopaths could set up under the title of 'remedial masseur', for example. It is pretty easy to send away for one of those internet degree parchments. I believe that the going price is around US\$75 to get one of those, so you have pretty much all you need to convince a patient that you are a legitimate professional in whatever field you choose: place an ad in a magazine or the local paper and you are in business!

It is fairly easy to rely on the assumption by most Australians that someone who openly practises with the title 'doctor' in front of their name does so with some official blessing. But this is not so for many fields of health practitioners. It seems also that it is easy for practitioners to attain some impression of credibility by joining or even creating dubious professional affiliations and then displaying that membership to their patients. It is a fact that many practitioners in the medical and health sector are unregulated. They are not part of any college, union or association that otherwise might demand of them a certain level of ethical practice and commitment to ethical standards. This is a potential problem that concerns both the deregistered and the unregistered. While some fields of unregistered practice have voluntary codes of conduct, there are no formal standards that apply to either of these groups of practitioners.

The motion before the house today also calls for the Social Development Committee to recommend to the government what powers might be necessary to deal with these dishonest and disreputable practitioners who pose a risk to patient health and, most often, to the patient's pocket as well. Of course, in venturing into the world of quacks, I am very aware of the history of the seeming war between conventional and alternative therapies. Indeed, I have been approached since raising this topic late last year by many medical doctors who class anyone practising chiropractic, natural therapy, massage, and the like, as questionable.

I want to stress, in moving for this investigation, that I do not sit in either camp; that it is not my belief that all alternative products and services are bogus, nor is it my belief that all conventional medicine is strongly backed by scientific evidence. What the bogus practitioners are selling is hope and, often, an illusion or feeling of wellbeing.

The quacks tend to be charismatic and positive, projecting an aura of confidence and health. They survive and thrive because of people's ignorance of or disillusionment with medical science, a situation that can be made worse due to the hostility between the traditional and alternative approaches. These quacks can even be given good media coverage in infotainment programs on radio and television and in magazines, which look for an entertaining story regardless of whether there is any truth to the promoter's claims. Indeed, the quacks themselves are good at generating newsworthiness by claiming to be suppressed by the authorities because they are unconventional; that is usually how they manage to get the free publicity.

However, these days the fastest-growing sales medium is the internet, and snake oil sales are on the increase over the internet. In January 2002 an alliance of 58 consumer protection and health authorities from all over the world, led by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, which conducted a global sweep of internet sites selling medical goods and services, found over 1 400 suspicious websites. Of those, the Australian-based sites numbered 77.

I am mindful of the need to keep an open mind about new and novel approaches to health practice, remembering, in fact, that in times gone by it was sometimes the medical blokes who did more harm to patients than the snake oil salesmen, who simply sold a useless medicine. I should point out that my purpose here is not to discredit such alternative fields—which are, more and more, being regarded as mainstream—but to uncover those individuals within any field who pose a risk to the public through unethical, dishonest and even dangerous practices.

At the very least, I hope that a Social Development Committee inquiry into this matter will facilitate the outing of any charlatans who may be practising in South Australia. These people tend to be very slippery characters, as experience interstate and overseas has shown, and as soon as the authorities start to close in they tend to pull up shop and shift jurisdiction to avoid disclosure or penalty. Of course, once they have done that they open up shop either in the same field or another one and continue to operate if they are not caught and penalised. It is my hope that, through understanding the extent and nature of the problem here in South Australia, the Social Development Committee may be able to advise the Minister for Health and the parliament about the best form of control of unscrupulous health practices in this state.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I support this motion; in fact, I would be happy for it to be taken a bit further to look at the wider aspect of people using alleged credentials to fool the community. There is, for example, a character from Greenwith who sometimes writes to *The Advertiser* and who calls himself Dr Warwick Raymont but whose real name is, I believe, Warwick Ring; he actually went to Unley High and, as far as I know, does not even have a certificate in anything. As I understand it, there is no law in South Australia to stop anyone from calling themselves 'doctor'. There is probably a law to stop yourself getting doctored, but you can call yourself 'doctor' and you can call yourself 'professor'. We now have (and this is another part of this whole area of

misrepresentation) a small number of people with honorary doctorates who are actually pretending that they have a substantive PhD. Some of the universities have, themselves, contributed to this debasing by issuing doctorates for course work (where people go to class), and I saw recently that one of our local universities is offering a so-called doctorate for attending on a weekend and doing courses on-line.

That is not a PhD; a PhD relates to someone who makes a significant contribution to theory by way of original research. For most people (unless they are in the category of Einstein), it probably takes them three years' full-time study, as a minimum, and sometimes longer. However, we have people going around abusing that term. Likewise, the term 'professor', in my view, is now being bastardised by its misuse.

I think it is time for our community to have particular requirements relating to people who purport to have certain credentials. I believe the character to whom I referred earlier has on the wall of his office all sorts of certificates allegedly given by bodies around the world. There is nothing to stop people from doing that, and they can fool someone who comes into their office. I am not suggesting that members here try it but, as far as I know, it is not illegal. So, people can claim to be more or less whatever they like.

In the medical profession, the number of people holding a doctorate in medicine or a PhD would be very small. The Minister for Education and Children's Services has one, but most doctors have a courtesy title. They have two bachelors degrees. I am not in any way trying to put them down, but that is not the same as going to the level of having a doctorate in medicine or a PhD in a medical field. It is a courtesy title, the same as veterinarians have, and nowadays chiropractors also use that title. They are courtesy titles; they are not substantive titles. However, most of the media do not know the difference, because they have never understood what training and education is all about.

I support this measure. People have a right to know that someone who is giving medical or any other health advice is properly trained, registered and accountable. Members would all be familiar with the case of Dr Patel in Queensland. Unfortunately, there is a decent doctor in Adelaide with the same name, as I understand it. It is unfortunate that he has that name, which I understand is a common name in India. I am not in any way suggesting that the local doctor is anything like the person who did bad things in Queensland. However, if this measure helps to protect people from those who want to prey on them through some misguided, ill-informed intent, I fully support it. I commend this motion moved by the member for Taylor.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I commend the member for Taylor. As a member of the Social Development Committee, I am quite pleased that she has moved this motion. I was certainly alarmed by a television program that I saw the other night. It seems that quite a few people are travelling overseas to access alleged stem cell therapy treatments. It bothers me that some of those people, who may be spending \$40 000 or \$50 000 at a time, are confined to wheelchairs and they need hope, and the only hope they have is to undergo that procedure.

We need to ensure that health professionals have the right credentials and provide the appropriate treatment for people, instead of peddling false hope. These people might think that they are getting better but, at the end of the day, it might be just a 'feel good' thing, and it is cleaning out their bank

account or they are mortgaging their house or using their savings.

With respect to what some would call alternative or run-of-the-mill treatments, such as massage and chiropractic treatments, I am a regular user of both of those services. My body has not been helped by many years in the shearing sheds in my former life, and they have certainly kept me going. I can recall that one day, at an inappropriate time, I woke up and my back had seized up. I went straight to the chiropractor and she fixed me up. So, I believe that there are certainly plenty of legitimate operators in the field of chiropractic. However, I think we certainly need to stitch up bogus doctors and other health professionals.

Mrs Redmond: That is what chiropractors are.

Mr PEDERICK: I get the interjection from the member for Heysen that chiropractors are bogus. As I just said, you need to pick and choose a bit. Some are not much more than massage manipulators, but I can assure members, as someone who has felt as if he had broken his back at times, they do help to bring you back to health. So, people need to be aware of who they are seeing and check their credentials, but I commend the motion of the member for Taylor.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I move:

That the 61st report of the committee, on the Emergency Services Levy 2007-08, be noted.

Regarding the Economic and Finance Committee's 61st report, Ecclesiastes Chapter 3, verses 1 to 8 famously intone:

To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven:

2. A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted;

3. A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up;

4. A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance;

5. A time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing;

6. A time to get, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away;

7. A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;

8. A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace.

Winter is the season and the time for the Economic and Finance Committee's examination of the minister's determinations in respect of the emergency services levy for the financial year 2007-08.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I know. Wasn't it? In accordance with the relevant provisions of the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998, the Treasurer (and a good Treasurer he is) has provided the committee with the appropriate determinations for the approaching financial year, and the committee has conducted a hearing and tabled its report within the 21 day time frame laid down by the act. Anyone who says I am a slack chair should apologise; anyone who says I am a slack chair, let them come to economic and finance meetings and see. Let them come to Berlin.

The committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services for 2007-08 is projected to be \$206.5 million. There will be no increase in effective levy rates either for owners of fixed property or for owners of

motor vehicles and vessels in 2007-08. Growth in property capital values, the number of property assessments and motor vehicle registrations will, however, result in an estimated additional revenue of \$3.7 million from levy payers. The committee notes that in 2007-08 target expenditure of \$206.5 million has increased by \$14.8 million from the 2006-07 estimated outcome. This increase is mainly due to the following:

- \$4.8 million relates to initiatives approved by cabinet as part of the 2007-08 budget.
- \$2.7 million relates to the state funding component of programs previously located within the Premier and Cabinet portfolio. These programs are jointly funded by the commonwealth and the state. There is no impact on ESL bills payable by private property owners. The state funded component will be met by government through higher remission costs.
- \$2.5 million relates to deferred expenditure on the Computer Aided Dispatch project carried over from 2006-07.
- \$2.5 million relates to capital expenditure brought forward from 2009-10.

The balance relates to general inflation and the cost of providing emergency services.

With respect to collection costs, the committee notes evidence that costs have reached the point where the minimum cost for the service may now exist—an important time for us all. The committee observes, however, that the recommendation for a review of collection costs contained in last year's report has not been acted on.

The committee notes with approval the operation of the Native Vegetation Council Bushfire Prevention Plan Subcommittee and trusts further improvements will be made in the capacity of private landowners to manage their properties in cooperation with the relevant conservation and fire authorities.

It is also noted that the Commissioner of State Taxation has acted on the community's previous concerns about enabling access to ESL concessions for retirement villages. Previously, ESL was being billed to the one owner of the entire property, which was often used by a majority of people who were eligible for concessions, and these concessions were not being passed on to the residents of the retirement village and, therefore, they were paying a higher rate of ESL. Because of the committee's good work and the Commissioner of Taxation's diligence, that has now been rectified, so we can finally sleep well at night. The committee reserves the right to make further comment on any issue discussed in the report. Given the above, and pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the all-powerful Economic and Finance Committee recommends to parliament that it note this report.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): As a dutiful attendee of the Economic and Finance Committee since being appointed last year, I thought it was important to make a small contribution to the 61st report from the committee about the emergency services levy for 2007-08. As a dutiful attendee I must admit I cannot remember the introductory words in the motion actually being said, but I do note that the honourable member is, in his words today, a firm but fair chairman of that committee; he gives everybody a chance.

One thing that became obvious to me when attending at the Economic and Finance Committee (and particularly the two reviews that I attended regarding the emergency services

levy) was the overkill of bureaucrats attending these functions. I believe there were only four people who spoke to us, but there would have been 20 people in the crowd. We debated afterwards—

The Hon. R.B. Such: That's because you're so powerful; they're scared of you.

Mr GRIFFITHS: True; they want to make sure they have an answer for every potential question that we asked. We debated afterwards what the cost would have been to the Public Service of all these people attending. I can understand there is a need to ensure that succession planning is in place so that people who may one day have to answer questions are aware of how it is run and have an opportunity to learn from their experienced colleagues, but I was a little bit surprised.

One point we did note, however, was the draw-down that has been occurring in the Community Emergency Services Fund. The fund is to have a balance of \$5.9 million at the end of the 2006-07 financial year and it has had drawings from it of \$3.9 million, but it is also intended, in the 2007-08 financial year, for this to be drawn down again by another \$2.4 million, leaving a balance of \$3.5 million.

Given that each year it seems that drawings need to come upon that fund as a result of government policy decisions, I think there needs to be some action taken to ensure that the budgeting is a little bit more prudent from all the emergency services departments or, indeed, that the fund is given an opportunity to boost itself. With those very few words I commend the chairman on his motion and I look forward to next year's version of the emergency services levy review.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I will be very brief. One of the issues that I believe should be canvassed and investigated to see whether it would be cost-effective is whether ambulance services should be brought under the umbrella of the emergency services levy. The reality is that some people in our community take out insurance but many do not and often, for those who do not, the cost is picked up by the community through bad debts and, I guess, the government in any event. It is worth looking at and needs to be investigated. It would be better to have a simple system so that everyone is covered for ambulance and we do not have to chase people who have not paid for their ambulance call-out.

Another point I want to raise is the reality that people living in not just the hills face zone but also through an area of the Mount Lofty Ranges stretching from Tea Tree Gully down to Woodcroft—that is just an approximation—pay an emergency services levy and they get CFS coverage. I am not in any way criticising the CFS—I used to belong to it myself once—but the issue is that, in an area like mine (Aberfoyle Park) where there are large shopping centres, large schools, retirement villages with 280 units. People in these areas are paying the same levy but are getting the services of volunteers, who do a great job.

We have a big shopping centre, excluded from CFS cover, recognising that they are probably not fully equipped to deal with that sort of fire. I do not want to see the CFS service diminished in areas such as Blackwood and Belair and so on. Should the CFS be further supplemented by an improved MFS coverage in the area? We know the CFS and MFS work together, but in reality we will always need the CFS to deal with bushfire type situations and sometimes to assist in road accidents and urban house fires and so on. Talking to people in the MFS, they tell me that, in any event, it is stretched to cover much of the southern area.

I note with pleasure in the latest budget that the government has decided to fund an MFS station around Aldinga-Seafood, which I welcome as it is a good initiative. Irrespective of that proposal, we still have the issue of the thousands of people who live in Belair, Blackwood, Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley, Chandler's Hill and all the suburbs to the north and south who currently do not get the benefit of an MFS service. The MFS could attend in those areas and sometimes will, but we have a station at O'Halloran Hill and one at St Mary's, and by the time one of those MFS units attends the top of Chandler's Hill, Belair or Blackwood, the fire would be all over red rover.

The CFS tells me that its turn-out time is four minutes or less. That must be an average, because I am not aware of people sleeping at the CFS station. To turn out in four minutes or less you would have to have someone on site. The MFS has people on site all the time. I am not suggesting that we diminish the CFS in the Adelaide Hills, but I am asking the minister, to whom I have spoken privately, to look at whether we need the further involvement of the MFS to provide an additional service complimentary to that which can be produced at the moment. The emergency services levy is worthwhile. My original point is that it is time we looked at whether or not it should cover ambulance services—and that is something the Economic and Finance Committee could look at. The other issue is the appropriateness of the current cover for the MFS and the CFS in the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): I support the Economic and Finance Committee's report into the emergency services levy 2007-08. I wish to comment on only one aspect mentioned by the chair of that committee, the member for West Torrens, when he noted that the Commissioner for State Taxation has acted on the committee's concerns about enabling access to ESL concessions for retirement village residents.

This matter has concerned me for quite some years. I wrote to former minister Robert Brokenshire on this matter quite some time ago. As members would be aware, I am strong in my advocacy for residents of caravan parks, of which I have a number operating in my electorate. State government bills for the emergency services levy were made out to the caravan park owner and it was up to the owner to decide what they did in terms of charging residents. While other residents throughout the community—if they were pensioners—were entitled to a concession on the Emergency Services Levy, caravan park owners were charging what they liked to residents. Indeed, we have had instances over the years whereby reductions were made for caravan park owners for things such as the GST and the emergency services levy, but they were not passed back to the residents who had been billed initially for those levies.

When I wrote to former minister Brokenshire he wrote back to me and said that the state government had no power to address this issue and he suggested that the best course of action was for my private member's legislation on rights for residents of caravan parks to be enacted. I am pleased to say that my residential tenancies amendments concerning caravan parks and residential village-type parks have made progress and this issue has finally been addressed, because it was quite an unfair impost on the residents of these sorts of parks and villages where everybody else who happened to be a pensioner could get a rebate but not these residents. So I am pleased to see that this issue has been resolved.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: DEEP CREEK

Mr RAU (Enfield): I move:

That the ninth report of the committee on Deep Creek be noted.

Sadly, I am not able to rise to the literary heights that were achieved by the chair of the Economic and Finance Committee, so I ask members to indulge me in the fact that I am not able to match him. The genesis of this inquiry goes back to a motion raised in the other place by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, which ultimately dropped off the list, so to speak, when the parliament was prorogued for the election in 2006, but which was reinstated by the committee. The scope of the inquiry was to look at land use activities in the Upper Deep Creek catchment and their impact on the health of, in particular, Upper Deep Creek but also the Deep Creek area generally.

The committee had the opportunity of hearing evidence from various relevant departments and going on a very interesting visit to the site. I think all the members of the committee found that very interesting. I have to say that we were ably accompanied by the local member, the honourable member for Finnis, who showed us the tremendous hospitality for which he is renowned in his area. In any event, we examined the issues, and the issues basically come down to this: it is the old story, the question of land development or commercial development on land against the balance to be given to the environment.

Members need to be aware of the fact that the Upper Deep Creek catchment is one of three or four streams which feed the river (or the stream) known as Deep Creek, which is the prime feature of the Deep Creek Conservation Park. The Deep Creek Conservation Park has been protected in various forms since 1972 and has, since that time, been accorded considerable protection under the law because of its pristine environment and its conservation value. It is very important for members to understand that the boundaries of the Deep Creek Conservation Park do not encompass within them all the catchment of Deep Creek. Therefore, what happens in the catchment outside the conservation park necessarily has an impact on what happens within the conservation park.

It was outside the conservation park in one of the catchment streams that our inquiry was focused. What did we find? We found a number of things. First, we found that up until 1990, or thereabouts, the land use in the area had been predominantly as open pasture, dairy farming and such like. In about 1990, the area at the head of the Upper Deep Creek subcatchment was acquired by Forestry SA and put over to forestry activity. It is now covered in radiata pine. I need to say that that is not by any means the only government plantation in that area and, indeed, there are many private plantations in the area. They are a mixture of both radiata pine and Tasmanian blue gum, both of which require the high rainfall which is in that area for them to grow effectively.

In any event, it was clear on the basis of the historical evidence presented to the committee in the form of historical rainfall records that there has not been a 10 or 15 year drought in the Upper Deep Creek catchment. In fact, there have been good years and bad years—as one would expect anywhere—and the past few years have been worse than previous years but nowhere near enough to explain the behaviour of the stream. Furthermore, it is clear from early observations by settlers in the area that it was traditionally a perennial stream; it was not a seasonal stream.

When we visited the Upper Deep Creek area we found the stream to be a dry creek bed, and we were advised by adjacent landholders that over the past few years increasingly it had reached the point where for short periods the stream would dry up—and those periods had become longer—until it has reached the point where from mid summer to late autumn the stream is simply an empty rocky passage through the Upper Deep Creek catchment. This is completely at odds with the way in which the stream operated up until the time of the introduction of forestry in that immediate vicinity. That was supported not only by 50 years worth of personal observation by adjacent landowners but also in the form, interestingly enough, of video material which showed the stream running during the summer months. It is clear that something quite dramatic has happened to that stream over the past 10 or 15 years; in particular, since the advent of forestry.

The committee also heard evidence from an expert hydrologist, Dr O'Loughlin, who spent some time explaining to the committee the effects of run-off from different types of land. He explained that in a pasture situation you would expect more run-off than from an afforested area, and so forth. Importantly, he explained to the committee that the level of setback from the edge of the stream is critical in determining whether or not the stream continues to be in receipt of enough water to be able to continue to flow. In very simple terms, what he said was that if you set the trees far enough back on the side of the stream you capture most of the run-off that would have gone to the stream anyway, without seriously damaging the stream.

The only exception to that proposition was that, where you have a convergent land form—that is, something approaching an amphitheatre-type description of land, which in the case of Deep Creek subcatchment is the head water of the stream—it is important that the setback be much further back because of the topography. It was clear to members of the committee on paying a visit to the site that the plantation had gone down quite close to the stream on both sides and basically had covered most of the convergent land form I have described. It therefore denies the stream any effective run-off whatsoever.

The impact on the Upper Deep Creek catchment seems to be to members of the committee quite obvious. There is a direct causal nexus between the plantation of radiata pine in 1990 or thereabouts and the current parlous state of the Upper Deep Creek catchment. Until something is done, particularly about the setback of the pine trees in that immediate area, which is not a large area but it is very significant from the point of view of this stream, it will continue and perhaps get worse. Bearing in mind that this is one of three or four feeder streams into Deep Creek proper and understanding, as we do on the committee, that other streams have suffered similar types of intrusions from forestry and damming, much of it unauthorised (which is another issue altogether), there is a serious threat posed to the viability of Deep Creek itself. Of course, that would mean the effective destruction of the prime asset about which the Deep Creek Conservation Park is centred.

This is a very important conservation issue. Interestingly enough, it is probably worth members of the house reflecting on the fact that, if we move into a carbon trading environment in the future, where carbon credits are disposed to those companies that are able to demonstrate that they are a carbon sink, the commercial pressure to place more forestry-type activity in high rainfall areas will increase. It will no longer

be simply a question about whether or not someone can sell the timber for whatever purpose but also it will become a question about the fact of there being a forest in place soaking up carbon being itself a generator of income.

Unless we get the science right, we will be confronting greater commercial pressures for forestry in the area with the fact that this will produce serious adverse environmental consequences, not to mention the social consequences for the communities that live in the member for Finnis's electorate because, as these areas of land are removed from farming activities in a traditional sense and put over to forestry, that changes the type of activity and the number of people who work the land and it changes populations and so forth. So, we are talking about significant change being a consequence of this.

What are the recommendations the committee came up with? Well, they are many, and I will not attempt to read them all out now because I do not think that would be useful, but I will summarise them in two broad areas. First of all, there is a recommendation that the relevant government departments take all steps necessary to make proper hydrological studies of these areas to ensure that future forestry development (which, incidentally, the committee does not oppose *per se*) be done in a way which is consistent with the continuing health of the streams about which this forestry development is to take place.

This work needs to be done urgently because, as I have said, there is already pressure for more forestry in the area, and that pressure will only continue. The second recommendation (an important recommendation from the committee) is that there be a program to remove the trees, particularly from the convergent zone of the Upper Deep Creek catchment, and to remove trees from along the sides of the catchment to an extent necessary to retain the appropriate hydrology of the area and to keep the stream, as it always has been, a perennial stream. Of course, these studies and these activities need to be replicated in the other streams feeding the catchment, including Dog Trap Creek and a number of the other creeks in the area.

This is an important issue for South Australia. This is an important conservation asset, being the Deep Creek Conservation Park, and we cannot waste time in failing to address this issue quickly. I express my thanks to members of the committee, all of whom were very enthusiastic and supportive of this inquiry and all of whom made a tremendous contribution to the work of the committee and the report.

I also thank the committee staff, including Knut Cudarans and John Barker, both of whom did a great job in supporting the committee. John Barker did the bulk of the work in preparing the committee's report, and I think he did an excellent job. I think that any members who have an opportunity to read it will be very impressed with his work. He has gone on to bigger and better things, and I wish him well as, I am sure, do other members of the committee.

I ask members, please, to give some consideration to reading this amongst the many other things they must read, because the issue of forestry and the pressure for developing forestry in the high rainfall areas of South Australia—limited though they are—will increase. This issue will become more important not less important. The member for Finnis, I know, has similar issues on Kangaroo Island which will need to be addressed. The member for Heysen has it in the Adelaide Hills in her electorate, and, I assume, the member for MacKillop and others also have similar issues. They are

important issues and they need to be addressed thoroughly. We must get the science right before we commit to any more of these plantings. If we get the science right there can be a happy co-existence between rational forestry development and a continuing secure environment.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I support the words of my colleague the member for Enfield in his eloquent rendition of the committee's report.

Mrs Redmond: No poetry?

Mr PENGILLY: No poetry? No, I will not do that. I also suggest that the honourable member is wasted on the backbench. Indeed, he should be sitting down the front in a ministerial position. However, that is another thing. The issues the member for Enfield has gone through and the issues that have come out of the report into Deep Creek are absolutely critical. It is a first step in identifying just what is happening in the high rainfall areas in relation to the environment, creek flows, water and everything else. In fairness to it, the forestry industry is critical in South Australia; it has been for a long time and it does a marvellous job. However, when many of these areas of forest were planted 30 and 40 years ago no-one had any idea of the potential impacts, as well as the changes in climate, rainfall and everything else that occur in Australia. These forests were planted in the best interests and with the best intent, so we cannot be too critical of where they are but we must fix it up.

What has occurred at Deep Creek is a tragedy. It is just a disaster that the waters are not running down through the conservation park like they used to all year round. The environment and the plant and animal life have changed accordingly. I believe that the government should jump on these recommendations. It should do something about it, and not just leave it to gather dust in a corner somewhere. It needs to act on it. It needs to ensure for the future that, when they are planted, these forestry areas do not impact too much on watercourses, rivers and creeks which are so vital to the culture of the environment in those areas.

The member for Enfield raised forestry issues in other areas. I think that council planners at the local government level are struggling to come to grips with it. In my electorate alone the four councils all have different land uses and permissions in their planning processes for forestry. It varies everywhere, and what is happening is that the forestry companies are buying up highly productive, high rainfall country. We see people in areas overseas starving because they cannot grow food. Our agricultural areas are changing all the time. They are buying the best of the country. I could live with it if they were buying some of the sandier, low-producing country and putting in trees. I could live with that, but I cannot live with the fact that, in many cases, they are putting trees on country that can carry five and six dry sheep per acre, and things like that. I still talk in acres, because you get more land that way.

Issues such as that are so important. As we live in a world where the population is absolutely booming (it is growing and growing), these high rainfall areas, particularly in South Australia and Australia, will just be so important to food producing in the future. I urge the government to look closely at the report of the Natural Resources Committee and to assist local government to change the planning capacity so that it can deal with these things quickly and expeditiously and that, in the future, forestry is put in appropriate areas. That is, that it does not buy up highly productive agricultural land and take it out of existence for the next 20, 30, 40 years. How-

ever, at the same time, we have to have a forestry industry. There is a demand for timber, pulp and this and that. I think the blue gum issue has got right out of control. It concerns me greatly that some of the best areas have gone into blue gums. It has been a way for many farmers to get out of farming with decency and with a few dollars. They have been offered enormous amounts of money to procure their land and they can get out with some dignity, decency and a few dollars for their retirement, whereas, for so many years, many farmers have struggled along without much at the end of the day.

The matter of these forestry companies, many with overseas money, buying and procuring land primarily for blue gums needs to be addressed. I know my views are at variance with some in the federal sphere, but it is different when you have a patch close to home and you see people disappearing from communities. As the member for Enfield pointed out, this is having a great impact on communities. The people are just not there any more. Sometimes they live in houses that are falling into disrepair and other nefarious activities are taking place in relation to growing green plants because water is available. This is what is happening. Consequently, the social fabric is being damaged. Sports clubs, schools and progress associations suffer from the drop in numbers and it goes on and on. People just do not have neighbours.

Indeed, I was speaking to the member for Bragg's brother the other day, who has property on Kangaroo Island. They are surrounded by forestry. Once upon a time, the neighbours would tell you when one of your sheep or cattle was on the road, a tree had fallen over the fence, or whatever. That is not happening now because there are no neighbours—and the people who are living in the scrub growing nefarious products are not interested. They do not want to know about it. It is not a question of dudding the forestry industry at all: it is a question of getting it right now for the future and ensuring that rural communities continue to survive and, hopefully, have something at the end of it whereby they do have a social fabric. Schools survive. The old adage that farmers always look to marry a school teacher or a nurse is still there: it is in existence. I married a nurse, I might say, which is the best thing I ever did: it is the best returning paddock on the farm.

I strongly support the report of the Natural Resources Committee of the parliament under the chairmanship of the member for Enfield. I have enjoyed the visits of members of the committee to my electorate on two occasions. I urge the committee and government members to ask the government to take due notice of the report and put some planning in place for the future. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I support the committee's recommendations.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): One of the positive consequences of the parlous state of the River Murray and the drought that we have been experiencing throughout most of south-eastern Australia has been a renewed focus on water resources, the health of rivers and the need to regulate to ensure that we have a viable future in terms of this very basic natural resource. This particular matter at Deep Creek Conservation Park was a very interesting topic. I must say that the health of this water system was something that had not even entered my radar until we had the opportunity to consider the matter, hear anecdotal evidence from local residents spanning 20 or 30 years and to see with our own eyes the degradation of the watercourse.

I support everything said by the presiding member (member for Enfield). There are 10 recommendations and, as the honourable member said, there are a number of strong

recommendations for action from government departments and from the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board. I will mention two arising out of the evidence provided by Dr O'Loughlin, the hydrologist; the first is that Forestry SA remove portions of its Foggy Farm plantations to maintain permanent buffers in the hydrologically affected areas of between 20 and 100 metres either side of the Foggy Farm tributaries.

Debate adjourned.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June. Page 450.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): It is my pleasure to make a contribution in relation to the Appropriation Bill debate. At this stage, I will confine my remarks to the areas I cover in my shadow ministerial responsibilities. Unfortunately, I do not think that 20 minutes will be enough time to get through all the comments I want to make. In speaking earlier in the week, the leader referred to the budget as being one of debt, disappointment and delay. I have to say that, whilst the areas of the Attorney-General, justice, disability and ageing do not necessarily involve debt, they do involve a great deal of disappointment and, most especially, delay. In fact, the first topic I want to touch on relates to delays in the legal system generally.

In the media over the last few weeks, we have all been aware of an ongoing dispute between the Director of Public Prosecutions and this government. It saddens me greatly that someone with the integrity of the DPP is being forced to spend a great deal of his time defending himself and his office in order to get done the job the government hired him to do. The dispute over the last few weeks has been the issue of his request for a much needed amount of money. I do not know the sum the DPP requested in his submission, but I understand that he needs something in the order of \$3 million to get his office into a position where it can get rid of the backlog of cases.

One of the things this government does not seem to understand is that, whenever it changes the law by increasing a penalty as part of its 'tough on law and order' campaign, it almost inevitably results in longer time being spent on cases, with more people resisting guilty pleas and contesting their innocence, rather than simply pleading to a case, and this results in an inevitable increase in the workload of the DPP. Some weeks ago, we had the bizarre situation where the head of the Department of the Attorney-General and Justice (Jerome Maguire) actually wrote an email to the staff of the DPP's office which purportedly explained that the DPP did not deserve any more money because he had not spent what had been allocated to him for this year in the first place.

The reality of that circumstance turned out to be that, whilst an amount of money had been allocated specifically to engage extra staff, the very officer who sent the email had been part of what appears to have been a campaign to prevent the DPP from having the authority to engage the staff to get the work done. It seems to me pretty clearly that the Office of the DPP, which operates under a specific piece of legislation—a Director of Public Prosecutions Act of 1991—is authorised to administer and control his office. Indeed, section 6(3) of that act provides:

The director has the administration and control of the office.

Yet, in spite of that very clear provision, this government seems intent on preventing the director from actually administering and controlling his office and, having awarded money for the purpose of creating the extra staff and getting the staff that are needed to help deal with the backlog, they have then thwarted his attempts to actually engage the staff.

So, not surprisingly, the DPP then put up a submission to the government for the provision of the extra staff still needed, and he did that with good reason. He actually had done a comparison so that he could have the evidence as to why things seemed to be under such pressure and stress at the Office of the DPP. Quite apart from the difficulties created by the government in their ongoing fight with his office—and with him in particular—he found that the file load of the prosecutors working in that office are mostly more than double the file load of prosecutors in similar offices in other states. So, in this state, we have file loads of prosecutors commonly in the order of 50 to 100 files, and in other states prosecutors are expected to manage 15 to 25 files at a time.

I never hold myself out as being an expert in the criminal law; it was not an area that I was engaged in much when I was in practice. However, I do know that managing an increasing number of files is a very difficult and stressful thing. Indeed, people in the community are often surprised when I tell them that I actually find this job less stressful than operating as a legal practitioner because, when I was a legal practitioner in the civil jurisdiction, I would generally handle up to about 300 files at a time, and they ranged over a great variety of areas of work. So, they were not all just putting sausages through a machine—in the parlance that is sometimes used in the profession; they were varied files with different time limits, different jurisdictions, different things to be attended to. I would often wake up in the middle of the night when I was practising as a lawyer because I would suddenly think: have I filed a certain document on time; have I prepared something that I have to have ready on time; have I done this, have I done that? So, I can well imagine that these prosecutors in the Office of the DPP are struggling with file loads which, in some cases, could be up to four times what their counterparts in other states are having to deal with.

So, the DPP then put up a submission, but the Attorney-General, on his own admission, decided not to forward that submission to the Treasurer; hence we then had the Treasurer responding to a question during the budget lockup about whether any money was to be supplied to the Office of the DPP. The Treasurer responded: no, he did not ask for any. Well, of course, that was far from the truth. There had been quite a specific submission about extra funding, but it fell on deaf ears because the Attorney—who, of course, has never practised law—decided there was no merit in it and he would not pass that on to the Treasurer.

But, of course, it is not just the Office of the DPP that is causing the problems, and I know, because of several matters that have hit my desk, we have significant delays in the forensic science area where we are waiting for people to give us reports. As a consequence, it causes a great deal of distress to families who have often had no contact with anything in the legal sphere until a family member dies in unusual circumstances, and those circumstances are such that there will be some sort of forensic inquest or coroner's inquest, and there is a great deal of delay within that office, although I noted in the budget that there did seem to be a minor increase in the funding for that office.

However, I noticed also that there was no apparent money for any new courts in the city. Just this week I was talking to

a barrister in the criminal field who complained that increasingly there are occasions when he might have his work ready for running a trial that is expected to go for a week in one of our courts, only to find that the trial is abandoned, either because there is no courtroom in which to conduct the trial, or because there is no judge to hear the trial.

It is certainly the case that there have been significant delays in the Attorney-General's department with the appointment of judges and magistrates in order to help with part of the backlog. As I said, there is no money—apparent to me in the budget, anyway—for any work on courts in the city. In fact, I know that there are reports as to occupational health and safety issues surrounding some of our courtrooms, and it seems that none of these is being attended to.

In addition, of course, in the last week we have had the issue of people being held in remand. Our Attorney-General seems to think that it is a good idea for people to be held in remand for up to two and a half years, in spite of Justice Anderson in the Supreme Court indicating that perhaps it was not a good idea. In a media interview the Attorney seemed to misunderstand the nature of remand in that, in fact, it is meant for the short-term holding of people who are, under our system of law, presumed innocent until proven guilty. Notwithstanding that, the Attorney seems to think it is all right that, even though you are presumed innocent, you can spend two and a half years awaiting trial in remand.

There seems to be very little in this budget to comfort us concerning the lack of money and resources actually being applied to our legal systems. Indeed, I noted that there were reductions in the crime prevention program, the crime statistics program, and the justice portfolio program. In the first two of those programs the significant reduction seems to be in the number of staff, or at least in the cost of the staff. Assuming no-one's salary is going down, it therefore seems that the number of staff is being reduced in certain programs when there is clear pressure on the system and a need to be doing much more to address a whole range of issues concerning the operation of our entire court system. The Chief Justice has been complaining about this and has made public comments about it for a couple of years now. There is no doubt that this government is failing to address that issue.

I could go on about that, but I note that I am halfway through my time. I want to make rather a lot of comments about problems in the disability sector, where this government has taken a path which I think is exactly the wrong path. The government could be described as favouring bureaucracy, centralisation and enforced community living regardless of people's preferences and regardless of the worth of the NGOs who have until now done a lot of great work in our communities. Indeed, in the last week or so I recall—I think during the debate on the Julia Farr Services (Trusts) Bill—that the minister referred to these parent groups in what I felt was a most derogatory way. His perception, I am sure, is that the NGOs are largely parent-run organisations which are inadequate.

The reality is that a lot of these NGOs may have indeed started out as parent groups, where groups of parents had the commonality of a child with a particular disability. Over a period of years they developed expertise and, really, with funding that amounted to the smell of an oily rag they managed to run a service which was extremely helpful for a range of people in the community who had children with particular disabilities. But, this government seems intent upon getting rid of NGOs and bringing everything into the disability sector. Of course, the government has quite

famously, over the last 12 months, managed to dismantle the intellectual disability services council, the independent living centre, the Julia Farr Services, and has defunded various other things. What worries me is that what is happening is that the government is creating a huge bureaucracy. Over 50 per cent of its announced funding increases are, in fact, salary increases. As I have mentioned before in this house, I am sure that I saw a figure somewhere to the effect that from 42 we have now gone up to 67 bureaucrats within that department who are earning over \$100 000 a year.

To give just one example, in the area of advocacy and information services the budget has been reduced from \$1.3 million to only \$550 000. More than half the budget has disappeared, with \$750 000 being taken out. I would like to refer to a couple of letters about that which I have received in the last couple of days. In fact one of the letters comes from an organisation and, while I will not refer to all the organisations, if you look at the minister's own press release of 7 June this year entitled, 'Waiting list for disability equipment cleared' (which I will come to in a minute), we find this little announcement being made in the very last bit of it:

The budget for non-government advocacy and information groups will be cut from \$1.3 million to \$550 000. The agencies affected are: Disability Information Resource Centre, the Brain Injury Network of SA, Family Advocacy, the Arthritis Foundation, Down Syndrome Society of SA, Muscular Dystrophy Association, Anglican Community Care, Physical and Neurological Council of SA, Deaf SA, and the Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association of SA Inc [I think that is now known as ParaQuad].

So the minister admits to having made those deductions. I would like to refer to just one of the letters I have received on this, which indicates that there are significant problems. In particular:

OUR VOICE SA (Self Advocacy for People with Intellectual Disabilities) has been taken over by Disability SA workers [that is, it has gone into the department, into the bureaucracy]. All the support for them will come from public servants. Hence the members of the OUR VOICE SA will be careful about what they are saying in the future. Further, their website and two training programs for people with intellectual disabilities (consumer rep and peer mentor training) will be dismantled because it was on the enablenet website, which has just been defunded. The training courses and the website were funded through a grant of the Department of Premier and Cabinet only last year and had been finalised on the website since October.

How dumb is that? We only finalised it in October and now this minister has completely defunded it. The letter goes on:

It really is a scandal to argue that \$750 000 had to be taken from the community sector in order to pay for services on the ground, when of the newly announced money (\$45 million) only just \$10 million is dedicated to extra services.

This lady goes on to say:

Hope you are getting something out of my cynical communication. The situation has never been as bad before, and the silencing of protest has never been as bad as it is now. People are really scared to lose what they have, so they do not speak up.

Another letter I received on the same topic makes similar comments. I want to quickly touch on this wonderful media release, issued by the minister on Thursday 7 June, in which he says that waiting lists for disability equipment will be cleared. Strangely enough, on 21 December 2004 he also issued a media release headed, 'Disability equipment waiting lists to be cleared'. I did a little compare and contrast between what he said in 2004 and what he said in 2007, and I found that in 2004 he said that there were 750 adults then awaiting equipment, while in 2007 he said there were 1 000 people

currently awaiting equipment. That it has gone up is not surprising; clearly he did not spend the money.

In 2004 the minister said there was \$5.9 million in one-off funding to be put into this sector to clear the equipment waiting lists, then in 2007 there was \$5.7 million in one-off funding to go into the equipment waiting list. In 2004 it comprised \$850 000 for Novita (it is \$2.37 million for Novita this year), \$150 000 for CanDo4Kids (\$300 000 this year), \$4.2 million in 2004 to provide 600 adults on waiting lists 804 pieces of equipment including wheelchairs, mobility aids and home modifications (this time \$100 000 for technical aid for the disabled), and \$2.92 million to pay for equipment to help hundreds of adults leaving hospital and those who need new wheelchairs or other equipment to be safe at home. Also included in the previous list was money for extra occupational therapists, and \$200 000 for the Royal Society for the Blind.

There are two points to be made about this. First, it is clear that the money announced in 2004 was not spent and did not, in fact, clear the waiting lists. The second point is that, in any event, this government still fails to understand that it is no good putting in one-off funding in the disability sector, nor is it sufficient to simply put in CPI increases. The sector is expanding. We need more money in there every year as the base capital and we need to grow that every year at CPI, at least, otherwise we will never catch up. The disability sector falls sadly behind the equivalents in every other state. This state should hang its head in shame, yet this government keeps pretending to be doing something to assist this sector.

I remember that, when the government previously announced its \$93 million to the disability sector, it turned out that \$25 million was one-off funding and \$32 million was into the transport and education departments, which left only \$36 million over four years—or \$9 million a year—which is simply an inadequate growth in the disability sector. We will never solve the problem unless the government puts some real money into the sector.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like to begin by saying that I believe this budget is quite a sound one. Of course, every budget will disappoint someone, and there are some aspects with respect to which I would like to see priorities changed. The first issue I would like to raise is the fundamental one of whether an annual budget is really the most appropriate way, in this day and age, for financial matters to be conveyed and announced to the parliament and to the community. I say that because we have this great build-up to the budget (and I know we have a half-yearly budget review); we have what I would call this 'budget orgasm', where we all get excited about the budget, and proposals are outlined for spending, and so on.

However, we do not really get with that document (or elsewhere) any sound basis for comparing what has happened in the recent past. Members might say that during estimates one can troll back and look at what has happened in the past and make comparisons, but the budget really comes out as a statement of today, in part, and I guess promises for tomorrow and into the future. However, it does not really deal with issues such as efficiency and effectiveness, in the sense that it is very difficult to judge whether or not we are receiving value for money, in terms of what is being provided or allocated in the budget.

Members might say, 'Well, the Auditor-General would deal with that.' Unfortunately, the Auditor-General tradition-

ally has not done so. Looking at the budget, it is impossible to know what money allocated to the police, for example, will result in, in terms of front-line policing and police out on the beat, and how many nurses in wards will result from the budget. I ask the Treasurer to consider whether or not it is time to look at a different format in relation to how financial matters are presented and whether or not, in this century, we should be looking at a different approach in terms of how we state our finances and the promise of what is to come.

In terms of specifics, I welcome the payroll tax reductions. I think the government has done the right thing there. I note that a comparison was made with Victoria, and that we had to follow or at least be in step with Victoria. I do not think that one would want to argue with that; it is fairly sound approach. We all know, and we have said, that payroll tax is a tax on employment and we need to get rid of it. The reality is: what do you replace that income stream with if you get rid of payroll tax? I am sure every member here would like to see payroll tax go, and maybe one day it will, but what has been done in this budget I think is a good first step.

In relation to water, which has been very topical and a very important issue, criticism has been made that the budget does not really come to terms with that issue. I guess, in fairness, we could argue that it has really only become an issue of concern in recent time, and one would hope the government will gear up with a greater focus, for example, on using urban stormwater and reusing grey water and so on in a way which is not currently reflected by expenditure announcements in this budget. I think we could do a lot more, particularly in the Adelaide metropolitan area, in terms of reuse of stormwater and making greater use of the aquifer which we are blessed with in this part of Australia. But I do not see much evidence of that in the budget, or any indication that it is on the radar of the government. I hope it will be.

Provision is made for a study relating to Mount Bold reservoir. I think the government needs to be very careful in relation to that, because the area of Mount Bold behind the spillway contains some of the most pristine habitat in the high rainfall area of the state. I think, if the government goes down the path of destroying that by flooding it, it will bring upon itself tremendous environmental wrath, not just locally but also from further afield. I personally cannot see how you can increase the capacity of Mount Bold greatly without destroying that pristine environment. It is one of the ironies, and it was probably not intended, that SA Water and its predecessors have been amongst the best conservers of native vegetation in this state because they have protected the buffer zones around the reservoirs and, in so doing, they have helped protect what little is left of our remnant native vegetation. So, I urge the government to rethink any proposal which would permanently destroy and damage that rare vegetation and native habitat to the east of the spillway at Mount Bold.

On the question of the hospital, I do not have a problem with calling it after our much-loved Governor. I would have thought the normal practice was to name a wing of a hospital after someone such as the Governor, but I do not have a problem with calling it the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital. I think the location has a lot of good aspects. I am not sure whether the government has looked at all the ramifications, including the impact on the medical school, the dental hospital, the IMVS and the nursing facility, recently provided by the University of Adelaide. I would hope that those issues have been looked at and they will be properly addressed, because it is going to be difficult if we have the medical

school (less so for the dental hospital) some considerable distance from the new hospital.

I understand that the government will relocate the railcars to the end of the suburban lines. It currently does that at Belair for the Belair line, anyway, but the bigger issue will be where they relocate the railway workshops. I suspect the cost of that will be significant and, hopefully, it has been factored in. Those workshops would be very expensive to replicate, and I imagine nothing under \$100 million would be needed to provide maintenance workshops. But, in any event—and, hopefully, this will be in a future budget—if the government moves to a light rail system (an electric rail system, standardised), one would hope that any move to relocate that railway workshop and the storage of railcars was compatible with a new light rail electric system. One would hope that was the case.

I applaud the government for putting money aside to improve the track on the Belair and Noarlunga lines. I was hoping there would be money in this budget for an indication of a commitment to a standardised light rail network, but I guess it is a question of fixing the basics first. I have spoken with the Minister for Transport and, as I understand it, any upgrade of the sleepers, etc. on those lines will allow for easy conversion to standard track should that happen in the future. It is necessary expenditure. It is part of an infrastructure commitment that should have been given and brought to fruition many years ago. It needs to happen but, unfortunately, it looks like the light rail system will be in the next budget.

I was pleased to see the provision for an MFS station to serve the southern area, around Seaford-Aldinga. That has been a deficiency for quite a while. As I have already said in this place on a previous occasion, I think the whole question of MFS coverage needs to be looked at, not only in some of the CFS areas in the Adelaide Hills but in relation to what I would call some MFS black spots in the metropolitan area. I trust the minister will have a look at that, but the provision of a new station at Seaford is certainly welcome.

There is a lot of money in the budget for health. In fact, you could spend all the budget on health and never satisfy everyone. You never will satisfy everyone. We hear people say, 'Spend the money on health to the exclusion of other things.' That is not sensible or possible. What I will counsel the government on, though, is to be careful about creating a bureaucratic system to manage health which does not improve and add to health services per se.

The government needs to be very careful that it not fall into the trap of creating a health bureaucracy which does nothing for the health of the community but only creates some highly-paid positions for people in administration. I think there is some evidence already that perhaps the government has let the reins go a bit loose in relation to some sections of the Public Service. I have never bagged the Public Service because I think, in the main, they are fantastic and dedicated people, but that is not to say that you should not have a Public Service which is efficient and effective.

There is a case for having a look at the bureaucracy being decentralised, more localised, with more authority given to local units to do their task, rather than have giant bureaucratic structures based in the city. I think that is something that DECS could well look at, because I think they have fallen into the trap of overcentralisation. I believe people should be allowed to get on with their job. We should trust staff to be given a task and then let them do it and not strangle them with too much centralised bureaucracy.

I have argued for a long time that our state school system has, unfortunately, been discriminated against—I think by the federal government, in particular. The federal government argues that it is the responsibility of state governments to fund state schools, and that is true to a certain extent, but the proof is in the eating and, if you look around, you will see that nearly every private school has been able to engage in significant capital works in recent times, including providing swimming pools and meeting halls, etc.

I would like to see the state government continue to increase funding for state schools because we still have some state schools where children are in temporary classrooms and unsatisfactory accommodation and as a priority we need to get rid of those substandard facilities and ensure that all children, whether in a private or a state school, have access to the same quality buildings and resources so that we do not have, in effect, a two-tiered system of education in this state.

The government is clearly committed to having more prisons and, if you have a policy that will result in incarceration, then you will need more prisons. I urge the government to look at the alternatives. We know that we have to lock up certain people because they are a threat to the community and that you have to punish people, but from my observation prisons achieve very little and the little they do achieve is at great cost. We need to look at mechanisms to change behaviour, and that is more likely to happen with a lateral thinking approach that would involve environmental work camps. Most of the people in prison are not likely to be a threat to the community.

Mr Hanna: Boot camps.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I don't support boot camps—

Mr Hanna: Gum boots.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: As long as they're wearing gum boots, that's fine. I do not support boot camps, marching around in ever diminishing circles—I think it is ridiculous. You have to change the mindset of these people, many of whom are illiterate, and you need to change their behaviour and confront them in a way that allows them to think about where they are going and what they have done, but you also have to get them into a routine of meaningful activity and employment, doing meaningful tasks.

Rather than spending hundreds of millions of dollars on prisons in a conventional sense, some of that extra money could be well spent on purchasing some properties in the rural area and getting people who are no real threat to the community to actually engage in community work and attend sessions at night where you might be able to improve their literacy and numeracy and change their attitude. More of the same by way of conventional prisons with cages will not change anything or do anyone any good, least of all the community.

In regard to the environment overall, whilst it has not had a lot of publicity, minister Gago has done some very good things in relation to creating some additional conservation areas, but the government itself in its planning laws and general policies and funding has to be careful that it does not slip into what might be seen as an anti-environmental approach. Sure, we need employment and activity in South Australia, but it should not be at the expense of the environment.

I fear that this government is latching too strongly onto a 'development at any cost' approach and sacrificing the environment in doing so. It is a dangerous course, one that takes it well away from the traditional Labor approach, where the Labor Party (to its credit) has done a lot of good things

environmentally. You only have to look at what Don Dunstan and Don Hopgood did to realise that there is a risk of the Labor tradition of being focused on the environment slipping away because of a misguided view that somehow we have to turn Adelaide into a version of Hong Kong or Singapore—and that is not something we want.

Apart from some small provision, this budget does not show much by way of financial commitment to the environment. You can have all the talk in the world and you can have all the statements in the world, but at the end of the day you have to match it by putting in some dollars to actually carry out environmental protection and proper environmental management, including the provision of appropriate conservation areas throughout the state.

The government has to be careful that it does not get seduced by the big end of town and the chummy-chummy talk of people whose interest is really their own pocket and not necessarily that of the state or the wider community. At the end of the day, economics and ecology should be seen as part and parcel of the same thing. As I have said in here before, they both derive from the greek word *oikos* meaning house or housekeeping, and good economics is good ecology and vice versa.

Overall, I would not call this budget sexy and I would not call it exciting, but I am sure the government has a few dollars up its sleeve as we get closer to the next election. I think overall it is a sound approach, but I come back to the first point. I question whether the big bang budget is really the way to go in this day and age and whether or not, with the time frames and so on that extend way out into the years ahead, we need a different approach to providing better and sound management of the finances of this state.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): This is my response to the 2007 budget. The key issue I want to address is the impact on our public schools. After this budget the Minister for Education can no longer keep telling us that state schools are getting more funding than ever. The Premier no longer has the right to call himself an education premier—more like a schools tax premier. Over the past 12 months we have already had threats to the instrumental music program, the aquatic program and other issues. Now, the biggest impact of all on school funding is the proposal to shift WorkCover costs and management to schools.

The proposal is to have schools pay 1 per cent of the salaries for teachers out of the local school budget. This is going to have an enormous impact. I have heard figures, for example, of my local high school needing to find an extra \$150 000 to cope with this measure. I have heard of a number of primary schools come up with figures of around \$30 000—a lot for a primary school. Most importantly, this means a real impact on the education of our children in public schools.

I have spoken with one primary school, but I am not sure they would wish to be named for fear of retribution. However, one of the officials from one of my local primary schools has given some examples. The sorts of things that will need to be looked at if this harsh WorkCover funding proposal goes forward is the dismissal of IT and SSO support staff. So, once again, those people who take the load off teachers and provide specialist advice and support are going to be in the firing line. Some of these people provide specialist computer training to our children, some provide reading for those who are less well off intellectually than others and some provide administrative support for teachers

who are already overloaded with the administrative load they have to bear in addition to their teaching time.

Another example that was provided to me of the potential impact of this WorkCover funding move is in relation to equipment in the school. One school has been fitting interactive whiteboards as a teaching tool in classrooms—that will have to stop. The other example that was given to me by a particular school was the two computers in the school library breaking down last week. If this happens in a year, they would not be able to be replaced because there will be absolutely nothing in the threadbare budget after allowance is made for WorkCover payments. There is also the issue of the TRTs, essentially the replacement teachers. If the TRT budget is exceeded for a particular school, then the school obviously would be faced with paying replacement teachers' wages. Power and water bills are already a problem in many schools.

The P21 reforms were said to be of great benefit to schools. They would enable schools to switch off lights at 4 p.m. and save any money they could from being frugal with electricity and water. The reality is that power and water bills have gone up so much since that time that they have become a significant item in school budgets. One of the suggestions that was discussed recently at one of my local schools was that perhaps the airconditioning should be put on only if the temperature exceeds 30°, and the heater should be put on only if it drops to under 10°. That is the sort of efficiency measure or frugality that is being forced upon schools by the threat of making them pay WorkCover fees. The end result is not just discomfort and distraction from teaching for students but, potentially, ill-health effects.

Let us look at how schools might cope if they have to pay 1 per cent of teachers' salaries in WorkCover levies. If they cannot cut any more than they already have, then they would be looking at drawing more fees from parents in the community. Some of the schools in my area have significant School Card representation among the parent community. So that means in order to achieve a 10 per cent rise in school fee income, something like a 20 per cent increase in fees might be necessary for those parents who are not eligible for School Card. If that sort of proposal was put to parents, many of them just would not pay. They would not be able to pay and they would not want to pay. In summary, this move to cut funding from schools is politically stupid. Perhaps it represents a degree of arrogance that the Labor government has reached after five years in office. It is incredible that it thinks that it could get away with taking this amount of money off schools and having either a cut in the quality of education delivered in our public schools or a very significant additional impost on the parent community. Mike Rann and Jane Lomax-Smith should be ashamed of this proposal.

I make one final comment about the education budget. As best I can work out from the budget document—which is difficult to read—approximately one-third of the budget does not go to schools. That is an astounding fact in itself. One-third of the education budget does not go to schools; in other words, it goes to district centres and the headquarters bureaucracy in Flinders Street. It is spent on a wide range of things. No doubt we need policy development and people to look after the accounting, the insurance and the nuts and bolts that keeps the whole system going, but it is staggering to think that the bureaucracy payments have blown out to one-third of the education budget. I say to the Minister for Education and Children's Services and the Premier on behalf of my community: look at cutting money from the education

department bureaucracy rather than taking it out of schools themselves. They are forcing a drastic impact on the quality of education in our public schools. That is shameful, especially coming from a Labor government.

I turn to the issue of WorkCover. It has been in the news this year, with the apparently ever-increasing liability problem, usually tagged as a blow-out in our media. First, I want to say something about the mechanics. I give credit to Dr Kevin Purse, whose report was released late last week in relation to the WorkCover problem. He points out that the way in which the calculation of liability is generally done in the media is quite misleading. Of course, the unfunded liability refers to the amount WorkCover or its agents might have to pay if every injured worker had to be paid for medical and income expenses and so on through the life of every existing claim. Dr Purse suggests that a better calculation might be the funding ratio: in other words, the value of total assets as a percentage of total estimated liabilities. After all, if you were looking at the health of a public company, you would not just look at its liabilities and say that it is a healthy company, or that it is an unhealthy company. That would be a really stupid approach.

Of course, you would look at the assets as well as the liabilities to get a better idea of the financial health of the company. It is the same with WorkCover. The figures Dr Purse has calculated are as follows: WorkCover was 65 per cent funded in 2005-06 financial year compared with 63.4 per cent the previous year. That is not a large improvement but, nonetheless, it is an improvement, yet we have all the doomsayers talking about the increasing bottom line of liability, and that in itself is misleading.

The other thing I want to point out is the two critical assumptions that underpin liability estimates, that is, the claims inflation rate and the discount rate. These items are based on very delicate assumptions, and the slightest change to those assumptions (for example, the minor variation to the assumed rate of return on investments) can lead to a very drastic reduction in the outstanding liability figure, potentially by hundreds of millions of dollars. I do not go along with the scare campaign the government, the opposition and the media, not to mention the employers group, have been pursuing and fostering. However, there is a problem, which I think is the result of years of mismanagement and neglect of the core issues of getting workers returned to work or off the system. Not only do the staff and management of WorkCover have some responsibility to bear but, of course, the minister also bears a heavy responsibility, particularly over the last five years of the Labor government—more so because the Stanley report, which was published some five years ago now, showed a way forward for the government, yet that report has been gathering dust.

It seems that the Labor government approach to WorkCover has been very much a hands-off policy, and that has led us to talk of a crisis. No doubt, the Labor government will come back next year with talk of raising the employer levy and also cutting benefits to injured workers. The payroll reduction this year is not going to win the government a cracker of favour from employer groups when the Labor government comes back next year to talk about increased levies for WorkCover. Dr Purse's report points out a couple of ways of getting WorkCover back on track, namely, that a better approach to redemptions and rehabilitation is the way to go, and I entirely agree. We would not be in the situation we are in now if a better approach had been taken to these issues years ago. There will no doubt be further discussion

about WorkCover when the report commissioned by the Labor government comes back after the federal election. Something tells me we are not meant to debate it until after that event.

I turn to the topic of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The important thing here is to take the issue of personalities out of the debate. This is not about Stephen Pallaras, Kevin Foley or Michael Atkinson: it is about how well that office is able to do its job of prosecuting criminals with the amount of money it is getting from the government. I was truly shocked to hear the DPP on Leon Byner's program on FIVEaa on 14 June describe how the office had been diddled financially. The Treasurer, in his previous budget, had allocated money for the hiring of additional prosecutors. On paper that sounded very good, but then the process was taken out of the hands of the DPP and handed to the chief executive of the department. The end result of the recruitment process was that only one additional appointment of a prosecutor took place. That is truly shocking.

In other words, the government gets the press release and the kudos of allocating extra funding for more prosecutors (it thrives on that; it says that it is tough on fighting crime), but at the same time it is choking off the allocation of that funding so that, in fact, it is not delivered where it is needed. The DPP's opinion is that an additional 30 prosecutors are really needed to cope with their workload. I know from discussions with prosecutors informally of the incredible stress they are under. They work a damn sight harder than most people in this place, I will say that.

Just to give an example of the sort of suffering that arises when the DPP's office is neglected, the DPP had specifically asked for additional funding to cover the number of cases arising out of Commissioner Mullighan's inquiry into the abuse of children who were wards of the state. Now, there is not funding to do that. In other words, when someone is named in the Mullighan inquiry and someone is advised by police that they will be charged with an offence of child abuse from 30 years ago, the victim is there wishing finally to see justice. However, that case will sit. Unless the victim is fortunate enough to have an accused person who pleads guilty in the case (and there are some examples of that), the victim will be in the situation of waiting for a year or two before the trial can get into the courtroom, and that is an appalling experience to put witnesses through.

Apparently, it is a price that Mike Rann, Mick Atkinson and Kevin Foley are prepared to pay for the sake of winning what they perceive as a personal spat with Stephen Pallaras, the DPP. This particular spat and the efforts to bring the DPP into line with government thinking reminds me of a word that was used in the 1930s in Germany. There was a consistent effort by the Nazi Party when it was in power to get everyone in every facet of life thinking the same way it did—in sporting clubs, cultural institutions, legal institutions, economic institutions and so on. It is interesting that we have seen that sort of pressure on the media, on non-government organisations in the community and even on the DPP in our state at this time. Incidentally, the word is 'gleichschaltung', meaning everything running the same way, a word originally applied to electrical circuitry.

While on the subject of justice, I submit that there ought to be a lot more money for restorative justice measures whereby, in our higher courts, victims and the accused can get together in an appropriate setting where everyone wishes that to take place to allow both healing and understanding. It

is a sadly neglected area in our criminal justice system. I conclude my remarks as my time has expired.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

DEFENCE CONTRACTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Today the federal government has announced its decision to award the air warfare destroyer design contract to the Spanish company Navantia. This government is delighted for several reasons. Firstly, it signals the official green light for a major \$374 million investment by this state government in the Techport Australia site at Osborne. Navantia is also to be congratulated not only for this contract but for winning a second contract, a design contract, for the \$3 billion amphibious ships, which is also a very significant decision for South Australia. I am very pleased to advise the house that the majority of the combat system design and integration work for the second contract, the amphibious ships, will also take place here in Adelaide. This work is worth an extra \$100 million for the South Australian economy. It consolidates South Australia as the centre for naval shipbuilding expertise in Australia.

I would also like to announce that the government is investing \$31.4 million in building the new air warfare destroyer systems centre at the Techport facility at the Port. This new custom-built air warfare destroyer systems centre will accommodate defence and industry companies working together to bring the successful ship design to life. The centre, established in 2005, is currently situated at Felixstow and has already created more than 300 new high-end jobs, including naval architects, warship designers, systems and system integration engineers and project managers. It will relocate to its new Techport Australia premises (worth more than \$30 million) in the first half of 2009.

I should say that winning the systems centre—we beat Victoria to win the air warfare destroyers contract, the biggest contract in Australian history—was a separate bid in which we were up against Sydney and again won; in fact, in some ways, it was an even harder bid to win. Preliminary building works have already begun at Techport to build the Maritime Skills Centre, while a total of more than \$60 million in contracts has been let for work on site. We were able to see some of the remediation work at Techport today. Today's announcement will give the go ahead to ramp up development of 35 hectares of land for subcontracting companies to establish their operations.

The federal defence minister, Brendan Nelson, has revealed today that the 15-year air warfare destroyer project will now be worth nearly \$8 billion, making Adelaide home to Australia's largest defence contract in history. Contrary to some views, Dr Nelson said today that work conducted by the Air Warfare Destroyer Alliance was able to determine little difference in the level of Australian industry involvement between the two options. The government understands that the decision to award the contract for a smaller Navantia air warfare destroyer design could lead to a fourth ship being built here—a move this government will strongly support. We will lobby strongly for a fourth air warfare destroyer to

be built here in South Australia—four air warfare destroyers, rather than three.

The government's vision to build Techport Australia around the air warfare destroyer project and attract leading defence companies from around the world to Adelaide helps fulfil the objectives we set ourselves in the state's defence sector plan. This government also aims to double the defence sector's contribution to gross state product to \$2 billion within 10 years. Our aim now is to build on that momentum and bring more of the industry and jobs into our state and to achieve our target of increasing South Australia's defence work force from 16 000 to 28 000 jobs within 10 years.

The air warfare destroyer project will help transform the South Australian economy, with around 4 000 direct and indirect jobs to be created, and it will give us the skills and capabilities to attract future naval and defence projects. To get as many local contractors as possible involved in the project, Techport Australia has launched a supplier registration portal and is encouraging local companies to actively pursue the opportunities that this massive project is providing. Contractors interested in exploring opportunities for work associated with the Techport Australia infrastructure can log onto the Techport Australia website.

South Australia has won more than \$10 billion in defence contracts in the past two years, and it is clear that this state is now the centre of Australia's defence industry. Another of the major defence projects we have won is the increased Army presence in Adelaide. I have to say that I love this theory that these would have happened anyway. Tell that to the Victorians! From 2011, Adelaide will become home to the 7th Mechanised Battalion and its ancillary support. This means that 1 200 soldiers and their families will be stationed at Edinburgh in northern Adelaide.

This is a new announcement: today, the Minister for Infrastructure announced the release of 28 hectares of land at Blakeview, with up to 100 blocks to be made available to Defence Housing Australia for the housing of battalion members and their families. This is part of the agreement made in April to provide up to 500 defence homes—500 Defence homes to be built—in the northern suburbs. We are looking to attract additional high-tech elements of the Army and other defence forces to Edinburgh. I would like to see the integration of other aspects of the Australian Defence Force, such as signals and intelligence capabilities, also at the Edinburgh site.

We are determined to expand the Edinburgh defence base into a complete centre of excellence for the entire Australian Defence Force. I was very pleased to go down and welcome a ship of the Spanish Armada to Adelaide, and we look forward to their being built here in South Australia.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I bring up the 62nd report of the committee on Local Government Audit and Oversight.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Minister for Energy (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Australian Energy Market Commission—Report 2005-06.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I bring up the 269th report of the committee on the Mawson Institute of Advanced Manufacturing.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I bring up the fourth report of the committee.

Report received.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER: I draw to honourable members' attention the presence in the chamber today of international students from the University of Adelaide, who are guests of the member for Adelaide.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL BUDGETS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. How many Labor backbenchers have indicated to him that they are concerned about losing their seats as a result of the government's forcing WorkCover charges and budget cuts onto public schools, and is the member for Bright among them?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): The answer is none.
Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We had a good day yesterday; let us not spoil it.

HEALTH CARE

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Health. What support has there been for South Australia's Health Care Plan?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Napier for the question. Two weeks ago today the government released its plan for public health for the next decade—the South Australian Health Care Plan. Since that time, I have been grateful for the support of many members of the public and many members from the health care sector. I am delighted that the AMA gave its support for the new health care infrastructure at its recent council meeting. The current president, Dr Peter Ford, also told readers of *The Advertiser* on 9 June:

[The government] has recognised the need to invest in SA's health system for the future. It did so with the commitment by the government to significant capital investment in our public hospital system, importantly through a new replacement hospital for the Royal Adelaide, the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital.

Again, it states:

This has required boldness and long-term vision on the part of the government. While the hospital project is iconic, the AMA is pleased that the building is part of a long-term integrated strategic plan for reform of health.

The University of Adelaide, a key partner of our public hospitals, has also supported our plan. Professor Justin Beilby, the dean of the medical school, said in a media release:

The new Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital gives our Medical School a unique opportunity to provide improved world-class

facilities to students, in addition to the quality education they already receive.

Ian Yates, from the Council for the Ageing, said the initiatives—

... are extremely welcome, and there is going to be much more than a new hospital—it is going to be an integrated system that allows us to plan in a coherent way.

I was also delighted to receive a letter from Willis Marshall, who is the Surgical Clinical Director at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Professor Marshall said:

This is the first time I can recall that there has been a comprehensive plan for the future of health care in South Australia. I will do everything I can to help implement the change program which has been long overdue but is now thankfully in place and we can work towards an effective patient focused health system over the next decade.

A key part of our plan is a new structure for delineating services across the state. This follows from recommendation 3.14 of the Generational Health Review, which called for the development of the service delineation guidelines. Yesterday, I was very appreciative of some strong support from an unlikely ally. The Leader of the Opposition on FIVEaa yesterday said: 'Certainly we need to rationalise surgical services. . . ' I will quote that again: 'Certainly we need to rationalise surgical services'—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: And he says, 'It's true,' today. I would like to publicly thank the Leader of the Opposition for the spirit of bipartisanship about the government's plan for the delineation of public health sector services. I now call on the opposition to extend this new-found bipartisanship and support the building of the new hospital.

HEALTH CARE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):

My question is again to the Premier. How many representations has he received from Labor MPs whose electorates surround the Queen Elizabeth, Modbury and Repatriation hospitals about concerns from their constituents regarding his government's plans to cut services at these hospitals and, if so, what concerns, if any, have these local MPs raised with him?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): What we have received is great enthusiasm for the biggest investment in health in this state's history. And let us compare the difference: \$1 billion more a year spent by this government on health compared to them. On Friday last week I was in Port Augusta, in the electorate of the member for Stuart, a person for whom I have enormous regard, the best member on that side of parliament—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, make him leader. They should have done it years ago. It was put to me about cuts to rural health by this government: \$180 million more on country health under this government, I am told, than under the previous government. And that is the difference. The greatest difference between both sides of politics on the issue of health—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: And I am sure that members opposite want to hear me courteously; they do not want to get written up as being discourteous in any way. I remember all those eight budget replies as leader of the opposition. Where were the then premier and the treasurer? They were never

there. I wondered whether they were busy; I do not know. I never saw it written about, not even by the chief of staff at the time. But never mind; that is another issue.

I guess the point is that the big, big difference between us on health is that their only solution was to cut beds and privatise. What have we done? We have put more beds into the metropolitan system, with more to come, and we have even deprivatised one that they took away from us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WORLD POLICE AND FIRE GAMES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What benefits did the 2007 World Police and Fire Games bring to South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. She will have remembered the excitement about what was, indeed, the biggest party that has ever hit town. About 11 000 international and interstate competitors and visitors came to South Australia to be part of the 2007 World Police and Fire Games. They stayed, on average, 11.2 nights. Some 66 per cent of the visitors were from overseas, which was a huge boost to our profile in our key international tourism markets. They represented almost 60 countries (including the USA, Canada, Spain, UK, Hong Kong, China, Sweden and Venezuela), with competitors taking part in 79 events over 10 days.

Adelaide embraced the really vibrant feel throughout the town, where the streets were full of young men and women with their red uniforms and backpacks. They were easily recognisable and were filling every bar, pub, restaurant, nightclub, cafe and shop. The experience for locals was rather exciting because our streets were full and, certainly, it was a once-in-a-lifetime experience for our own firefighters, law enforcement officers, correctional services officers and customs officers who were competing in events with their colleagues from around the world. Particularly exciting were the ice hockey, soccer and track and field events and, of course, some of the unusual events such as tug-of-war.

Those who travelled to South Australia for the games enjoyed staying at our hotels and enjoyed our relaxed lifestyle, climate and our extraordinary hospitality which was shown to the visitors. The visitors, in fact, produced a 93 per cent bed occupancy level in South Australia, just about the heaviest bookings known to history. In addition, many of them explored the Barossa Valley, Kangaroo Island, the Limestone Coast and Eyre Peninsula. The World Police and Fire Games office, in fact, booked over 1 800 intrastate tours to the regions and, of course, many were booked directly by the visitors through other operators. We guessed through our survey and modelling—I should not say 'guess' because it was through very accurate modelling and data collection—that 123 200 bed nights were booked in accommodation through the metropolitan area during the games. The economic impact for South Australia was \$32.4 million.

In addition to the World Police and Fire Games, South Australia has successfully bid for a range of events in the future. These will be mass participation events, some of them geared to occur just before the Olympic Games and all of them producing, we expect, massive international visitation. In particular, I should tell the house we will be welcoming the UCI BMX SuperCross in 2008 and the 2009 BMX World Championships just before the event goes to the Olympic

Games; the 2010 Special Olympic National Games; the 2008 and 2010 School Aerobics National Championships; the 2008, 2010 and 2012 Inline Hockey Championships; and, one really to put in your diary because it will be very exciting, the 2012 World Lawn Bowls Championship.

This government's investment in major events has been a significant contributing factor in South Australia's growth in the international and domestic tourism market. We will continue to strategically invest in these games and events, particularly the mass participation events that bring people to South Australia in our quieter months. I hope members put those dates in their diaries.

HEALTH CARE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition):

What is the Premier's response to the views expressed publicly by Mr John Horowitz, Professor of Cardiology at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, that the government's new 'centralist health plan' was not properly consulted and was developed by his government as a 'fascist exercise' which, in the case of the QEH, will be 'very damaging, fundamentally untenable, and will drive medical staff away from the QEH and South Australia'?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for the question. I am prepared to stand here and acknowledge that not 100 per cent of the medical profession supports our Health Care Plan. The overwhelming majority do, as I indicated in my comments earlier.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: If the honourable member wants to ask me questions, he should go ahead, but he should ask them in a series rather than all at the one time. It is hard to deal with all the disparate issues at the one time. I did not hear directly what Professor Horowitz said this morning. Needless to say, I do not agree with his analysis of the situation. The plans which we have in place to develop an integrated health care—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The plans that we have in place will provide for South Australia an integrated health care service, which will be safe, affordable and of high quality, so that we can ensure that, as we move into the future, South Australians will have access to the very best health care. One of the things I did hear Professor Horowitz say—because I got out of the car part-way through his comments—was that we needed more health care services in the northern suburbs. That is precisely what we are trying to do through this Health Care Plan. We are introducing a tertiary hospital in the northern suburbs. We are upgrading substantially the Lyell McEwin Hospital to provide services—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, I say to members of the opposition who keep asking these questions: please explain to me what the Leader of the Opposition meant when he said yesterday that he supports the rationalisation of surgical services—because that is precisely what this is about. It is about ensuring that we have high-quality surgical services available for all South Australians strategically placed across the city. That is what we are planning to do. We can no longer have every hospital trying to give everything to every

person all the time. For a start, we do not have the resources to support that, either in financial terms or in human terms.

MOBILE PHONES

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs advise the house what action is being taken to address warranty obligations and contracts for mobile phones?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs): There is no doubt that the use of mobile phones has increased substantially in our community. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has been receiving an increasing number of complaints, particularly about mobile phone retailers not honouring warranty obligations in relation to faulty phones. There have been issues with contracts that have been entered into and also phones that are not fit for the purpose for which they have been bought. It would seem that many people find themselves in the extremely frustrating position of having a broken phone and retailers ignoring their obligations under legislation in relation to a refund and warranty provisions. There is also an increasing trend of people getting trapped into expensive monthly subscriptions for top 40 ringtones, and the like, that are easy to get into but extremely difficult to get out of.

In response to these complaints, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs is conducting an education campaign aimed at both consumers and retailers. The campaign consists of several elements including a designated phone-in today whereby people can ring a dedicated team of officers to lodge complaints, either in relation to their dealings with a particular retailer or dealer or in relation to difficulties with their phone or warranty. I have been informed that until lunchtime today over 80 survey responses have been completed through the phone-in, covering a large range of issues relating to mobile phones. This reinforces the fact that it is an important issue to South Australians. The local campaign will also include visits to and monitoring of local retailers, contact with mobile phone service carriers, contact with equipment suppliers, provision of public information about warranty entitlements and other related matters, and the ongoing gathering of information about the nature and number of consumer complaints.

I am pleased to advise that South Australia's work will be used in developing a project to lead a national campaign aimed at combating the many problems people are experiencing with their mobile phones. The intention is to include a number of other independent and government dispute resolution agencies, including the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman, the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission and other state and territory fair trading agencies. I strongly urge people to contact the Office of Consumer Affairs on 8204 9777 if they are experiencing problems with their mobile phone warranties or contracts.

HOSPITALS, NEW

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the government has plans to bulldoze the Royal Adelaide Hospital, why is it necessary for him to take advice, claim confidentiality, delay or further withhold from public scrutiny detail of his claim of a \$1.4 billion costing estimate for a rebuild of the RAH at that site?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This business of groaning whenever a minister, who is different from the minister who was asked the question, gets up to respond is getting out of hand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is interjection and it is disruption. That is what standing order it is. It is disruption of the parliament, and it is getting out of hand. Any minister has the right to get up and respond on behalf of the government to any question. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am pleased to have the opportunity to provide to the house a very good understanding of the basis for the costings. This is a reasonably detailed piece of information so I beg the indulgence of the house while I go through it for members. To put into context the costings for the RAH, I need to start off by how we costed the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital, because my explanation about the second relates to the former.

The spatial brief for the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital was developed utilising the input of an external adviser from STH Architects working from service information developed from the Hardes modelling, using current knowledge of RAH and using national benchmarking where that is available. The adviser is also the key health planner for the Western Australian Fiona Stanley Hospital.

The planning and construction program for the central hospital project was developed in Adelaide utilising interstate experience to guide the staging and time frames for the program. This was also benchmarked against the Fiona Stanley project, which is the nearest comparable project available. Davis Langdon, who are cost consultants, worked as independent consultants undertaking a review of all the costing for the central hospital, and concluded that the costing model was sound, cost provisions were robust and estimates of time, which impacted on escalation, were also appropriate.

The cash flow has been developed by allocating the cost provisions against the program. Davis Langdon reviewed this cash flow and indicated that it represents the best assessment that can be modelled without a decision yet on the detailed procurement approach. The advised cost on completion of this work was that the cost of the rail yard relocation was estimated as \$157 million—and that is provided for in the transport budget—and the construction of the new hospital at \$1.677 billion. Completion has been assessed as being possible by early 2016.

The same costing model was used for the development of the RAH redevelopment costing. The source information was, in the main, work completed in the stage 4 master plan—which has already been done—and extrapolating that forward to reach an equivalent stage of completeness of solution to the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital. The redevelopment scope included:

- demolition of the Residential Wing and R Wing (of the RAH);
- building of a new R Wing and adding to Q and S Wings;
- refurbishment of Q and S Wings and the remainder of the theatre, outpatient and emergency buildings, plus limited works in the Bice, Allied Health buildings and Boiler House;
- major replacement of electrical and engineering infrastructure, and major sustainment works identified in the previous reviews;

- refurbishment of the Hone Wing, the remainder of Bice, Allied Health, Sheridan, Women's Health Centre, Boiler House and Robert Gerard buildings.

The costs did not include upgrade of the East Wing, which was not required to meet the hospital brief. The redevelopment time frame was drawn from the earlier assessment of the original stage 4 master plan where at least three stages were required to enable the site to maintain its operation while this major staged redevelopment took place. The scope for the full redevelopment of the RAH is significantly larger than the stage 4 redevelopment defined as it anticipated a stage 5 to complete the redevelopment required. Nonetheless, it was assumed the stages of this larger redevelopment could be done in the same principal stages, and those stages are:

- Stage 4A undertaking key infrastructure upgrades such as the electrical high-voltage system upgrade, creating temporary accommodation for patients in the East Wing to enable the R Wing to be decanted, and works generally to assist the early decanting and operation of the hospital.
- Stage 4B focused mainly on the replacement of the R wing but would also include upgrades to other buildings as could be accommodated whilst still maintaining hospital operations.
- Stage 4C focused on upgrades to Q and S wings, the theatre, outpatient and emergency buildings, and the remaining buildings.

It is expected that more stages would be required to make the redevelopment scope practicable for the operation of the RAH. Time frames are assessed against the previous time modelling for stage 4 extended to cover the larger scope. Davis Langdon undertook a review of all the costing of the RAH redevelopment and concluded that the costing model was sound, cost provisions were robust, and estimates of time, which impacted upon escalation, were appropriate.

Cash flow has been developed by utilising a cash flow model generated by DTEI. Davis Langdon reviewed this cash flow and indicated that it represents the best assessment that can be modelled. The advised cost on completion of this work was that the RAH redevelopment was estimated at \$1.367 billion, excluding the refurbishment of the east wing. In addition, \$17.5 million was allocated for ward upgrade to increase the bed capacity at the RAH, making a total of \$1.384 billion.

Completion had been assessed as being possible by 2021 but as it was dependent upon a more detailed assessment of staging it was likely to take longer. That is a key point. Redevelopment of the RAH carried with it a significant risk in the original redevelopment plans. This would be further amplified in this more comprehensive redevelopment, adding to the difficulties with staging and the continuity of hospital operations.

I also point out to the house that when we looked at the two models, because one was about \$300 million dearer than the other, it was the operating cost savings that would come about through the new hospital which would make the new hospital the cheaper option. We estimate a saving of about \$50 million each year once the new hospital is built. If you look at each hospital over a 15 year time frame, the new hospital would be built in about eight or nine years' time and, after operating for about five or six years, it would make savings of between \$250 million and \$300 million. If you take that figure away from the cost of building it, you get to the \$1.4 billion, which would be the cost of building the RAH.

I now want to give the house details of those savings. The following relates to the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital. I am advised that, whilst full identification of savings opportunities cannot be finalised until the detailed planning of the new hospital is completed, it is estimated that recurrent savings in the vicinity of \$50 million per annum will be realised. I am told this is a conservative figure. These savings will arise from: reduced energy use—we know it is about a 45 per cent energy reduction; reduced cost of energy through the ability of the hospital to generate some of its own energy supply; the development of more efficient work practices made possible by improved functional relationships between parts of the hospital—in other words, staff will not have to travel as far; improved communication services and internal transport arrangements; more efficient cleaning processes; reduced maintenance and equipment replacement for at least five years; and better use of staff through improved design of clinical areas such as wards.

It is important to note that the new hospital will be bigger than the RAH and will have a greater throughput. The final analysis may indicate that we are able to care for more people who have more complex illnesses for minimal additional expenditure. I think that comprehensively demonstrates—and I apologise for the length of the explanation—that the building of the new Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital over time will be the cheaper of the two options.

I have also been advised that there are minimal opportunities for operational savings through a rebuild of the RAH. The hospital could generate some of its own power supply and in time achieve some of the other efficiencies listed above, but that would occur in a piecemeal way over an incredibly long period of time.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I ask a supplementary question. Given the qualified nature of the advice from the department that the minister has just given the house, if the minister has confidence in that information why would the government not release to the house the public scrutiny, the proper costing documents in full and the consultant's review?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): If I may, I thought the minister gave an incredibly detailed answer, far more detailed than I ever recall receiving when the former government was in office about such questions. I think that was—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: That was six years ago.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Six years ago. You were a member of that; quite a lot of you were. Yesterday I said to this house that I would take that question on notice, and where we are confident that it does not impact on commercial sensitivities as it relates to tendering for these projects, I am more than relaxed in releasing that information.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: When?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: 'When,' he says. Well, he asked me the question 24 hours ago. This is not something for which one drops everything and with which one runs back into the house immediately. A process will be gone through. I took the question in good faith. I gave the answer in good faith and I maintain good faith. We will see whether there is information further to what the minister has provided that will not in any way impact on the commercial negotiations. I am more than happy for that information to be released to the Leader of the Opposition.

AUSTRALIAN WORKPLACE AGREEMENTS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Is there evidence to support the proposition that South Australians will get less pay for the hours they work under Australian workplace agreements?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The Australian Bureau of Statistics recently released an analysis of earnings and hours worked, and it makes very clear that workers on AWAs get paid less for the hours they work. It makes it clear that workers on AWAs work longer and get paid less for the hours they work. If we use a 38-hour week as an example, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics data on non-managerial workers, workers on AWAs are about \$1 800 a year worse off than workers on collective agreements—and that is based on AWAs before WorkChoices. That is based on AWAs that were supposed to meet a no-disadvantage test. WorkChoices abolished the no-disadvantage test and, in a backflip, the so-called 'fairness test' has now been introduced.

One of the major objectives of WorkChoices is to legalise AWAs which leave workers worse off. With workers on AWAs that were supposed to have a no-disadvantage test being \$1 800 a year worse off, I am extremely concerned about the pay cuts to South Australian families under the new WorkChoices AWAs. The ABS figures prove that, no matter what window-dressing you put on AWAs, whether it is a no-disadvantage test, a fairness test or anything else, AWAs mean working harder and longer for less money.

TECHPORT AUSTRALIA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier's statement today that the cost of the Techport site investment at Osborne has blown out by over 300 per cent to \$374 million indicate that his original \$120 million cost estimate for the work made and announced in May 2005 was flawed; and does this confirm ongoing weaknesses in the government's infrastructure planning, costing and management processes?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Only a flip-flopping, negative, carping opposition leader would try to put a negative spin on what is today one of the truly great announcements for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Bearing in mind, that this is the same Leader of the Opposition who really caused quite a degree of concern at a national level, as well as a state level, when he ran out when the *USS Larson* was in town—

Mr PENGILLY: Mr Speaker, I have a point of order. The Treasurer is debating the question and not answering it.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer does need to get to the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. It is all about the commercial confidence of what we are doing in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition embarrassed himself and angered—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—Senator Nick Minchin when he called for the American proposal to be backed. It is a nonsense—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Peace, brother.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What did he get—two out of 10?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Two out of 10; you get one for turning up.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, dear, Marty. It is a non-sense to suggest that it has blown out. What we are seeing with the infrastructure we are putting into place—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want an answer, or do you want to just throw back at me? The project is made up of a number of critical components.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy not to bother answering the question, to be honest, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They either want to listen to an answer or I'll go back to reading the *Financial Review*. It's more fun.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'll give you one more chance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The Treasurer is not debating. He is answering the question, and he must be listened to in silence. The Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The original cost of \$116 million related to what was expected at the time to be the cost of the ship lift to meet commonwealth requirements. As we pointed out over a year ago, from memory, or certainly some time ago, that figure was increased by a further \$115 million following a scope change by the commonwealth—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —and following advice from the commonwealth that, to meet its requirements, it wanted us to put further infrastructure in place, which we agreed to, as well as taking the opportunity, where we decided that the ship lift itself would not be simply given to the Australian Submarine Corporation (ASC) but would become a common user facility—that is, other companies that may wish to set up or take advantage of our ship lift could have access to it. Priority would always be given, under a lease agreement, a contractual agreement with the ASC, to the ASC, but we decided to make it a common user facility, which added further cost.

The other amounts of money the member tries to throw into this relate to components quite apart from the ship lift, that is, the decision by the government to support a systems integration centre located at the site. They are currently using leased facilities from the old JP Morgan building out at Felixstowe, which you guys paid a hell of a lot of money for and they lasted a matter of a minute. We are actually locating them on the site as part of the master precinct, and we are building a purpose-built facility (which was made public some time ago) quite separate from the original project. That centre will become the system integration centre, where the air warfare expertise, the radar expertise, the Lockheed people and the Raytheon experts will be integrating the Aegis

radar systems and the various weapons systems on site. Originally, that was almost certainly going to be located in Sydney. We made an effort to get that facility to Adelaide, and we now building a purpose-built facility at Osborne.

To show how good our decision was, whilst we cannot say it with absolute certainty, we can say this: the federal government has announced that \$100 million of system integration work for Navantia's amphibious ships (which are to be built both in Spain and Victoria, I understand) will be undertaken here in Adelaide. Whilst we are not able to say that it will be at the systems centre, I would very surprised if it is not, because that is the type of work it is. So, that investment was a very sound one, which will ensure that the high tech end of naval and, indeed, aerospace and land-based high-tech weapons and radar systems will be undertaken almost certainly at this facility.

On top of that, we have the Maritime Skills Centre, where we are building a purpose-built facility to train the expertise and to provide retraining of the expertise needed for the air warfare construction phase. There are more costs associated with remediation and the preparation of the entire Techport site. We are only a matter of weeks away from announcing, once the due diligence and the final assessments have been undertaken by the independent advisers, a major industrial developer taking possession of the Techport project to bring the industrial side of that project onstream. When that happens, we will see an entire industrial sector primarily focused on naval defence, but high in electronics, spread around, I think, some 60 hectares (give or take some hectares) of land adjacent to the ASC.

Mr Pengilly: It will be a revolution.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, it will be a revolution. It will be a revolution in terms of developing an industrial capacity that this state has never had before. That has required a substantial state investment of around \$350 million; I do not have the exact break-up in front of me now. It is a logical, sensible incremental allocation of resources up and above the original ship lift to ensure that this \$8 billion program is delivered successfully but, indeed, we get a hell of a lot more work here. What people have not focused on is that Western Australia, whose government was about to buy a ship lift to actually build the amphibious ships in Perth, did not get the work; it is going to the east.

What does that mean? It means that our decision to build the largest single ship lift in the southern hemisphere will have no other rival in Australia. WA is out of the ballpark. In future, the two major naval shipbuilding facilities are here in Adelaide and in Williamstown in Victoria. Anyone who has studied the logistics of Victoria will see that Port Phillip Bay and the housing and development encroachment on Tennex's operation there will mean that whoever ends up buying the ASC will have access to the only significant ship lift facility of its type anywhere in Australia. The decision for amphibs not to be built in part in Perth, in my view, all but guarantees South Australia as the centre for naval shipbuilding for all time in Australia, and that is because this government invested in the right infrastructure, and we are proud of it.

GUARDIANSHIP CARE

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. What support is provided for children under the guardianship of the minister once they have left the care system? What recent achieve-

ments have been made to provide further support for this group of young adults?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her questions. The matter of young people leaving care has been sadly neglected over decades in this state and in this country. For the first time we are now actually recognising that, as in the case of an 18 year old leaving care, there is obviously an obligation to continue to provide help and assistance to those young people who are making their way in the world. For many young people, they obviously have mentors: they have their birth parents and other significant adults in their life who can help them with those really important decisions and some not so important decisions, such as, 'What's that green stuff at the bottom of the refrigerator?' as you move out into your own unit, or really bad—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Well, what have you got in your fridge Jay?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is right; I had a very untidy share house. There are also the very serious issues: the things that go badly wrong and a bit of assistance with mentoring and those sorts of matters. We took the first step by making sure that when we set up the rapid response framework we put guardianship kids at the front of every queue, including those young people who are exiting care. There are things like accommodation services, TAFE courses, and a whole range of other services the state government provides—

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Preschool services, and a whole range of other services that we wanted to make sure guardianship kids had priority access to, and we are now extending that to care leavers. We had a very moving ceremony where care leavers, some of them adults, spoke about the fact that if a service like this was available for them when they were 18 exiting care it would have made a big difference to their lives. Many of these young people, one has to remember, have never had the recognition that goes with being part of a broader family. Their family is the system, and their parents are the state. Up to this point, we have not accepted our responsibilities as a good parent to these young people exiting care.

As I said, it was a very moving ceremony. Care leader after care leader came forward and told of their experiences in care and how a point of contact would have been helpful, even to do simple things, such as to find out about their records and what their life was and their history—access to the sort of records that perhaps are available in a family home but are not available if you have been a kid in care. This has been a well received service. It was first mooted in the Layton report and it has been intimated in the early observations of Commissioner Mullighan. I am very proud that this government has taken the step to introduce it.

HOSPITALS, NEW

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): My question is to the Minister for Health. In planning for the new hospital, what consideration has been given to the possible relocation of the medical school, the Dental Hospital, the IMVS and the newly established nursing program run by the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Fisher for his question, and I acknowledge his great interest in all matters to do with health. He raises

matters with me on a regular basis, with respect to a particular set of issues which I am aware of his great interest in. With the agencies responsible for the services that the member described, we are working through the issue of how those services will be linked into the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital. It is our intention at this stage that the IMVS, which is on Frome Road—at least, the Hanson Institute, which is a research institute—would stay where it is. However, of course, there will be IMVS services within the hospital to provide pathology services to the hospital.

In relation to the medical school, we are having conversations with Justin Beilby, the dean of the medical school, and I am sure we will come to a very satisfactory arrangement with him. We are also in conversation with Professor de Vries, the head of the dental school. Members may or may not be aware that the facilities at the dental school really need refurbishment. We are looking at potential new ways of delivering that service, which may involve putting more chairs out into the community, so that teaching happens more in community settings—for example, perhaps through the GP Plus health care service. So, we are working that through with Professor de Vries. I am not aware of the issue to do with the nursing services, but I am sure that my department is also working through that issue with the university.

MOTORCYCLE GANGS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Premier yesterday call for a national strategy on bikies, when the federal and state police ministers, including those from South Australia, agreed on such a plan in 2001? Why has his government failed to deliver results on the existing 2001 bikies agreement and on his own promises? It was a publicity stunt, wasn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I think that is the kind of juvenile statement that will undoubtedly be written up in *The Advertiser* tomorrow. People deserve better. If you want to be the leader of all the people of the state, they expect more than that. What we are suggesting is that—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the Premier. The Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yesterday, I met with—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I beg your pardon? Does the Leader of the Opposition want to hear the answer or not? There is a common courtesy involved—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —in asking questions and wanting to hear them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will come to order. I implore members not to interject. Let the Premier get on with his answer. It is impossible for me to call ministers to order when they are responding to interjections.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you very much, sir. The Police Commissioner yesterday met with a number of ministers with a range of suggestions in terms of toughening up, even further, the laws in relation to outlaw motorcycle gangs. A number of those issues that were raised have national implications. The Police Commissioner pointed out that we are dealing with issues where the law only applies in one state but the laws are different from state to state. He

talked about harmonising laws, and we also talked about complementary legislation—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question was whether the Premier was aware there was already an agreement in 2001. He is not answering the question. Standing orders require it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was, as I recall it: why did the Premier call for a national strategy? That was the question, and, as far as I can tell, that is what the Premier is answering. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to look at the question if the Leader of the Opposition wants me to answer it exactly, but I remember it in the same way as does the Speaker. Anyway, the suggestions made by the Police Commissioner relate to suggested improvements to the law in South Australia, hopefully crafted in a way that would not be subject to legal challenges in the court, because we have seen the lawyers line up to defeat laws that have been passed by this parliament.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop has already been warned today.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: So, the Police Commissioner suggested to the ministers that we look at changes to the law that relate to extradition, intelligence and surveillance, and issues relating to cross-border relations on these matters. I am going to take the advice of the Police Commissioner on matters relating to outlaw bikie gangs and, therefore, I thought it was important for me to put these matters on the agenda of the next COAG meeting. There has been considerable progress in recent years in terms of better relations between federal and state agencies, including the successor organisation to the National Crime Authority. We remember when the reference to outlaw motorcycle gangs was dropped some years ago and there was a cutback in resources to the NCA here in South Australia—in fact, even after the NCA bombing in South Australia. I thought those cutbacks were simply extraordinary. A number of agreements have been made by police ministers and others to achieve better complementarity between the various states, the commonwealth and the territories.

The Police Commissioner, yesterday, in a meeting with ministers, suggested further action at the national level. Opposition members would be today standing up and condemning me if I turned my back on the Police Commissioner's advice, so, therefore, I have put the matter on the agenda of the next Council of the Federation and the next COAG meeting. If there need to be further changes to the law or if there needs to be complementary legislation, taking into account the kind of laws we passed in a bipartisan and cooperative way on terrorism, why would we suddenly say, 'This was dealt with five years ago, let's not improve it any more'? That is not a way to run a country, and not a way to run a state.

HAWKER BRITTON

Mr PISONI (Unley): Will the Premier advise whether his trip on 12 June 2007 to Sydney and his speech to clients of the Labor Party's PR agency of choice, Hawker Britton, at the exclusive ARIA restaurant on Sydney Harbour were for the benefit of South Australia or for the benefit of the Australian Labor Party?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am very pleased to respond to that. Some of the leaders of Australian business

were at that dinner, and I was able to tell them what a difference a government makes, and I was able to tell them what the unemployment figures were—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, it was not at Kirribilli House.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Unley has another question, I am more than happy to give him the call. He does not need to scream it out while the Premier is answering his first question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Unfortunately I was not on the invitation list to Kirribilli House, but I will give an address when I am invited to do so, whether it is by the Property Council, Business SA, the engineering employers, or various banks. Indeed, on that same day I spent more than one hour with the Macquarie Bank. What were they interested in talking about? They were interested in the possibility of a PPP for a \$1.7 billion hospital in South Australia! My message to people is this: if I am invited to address top business leaders in South Australia, then I will do so.

But, because the honourable member is keen to know, let me reprise the speech—because I think the honourable member wants to know exactly what I said. I told them about the changes that had occurred in South Australia since we were elected. I told them how Kevin Foley—my deputy—had brought down six budgets in surplus compared to year after year of budgets in deficit by the Liberal opposition. I told the business leaders who were present about how we had seen a change in the fortunes of our state in terms of private sector investment in this state. I told the business leaders present that, in fact, there was \$34 billion worth of projects in South Australia. I contrasted the rate of growth in South Australia under Labor compared with that under the Liberals. And, because the honourable member wants to know more, I am prepared to keep going—because I know you want to listen and you believe in courtesy.

I also talked about the difference that a few years of Labor has made in terms of mining and mining exploration. To members on the other side of the house, mining was simply a mirage in the desert. One of the first phone calls I made was to Robert Champion de Crespigny to head up the Economic Development Board. The Economic Development Board came to this government and said, 'We are amongst the most underexplored regions in the world, other than Siberia. What we need to do is to go out there and partner with and pay people to come and explore in this state.' Of course, when we announced that we were attacked but, as a result of that initiative, we have seen a sevenfold or eightfold increase—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Eightfold.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: An eightfold increase in mining exploration—double the previous year's all-time record—to over \$230 million, from memory. We are second in the country. Can members recall any time in this state's history when we were second in the country in terms of mining exploration: higher than Queensland, higher than Victoria, higher than New South Wales, higher than Tasmania, higher than the Northern Territory, and second only to Western Australia? I know the Deputy Leader of the Opposition disputes this, but I told them about the Fraser Institute in Toronto. It is interesting that members opposite have heard of the Fraser Institute—or certainly people nodded around the room. I said that just three or four years ago we were 36th in the world in terms of mining prospectivity. Now, we are fourth in the world out of 65 jurisdictions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think there will be a story tomorrow: leader walks out! I am sure there will be a story about the leader walking out when I am asked a question by his side of parliament.

Mr PENGILLY: I have a point of order, sir, on relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do point out to members that it is an extreme discourtesy to make reference to the absence of members from the chamber. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: But the point of order was the best point of order I have heard since we have been in government—because the point of order was about relevance. That is exactly what I am talking about. It is the relevance of Labor's being in government compared with the Liberals and the difference in economic results, the difference in employment growth and the difference in social outcome. I told them that—

Mr PENGILLY: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I know what the point of order might be. The Premier is now debating the matter.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I also spoke about the health system, because people wanted to know what was in the state budget. So, because the people know that fiscal rectitude are my middle names, I went through the process of the extraordinary consultation that takes place between the Treasurer and me. Fiscal prudence: why we went for the AAA credit rating. I see, by the way, that New York State—under the billionaire leadership of Mayor Bloomberg, and celebrated across America—now has a AA credit rating. I have asked the Canadians whether any of them have AAA credit ratings. I have asked US governors whether any of them have AAA credit ratings. New York has just cracked it—it has a AA credit rating.

So, we went through the process of why it was vitally important in this state to get the finances right; why it was vitally important to get economic confidence going; why it was important to get the mining industry turning over; why it was important to break the Labor Party's federal policy to allow an expansion of uranium mining in this state; and why it was important to stand up against your own party in the interests of your state. That is something that your leader does not understand when he comes out and tries to undermine the defence industry today. Put your state before your party.

So, I am happy to accept invitations. If the Liberal Party wants to invite me to some functions to talk about the difference between Labor and Liberal, then give me a call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): As there is only one minute to go in question time, I move:

That question time be extended by 15 minutes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That motion has to be moved by a minister. The Minister for Transport.

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

That question time be extended by five minutes.

Regrettably, I have moved that it be extended by only five minutes; this has been fun.

Motion carried.

Mr PISONI: I have a supplementary question to the Premier. How much did the business leaders pay Hawker Britton, the preferred PR consultants for the Australian Labor Party, to hear you on that occasion?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: How much did they pay? I do not have a clue, but I can tell you this: I did not walk out with any cheque, because that is the difference between what we do and what you do with public assets like Kirribilli House.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Attorney-General. On what basis did the Attorney-General decide that the funding submission of the DPP was not worth passing on to the Treasurer?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):

I listened with interest to the member for Heysen's contribution this morning on this matter, and I noticed that she said that the DPP had requested a much needed amount. Then she says she did not know what that sum was, but it was much needed. In 2002-03 the budget of the Office of the DPP was about \$7.5 million. At that time a Liberal MP—alas, like so many of them, no longer with us—said to me, 'The DPP's office, under us, has run on the smell of an oily rag,' so it was coming off a very low base. In 2006-07 it is now getting about \$13.2 million. In terms of legal staff, it is up from 47.8 full-time equivalents to 70.83 full-time equivalents. In total full-time equivalents it is up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—from 70 to 111. Let us do a comparison with what has happened to some other budgets in the justice portfolio. In the same period, the Crown Solicitor's Office, up 7 per cent, but it is coping. It was under a great deal of pressure when we came to office, but it is coping with a 7 per cent real increase. The police, up 32 per cent; the Courts Administration Authority, up 15 per cent; the Department for Correctional Services, up 31 per cent; the Office of the DPP, up 57 per cent in the same period.

I find it extraordinary that the DPP, Mr Pallaras, and the opposition spokesperson seem to have a strong opinion about who the chief executive of the Justice Department ought to be. They both seem to have their own candidate, but that is a matter that will be decided according to law. The Chief Executive Officer of the Justice Department is Jerome Maguire, and I have full confidence in him. He has every right to send balanced, factual information by email, post or internal mail, or orally, or whatever way he likes to employees of the Justice Department—and that includes officers of the DPP.

In three of the last five years there has been an underspend in the Office of the DPP. It may be that the Office of the DPP needs more money, but it could do with a leader who knows how to draft a budget bid. I would be shot down in flames if I took a budget bid which contained entirely flawed assumptions about the number of police in South Australia. There may be more money needed for the Office of the DPP; someone in that office has to be bright enough to draft a good submission.

Mrs REDMOND: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier intervene in the dispute between the Attorney-General and the DPP and direct the funding of an additional \$3 million per annum to enable the Office of the DPP to get the file loads of prosecutors down from some-

where between 50 and 100 per prosecutor to the New South Wales standard of 15 to 25 per prosecutor to enable us to put away paedophiles, criminals and bikies, as the Premier wants?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I see little point in doing that. There is a clear ministerial line of responsibility. I have met with the DPP. He came and spoke to me—I think, last year, or it may have been the year before—and we had a long meeting in my office. There was also the very famous meeting when I actually agreed, as no other Premier of not only this state but any other state has done, to meet with the DPP personally and to go and hear the grievances of the DPP's staff. I was somewhat astonished on that occasion, because the first question with all the staff there was from the DPP who asked for an increase in his pay commensurate with a Supreme Court judge's status.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It was a 45 per cent pay increase.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am advised that it was a 45 per cent pay increase. That seemed a bit strange to me, because, presumably, when he moved from Western Australia to South Australia and signed a contract, he would have known what salary he had signed up to. Later, I was told that I misunderstood, that it was really about the importance of status as opposed to pay. Various people asked questions. There were some very decent people there. I remember one lady saying that she thought her five or six year old son had a better understanding of the criminal law than I did. I guess the DPP has talked about the balance of powers and all those sort of things. I did not take offence. My response was to think, 'That's terrific; it's great that he has that kind of interest.' Perhaps we can look forward to him being a future DPP. I have nothing against the DPP. I am sure that, if I announced I was to meet with the DPP, it would be blown up into a massive story, entitled 'Crisis meeting' or something like that. Obviously, the last thing we want is attention seeking.

COMMUNITY RECOVERY CENTRES

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I table a ministerial statement made in another place by the Hon. Gail Gago.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

KERNEWEK LOWENDER

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Contrary to some of the things we have heard in the last hour, I wish to talk about a good thing that occurred in my electorate: the Kernewek Lowender, which is a celebration of the Cornish people and which took place from 14 to 20 May. This is the 17th Kernewek Lowender that has been held, the first one being in 1973.

Ms Breuer: It was an excellent one.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It was, and I note that the member for Giles was present on the Friday and the Saturday. It was a pleasure to have her in my electorate. The Hon. John Gazzola from another place came on the Friday, and we had the great pleasure of the member for Schubert being there on the

Saturday and Sunday, and I will talk about his involvement later.

The planning for the event started in 1970, and it took three years for the community to come up with a program they thought would attract people to the area. Importantly, they wanted events that would build upon the tourism opportunities in that community. Through a lot of hard work, over the years it has managed to develop into a festival that attracts 80 000 visitors. Members must realise that this is a community of 12 000 people, so it is just wonderful to see its population suddenly multiply by about seven within a short space of time.

I had the opportunity to attend quite a few of the events, the first being the art exhibition on Monday 14 May. It was a credit to all the entrants, and it was a pleasure to be involved and to congratulate those who won prizes. The Dressing of the Graves occurred during the week, when the proud Cornish history was exemplified by schoolchildren attending Cornish heritage graves in Moonta, Kadina and Wallaroo. People were dressed in period costume, which was also wonderful to see.

This year, the event was a great challenge, because the government had decided to move the long weekend back to March to allow it to be part of that celebration of events, so it clogged up that period. The community wanted to keep it at the traditional time of year, but it faced the challenge of extending it to a week instead of its being concentrated over a three-day period. They really had their fingers crossed, because they were worried about what the support would be from the people who traditionally came. However, it was an outstanding success.

For those who are intrigued by the name, Kernewek Lowender means 'Cornish happiness'. I know that probably a few members of this chamber are very proud Cornish descendants, and I see a few of them raising their hands now.

Mr Venning: Trelawney.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Indeed—a great song. My wife and I had the opportunity to attend on the Friday, Saturday and Sunday, which was a bit challenging in itself because you were expected to wear period costume. My wife looked beautiful in her dresses but, unfortunately, my big ugly face was not quite as complementary, so I detracted a bit from it. However, it was wonderful to see many people dressed in clothing from 120 years ago and really being proud of their community and wanting to celebrate it.

The volunteer effort that goes into events such as this is really hard to adequately describe. The preparation work over the year or so beforehand would have been immense, but the preparation that actually goes into the day's events is just wonderful. You have people setting up for each day in Kadina on the Friday, Moonta on the Saturday, and Wallaroo on the Sunday, probably starting at 6 o'clock in the morning and not finishing until 11 o'clock at night. The number of people involved in the community groups who were providing the catering for all the visitors that came is great to see.

There is one special thing that I want to mention, and that is the cavalcade of cars, in which the member for Schubert participated.

Ms Bedford: As a car or as himself?

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, in one of his vintage vehicles. It is a 1912, and my apologies because I do not know the—

Mr Venning: Hupmobile.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It was a 1912 Hupmobile. I had the pleasure of travelling with him. We were number four on the list of 850 vehicles that entered.

Mr Pisoni: How was the suspension?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Beautiful. It actually took an hour and a half for the vehicles to start from the commencement point; that is how many cars were involved. This event has been run by Mary and Bob Jervies of Wallaroo for the full period since 1973, and it is a credit to them. There were vehicles such as sports cars, motorbikes, rev-head cars and period cars. The member for Schubert's vehicle was the oldest on the field, and I think for the first time it did not have to stop to fill up the radiator. We had some cooler weather, which was a bit challenging for us because we were not covered at all—

Mr Venning: No swanky.

Mr GRIFFITHS: No swanky. There was nobody on the side of the road to stop us and offer us a drink to try to keep warm. I want to pay special tribute to the chairman of the organising committee, Mayor Paul Thomas. He has done it four times, and he did a fantastic job. He and his wife Catherine worked tireless hours beforehand and on the day. They catered for numerous groups. I also want to thank John Meier, the previous member for Goyder, who was chairman in 2005 and who was also heavily involved again.

Time expired.

REYNELL ELECTORATE EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Members who have been here for a while would know that I regularly comment on the need to improve educational outcomes for young people in my area. I will begin by acknowledging that, fortunately, thanks to the initiatives of the current state government, school retention rates and engagement are slowly improving in Reynell, but they started from a difficult base.

In terms of people with trade qualifications in Morphett Vale, which is the majority of Reynell, in the 2001 census, 20.4 per cent of the community had trade skill qualifications, compared with 18 per cent of the Adelaide statistical division. This is pleasing. People with trade qualifications provide many essential services in our community. Indeed, I believe they save more lives than do doctors, generally. However, when we look at people with university qualifications, the picture is not nearly as pleasing. Only 5.8 per cent of people in Morphett Vale had a uni qualification in 2001, compared with 16.9 per cent across the city. We know that just as important as trade qualifications and the contribution made by people holding those contributions are university qualifications. A balanced community has people with both sets of skills.

My concern is to look at how we are going in Reynell to improve the situation. Again, an analysis of the 2001 census—completed by our wonderful library here—showed that, if young people in Reynell were acting in the same way as their peers across the Adelaide statistical division, 746 more of them would have been in study. Nearly all those would have been at university; in fact, 537 more of them would have been doing full-time university study, and 208 would have been studying part-time at university. We are keeping up with the Adelaide statistical division average in terms of TAFE participation, but to maintain our existing qualifications we need to be doing better than the ASD, and we are not.

It was against that background that I was very pleased to receive the report of the Smith Family, entitled, 'On track: students choosing a career—An investigation of educational and vocational plans of learning for life students'. This report

outlines the disturbing finding that many young people in their programs do not plan or are not aware of the correct pathway to follow in order to reach their goals. The report shows the results of a study that focused on years 8 and 9 students who were involved in The Smith Family's Learning for Life program.

Whilst attention is often given to vocational guidance in the later years of high school, it seems that many young people are simply not planning the level of education required to gain their preferred employment. This brings up many concerns about the future of some students, who may find that they cannot achieve their goals, simply because they did not equip themselves with the right kind of knowledge. The Smith Family report found that about 35 per cent of students did not intend to complete the education required to embark on the career they wanted. Of those, 70 per cent of students expected that they would, nevertheless, get their chosen career. So, a third of young people will not get the job that they would like and expect to get because of their educational level. That is a significant number of disappointed young adults in the near future. That is why I am particularly concerned about the federal government's model of supporting vocational education.

The Labor Party, both state and federally, is supporting trade schools, with improved access to trades and technological education that will lead to both TAFE and university qualifications from years 8 and 9. It is improving the career knowledge and options for students at years 8 and 9. The Howard government's model of Australian Technical Colleges waits until students are in years 11 and 12 to make improved access to technological training available to them. By that time, the students about whom The Smith Family and I are most worried have left. We need to increase our access to trades and technical education and all forms of engaging education at years 8 and 9.

Time expired.

SERVICE CLUBS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I would like to take the opportunity today to talk about and give thanks to the various service clubs along the length and breadth of my electorate. The Rotary, Lions, Probus, Zonta and Apex clubs that I am aware of do an enormous amount of good. The Rotary clubs in my electorate have three different island clubs: the one on Hindmarsh Island, the ones on the mainland part of Australia (which is an island) and the one on Kangaroo Island. Indeed, it is rather special. As a member with such a geographically challenging electorate, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to stand up today and talk about the amazing job that is done by those service clubs.

I raise this matter today because this is the time of year when the various service clubs hold their annual changeover dinners. The old presidents and chairs go out and the new ones come in. It is generally a good time for us to be appreciative of their efforts and the amount of work they do and the money that they spend in the community. The clubs that I have had more to do with over a number of years are probably Rotary and Lions. I have never been a member, but more latterly I have been made aware of the Probus Club's activities around Victor Harbor and also on the other side of the Fleurieu around Yankalilla. The Apex Club in Victor Harbor is small in membership but keen and enthusiastic.

It does not matter much where one goes around Australia (and it is certainly no different in the electorate of Finniss):

in towns, little hamlets, villages or even where there are only a few houses clustered around, invariably one will see a park or a barbecue (or something like that; it does not matter much what it is) that has been funded by the local service clubs. It is quite an amazing part of the Australian culture. We inherited some of these ideas from the United States, and they were terrific organisations. They have now become Australianised, and we do it in the Australian way. I think it is most important to recognise the amount of their input into the community.

The people in these clubs are volunteers, and they spend an enormous amount of time fundraising and undertaking community activities. How often does one see a Lions Club, a Rotary Club or an Apex Club barbecue operating at a function, for example? How often do you see them having a Lions sale or a Rotary auction, and how often do you see them setting up something such as the art show in Victor Harbor? The art show in Victor Harbor is an enormous success, and it all comes down to the Victor Harbor Rotary Club and the various organisations that assist them with it.

The amount of money that these service clubs generate and turn back into their communities is remarkable. They are amazing figures of money, and it is all raised by hard work and people getting out and doing things such as holding raffles. More to the point, it is also significant to note that they go and assist people who are far less well off than many others in the community, and I take my hat off particularly to the service clubs in my electorate—from the western end of Kangaroo Island, the Western Lions Club and the Rotary Club over there; the newly formed Rotary Club on Hindmarsh Island, which has only been in existence for around 12 months; and the long-established clubs in the other key towns in my area, which include Yankalilla, Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, Goolwa and surrounding places. They all draw from those communities and work together.

It is very gratifying that each year on the South Coast they have a combined service clubs dinner where they get together. It gives me a great opportunity, as the local member, to thank them for their work, and I have great pleasure, along with my wife, in attending that dinner—and also as many dinners as I can possibly get to during the middle time of the year. It is a very busy time and sometimes arrangements are duplicated. However, I give full credit to the activities of the service clubs in my area, and long may they continue and long may their good work go out into the community.

SLEEP REGIME FOR CHILDREN

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): A recent article in *The Advertiser* by Rebecca Gill is headlined 'Sleepy young battle to cope', and it talks about the impacts lack of sleep is having on children's schooling. As we discuss daylight saving measures for the coming summer, which will not be too far away, it is important that we are mindful of the importance of sleep and good sleeping habits for our health as well as our lifestyle and business practices. The article speaks of research at the University of South Australia, with quotes from lead researcher Dr Jim Dollman comparing 1985 data with 2004 data involving approximately 500 students from the same eight schools in South Australia, and it was only looking at the days Monday to Friday. The children were found to still wake at around 7 a.m. but they were going to bed about 30 minutes later, on average. Girls aged between 10 and 15 years were going to bed around 10 past 10, with boys going to bed about 10 minutes after that. One startling finding

was that boys from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are now up for the longest—an average of 45 minutes longer.

Dr Dollman says the community seems to be unaware of the amount of sleep young people need at different times of their lives. This is similar also for adults. Some seem able, as we know, to function on practically no sleep at all, while others must have the same, and longer, rest every day or they and others suffer. The survey showed that children who went to bed late were inattentive and unable to work effectively, and had a higher risk of being overweight and obese.

I am looking into whether this result could be part of Australia's epidemic around weight problems and the health impacts that are already apparent. Dr Dollman went on to say that many households have less structured evening routines. Often care givers are working longer or are not at the home at all—they are shift working—and a great number of adolescents have part-time jobs, not to mention the greater variety of electronic diversions these days. In the old days, as they like to say, we had radio, TV and record players, but we now have the problems that computers bring—games and emails, not to mention chat rooms, and the list, of course, goes on.

Children aged between three and five years need between 11 and 13 hours of sleep; five to 12 year olds need between 10 and 11 hours; and 12 to 18 year olds need eight to 10 hours. Lack of sleep can contribute to mood and performance and, although I do not have further information with me today, it is worth considering the role of sleep in allowing our bodies to repair themselves and remain healthy and the role of sleep in ensuring wellbeing.

Modern phenomena, such as road rage—and every other sort of rage that has manifested itself lately—could be part of the current trend seen as sleeping less. This goes to the core of the work/life balance phenomenon, and I look forward to the report of the select committee of the member for Hartley on this very subject. As someone who has worked permanent late nights—at the time I had two children under the age of five—I can claim first-hand experience of the impact of lack of sleep for nursing parents and shift workers. The ability of the human body to recover is miraculous, especially if we let it, and we all know here about burning the midnight oil and how that affects us. Sleep deprivation is also a major factor in road accidents. Many deaths and injuries occur each year because of drowsy drivers. Industrial accidents, too, are part of the dilemma which we must face and about which we must take some action.

Into this mix is tossed the notion of daylight saving, its purpose and outcome. Debate about time zones is as old as time itself and we will soon have to consider this topic again. It is important to weigh all factors in this decision, as with any decision made democratically, so that most people are accommodated with as little adverse impact as possible for others. Daylight saving is, after all, only the naming of the hour of the day. Why is it such a polarising issue in our community? Working people welcome it, particularly if they do not have access to flexitime. However, it does have ramifications for school students and young children at a very important time of their life, when they are growing and learning to ensure that they mature into well-balanced adults.

As I said, I look forward to the outcomes of the deliberations of the work/life inquiry, and I hope adults will give consideration to the importance of proper rest in their life. The current IR debate will have a significant influence on future work practices here in Australia. Trading for 24 hours, seven days a week, will not be good for everyone and we

should question who benefits most when Sunday—or whichever day we designate—is not a day of rest. Then, of course, we will also remember the importance of the eight-hour struggle and what it means to us now.

HAMMOND ELECTORATE COMMUNITY GROUPS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I rise today to speak about a couple of community support groups in my area. I am heavily involved in one group which is presently being formed and the other group has been around for 10 years—and long may it continue albeit in a new form from 30 June next year. First, I speak about the Murray Lakes and Mallee Alliance.

On 18 May representatives from the Murraylands Regional Development Board and the six councils that fall or partly fall within the electorate of Hammond—Coorong District Council, Rural City of Murray Bridge, Southern Mallee District Council, Mid Murray Council, District Council of Karoonda East Murray and Alexandrina Council—and other state and federal MPs met at my office to discuss the possibility of forming an alliance to work together to identify opportunities and prepare strategies for the coordinated and structured development of the whole region. I am pleased to say that this group unanimously decided to move forward with the proposal and the Murray Lakes and Mallee Alliance is now a reality. The group will meet every second month at different places within the region. These meetings will enable those present to discuss events and opportunities that are shared across the region in an informal atmosphere, where they can speak openly among their peers without fear or favour.

Since being elected I have been involved with the Fleurieu Alliance—a similar group based on the Fleurieu Peninsula—and I have been very impressed with its creative and proactive approach to regional strategies. This group also provides an opportunity for various departmental personnel and others to meet with the highly concentrated group of main players from the regions and saves them having to arrange several smaller meetings to discuss points of common interest. The group works alongside existing development boards, complementing their important activities, and requires little or no funding and, accordingly, is not a drain on existing resources, state or local. I look forward to the upcoming meeting of this group in Tailem Bend next month, and I am sure it will soon take its place in the region as an important generator of ideas and activities.

The other group I wish to discuss is the Murray-Mallee Strategic Task Force, which I have talked about in this place before and which has been around for 10 years. I will declare an interest: my wife was the first main component of this task force being the first full-time staffer. I think she did a wonderful job—but I have to say that because she may read this *Hansard*.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, she did do a wonderful job, and she still does with her work, which is a couple of days a week with the natural resources management board. This group was formed through various community-minded people worried about social matters within the region, and how to coordinate them and assist government at all levels, be it local, federal or state, to get the right outcomes, because too many times the social needs of people are forgotten.

On 14 June we held a meeting to decide the future of the task force, and it was pleasing that, after much vigorous debate between PIRSA representatives, myself and other members—the Hon. Bob Sneath was in attendance as a representative of the government on the task force—it was decided to keep the task force running for another 12 months. Hopefully it will then meld into part of the local regional facilitation group, which comprises departmental heads who now meet regularly. We decided this was probably the best way to move forward as groups in the regions seem to be struggling to access funding to keep going. The task force has been struggling, but we think that, if we merge with the regional facilitation group, it will give a social face to that group. I will be writing to them to see if I can become part of that group.

I also acknowledge the Hon. Rory McEwen for writing a letter to John Berger requesting executive support through Rural Solutions SA for a period of 12 months. I am sure I can speak on behalf of the chair, John Berger, that he will accept that offer as it stands in a letter of 5 June to me from the Hon. Rory McEwen, and I wish the task force all the best in the future, albeit in a different form, but they will certainly be keen to accept the offer from the minister.

Time expired.

RED CROSS BLOOD SERVICE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Today it gives me great pleasure to talk about the Australian Red Cross Blood Service, and to pay tribute to the many Australians who give their time willingly and selflessly to donate blood to help save the lives of others. Along with voluntary donors, the Australian Red Cross Blood Service plays a significant role in the quality and safety of the Australian health system.

The blood service was established as a national organisation only relatively recently in 1996, but its predecessors date back to 1929 through various state and territory Red Cross transfusion services. Now, thanks to their hard work, Australia has one of the most effective and safest blood supplies in the world. Its vision and mission is simple: to share life's best gift by the provision of quality blood products, tissues and related services for the benefit of the whole community. The success of this vision has been extraordinary. Currently a little more than 500 000 Australians give just over 1.2 million donations each year. Last year those donations benefited almost half a million patients, resulting in many lives being saved and a significant improvement in the quality of life for others. I, for one, am proud to be an active blood donor and last week I celebrated—if that is the right word—my 92nd blood donation. I am certainly hoping for a telegram from the Queen when I reach my 100th.

However, despite the fact that the blood service is currently not short of blood and continues to save hundreds of thousands of lives, as a country we must not become complacent or simply think that it is someone else's problem. Recent government forecasts suggest that demand for blood is expected to increase by 100 per cent in the next 10 years, which means that Australia will need around 2 million individual blood donations each year—that is almost double what we currently provide—to ensure that people, both young and old, have the lifesaving products they need to survive.

As a nation, we therefore have two options. The most obvious one is to increase the number of donors, and this must be a priority, especially as Australia's half a million

donors represent only 3.5 per cent of the eligible donor population compared with an average of 4.4 per cent for other comparable nations. The benefit we also have is that we give voluntarily, whereas in a lot of other countries people are paid for donating, or for giving or selling their blood. We need to increase that percentage, and it is up to us to actively get out there in the community and promote the blood service's lifesaving message.

Therefore, I was delighted last week that our health minister, John Hill, officially opened the new state-of-the-art Pelican Plaza Blood Donor Centre at Ridgehaven in a ceremony coinciding with World Blood Donor Day. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was also there. In Canberra this event was promoted as 'Prick a pollie day', so perhaps we need do the same thing here in South Australia.

Accessibility to blood donation services is essential in encouraging more people to donate, and expanding the blood service's presence into the north-eastern suburbs by providing a facility that meets the needs of existing and new blood donors is fantastic. I know the member for Newland and the member for Florey are very happy at having this service in this area. A second option is to increase the frequency of donations already given by our wonderful donors. This is the central theme of the blood service's current Four Seasons campaign. If every donor gave blood four times a year instead of the current two, in each of the four seasons, then we would also have enough blood to satisfy the medical need of our community. A combination of both these options would, of course, yield the best results. To put it simply: if you are a donor consider donating more often and if you are not a donor—and there is an eligible 14 million of you across Australia—then it is time to immediately join up. The only fact you need to know is that one single blood donation can save the lives of up to at least three different patients, and contribute to making up to 20 different life saving products.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: If we care about our community and giving back to it, then this is a very practical and real way of showing it. I am glad to hear that the member for Schubert is a blood donor. You are one of the rarer blood groups?

Mr Venning: AB negative.

Ms CICCARELLO: AB negative. Well, I am AB positive, so you are just a bit rarer than me. There are only about 2 per cent of us in the population. So, with that, I would encourage everyone to take up the cause, and it is not only by donating blood but also plasma, and it is a very, very good thing because it does contribute to the health of our community.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 463.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Today the minister said that we should all stay healthy, and that is a very important message because if you are sick in South Australia you've got bugger all chance of relying on his health system, and let me say this, that when the Premier comes into this house—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Point of order?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Madam, I believe that what the member said was unparliamentary, and I would think it was somewhat offensive.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe I heard a word that was unparliamentary also. We have not consulted the list, deputy leader, but perhaps you might like to reconsider.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy for you to investigate that matter, Madam Deputy Speaker, and come back to the house.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not think that any decent people would need to examine a list, and that they might consider that language unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, my advice is that precedent indicates that the use of that word in that way is not unparliamentary—although I consider it to be impolite.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you, madam. I do think that is a great shame and not a good example to set for the community.

Ms CHAPMAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, this is not a debate. This is the Appropriation Bill.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Do you have a point of order, deputy leader?

Ms CHAPMAN: I do have a point of order: the minister speaking again after you have indicated your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, deputy leader, you now have the call.

Ms CHAPMAN: Notwithstanding the Premier's repeated statements to this house, and publicly, of how much his government has spent on health, \$3 billion last year and more than \$3 billion this year and the fact that it all sounds impressive, here are the results of what the independent reports say. Notwithstanding spending all that money, this is what the State of Public Hospitals report, the Productivity Report and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report tell us.

They tell us that we are the seventh lowest of all the states and territories in this country for money spent per capita on public hospitals. They tell us that our readmission rates for patients is the highest in the country. We are at 4.8 per cent, when the average is 2.8 per cent. We are second to bottom in four or five categories in the emergency department relating to patients seen on time. We are the worst performing state in the country for elective surgery, and I might say that, last year (2005-06), we did 800 fewer elective surgery procedures than in 2004-05. Their own website in February 2007 tells us that 1 085 people are waiting more than 12 months, a 21 per cent increase since June 2006. The average waiting times have blown out under Labor and they are a disgrace. All that money and no delivery of services.

The Hon. Lea Stevens, the former minister for health, got it right. She said that the health system is stuffed. I give her credit. At the very least, she commissioned John Menadue's report—the Generational Health Review—which we obtained in 2003 and which had a very strong focus on primary health, consulting with the people and keeping it local. That was a very clear message in that report. She proposed major mental health projects and even budgeted for them. She established the Clinical Senate, which consisted of an excellent body of professional people who put out regular press releases—and she got dumped. For all that, she got dumped. She was on the right track.

Enter the Hon. John Hill, the new Minister for Health. He brings in the first of his health Hitlers, Dr Tony Sherbon, as the new CEO. He bins the Generational Health Review and

cannot even tell the parliament why the department took it off the website. He claimed that Labor did not even have a health policy. I heard that at the AMA dinner. That is what he claimed. I am sorry to tell members that, especially the former minister, but he told us that he had sat down with Dr Chris Cain and they wrote one. He cancelled the mental health capital works projects and downgraded others implemented by the former minister.

We have not heard from the Clinical Senate since its last press release on 7 March 2004, when it was going to embark on its involvement in a major plan for health. The minister announced a shiny new hospital to be built in 10 years. He slashed the infrastructure programs at the QEH and the RAH, leaving the Women's and Children's, Glenside and dozens of other country hospitals rotting in decay. He says that change is hard, but you have to take your medicine and shut up.

He ignores the pleas of the medical and nursing professions who are at the bedside of patients—that is assuming, of course, they can even get a bed. The truth is that the whole health industry has been gutted and gagged. We have heard Dr Chris Cain, the former AMA president, sing the praises of the government for two years and now, of course, we know that he is the architect. Let me tell members what he says in his budget submission for 2007-08. After his glorified account of what the government did last year with an extra \$400 million, he says:

Growth funding specifically for health has been provided by the state government in the September 2006 budget, however, in reality this is no more than the predicted increase needed to maintain current services over the next four year cycle.

How right he was. In the same report, he tells us that the No. 1 priority is for mental health services to be included. Furthermore, he goes on to tell us about workforce health, primary health, rural health, public health and Aboriginal health—all priorities in this submission. Then on page 4 he says:

Health services offered in our public hospitals need to be better coordinated and consolidated. As one example, we do not need all eight of our public hospitals offering full 24/7 accident and emergency services. Transplant, neurosurgery, major trauma and other specialised areas of medical and surgical treatment at least require better coordination, if not centralisation and consolidation.

That is a very telling paragraph. That is what he said in January 2007. Let me tell members what he also says in the submission. In relation to infrastructure, on page 17 he says:

Several rural hospitals are in dire need of redevelopment. . . The Royal Adelaide Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital also require a considerable investment to upgrade accommodation facilities. . . Modbury Hospital is also in need of significant investment in infrastructure. . . capital works required to upgrade and maintain services must be fast-tracked.

But what do we get from the government? We get the cancellation of the next stage of the Royal Adelaide Hospital (which, of course, has now come back as a positive on the budget because they will not spend that) to fund their new hospital. The amount of \$212 million is the down payment for the new hospital and there is \$105 million for the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Nowhere in this budget submission is reference made to a shiny new hospital as a priority. What about other stakeholders?

On the question of promoting and strengthening primary health away from tertiary health, in its submission SACOSS states:

There is a strong need to break the hospital-centric focus of bureaucrats, politicians and, indeed, the wider public.

It goes on to say:

There is a need to engage the community in an understanding of what constitutes primary health care and the role of existing services, including but not confined to general practitioners, within the broader primary health care cohort.

There is not one single indication from the Nurses Federation that it needs a \$1.7 billion hospital. That is what the primary stakeholders say. Notwithstanding that, the government announces this great big decoy: the \$1.7 billion North Terrace relocation to be operative by 2016. I will come back to the stripping of all the other hospitals, cutting them to the bone and selling off the surplus to requirements. This rationalisation is supported by a multimillion dollar budget for the glossy brochures we have all received and the advertising to campaign for and promote the Mike Rann Show.

Of course, there are also the cold, callous memos that go out to the hospitals that are about to be slaughtered—the Queen Elizabeth and Modbury hospitals, the Repatriation General Hospital and all the other country hospitals, except the honoured four, which are to be 'enhanced'. They say that, in exchange for the \$34.72 million for Ceduna Hospital rebuild by 2012, they will have to cut \$35.7 million out of country health for the services it will provide.

While I am on the subject of rural health, let me say this. Out there in the real world—in the regions where this government has obviously taken not a scrap of notice—we have birthing service closures in the Riverland. You cannot have a baby in Cleve because of the rule that, unless an anaesthetist is there, you cannot do it, yet you can have baby after baby at the Lyell McEwin Hospital with a midwife, which happens there and at other metropolitan hospitals on a daily basis. Of course, it is a lucky dip if you have a baby at Streaky Bay or on Kangaroo Island.

The roof has collapsed at the Leigh Creek hospital and SafeWork SA has closed it down. That is how good the maintenance is there. Then there is the boiler at the Naracoorte hospital. Some members will know about this hospital because it has been around for so long that it should be on the heritage list. That hospital is a disgrace. Angaston Hospital has list after list of breaches of occupational health and safety requirements in its facilities. We could go on and on about the country.

In some towns, such as Elliston, the biggest employer is the local hospital. These regional communities have been decimated by drought. The level of distress is such that we hear that there is one suicide every four days in rural Australia. That is unacceptable and ought to be a clear indication to the government that chopping out \$35.7 million worth of services over the next four years is totally unacceptable. But what does the minister say? He says, 'We are going to consult about this.' That is a bit like telling someone, 'We're going to chop off one of your hands, but we're going to consult with you and you can tell us which one you'd like to have chopped off.' That is how callous the message is.

Turning to the workforce, we have an unprecedented level of industrial dispute. We have nurses on strike, and 100 elective surgeries have already been closed; 50 psychiatrists are threatening to resign; and paramedics (the ambulance people) are on stop-work over industrial awards. They all claim that they are overworked, underpaid and want some respect. Over the last year, radiologists, intensive care workers, vascular surgeons, sonographers, physiotherapists, radiographers and social workers have all been involved in industrial disputes with the government. That ought to tell the government something but, no, it sends out a message—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, let's get this right. Regarding the increase in the number of doctors, we have had 10 000 extra public servants under this government and, of those, in the last year there have only been 58.6 extra doctors and only 347.6 full-time equivalent extra nurses. That comes from their own documents. It took them eight months to answer that question, and they slipped it in, but there it is in black and white. Here is a memo, dated 14 June, that was sent out in callous disregard of these hospitals:

Consolidation of Intensive Care Units—Intensive care units at TQEH, RGH and Modbury will be consolidated into the tertiary centres.

The memo goes on to list each of them. This will happen. It does not say, 'We will consult with the management in the meantime until you get there.' The dates are stated: February 2008 and December 2007. It is a pretty callous memo: 'Let's send it out there, tell them what we're doing and then pretend that we're going to have some consultation.'

What do the experts say? Ruben Sebben, who has 28 years standing at the QEHL, states:

... a unilateral decision has been made, without any consultation, to move the renal transplantation unit. . . essentially the whole infrastructure's been built up and over the last 35 to 40 years to produce this centre of excellence is going to be moved lock, stock and barrel to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where there is no infrastructure present. . . It is an insane move. . . it was not only unpopular amongst the staff, it's been completely refuted as a sensible option by the people who run that unit. . .

Greg Otto, a senior specialist who assists with training at Modbury, states that he delights in having been able to work in a hospital with a diversity of people and cases, a variety of work, and the rewards one gains in being able to work with young medical students. He warns that, with a 90 per cent increase in medical graduates by 2012, there will be no training places as a result of the loss of specialists and the loss of training. He is very clear about the loss of senior clinical staff that will result from this, and he is considering leaving that role. We heard from John Horowitz today. He states:

... no-one consulted really. . . essentially it was a fascist exercise. . . it was Macbeth meeting Rousseau.

He goes on to expose the fact that these regions are where the oldest, sickest and poorest people are in the state who were serviced by these hospitals.

The danger in the loss of training and the loss of services in those communities ought to be very clear. Of course, we have had other brave people who have been prepared to make public their opinions, including Dr Rod Pearce, a former AMA president. These are the senior guard who are prepared to go out and publicly explain to the people of South Australia how callous this approach has been, what lack of consultation there is, and how dangerous some of these decisions are.

As I said, we had a clinical senate: we have not heard from them; they have not issued a press release since 2004. We have chairs of clinical networks. They were appointed on 14 November 2006 in accordance with a ministerial statement, and the specific members were announced. They, of course, have a task to perform, but they are in the same situation, I suspect, being kept in the dark. We have had stunning silence from the government advisers on whom we are, of course, relying for direct and regular consultation. We have not heard anything on this issue from the Health Consumer Alliance. We have had a slashing of services. The public, frankly, does

not accept that the elective surgery carrot being dangled in front of them is not without a major risk to health, lives and the work force.

What do the public—patients and families—do if they do not ring up Leon Byner or contact my office? Well, in the Riverland or Mount Gambier they should ring ministers Karlene Maywald and Rory McEwen, who sat in the cabinet when this decision was made. If they have a local member in a Liberal district, we are pleased to hear from you. Please let us know, as you have been doing, and thank you to those who have. If you live in the western, northern or southern areas (where the QEHL is), of course, you may well be in the electorate of the member for Cheltenham (minister Weatherill), who was in the cabinet meeting when it made the decision. The catchment area around that all involves ministers, including the members for Colton, Lee, Port Adelaide and Croydon. Ministers Caica, Wright, Foley and Atkinson all sat there and made that decision. The only other one that is close is the member for Enfield, and I implore the people concerned to have a word with him.

In Modbury it involves the member for Florey's electorate. She has been silent: not surprising after the whack she was given after speaking out against the Attorney-General. The Repatriation Hospital is, of course, in minister Conlon's electorate of Elder. He also sat in the cabinet to make this decision. So, they have snuffed out and silenced the capacity for the general public to have a say. The local hospital boards had better get in quick because, of course, they are about to be axed, as will be the regional boards—central, northern, southern and Women's and Children. Ray Grigg, who is well known as the chair and who has resigned, said:

I just don't agree with the principle of the way the system is being run. You know, that's not my way of operating. I don't want to sit here and be a listener to reports. I want to be able to act, you know, in conjunction with my fellow board members.

That is a far cry from when the member for Little Para, the former minister, announced the important role that Ray Grigg was going to play in it. Well, he has resigned and is out of there. We then have the health care act, which is coming soon and which will abolish all the boards in South Australia except for the Repat Hospital, and the APY lands will have their own. We have had Ray Grigg's statement, and we have had the minister's response, which I find unbelievable:

I am sorry if any of the individuals on the boards feel that they should have been more greatly involved, but in my view, I'm the minister. I'm responsible. I'm the one who gets up in parliament. I'm the one who has to answer the questions. I'm the one who has to do the radio interviews day after day. The chairs of these boards, you probably wouldn't even know their names, except when they resign.

What a disgraceful statement! In terms of abolishing all the country boards, on 31 May he stated:

... but I think that this is modern times. . . even the most strong advocates of local involvement would say it is inappropriate for local elected volunteers to be responsible for running essentially a multi-million dollar complex business, which is what a hospital is. They have to employ clinicians, doctors and nurses. . . they don't necessarily have the skills to do that.

Well, how dare you, minister! How dare you say that to the people of South Australia—the people who pay the tax. These are the people for whom you have a responsibility. It is a privilege for you to sit in this house. It should be an honour for you to be a minister. If the questions are too hard and you cannot manage, then get out of the way, or, Premier, get rid of him and put somebody there who will manage the job.

Time expired.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): This government has wrong priorities. They are priorities that waste money and opportunities while the economy is strong. Our state should be able to progress and develop its great potential, to be visionary and to be able to afford a good quality of life for everyone now and into the future. Instead, we have growing debt despite a windfall of hundreds of millions of dollars more than was expected from the GST and increasing taxes, now even on schools, with a workers compensation levy of 1 per cent on the total salaries of each school site.

Regions are being overlooked for city-centric media-based gimmicks. The regional disabled and their carers, small schools, hospitals and infrastructure that would create wealth and jobs, where there are few, are being totally ignored. The government's population-based funding policies take no account of the increased cost of providing training and services in remote locations with small populations. Retrofitting city government buildings with wind turbines and solar power when they already have excellent power supplies and a small hydro turbine on a downpipe from a reservoir only provide huge upfront costs and ongoing maintenance costs of hundreds of thousands of dollars for the taxpayer to pay. It is money that I am sure taxpayers would much prefer to spend on helping our disabled people or on one of the many other higher priorities that this state has, instead of these Rann gimmicks.

This government, with its city-centric views, expects economies of scale that are available in the city with its large population to create savings, but there are huge cost differences for the provision of services in regions that mean these savings are not possible in regional communities. The cost for services in regional areas cannot be competitive with the city-based benchmarks that are being used for comparisons. One example is the Moving On provider for Eyre Peninsula's disabled, who was not eligible for the 2.6 per cent indexation increase in funding because the group of disabled is too small. They do not have the advantages of economies of scale, and the set benchmarks are unrealistic for their program. So, the funding is not provided, and the most vulnerable people are put at even more of a disadvantage.

Travel costs, time costs and small group sizes mean that this Labor government's population-based funding policy is not only hitting the disabled but also encompasses all aspects of regional life, including hospitals and schools, and particularly hits volunteer services. In my electorate alone, there is the potential for the downgrading of eight hospitals and the loss of up to 10 schools, and there are the associated accompanying costs and difficulties for parents and children. Regional TAFE is having the same 'get big or get out' philosophy applied. I have been told that a number of courses that could once have been accessed locally are now available only in the city.

We could be the national leaders in many instances. Instead, we are trailing along at the back end of Australia, and our state appears to be shrinking back to Adelaide from the outside in, when only the opposite will enable us to fulfil our destiny. Outlying regions must be nurtured, not neglected, if the whole of the state is to achieve its potential. It is no surprise that, in the recent edition of Adelaide's *The Independent Weekly*, on the front page reporter Hendrick Gout called South Australia a 'disappearing state' and went on to say:

Kevin Foley's sixth budget is compelling. It acknowledges that South Australia is small and getting smaller. The budget shows that the state's economy grew a miserable 1 per cent in the current

financial year—2½ times below the national average. Our unemployment rate is higher than every other mainland state, which means you're more likely to find a job if you leave South Australia than if you stay. And people are leaving still. Our population growth is less than half of Queensland's or Western Australia's.

This gloomy outlook is backed up by the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication 'South Australia at a Glance 2007', June update, which states:

Housing affordability is one area that South Australia has previously had a significant advantage over other States, but unfortunately the gap is closing fast.

Our leader has spoken about the debt, disappointment and delay put forward by the government in this budget. So, I will use Eyre Peninsula and my electorate of Flinders to highlight the government's wasted opportunities and outline a positive way forward for the progressive and prosperous future that we could have if this government could see past Gepps Cross and see a state-wide vision for the future. With 40 per cent of the state's grain and 65 per cent of fishing, aquaculture and tourism, the region already produces about \$1 billion of the state's income. This equates to about 6 per cent, with about 3 per cent of the state's population, over more than 50 000 square kilometres.

However, with the global increase in the value of minerals, mining on Eyre Peninsula has become viable and could double or even triple its income to the state very quickly. Much of the necessary infrastructure is already in place, but it needs upgrading and extending to accommodate new industry. Power, water, roads, railways, ports, people and housing need to be planned now for an increase of thousands of jobs and to mine, transport and potentially process millions of tonnes of minerals. However, the budget reflects none of this planning or vision for the future.

Like other regions, Eyre Peninsula has the potential to boom. The Terramin and Zinifex mine at Menninnie Dam west of Whyalla will be sending its silver, lead and zinc products through to the Port Pirie smelter in the near future. North-west of Ceduna, there is a world-class deposit of mineral sands, which is very high in zircon. Iluka Resources, Adelaide Resources, in a joint venture with Iluka; and Red Metal combined with Rio Tinto, all have leases. The mining of this deposit, potential processing in Ceduna and exporting from Thevenard can happen if assistance with the necessary infrastructure can be provided by this state government.

Centrex Metals is moving quickly with a haematite iron ore deposit near Lock at Tooligie, and it has other significant deposits near Warrambo, Cowell and north of Port Lincoln. Large Chinese investment and contracts have been obtained. There is the possibility of Lock coal replacing Leigh Creek coal for the Playford Power Station at Port Augusta when Leigh Creek coal runs out in the next few years. Alternatively, the coal could be gasified for use in a local power station or it could be exported direct to China. In a letter to Havilah shareholders, Dr Bob Johnson said:

The Gawler Craton is a premier exploration destination for large copper-gold-uranium deposits, of which Olympic Dam is the outstanding example. Such mega ore deposits are rare on a world scale, and . . . will generate immense wealth for South Australia for many decades to come. . . The prospectivity of the Gawler Craton for more discoveries is highlighted by Prominent Hill, which is a copper-gold deposit of similar style to Olympic Dam.

He referred to other very significant Olympic Dam style copper-gold discoveries at Prominent Hill and Carrapateena on the western edge of Lake Torrens. The Gawler Craton covers the whole of my electorate of Flinders, with only millions of years of sediments covering its potential! Other

minerals that can be found in the region are diamonds, graphite, jade, salt, talc, gypsum, kaolin clay and, of course, huge quantities of uranium and thorium. This government should be initiating the investigation of a nuclear power plant running on uranium or thorium from deposits that are found on the Eyre Peninsula and all over Australia. However, instead, it has ruled this out, despite enthusiastically exporting uranium. No responsibility is being taken for research or waste disposal, as it morally should be.

A new section of road and an upgrade of the existing road to link Ceduna to the world-class mineral sands deposits to facilitate development is needed now. Standardising the whole of the Eyre Peninsula railway line or at least extending it to link with Whyalla for port access and processing iron ore to connect the region to the whole of Australia should be considered. There is 670 kilometres of narrow gauge rail on Eyre Peninsula from Port Lincoln through to Cummins, to the west of Ceduna and north-east to Kimba. The Kimba spur stops about 70 kilometres short of OneSteel's rail line to Whyalla. The \$48.5 million spent on the pipeline between Whyalla and Kimba to bring 1.4 gegalitres of River Murray water (which I tried to stop) would have gone a long way towards the provision of this railway line, which would have had huge economic benefits for the state. Recently, about half the length of the rail line has been closed to traffic, with only the Port Lincoln to Wudinna and the Port Lincoln to Kimba sections being upgraded for the continuation of traffic. However, in the future, minerals will necessitate the upgrade of the Wudinna/Thevenard section as well. Where is the plan?

Currently, several companies are looking to develop desalination projects on Eyre Peninsula and they cannot obtain approval from SA Water. The government must encourage private enterprise to develop desalination plants and give them access to the existing pipelines and customers or allow SA Water to buy their water and/or provide water desalination plants that compete. Nowhere is the government's bungling ineptitude more evident than in water, and nowhere in the budget is it dealt with.

A desalination proposal by a private company to desalinate sea water at Penong, west of Ceduna, would provide water to meet current needs of the local region and Ceduna, as well as the water required for mineral sands mining and processing near Ceduna. The desalination plant at Penong could be expanded to provide water to other mining developments nearby if connection was put into existing pipeline, possibly at Wirrulla. This pipeline could follow the Glendambo road. The Penong proposal is environmentally sound, as the waste would go into the salt pans near Penong, from where salt is already harvested commercially by Cheetham Salt. But this blinkered government has stonewalled this proposal. The cost per kilolitre of desalinated water would be around the same as that being provided by SA Water, at about \$1.07 per kilolitre.

Additional desalination plants along the coast, in conjunction with green wind farm energy, could provide the necessary water to increase horticulture and selected agricultural projects on the terra rosa soils that are to be found across the region. A visionary government with sound economic management practices would facilitate the installation and development of these private desalination plants using green energy as quickly as possible.

While spending millions of dollars on opening bridges, this government has failed to put in place any funding to help with the planned port infrastructure upgrades. In September 2005 Eyre Regional Development Board appointed a

consultancy firm to develop the Eyre Peninsula Ports Master Plan, with reference to Port Lincoln and Thevenard. The upgrade of both these ports will be necessary for the future of the mining industry in the region. Port Lincoln's Boston Bay is the largest natural deep water harbour in the southern hemisphere and is at least three times larger than Sydney Harbour. It takes Panamax vessels and, with dredging, Cape Bulkers may be possible. Grain is exported in bulk. Mining projects now being developed ensure expanded activity in the port.

There is an urgent need to develop the old BHP wharf for the fishing industry to remove congestion on the main wharf and to enable expansion that includes the mining industry. The main wharf needs upgrading, with possibly the reclamation of more land for sheds and gantries for the mining industry. If this is not possible, the BHP wharf or other sites will need to be considered. Esperance is undertaking grain and mineral handling alongside one another with no dust or contamination problems, and provides a template of what could be achieved at Thevenard and Port Lincoln.

This government is sitting back, enjoying the mining boom fuelled by the appetite of China and India and the price increases, but does not seem to see that, if this is to translate into royalties on new mining ventures, then the infrastructure must be planned now and the government's share of the costs factored into its budgets.

Heavy road transport access to the Port Lincoln harbour from the north is a problem for the road trains (70-plus tonne capacity B-doubles and triples), as all trucks are forced to use the main street in Port Lincoln's CBD. In excess of 1 million tonnes of grain is exported through the main shopping precinct. A Port Lincoln Freight Access Study by Transport SA in April 2002 states that about 125 heavy vehicles per day use this route. The lowest cost estimate by Transport SA for a heavy vehicle bypass road around Port Lincoln to allow access from the western approach road was \$13 million. While AusBulk can be encouraged to upgrade strategic sites on the rail line to reduce traffic from silos located on highways, and upgraded rail infrastructure would increase the use of rail provided the economics stack up, freighting grain by road will always remain a major exercise. Despite Port Lincoln's growth and a bypass being a priority for the council and becoming urgent, there is no apparent state government support.

Thevenard, the port of Ceduna, will service Iluka mineral sands and other minerals, in addition to the grain, salt and gypsum already catered for. Preliminary findings from the consultancy firm show that the future demand for the port and its infrastructure is very positive in terms of projected economic growth. Surveys on deepening the channel and profiling of the sea bed are being undertaken. The upgrade of this port and its infrastructure is vital to the viability of the new mineral sands mining projects and also the current exports of gypsum, salt and grain. Sadly, however, this budget does not mention, that I am aware of, the Port Lincoln or Thevenard ports, nor the connecting roads and railways that will need upgrading.

While the main arterial roads on Eyre Peninsula are either fully or partly sealed, only 5 per cent of all roads are sealed, with approximately 12 000 kilometres still to go. The Lincoln Highway upgrade is completed, but passing lanes and adequate parking bays for trucks are needed, especially when the proposed mining projects come on stream. As well as community roads, the special roads program to seal roads of

economic importance put in by the previous government needs to be reactivated for both tourism and mining roads.

Port Lincoln has the busiest airline terminal outside Adelaide, with 140 000 passengers annually, with full fares being \$462 return, varying down to \$198 where conditions apply. Ceduna fares vary from \$298, where conditions apply, to \$713. Regional Express (that is, REX) is now the only commercial service to Port Lincoln and Ceduna. The government should facilitate the reintroduction of commercial services to Cleve, Wudinna, or other Eyre Peninsula towns, perhaps with some form of subsidy as applies in the Adelaide metropolitan public transport system. The expenditure of \$31 million for trams to replace free buses is very unfair when compared with regional travel costs.

Air transport is essential for moving people and locally produced fresh seafood quickly to and from our capital city. A visionary and economically competent government would assist the Port Lincoln airport owner, Lower Eyre Peninsula District Council, to lengthen the runway to take larger aircraft and upgrade the terminal, while developing freight linkages to overseas air-operator connections. However, this budget has withdrawn even the \$4 million in assistance that was announced in last year's budget, and the busiest South Australian airport outside of Adelaide remains an embarrassment.

There are good soils across the region for these industries—for viticulture and horticulture. Vineyards using desalinated water (one is operating on the edge of the Nullarbor Plain and there are others near Port Lincoln), and olive groves are two new industries. Flowers and vegetable products are grown locally. With plentiful water and support from PIRSA, these could be expanded and air freighted out with existing seafood into Asian and European markets. However, the reality is that PIRSA's funding has been reduced significantly in real terms in the budget over the five years of this government, and this Labor government needs to remember that our state relies heavily on our farmers. They are well aware of the effects that the drought has had on the state government coffers.

Other infrastructure that is overlooked includes housing that will be required for the hundreds, possibly thousands, of new workers employed in the near future, first, in mining, then in other sectors through a flow-on effect. The increase in population will also affect the delivery of health, education and other services. Skilled workers to build homes are already in short supply. The government must work with local government to provide housing of an acceptable low-maintenance standard while facilitating the immigration of skilled workers to fill the mining, tourism, fishing and farming jobs that are being created.

All hospitals on Eyre Peninsula must be maintained as acute-care hospitals to service the industrial, mining and other developments, in addition to their traditional roles. The service at Port Lincoln Hospital should include a recompression unit to protect divers and for its general health benefits. All hospitals and specialist health services, not just those in Port Lincoln, Berri, Whyalla and Mount Gambier, should be adequately funded by the government instead of some being downgraded (as the current government is doing). With a cut over the next four years in regional health services of \$35 million this budget, the only highlight of the budget in rural health is the new hospital at Ceduna, possibly to start in 2009 and be completed in 2010. As this much-needed facility has been announced in this budget, surely it could be started in this financial year and be completed by 2009. The reason

for the delay in providing this one major regional health development is beyond my comprehension, unless it is to ensure that the opening will be just before the next state election.

All area schools and secondary schools on Eyre Peninsula must be retained with specialist courses, such as the olive industry at Tumbly Bay and aquaculture at Cleve and Cowell, being supported.

Time expired.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): I follow the member for Flinders in this place today, and it is another speech from the honourable member in which she whinges, whines and carps about every single thing that is happening. Eyre Peninsula is a place very dear to my heart. I love Eyre Peninsula: the people, the tourism industry, the aquaculture industry and the farming industry. There are some fantastic people doing a very good job. The member for Flinders making speech after speech about what is not happening paints an untrue picture. We have had a lot of dealings with the Eyre Peninsula over five years. The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, the Minister for Transport (also the Minister for Infrastructure), the Minister for Regional Development, the Treasurer and the Premier have a long history of doing business with the people on Eyre Peninsula.

People such as Mark Cant and Jane Lowe from the Regional Development Board on Eyre Peninsula are very good, hardworking people who have done a lot more for the region than the member for Flinders. The greatest service she will do is to retire at the end of this term. The people of Eyre Peninsula deserve a better representative than the member for Flinders. It does not matter from which political party that person comes, they will do a much better job than the member for Flinders who just comes in here and whinges about everything. I saw her in action at a Property Council seminar which was held on Eyre Peninsula in 2004, where she got up and called local government members and mayors uneducated farmers in those roles. I have to say that it was embarrassing to sit there and hear that.

Her nickname over there is Queen Elizabeth because everything is 'my schools', 'my powerlines', 'my roads', 'my train lines'—and that is how she carries on. When I went there for the launch of a wind farm, I found it interesting that the honourable member was talking to the CEO of ElectraNet (the company that owns all the major powerlines in the state) about her powerlines. He had a bit of a wry smile and must have thought, 'Well, they're not your powerlines!' Then she came up with another one of her crazy schemes about how desalination and wind power, and all these things, can be unleashed and made economically possible. If the people with the money for these proposals are not prepared to put up their money, why would a government get in and back them? Perhaps the honourable member should do more research on what is available, what the science and engineering of these projects are, and look at whether they are feasible, instead of coming in here and pretending they are feasible when they are not feasible. I have spent enough time on that.

I congratulate the Treasurer on delivering his sixth surplus budget. It is a very good budget. It is a budget that looks after Labor's key areas of health, education, law and order, and transport. It is a responsible budget which will retain our AAA credit rating—an important factor for this state's economy, something that the Liberals could not deliver. In the area of education, as a parent of a child who is in the state school system, I am pleased to see that the education budget

now provides, on average, \$11 204 for every government school student—an increase of \$3 600 in spending per student since 2001-02.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: I will not put up with interjections from members of the Liberal Party, which closed schools in this state without any consultation; so do not come in here and have a go at us, member for Finnis, about looking after the education of our young South Australians. I think the Minister for Education and Children's Services has done a fantastic job, and we have seen an increase in this budget of 6.7 per cent on every government school student. We are paying our teachers more money. Teachers deserve every dollar they get. They are fantastic and they play such an important role in the development of our young people and future leaders. I pay tribute to all our teachers in the state, including in the independent sector, and the principals of our schools who are also doing a very good job.

Total expenditure in education and children's services increased by \$127.2 million compared with last year. Some \$127 million is a huge amount of money. There are some challenges to be faced by schools in terms of meeting WorkCover payments and hitting targets for energy and water use. They are things that we will work through with our local schools. I am sure most representatives here would have been in contact with schools in their local communities. There is some angst at present but, as always with change, there needs to be further discussion; and those further discussions are ongoing. We need to put some responsibility back onto the schools to hit these targets on water savings, energy targets and workers compensation. If we do not, it is human nature to think that other schools will carry the can and pick up the slack; and that does not always happen. Having said that, there are some fantastic schools in my area that are working really hard. It seems a little unfair to make them have to work harder in that area, but the end result will be more money for students which will not be wasted on power bills, water bills and workers compensation bills.

Another area of record spending is in transport. I am very pleased to see in the \$542 million package for transport that the Noarlunga rail line—which was first laid in the 70s—will be completely redone with concrete sleepers. This will shave between three to five minutes off the service between Noarlunga and the city. That will be of great benefit to the people of Mawson, the electorate that I am very proud to represent.

Over the past few years I have had a lot of discussions with operators of both small and big business in my electorate, and I know they are very happy with the reduction in payroll tax. Payroll tax is one of those imposts that does not help our employment or growing business, so it is very good to see that it received attention this year. From 1 July this year the rate of payroll tax will be reduced from 5.5 per cent to 5.25 per cent, and a further reduction on 1 July next year will see that rate drop to 5 per cent. This will mean that we will have payroll tax equal to that of Victoria and equal second-lowest in the nation. That is very important when you look at the job market in Victoria. We need to be competitive with Victoria, and this will allow us to do that. I note that Peter Vaughan, of Business SA, has warmly welcomed the Treasurer's move in that respect.

The tax cuts announced in this budget will take the total amount of tax relief provided by the Rann Labor government since it came into office to nearly \$2 billion when fully implemented by 2010-11. This \$2 billion is an enormous

amount of money, and I congratulate the Treasurer on returning that money to the people of South Australia as well as delivering increased services in health, education, transport, and law and order.

On the subject of health, I note with interest that the Flinders Medical Centre is receiving millions more dollars—which is fantastic for the people of the south—as is the Noarlunga Hospital. We are very well served by our hospitals in the southern region of Adelaide, and I am very impressed with the health minister's idea of having a spine of hospitals running the length of the metropolitan area, with the Lyell McEwin Hospital in the north and the new hospital which will be developed over the next few years on the old railway site—the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital.

I think the new hospital is a fantastic idea, one that will be warmly welcomed by so many who have had to put up with substandard conditions at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for a number of years. A lot of money has been spent on that hospital, but trying to patch up an old hospital is always an expensive exercise. I think we will be much better served by a purpose-built hospital with a railway line running underneath it, and a tramline connecting people to a hospital that is in the centre of town. So, that is the middle part of the spine and, of course, the southern base of the spine is the Flinders Medical Centre, which is a wonderful hospital, and we will be well served by regional hospitals such as the Noarlunga Hospital.

Also in the area of health, we are about to open our new ambulance station at McLaren Vale, and that is a very welcome addition to my local area. The ambulance has actually been on site there since January, and it costs almost \$1 million a year to run. The ambulance station, which is under construction at the moment, will cost just under \$1 million. That is a lot of money. I heard the opposition health spokesperson talking in here earlier about how ambulance officers are being overworked. When we came into government in 2002 I was working for the then emergency services minister, and almost immediately we had to put an extra \$6 million into the ambulance service and employ 60 extra ambulance officers just to meet the demand and stop all these people having to work double shifts and more when they were at the end of their tether.

This was at a time when the former member for Mawson (the emergency services minister in the Olsen government) had promised the people of McLaren Vale an ambulance station. There was no way the ambulance service could have been extended at that stage because there were not enough ambulance officers to go around. We have increased the number of ambulance officers, and now we are expanding the service. Apart from McLaren Vale, I know there are new ambulance stations being promised around the state.

I refer again to education. I wish to thank the education minister for the money she has provided for a feasibility study into the upgrade of some fairly outdated buildings at Willunga High School. For the past couple of years I have been fighting hard for an upgrade, and I am pleased to have taken the Premier and the Minister for Education on a tour of Willunga High School to show them these dilapidated buildings and what needs to be done. The money is now available for a welcome upgrade of Willunga High School.

Soon we will be opening the marvellous new development of Willunga Primary School. A lot of money has been spent on this school by the state government. It is a brand new school, almost from go to whoa. The students have already moved into their classrooms, although work is still being

carried out before the official opening. I must say that the people of Willunga are very pleased with what has happened at the primary school, and we are looking forward to a similar upgrade at the high school over the next couple of years.

Another school in the area to do very well is the lovely McLaren Flat Primary School in the electorate of Mawson. It is undergoing a \$2.2 million upgrade, and a lot of that money is coming from the federal government. I think our spending on that one is \$400 000, but it is a demonstration of a collaborative effort to work with the federal government. I give credit where it is due with the two spheres of government working together for the betterment of our school children and their facilities. Hackham West Primary School will also benefit from a new security fence to be built around the school. This will add to the safety of Hackham West Primary School and make our teachers and students feel a little safer.

So, again, I would like to pass on my congratulations to the Treasurer, and all the members of cabinet. It is never an easy job to frame a budget. We could always do with more money in various areas. I know that the ministers all fight hard for their particular patch, but at the same time we need to be responsible in our spending and need to protect our triple A credit rating. If we served up all the money that is promised from the opposition benches the state would be bankrupt, because those people over there have no idea about fiscal constraint. This government is seen now by the people of South Australia as fantastic economic managers. If we sat down here and we tallied up everything that the people on the other side had asked for it would run into billions and billions of dollars and we would be back into the bad old days of a Liberal government, where we were the rust bucket state of Australia. The Rann Labor government of the past five years has turned the fortunes of this great state around, and we are looking for an even brighter, more prosperous future, thanks to this budget and the forward good economic management of this state.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): It gives me a good deal of pleasure to rise today and have my input into the budget of 2007. If South Australia ever wanted such a supremely out of touch, mindless, no brainer budget, it was delivered in this place a fortnight ago. It is only a matter of time before a majority of our community wake up to the nonsense that is being peddled around by the Premier and his henchmen and consign them to the annals of history where they belong. The total lack of business acumen and experience in the cabinet and, more to the point, a treasurer who carries on like a latter day Napoleon Bonaparte, accepting no criticism from anybody, on either side of the house, nor indeed any person outside, is symptomatic of an arrogant and contemptible government. I would suggest that what happened to Bonaparte in Moscow might end up happening to the Treasurer.

In the midst of one of the greatest boom periods in Australia's history, courtesy of an outstanding federal Howard government, and the amazing economies of India and China in particular, we are going backwards in South Australia, despite what you may hear in this place. It will take a miracle for our manufacturing industry, particularly the motor car industry to survive, given the price of cheap imports, and I do fear for the thousands of families who rely on the jobs in the car industry, and I am sure that neither side of the house wants to see this go into further decline. That would be the last thing anyone would want. What we should

be doing is putting in place alternatives should that happen. We just simply cannot compete with the labor costs in China, Korea, India, and those places where motor cars are now being produced.

The mining boom will ultimately back off and the defence industry initiatives are federally driven. We do have a good news premier, only around for the cameras when it suits him. The Premier is missing in action on the current education debacle. Why should parents have to hold sausage sizzles to fund WorkCover levies? Why should South Australian parents have to see their children's music programs cut? Why should South Australian parents have to see their kids' aquatic programs put in jeopardy? Where is the Premier? He is nowhere to be seen on the horizon and, instead, leaving it up to poor old public servants and so on to fight a good politician bun fight. It cannot be good news. That is why the Premier is not to be seen on this issue. Where is the Premier to be seen in the nurses' demands for a fair deal? Nowhere to be seen. When is the Premier going to actually do something about the bikies issue, rather than just gesticulate and look cross in front of the cameras?

The events of the last few days and weeks just provide further evidence that empty rhetoric from the Rann government does nothing to make safe decent and honest South Australians going about their lives. Why should our young people be put at risk of being shot at, near and around nightclubs? Premier, you stand condemned on your lack of action and empty words on the bikies issue. This matter needs a heavy and swift course of action to wipe out once and for all these mongrels of society who sneer at the law and fill our community with drugs, crime and fear, and run their illegal enterprises, seemingly willy-nilly, without anything being done to stop them. When are we going to see a bulldozer actually knock down one of these fortresses? For heaven's sake stop talking and do something about it. Get real, Premier, I say.

My portfolio area of local government is drowning under the imposts of the Rann government. More and more financial strain is being placed on this core source of governance by a cold and arrogant Rann administration. Waste levies disappearing into state coffers instead of going back into the local government sector are a frightening example of disdain by the Rann government. I say to members opposite, and particularly those in marginal seats: beware the Ides of March and, more particularly, 20 March 2010, because the electors of this state are going to be reminded constantly every time they get their rates notices from their local councils that the added revenue raising that appears on their bill is more than likely coming from another state demand pressed on councils, rather than from their council.

Councils are the fall guys for a greedy and hungry Treasurer who cares about people not at all. While council roads are languishing across the state, in both the metropolitan and rural areas, this greedy Treasurer basks in the wash of money from the GST, something he and his cronies opposed and screamed about and fought to the end about. How the worm has turned. Heaven forbid that Kevin Rudd and a Labor government were elected federally, because I think the first thing they would do, with the acquiescence of all the other states, would be to raise the GST. It would make them extremely happy and give the Premier even more money to play with and spend on nonsensical areas like SHine and otherwise loony programs, instead of putting it back into core South Australian services, such as roads. Both

rural and city local governments have care and control of many roads.

Much is waffled about by premier Rann in relation to the environment, recycling, water conservation, etc. However, little or no money follows the empty rhetoric, and I will come back to that later. State demands are followed by state contempt. So many local government areas have no effluent disposal but are put under even more legislative requirements by an out of control EPA which puts enormous dictatorial demands on a sector that simply does not have the resources to carry out those legislative requirements and demands.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: If the minister wants to have a crack, Mr Speaker, he can get up in due course and give a speech. I am happy to take the interjections; it is like water off a duck's back. However, he can have a go, and I would be pleased if he would have a go after me. The continual belting of local government by the Rann government is being ingrained in the minds of many mayors and councillors, and their memories are long. I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the house in marginal seats are delighted at the actions of the troika on the front bench and cannot wait for 20 March 2010, and I can't wait either, I can tell you.

The tourism sector has once again been served a dose of snake oil and left floundering. It is an arrant nonsense to suggest that marketing has been given a big tick in the Foley budget. It is more a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Why, you may ask? The marketing announcement is at the forefront of the government's considerable propaganda campaign—radio, newspapers, TV—and being paid for, once again, by the poor old South Australian taxpayer. While some funding increase to domestic marketing is welcome, international marketing has been cut back. I would say that that is pretty smart stuff. But, worse, where is the funding coming from for the marketing? Events SA has had its budget shafted with nearly \$500 000 being removed to go into the marketing budget, which is, as I say, robbing Peter to pay Paul.

What does this mean? It means that when Events SA goes in to bat for events and bid around the world on behalf of South Australia, it will have a budget of zilch to compete with. While other countries and states spend real dollars, we in South Australia have equipped our tourism people with a handful of dollars and a fistful of Treasury contempt and arrogance. It has nothing else to battle away with. I can just imagine their going to the United States, England, Europe or somewhere where they are going in to bat to try to get an event.

It is interesting to note that today the tourism minister waxed lyrical about the Police and Fire Games. It is probably worth putting on the record once again the fact that the Police and Fire Games were brought on by the former Liberal government. It did the bidding and the hard work. Once again, we had the pleasure of going to the opening of the event. The former minister, Joan Hall, sat at the back, along with me. She got a brief mention, but that was about all. We were the ones who got the Police and Fire Games—the former Liberal government—and we have really nothing to replace it.

At least two key events over the past 12 months have brought people to South Australia: one was the South Australian Tourism Exchange, which was a oncer, and the other was the Police and Fire Games, which was a oncer. We do have other events coming, such as the bowls competition and other small-scale events, but they really pale into insignificance when compared with the Police and Fire

Games. There is really nothing on the horizon by way of a large event. We have this artificially inflated figure for tourism in the city for the last 12 months which, if you drill down into it and find out where they went, next year it will not happen, I can tell you.

Our people bidding from Events SA have been left like a forlorn bride at the altar: destitute, disappointed, forgotten and penniless. Next time the Premier and his minister open an event and grab a camera opportunity, just remember that, as the events wind down, you have no-one to blame but yourselves. You do not have any other big events coming. You have a multitude of small events. You could not even get a major sponsor for the Tour Down Under. What do I do? I put in a freedom of information request, but I am told, 'No, we can't do all that. We can't let you have that. You can have a handful of information.' This Rann Labor government has emasculated the Events SA team, and it is a disgrace.

Tourism is a tough game with small margins. Those South Australians who work so hard in so many small businesses are making it very clear to me that they feel deserted by this Rann Labor government and its failure to assist their industry by way of a decent budget allocation. It seems to be that every year it just holds its own and that is about it. Figures are juggled around so that they can put out a glamorous press release saying that marketing has gone up. What a lot of nonsense!

Tourism organisations and businesses around the state have contacted me and expressed dismay and growing anger at the Foley budget. Why would they work themselves into the ground only to see the minister and the Premier pay little more than lip service to this critical employer? Tourism employs thousands of people around the state and is a core employer in and around the city and in regional parts of South Australia. Apart from mining up north, it is about the only industry that is employing, and it is a complex industry.

Air services, tour bookings, accommodation and so on are very susceptible to events overseas. The very hint of a terror attack or, indeed, heaven forbid, a plane disaster immediately impacts on the travel plans of so many potential overseas visitors. Only one of these things need go astray and visitors from many overseas countries drop the ball. Large numbers of American and Italian visitors, amongst others, get very nervous, cancel very quickly and do not come, which is totally understandable.

So, we should be spending even more on our international marketing efforts; we should be spending even more on our domestic marketing efforts. We should be spending a power of money on trying to lure Asia into Adelaide to provide more air services at a cheaper rate, but that is another story for another day. Marketing is so important to tourism, and to see it gutted in some areas and so little spent in others is tantamount to a critical act of neglect. The Rann government stands condemned for its attitude to a longstanding and proud industry. It is my intention to listen to industry and not just show up every time there is a photo opportunity but assist that sector in practical ways, despite the fact that it is regularly forgotten by this arrogant government.

The poor old southern suburbs have once again been treated in a dismissive manner by the Rann Labor government. Yesterday, six minutes of time was spent by a southern seat member talking about railway sleepers. Why, you ask? The reason was that the member for Bright had only sleepers to talk about, because that was about all she got in the budget. If the press and the rumblings around the corridors are to be believed (and I have no reason to doubt them), the cuts to

education and the pressure being put on families and teachers around the state are causing a good deal of angst—and so they should. I think that what is happening to education in this state is an absolute disgrace. Once again, I say: roll on 20 March 2010.

The completion of the Southern Expressway, the extension of the rail line to Seaford, and public transport schedule improvements to McLaren Vale and its surrounds have once again all been left to a future Liberal government to fix up. Premier Rann, you have forgotten the south. No doubt, we will see a flurry of money and a shower of gifts in the last year or so of this government in a sick and sorry attempt to remedy the situation. Showering the people with gifts is no panacea late in the day for a term of neglect.

I remain most concerned at the increase in debt caused by Treasurer Foley in this budget. I would have thought that Labor had learned from the State Bank debacle of the early nineties. However, it appears that Treasurer Foley is once again taking South Australia into deep and depressing debt waters. Once again, a lack of business experience is showing up at cabinet level.

I fear that we will plunge into the mire of fiscal disaster. They are a few of the negative issues. I do actually support the thrust of the government in relation to payroll tax deductions; I think that that is a step in the right direction, although it has not gone far enough. Quite clearly, despite Mr Vaughan's comments, the message that I am getting from business around the traps is that they would like to see a lot more encouragement and a push to assist them in going about their ways.

I would like to spend a bit of time talking about health. I actually feel terribly sorry for the people of South Australia with what is being done to the health area. For the life of me, I cannot understand what the minister and the government intend to do about health. Instead of actually trying to fix it up, they will completely mess it up, in my view. The first thing they will do—and they are just pandering to the Mandarins in Hindmarsh Square—is remove boards. Only yesterday, we heard that the Chairman of the Central Adelaide Health Board will resign on 30 June. These boards have been around the city and the state for decades. In many cases, these units were put up by communities; they were built by communities. They were funded by communities, and for a long time the state was relieved of a lot of the cost for this.

What we are seeing now is, in my mind, an absolute debacle. The minister has not given us an indication of how many country hospitals he will close: 'Oh, no; we won't close any.' You wait to see what happens. Mark my words; what will happen is that the role models in a lot of those hospitals will be changed. They will come back to nursing homes and age-care facilities. You will not be able to have a baby in many of these units; you will not be able to have minor surgery because none of that will exist.

Regional people will be made to travel, in many cases, hundreds of kilometres away from their families, and be made to pay accommodation expenses and everything else to get simple, basic medical care that they have always had. You will also see another drift of doctors from the rural areas into the city. They will not want to stay out there just to look after age-care homes and nursing-type situations; they want challenges in health. They will get duded.

I recognise that the government will spend money in four regional hospitals, but that is not much help to those in other places around the state. Similarly, what an absolute debacle

is taking place in education in South Australia. I think there are a few former Labor premiers and ministers who would turn in their graves if they could see what is being done to education. I think it is absolutely atrocious. We have raised the issue of music and aquatic programs being targeted, but then the last two weeks has seen the absolute epitome of stupidity in what is happening with the demands that have been put on schools to come up with workers compensation levies. I cannot believe that families—parents, grandparents, uncles and aunts—everybody—will have to raise money to fund these things.

School programs will have to be cut to fund this. It is a core responsibility of the state, in my view, that these workers compensation levies are paid by the state through the departmental finances, not thrust back on the mums and dads in the city or around the state. It is appalling, and I think it will come back to haunt this government. The issue of water is also huge in South Australia, and I do not really think that this government knows how to come to grips with the situation. I think muddle-fuddling around like it has done for the past five years and accomplishing nothing will come back and bite them severely in the stern before it is all over.

The Liberal Party came up with a plan for a desalination plant. All of a sudden, that was a terrible idea, because the Labor government did not think of it in the first instance. I say to you, Mr Speaker, and to members in this place, that desalination is a terrific way to go. Why on earth would Labor governments in Queensland and Western Australia (which is committing to another one) build them? But, no, we cannot have one here; if we are to have one, it will be in the next umpteenth years. It is the same scenario with the Mount Bold reservoir; we are not going to have that for another 10 years.

Lord help us if we stay in drought for an extended period, because we will have no water, parents will be having sausage sizzles to pay for their kids' education, the hospitals will all be duded, and there will be no doctors out in the country. In the metropolitan area you will not be able to have a baby at Modbury, and down at QEH you will not be able to get renal treatment. And these are in Labor seats currently, might I add, Mr Speaker. I say to the government: I think it is about time that its backbenchers got busy and held their front bench to account, and started having some serious input into where this state is going financially and economically. They should be listening to their communities, because there is no doubt that they are getting plenty of information and communication by way of letters, emails and phone calls about what a disgraceful thing is happening in South Australia at the moment.

Time expired.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): It gives me great pleasure to speak on the budget today. The Rann government continues to deliver sound and financially responsible budgets that honour our commitment to work together to advance the interests of South Australia and the welfare of its people. Economic responsibility has been our hallmark for the past six years, and the Treasurer is to be congratulated on his sixth budget. This has enabled us to not only achieve our sixth consecutive budget in surplus but also to invest these extra funds in such critical portfolio areas as health, education, transport, water supply and community services. Importantly, though, this budget is not a reflection of simply resting on our laurels and continuing as we have done before. Rather, it is an example of bold and ambitious

decision-making, which sets a framework for our future. It is a budget that reflects our current confidence in our place within Australia and our optimism in realising our potential.

While this is very much a budget for all South Australians, I would like to mention a few initiatives that are of particular significance to my electorate. In this budget, the Rann government is launching the biggest health reform in the state's history. With 30 per cent of people living in the electorate of Norwood aged over 60 years, I am acutely aware that improving the health system is a top priority for them. Many of the issues that they have raised with me are those which confront our health system throughout the state. These include an increasing demand for hospital services, an ageing population, deteriorating infrastructure, and the growing cost of medical technology.

However, as we have done, and have continued to do since we came to government, we have listened and we have responded. We are prepared to meet the challenges of unmet need, and we have done so by increasing our net health spending over the next four years to \$523 million, including \$250 million to allow for an extra 60 000 people to be admitted to hospital. We are also investing in health infrastructure, with the construction of a new \$1.7 billion hospital to replace the Royal Adelaide Hospital and over \$300 million to improve our other public hospitals. We are committed to health reform, and that is precisely the reason why we have a health care plan for the state. By providing more primary health care services through our GP Plus health care centres and by modernising our public health system, we are determined to keep all South Australians fit and healthy.

Another budget measure, and one which will benefit many businesses in my electorate, is that which delivers the biggest reduction in payroll tax in South Australian history. From 1 July 2007, the rate of payroll tax will drop from 5.5 to 5.25 per cent and, from 1 July 2008, it will drop to 5 per cent, which is a payroll tax rate equal to that of Victoria and equal second lowest in the country. To the tune of more than \$300 million over the next four years, this reduction will provide relief to over 6 500 businesses and 370 000 employees across the state. Many businesses in my electorate have talked to me about payroll tax in the past, and I am delighted that they have again contacted me to say how pleased they are that the government has acted to address their concerns. Mr Peter Vaughan, the CEO of South Australia's peak business body Business SA, perhaps summed it up best when he stated:

This is a red-letter day for business in this state. The government has delivered, it is to be applauded. . . It makes us totally competitive with the rest of Australia.

You cannot do much better than that. The Rann government's agenda has always been to ensure that South Australians continue to experience the best economic conditions possible so that we can all enjoy higher rates of job creation and higher living standards. Adelaide has consistently been rated as one of the best places in the world in which to do business and, with business investment increasing by 73 per cent over the last five years and with our unemployment rate currently below 5 per cent, there is no better time to do business in South Australia.

For instance, key initiatives currently under way in our state that highlight our prevailing business conditions include the securing of more than \$3 billion of major projects and, of course, winning the \$6 billion contract to build air warfare destroyers for the Australian Navy. All these successes continue to provide significant economic employment

opportunities for South Australia—and we heard the Premier make further announcements today about the success that South Australia is having in this area. As the Presiding Member of the Public Works Committee, I can indicate that we have been very pleased to see the number of projects coming through that will benefit not only South Australia but also, in particular, the people of the western suburbs, such as the revitalisation of the Port Adelaide area.

However, even though our employment numbers continue to rise and our economic performance continues to be sound, we must remain firmly focused on the job at hand. We must continue to educate and train South Australians to ensure that they have first-class skills and knowledge. We must maintain the most competitive business environment possible, and we must continue to invest in economic and social infrastructure to further enhance productivity. I am delighted that the budget addresses all those principles, not only right now but also in its clear vision for the future.

However, whilst it is always the big ticket items and new spending in the budget that attract all the attention, we should not forget the continual work that the government does throughout the year. As local members, we see the many grants that come through to our local organisations. They are provided by the government, which takes heed of the needs of the community and also the smaller community organisations, which sometimes would find it difficult to operate without government support.

At this point, I would like to mention some projects with which the government and I have been very involved throughout the year and which have involved significant economic outcomes for my electorate. The first is the redevelopment of the Norwood Primary School. I certainly pressed hard for this proposal, and I was delighted that the Rann government invested \$4.3 million to provide modern, efficient and functional areas for the effective delivery of education to the Norwood community. This project will allow students to experience a variety of teaching methodologies and will provide opportunities for enhanced professional learning for all staff and improve the amenity of the site for the wider community.

Money also has been allocated for a feasibility study to be carried out with respect to the East Adelaide Primary School for the upgrading of its administration area. Many of the schools in my area are very old, given that Norwood was one of the first settled areas in South Australia, so they have been in need of refurbishment. I am very pleased that we have been successful in gaining some support for our schools.

Another project in which I was heavily involved with our government was the allocation of \$800 000 to the City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters to help fund flood mitigation works along First Creek. Flooding issues have been of concern to my constituents over the years, and I was very pleased that I was able to achieve a great outcome for them in this area. The grant will go towards stages 1 and 2 of the works, which commenced prior to Christmas last year. The remaining stages are scheduled to be undertaken in late 2007.

Another project for which I lobbied very hard was the allocation of some money, again to the City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters, towards the purchase of some land that would create more open space. The land is at 132 Magill Road, Norwood. This land, which represents an extra 613 square metres of space, will be incorporated into Richards Park and will enable the council to create a much improved park entrance for the Norwood community. I had

made my thoughts quite clear to the government that I believed there was an unmet need to enhance open space in Norwood. I repeat that Norwood is an old area that was originally surrounded by farmland, so open space was never considered to be an issue. Now it is very difficult to provide the appropriate open space in the area, when a very small block of land might cost something like \$600 000. So, I was delighted that funding for 50 per cent of the purchase price was able to be secured.

The community now has more publicly accessible land to enjoy, and the business community on Magill Road has more opportunities to benefit from increased pedestrian traffic and the provision of new services and facilities, which will encourage greater visitation. All this is possible because of six years of responsible economic management. I know that my colleagues from the southern suburbs might say that Norwood is not a destination, but I think it certainly is. We are all very proud of our own communities, and I am very proud of the Norwood electorate. It is small—it is only 13½ square kilometres in size—but it does have a lot of services. It is a very densely populated area and, with that, come many more challenges to provide appropriate services and facilities for the community. However, I am happy to say (and, again, referring to a colleague from the southern suburbs) that we do enjoy a lot of the wines which are produced in the southern areas. We have our Norwood Food and Wine Festival, which is very successful and will be coming up again in March next year. We have something like 80 000 people participating, and it is certainly one of the more popular events in South Australia.

Our government has also allocated an enormous amount of money in the area of the arts, and we have seen that WOMAD has now been extended to become an annual event. The Fringe has also been extended. The Adelaide Film Festival is enormously successful and, again, although we are a small state and we probably do not have as much funding available for the film festival as perhaps some of the international festivals, the South Australian Film Corporation has been extremely successful with some of the films it has produced. In fact, at the Cannes Film Festival last year (or was it early this year), *Ten Canoes*, which was one of the films produced by the SA Film Corporation, won an award, so we can be very proud of that. We have also invested in biotechnology, because it is certainly important to our state.

Going back to the Adelaide Festival Centre, its debt of something like \$25 million was wiped off, so the Festival Centre can now go forward without having to worry about the debt and again produce events and activities for the community of South Australia. Currently, we have the Cabaret Festival, which is also proving to be very successful. My friends interstate ask, 'What week is it in Adelaide?' or, 'What festival is taking place?', because they know that we are great supporters of the arts, particularly the special events that we have here in South Australia.

A lot of money has been invested in infrastructure, and we will see many of these projects come before the Public Works Committee. One thing that I neglected to mention in the electorate of Norwood is that work on the Beulah Park fire station will be starting fairly soon. Also, something which is dear to my heart, apart from the various infrastructure projects, and one that will be very popular with cyclists, is the criterium track to be built in South Australia. The Norwood Cycling Club, which is the oldest cycling club in the southern hemisphere and of which I am very proud to be a patron, currently conducts criteriums on Regency Road and around

the Regency Park area where members have to contend with a lot of traffic, particularly trucks, which is particularly dangerous. So the criterium bicycle track will be built at the State Sports Park (the commencement of that work will be fairly soon), and it will certainly be a boon for cyclists in South Australia.

All these works, and many others, are possible because of six years of responsible economic management. All this is possible because the Rann government has shown that it has the ability and vision to secure the health and prosperity of South Australia. I congratulate the Treasurer upon the presentation of this budget. It clearly demonstrates what we do best: that is, we act in the best interests of South Australia and its people.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, am pleased to make a contribution to what is, obviously, an important piece of legislation—the Appropriation Bill—through which sufficient funds are attributed to the different departments and agencies of the state to see them function correctly throughout the ensuing 12 months. However, as the leader and other members (particularly on this side of the house) have already stated, there are some quite distinctive characteristics to describe this budget, and they are really summed up in three words: debt, delay and disappointment.

First, I would like to speak about the issue of debt. It is important to look at some statistics when we talk about economic issues, and the budget papers show that the former Liberal government had reduced the state debt from \$11.6 billion in 1993 to \$3.2 billion in 2001. Since that time, we have seen the current estimate of the Public Service debt at June this year to be \$3.361 billion, which includes a general government component of debt. If you want to put things into context, you have to look back at the previous Labor government's regime where, as a result of the ineptitude of that government and its lack of control of its financial affairs, the state was left with a debt of \$3.5 billion as a consequence of the State Bank collapse. That compares quite closely with the estimated debt level as at June this year of \$3.361 billion. So, we are now in a situation where we are back to the future with this current budget.

What is also quite disturbing is that, if one analyses the situation a little further and thinks about these issues impacting the state's finances, this increase in debt has the potential to put the state's finances into a highly geared situation. The Treasurer is basing his projections on 4 per cent growth in the state. Only last year we had 1 per cent growth. The Treasurer has explained that away by saying that it is related to the drought, and so on. The nation has been gripped by drought over the past 12 to 18 months, and parts of the country have been gripped by drought for a lot longer, but we have seen a national growth average of 2.5 per cent.

This budget is based on hope and a wing and a prayer. In order to achieve the revenue outcomes we are looking at 4 per cent growth. I question whether that growth is achievable. If it is not achievable, potentially we will not receive the level of income that is forecast. We have increased our borrowings and debts and potentially we have a reduced repayment capacity. Therefore, it puts the state into what is referred to as a highly geared situation. The repayment capacity has reduced and debt levels have increased, and the outcome will be a threat to our AAA credit rating.

Previous Labor governments have form on this. As a result of the State Bank collapse and the absolute shambolic state in which our economy and finances were left, we lost our

AAA credit rating. It was downgraded. Former Liberal governments through the 1990s and into the 2000s fought tooth and nail and made some really tough decisions—at times quite unpopular decisions—to try to claw our way back into some semblance of financial order and financial credibility.

This budget has the potential to threaten our AAA credit rating. We all know what happens when the credit rating is reduced. The cost of funds will increase, so the interest that the state has to pay on existing borrowings—depending on the terms of the borrowing contracts, whether fixed rate facilities or flexible rates—will have a deleterious effect on our economy going forward. I think that is an important point that needs to be highlighted in terms of the potential for the state as a consequence of this budget and as a consequence of increased debt levels.

I want to raise some issues concerning schools and education services. The government has failed miserably in this area, but the Premier has tried to portray the image that he is the education premier; that education and the wellbeing of our children is the No. 1 priority on his agenda. It is difficult to understand that when we see what has happened to our education services with the quite significant and astounding cuts to the education budget. Obviously, this is a continuation of a series of cuts. Several months ago small schools—I think the criterion was a 50 kilometre radius of Adelaide, which means schools in the electorates of Heysen and Schubert and my electorate—received some quite severe cuts—\$30 000 to be precise.

There was some real community concern—which still continues—in relation to those cuts. At the time we raised those issues here in the house. I clearly recall making a speech on the matter. I raised issues concerning the member for Morialta (and it is good to see the member for Morialta in the house at present) and also the member for Newland. As a consequence of the redistribution of electoral boundaries, some of these small schools in the Adelaide Hills will be placed in the electorates of Morialta and Newland. The level of community concern in those areas will have a direct effect on the electoral outcomes for the members for Morialta and Newland.

The member for Morialta yesterday advised the house that she had been doorknocking. Well, she needs to do more than doorknocking to secure her seat in March 2010; she needs to convince her Minister for Education and Children's Services that she has made a catastrophic decision which is having a huge impact on these small schools. From memory, the member for Morialta might have only one of these small schools go into her electorate—Basket Range, I think—but the member for Newland will have three or four of these schools going into his electorate from the districts of Paracombe, Houghton, Inglewood and Cuddlee Creek-Millbrook.

If one looks at the margin by which the member for Newland holds his seat and the number of electors that will go into Newland from these areas which are directly affected by these callous and harsh cuts by the Minister for Education and Children's Services, more than enough new electors are going into Newland from these disenchanting districts to see the member for Newland lose his seat. I think he holds it by about 5 per cent, which equates to about 1 000 votes. In electorates of 22 000 voters, about 10 per cent do not vote, so there are about 20 000 people who register and cast a vote. From memory, there are about 1 500 new electors going from those districts in the Hills into Newland, so there is half that

number again to have a direct impact on the electoral outcome for the member for Newland. I think it would be in his best interests to speak to the Treasurer, to the Premier and to the Minister for Education and Children's Services in an effort to have that nonsensical decision reversed, and reversed pretty quickly. Some of those areas are currently in my constituency, and I continue to receive a significant number of contacts from constituents raising this particular issue.

In the latest round of cuts, larger secondary schools will have their budgets reduced by some \$100 000. In my electorate there are two secondary schools—Oakbank Area School, which is an R to 12 school, and Mount Barker High School. As a consequence of the redistribution, I will regain Birdwood High School. They are all very good schools but, with a cut of at least \$100 000 from their budget, I wonder how they will adequately meet their needs. There are two things they can do. First, like any budget cuts, they can reduce the services provided to the children. However, we need to remember what the charter of the education department is. It is all about providing a very good level of educational service to our children, but it seems that, as a consequence of these latest cuts, there will be a reduction in services to our children. The other option is to hit the parents, the community, with an increase in fees. I understand that the member for Davenport has met with all the secondary schools in his electorate. On average, parents are facing an increase of \$100 per child per annum, which is a significant cost to the families and our communities around the state.

I also wish to speak about some issues that the government has recently raised concerning our water resources and water security. The Minister for Water Security recently announced a study, consultation or review—whatever we like to call it—into the expansion of Mount Bold reservoir. Mount Bold reservoir is not in my electorate: it is in the electorate of the member for Heysen. However, I have an understanding of water-related issues in the Adelaide Hills, and I am pleased to represent part of that region in this place.

I am not quite sure what plan the government has. I know that it does not really have any idea about what it will do if and when it expands the holding capacity of Mount Bold reservoir. I have been to a number of meetings in my electorate, and also in the electorate of the member for Heysen, in relation to the prescription process concerning the western Mount Lofty Ranges water resources. Senior departmental officers have attended those meetings and, in the course of the discussions, those senior departmental officers have advised that no additional water can be taken from the Adelaide Hills—no additional water over and above what is currently used for industry, primary production and for environmental flows. If the Minister for Water Security thinks there is surplus water running out of the Adelaide Hills to increase the capacity of Mount Bold, I do not believe she is speaking to her senior departmental people on the issue.

The government cannot take water from the Adelaide Hills because it is at its limit. The member for Heysen and I, as the local members, and the farmers, businesses and the industry people in the Hills have been told that there is no surplus water in the Adelaide Hills. The only other option available to the government is a desalination plant that will desalinate water and pump it into Mount Bold, but I do not think that is an option because, once the water is cleaned and filtered, it should not be put into an open catchment basin. Therefore, in order to fill Mount Bold the water will have to come from the river.

Members can tell me if I am wrong, but I thought the major thrust of this government—and all governments that rely on the Murray-Darling system—is to try to wean the state off its reliance on that river system. I thought the general thrust was to get away from having to pump water from the Murray, that we are trying to reduce the amount of water we are taking from the river. If we are to expand the capacity of Mount Bold, that is the only source of fresh potable water that can be delivered into Mount Bold. So, the government has an enormous amount of work to do in relation to that issue.

In closing, I want to talk quickly about some issues relating to mining and mineral exploration, in particular, the issue of uranium enrichment. We have heard the Premier make public statements that he categorically opposes any initiative that might progress the area of uranium enrichment. We have also heard him publicly oppose even having a debate with the leader about any issue concerning nuclear energy. What is evident from the Premier's statements on these issues is that he is a follower. The Premier is a follower: he is not a leader. All he does is try to attract public attention through the media on populist issues.

If the Premier were a true leader, he would engage in a debate on nuclear energy. He would at least have some proper scientific research done on uranium enrichment, because I do not think that he really understands what uranium enrichment is about because, if he did, he would look to progress the debate and have an open mind on the issue. The Premier is a follower, not a leader. This state needs a leader, not a follower.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjourned of the debate.

HARBORS AND NAVIGATION (AUSTRALIAN BUILDERS PLATE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION BILL

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments Nos 12 and 17 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed, did not insist on its amendment No. 3 and made an amendment on account of disagreeing to the alternative amendments made by the House of Assembly in lieu thereof, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Clause 3, page 1, after line 10—Delete paragraph (ia).

Consideration in committee.

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

That the House of Assembly's disagreement to amendments Nos 12 and 17 of the Legislative Council not be insisted on; that the alternative amendments of the House of Assembly not be insisted on; and that the consequential amendment of the Legislative Council made as a result of the Legislative Council no longer insisting on its amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

If I can break that down into language which ordinary citizens can understand, we have reached agreement with the other place and we are happy that that has occurred. We are very pleased, with the concurrence of the committee, that this matter can now be resolved.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I thank the minister for signalling the government's agreement with the amendments

made in the other place. The opposition also agrees with those amendments and we look forward to the passage of the bill forthwith.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank the opposition for its support of that proposition. While I am doing so, can I say on a personal level how pleased I am to see the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill pass through this place. In a former parliament, I was the minister responsible for this area of policy and it is a matter which gives me some pride that the parliament has adopted this. This was a commitment that the Labor Party made at the last election and I am very pleased to see that the Premier has been able to advance this to this stage. On his behalf, I extend to Tim O'Loughlin (who is with me at the moment) and other officers who worked on this, his thanks and my thanks for the outstanding work that they have done in preparing this legislation.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I also signal (as the bill has now come through the entire process) that the opposition supports the bill and considers the matter of climate change, which it addresses to be one of the most important issues we face in South Australia. We have made the point—and I think that the bill in its current form reflects that—that the economy and the climate are joined at the hip. I think that as the bill has passed through this process the house has learned that we have to be very careful about setting targets which are not achievable economically or which will destroy the lives of families. I think it is a credit to both houses.

I think, too, that the bill (as it has now progressed through both houses and with these amendments to which we are agreeing today) does offer a lot of symbolic messages to the people of South Australia—but, as we made the point, in its current form. More could have been achieved and more needs to be achieved, and we all need to work together to ensure that we do achieve actual tangible results.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 490.)

Mr VENNING (Schubert): It has come to my turn at the end of the debate, and I have listened to it with great interest. I have to say that, when you hear some of the discussion, some members are living in cloud cuckoo land, particularly the member for Mawson; I could not believe that we were talking about the same subject. This has been the Rann Labor government's sixth budget and the 17th I have seen in this place. I have seen many budgets, and I have to say that I am less enthusiastic about this one than any other I have been involved in. I have been involved with previous Labor governments—with the Bannon and Arnold governments—and this is less responsible than most.

Of all the things that annoy me, the worst are waste and misconception. This government has more money at its disposal than any previously. It has \$12.1 billion in this budget and, my word, all South Australians are paying for it. We have the highest taxing government ever and, along with the huge returns from the federal GST payments, this government has approximately \$3.5 billion more than the previous Liberal government had in its last year, 2001-02. The federal Treasurer, Peter Costello, is dead right: the GST to states should have been matched with the corresponding abolition of state taxes, payroll tax, land tax and stamp duty,

and the list goes on. However, now Labor in all states and territories has just absorbed the extra money and often, like people with newly found wealth, squandered it: easy come, easy go.

People do not like to be overtaxed, but there is a trade-off if they can see something tangible for their money, especially projects that improve the quality of life for them and their family, such as better and accessible health care, adequate levels of disability care, security in the community, modern and convenient infrastructure, roads, rail, and passenger and bus services; in other words, they want options and quality of life. However, forget all the political rhetoric, what are the facts? In a budget of \$12.1 billion, only \$1.5 billion has been budgeted for capital works for 2007-08, that is, approximately 11 per cent of the total revenue. It is a disgrace. Go back and check any other government's budget and see whether you can find a lower figure. It should be more like 35 to 40 per cent, particularly in this case, where we have run-down assets.

It is much higher in other states: \$5.8 billion in Western Australia and \$3.6 billion in Victoria and, even though I think those figures are still far too low for those states, they are much better than South Australia. In addition, according to today's *Advertiser*, New South Wales has evidently just announced unprecedented levels of spending on infrastructure. All this leaves us so far behind and way out of step. South Australia is living on assets created in another era of decades ago—that of Premier Tom Playford (who is up there on the wall), our parents and, for some here, our grandparents, the 1950s and 1960s—when a fantastic standard of public infrastructure was built here in South Australia. We had the best roads in the nation and the best electricity distribution system. Most country people, and even those on the farms, had electricity delivered to their homes and farms. What a huge project and what cost? As to schools and hospitals, most of our current hospitals were built in this period.

Why is it that, in these booming economic times, we see so little emphasis on replacing or upgrading these facilities? Apart from the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, with a starting price of \$1.7 billion, there is nothing else of major state consequence. This is an appalling record when you consider what was achieved by the previous Liberal government. When it came into power in 1993, after the State Bank debacle, even with our pain of a \$4.6 billion debt, look what we achieved. In my electorate alone, \$19.6 million was spent on the Morgan-Burra road. Gomersal Road cost \$7.7 million, Annie Lane cost \$3 million, and there was a long list of projects, including water schemes and new schools (Tanunda Primary School and Nuriootpa High School). It was a similar story across the state, with the South-Eastern Freeway and the Southern Expressway and many road upgrades. A lot of the work was done.

With a huge budget of \$12.1 billion and boom times, where has all the money gone and where is it going? The excesses of this government have gone off the graph. First, it has lost control of its huge burgeoning Public Service, with over 10 000 extra employees when it had budgeted for 1 500. What of the excesses close to home and the money government spends on itself? I am alarmed to see figures like \$26.3 million spent per year on the offices and staff of the Premier and ministers. It is there in the budget papers. In a state of 1.8 million people, we spend \$26.3 million of their money propping up our political bureaucracy. This includes the elaborate Premier's spin team.

I know that all governments have done this in recent times, but it does not make it right, and it ought to be outlawed and made illegal. My calculation shows that the Premier and ministers employ at least 320 people in their offices, mainly needed to look after their media and public relations. The opposition has eight. Even a single minister gets over \$2 million to run his or her office. The opposition leader gets about one-third of that sum. Not only is it totally inequitable, it is grossly wasteful. No wonder that the Rann Labor government can and does con, or at least lull, the people into a false sense that all is well.

I do not mean any disrespect to our good public servants, but 10 000 of them? What do they all do—fall over each proving that their positions are worth while? We have all experienced it one way or another. You can always work to justify your job. Sir Humphrey is alive and well, and we expect this to happen. Instead of having the essential, well qualified and hardworking public servant, that servant now has an extra research or project officer, a secretary, an equal opportunity officer, a training officer, a technical planning officer, and even an occupational health and safety officer—and the list goes on and on. We may joke about it, but we know it is true, and it happens. And somebody picks up the tab—the taxpayer.

All well and good, but it all costs money, and it is all using up resources that should be used on things that we can see—tangible projects which can benefit our children and which bring long-term value to our community, not just money lost in a huge public sponge. Last evening I was speaking to the member for Light, who was with his son. I said to the honourable member, 'What are you going to leave your son as an asset? Toll roads?'—because at this rate that is what we are going to leave them; we are not going to leave them the roads that we inherited from our forebears.

Labor's record in this field is well known. Labor governments have always had difficulty managing money, and their public servants even more so. This government will hopefully get out of gaol by using public and private partnerships, and it will work on that. However, either private money has to be paid back, or the users—the public—pay as they use the infrastructure; pay as they go. Are the people of South Australia getting fair value for their tax dollars? In recent days, I have been making noises about benchmarking councils, that is, comparing the best and worst performing councils, because currently there is a huge gap between the top and the bottom. Well, the same goes for state governments. We should be benchmarked against other state governments. How would we rate? Bottom or second to bottom, in accordance with most criteria. Only Tasmania with its much smaller population saves us from coming bottom in all categories.

To make matters worse, as I said before, all this decline in essential public infrastructure is happening during a time of huge economic success across Australia. The minerals boom is unprecedented in our history. There is money, investments, royalties, jobs going around everywhere. How long will it last? What happens when the boom finishes? And we all know it will. Everything is cyclic. So what happens? I compare this to life on the farm. When you get a series of good years, you do not go mad and blow the results of good crops and enterprise. You save and reinvest because you know that around the corner will come leaner times—crippling drought, as we have right now.

Those who are careful and reinvest in essentials and put away money can withstand the lean times, even prolonged

drought. Those who have frittered away their opportunities battle hard when the lean times come, become beholden to the money lenders, and often lose everything. We all know the moral of this story. Governments are the same. I have already indicated the excesses in government that I can readily see. What about what I cannot see, as with an iceberg? I bet there is much more below the surface. People are now being preconditioned to get used to the idea of toll roads. Is this the way for the future? Is this what we will get after a decade of Labor government in South Australia?

Labor purports to represent the workers, or it used to. Who bears the brunt of costs like these? The average everyday families who are careful with their money are the ones. It is grossly unfair that a government, by its own ineptitude, leaves a legacy like this to a largely unsuspecting community. If members do not believe me, I suggest that they turn on their TV one evening and look at the programs and at the next round of taxpayer-funded ads promoting the budget and the government, even down to the line 'Spoken and authorised by Mike Rann'. This is straight-out political advertising. Even in *The Advertiser* we have had a glossy South Australian Health Care Plan.

Was it not Mike Rann who said, prior to the 2002 state election, that taxpayer-funded political advertising was wrong, and that as soon as he got into government it would cease immediately? Well, I know that over the years all sides of government have done this, but this is the most lavish and blatant advertising that I have ever seen. It is wrong; it is a blatant abuse of taxpayers' money, and it ought to be illegal. It is in some countries, especially in South America. I know other governments have done this, but that does not make it right. It should be illegal for all governments to use taxpayers' money to promote their own ends.

I challenge the Premier or the Treasurer to tell the house what these lavish ads are costing to produce and put on prime time TV. It is not smart or clever, it is not necessary, and it is very expensive. And this, at a time when the government will not consider a reasonable pay offer for our nurses; it cannot afford it! Going back to those ads, the health ad promoting the fantastic job the government is doing with country health could not be further from the truth. I noticed on the map, north of Adelaide, Gawler was marked, but no Barossa, no Kapunda, no Mount Pleasant, no Clare. Is this the much trumpeted Labor regionalisation of health? Is the prediction coming true that rural and community hospitals will be reduced to first aid posts? They have already sacked the local hospital boards. This will tear out the heart from those communities.

Why select Gawler? It is only 15 minutes from one of our largest hospitals, the Lyell McEwin. Oh, but I forgot: it is a marginal Labor seat. What other reason exists for all the others to miss out? Will the new Marj Mahal—and I say that respectfully—soak up the health dollars for the next 10 years? Will the cost remain at \$1.7 billion? No way, given the government's recent track record with its major projects that have suffered such massive cost blow-outs. Instead of the \$1.7 billion, it could cost \$2.7 billion. How can a small state like South Australia afford that for one hospital? Yes, I agree wholeheartedly with my leader and our party: renew the Royal Adelaide Hospital where it is, and retain its iconic name. That is no disrespect to our current gracious Governor.

Barossa Hospital was not even mentioned in the budget, but I was very pleased with and encouraged by Minister Hill's answer yesterday. As the minister graciously said, 'I am prepared to be positive and to keep politics out of the

matter.' I will wait patiently and, hopefully, something will eventuate and we will see a new facility in the Barossa. I hope that minister Hill's relative in the Tanunda Hospital is comfortable, and I wish her all the best, even though I understand that the prognosis is not good. Our thoughts are certainly with her and with those who are suffering.

The situation gets worse. In these bountiful economic times our schools are in a mess. First, in my electorate and others, this government cut the \$30 000 small school grants—as the member for Kavel has indicated—for seven schools in my electorate alone. This has been a very savage blow. To make it worse, the government will tax schools up to \$80 000 every year through a workers compensation levy. Will this be the killer blow for many of these small community schools? I have called this the most city-centric budget ever. As I said, country health, country schools, country infrastructure, especially roads and rail, have all been overlooked by this government. I note the comment by the member for Morphett, our shadow minister for transport, who listed the options.

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

Mr VENNING (Schubert): As I said, I am very grateful for the capital works that have been funded for Schubert. They include \$5 million for heavy vehicle access improvement and specific improvements to the intersection of the Barossa Valley Way and Seppeltsfield Road (for which I have been lobbying for some time); \$200 000 for the Birdwood Mill building upgrade (which I was pleased with); ongoing funding—\$2.6 million—for the provision of new specialist teaching areas for home economics, arts and technology at Birdwood High School; and \$2 million to finish off the \$3.5 million project to provide new specialist technology teaching areas at Nuriootpa High School. I was very pleased about all that.

We have a good railway line in the Barossa, but this city-centric government will not even trial a passenger rail service, which would just be an extension to the existing Gawler service. I have received correspondence from minister Conlon with excuses as to why it will not do so—too many curves, timetable and track restrictions, and so on. I cannot accept any of that. A very heavy stone train uses it once a day, one up and one down, between Angaston and Adelaide. Surely we can run one railcar, even at a reduced speed. But we are not even having a trial. I note that a member in another place, the Hon. Sandra Kanck, also has been pushing this idea in the media recently. I thank her very much for her support, because the people in my electorate certainly would appreciate that service at least being trialled.

What have the people in my region done to upset the government? Ever since the Rann Labor government came to power in 2002 (5½ years ago), this region has been absolutely starved of government funding for anything. When one considers what the Barossa does for this state, it is a disgrace. It is one of South Australia's greatest success stories and is an economic powerhouse in the state, with lots of investment and jobs, and it receives accolades and positive publicity the world over. And what do we receive in return? I think we will have to rely on the federal government to get around this logjam, and have directly funded federal projects.

The hardship to rural communities does not stop there. Country families rely on their motor cars much more than their city cousins, even if it is only because of the lack of the transport options that I have just mentioned. So, what do we

see in this budget? Increased motor vehicle registrations are up 4.5 per cent—three times the CPI. We now have the highest registration costs in Australia. On the other hand, we have the worst Australian regional transport network. It is a cost that country people can neither afford nor avoid. And we must not forget what the government is doing with all this money: 300 people employed by Rann and his ministers in their offices, 84 more than the previous Liberal government, which is an increase of 44 per cent.

No speech being delivered today would be relevant unless we mentioned our most serious problem, which is the lack of water and the dire prospects for the weeks and months ahead. The government has to stop using SA Water as a cash cow for its general revenue. By all means, collect the money, but it should be quarantined for water infrastructure—new pipes, new drains, stormwater recapture and recycling and a desalination plant. We have known for some time that we have a problem. The previous Liberal water minister delivered the paper on Waterproofing Adelaide, which spelt out the obvious problems that we faced. The government's own Thinker in Residence, Professor Cullen, highlighted it just three months ago, and again this week. But what has the government done? There has been a lot of talk but no action, which is deplorable. We have been in a severe crisis for over nine months, and the government has done nothing. It is powerless, paralysed, mute, dumbfounded and totally directionless. Most other drought-affected states have put in place plans to cover the problem. But what are we doing? Hoping for rain! The problem is that the government does not look like coming to a consensus and putting into action something—or anything—to protect a minimal supply of water for Adelaide.

What will happen if we get a blue-green algae outbreak at Mannum? How much water is in our reservoirs, and how long will it last? Professor Cullen said 30 weeks. Then what will happen? When did we last build, upgrade or extend a reservoir? When will we get the promised upgrade to Mount Bold—10 years? What do we drink in the meantime? The government is flat out promoting itself—such as funding \$120 000 earlier this year to have its tourism website displayed on the shirts of Adelaide United players for three overseas matches.

I appreciate the assistance given to struggling farmers by way of the exceptional circumstances funding in this budget because of the drought, but what about the stamp duty they will be charged when they have to increase their mortgages, at a rate of \$900 for every \$200 000 mortgage increase? The bottom line is that the government has to deliver more for the huge amount of money at its disposal in this budget: \$12.1 billion. It is a lot of money. The government is doing a top job of shielding the real picture from the people of South Australia by its slick public relations spin teams—300 to the opposition's eight.

However, there will be a day of reckoning, as there always is, as it was for the previous Labor Bannon government: a government in which Mr Rann was a senior minister. As I have said to members, we will all be judged on how we governed South Australia in the early 2000s. The government backbenchers will wear it for their frontbench colleagues, who I do not think involve them in the decision-making process. I wonder whether the member for Little Para (Lea Stevens) knows what is happening. I certainly do not support the budget.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I rise today to speak on the 2007-08 budget, which is provided for by this Appropriation Bill. The first item I would like to acknowledge is the speech made by the member for Bright. Just when I thought she was warming up and getting through what I believed to be the first topic of her speech, she sat down. I found it extraordinary that, for a whole six minutes, we learnt about basic railway maintenance. However, it is good to see that the government is spending money in this area, on the Noarlunga and Belair lines. It reminds me of the days when I assisted with the Melbourne-Adelaide railway standardisation project about 13 years ago. I did about six weeks' work on that to supplement my income on the farm. It was a big operation and the railway staff worked with the casual staff very well. This budget—

Mr Kenyon: Working on the railway!

Mr PEDERICK: You will have your chance, if you haven't had it already. This budget tells us that it delivers a strong future for South Australians. During my speech I will address that and list plenty of points where the government has fallen down on the opportunity to govern South Australia into the future. It does not address the state's most pressing need, and that is water. We need water as soon as possible from sources other than the Murray. The Mount Bold 10-year expansion plan still requires water from the River Murray if it is ever going to be full and the plan realised. I believe politics are being played with desalination. The Liberal Party came up with a policy months ago and put it up as a policy priority, and the Labor Party candidate later claimed we were working on it all the time.

We have had the floating of the big balloon of a new hospital and, on the government's past record, you get the feeling that that big announcement was meant to divert attention from some other less attractive realities. Four regional health centres offering improved services is good news, but is it at the expense of other country hospitals? And will they be able to provide a reasonable range of services locally? Citi-centric attitude to public services is now in a new form, with local hospitals reduced to being bandaid centres and ambulance terminals. Try asking someone from McLaren Vale to drive to Gawler for assistance, or from Port Adelaide to Murray Bridge, etc., past three hospitals en route. Country hospitals are soon to become ambulance transit lounges, and medical trainees will find themselves travelling further and choosing from fewer centres to participate in training. This is short-sighted. Then there is the cost of transport to save money on service provision and adequate facilities. What the government wants to save on these will be spent on transport, road and air.

I turn to repairing the state's ageing infrastructure, and we have to remember we have not seen anything built in this state for the last five years, and we have the Rann tram to nowhere. But now we realise why it turned left into North Terrace—because that is where the Marj Mahal is going, and that is no disrespect to Marjorie Jackson-Nelson: she is a lovely lady and a great Governor. If we make irrigators go without water for food production, we will not have to spend money on replacing water mains, as long as we have enough for the Labor votes in the city. It will be more a case of crisis management than a planned program of maintenance and upgrade.

The government says it is getting on with the job of securing Adelaide's water supply. What about the rest of the state? It says it is committed to developing a waterproofing strategy for regional South Australia. It took a drought to get

the government working on it and, since Premier Rann's statement last November that we are in a one in 1 000-year drought, not one drop of extra water has found its way into the country—or into the city, for that matter. In fact, until a few days ago, country irrigators were asked to go without altogether. They have only just come up from zero allocations to 1 per cent allocations, and there were plenty of people who were going to switch on their irrigation and wear the fine.

No doubt, the people of Clayton are pleased to hear that at last a pipeline will be laid over the 15 kilometres needed to supply them with mains water, and that is a great thing for the Clayton district. They have had about six or seven private irrigation systems; in fact, I was given the opportunity to speak to the Public Works Committee this morning, and I thank SA Water for doing this because it is a great thing for the Clayton community to move forward. There will be a problem in the future, perhaps, with some of the delivery pipes—old asbestos pipes—but at the moment they say they will get them through. This water will be delivered at their front door: the river at their back door is threatened with a weir at Wellington.

Mr Foley talks about budget surpluses. They must come in handy for the major cost blow-outs we are getting used to seeing. We have seen around \$600 million to \$650 million of road projects, all in the city—the Northern Expressway, two underpasses on South Road, and other infrastructure—blow out to around \$1 billion in round figures.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: It is unbelievable. In regard to public transport, understandably (according to the Labor Party), most of the money will be spent in the city and suburbs where the majority of the population lives. In his budget speech Mr Foley mentioned spending \$5.7 million on rural road safety. That is \$1.4 million a year. As far as regional transport and public transport are concerned, country people get around 13 to 14 times less subsidy than city commuters.

It is good to see \$4 million in the budget to increase the capacity of aerial firefighting, but who calls the shots when the men and women on the ground call for the support? I have seen two examples recently in my own area where, if aerial support had been called in on the morning straight after a big fire had flared up—air support brought in in daylight—it may have even snuffed out those fires instead of burning thousands of hectares more. There needs to be more money allocated so that planes can be launched first thing in the morning. I have seen plenty of plane loads go into the middle of national parks at \$1 000 a load and dump water, and for what reason? It is only when asset management comes into question that they might bring out the planes.

In regard to water supplies, SA Water has committed \$3 million for environmental studies to determine the feasibility of a desalination plant for Adelaide. I think that is a good thing. We do need to have proper environmental studies done. Members of the Liberal Party went over to Perth and saw the plant over there. The intake pipe is only 200 metres from the start of the desalination plant and the outlet pipe goes out another 250 metres, letting the briny water go back into the sea over that 250 metres. This water diffuses back to within seawater levels of salt within 50 metres. It is permanently monitored. I know we live on a gulf, but I think we could operate desalination quite successfully for Adelaide. We attended a briefing in the past day or so with BHP, and it is looking at studies to place a desalination plant off Port Bonython. Extensive studies are being done there to help with Olympic Dam's water and some water

for Eyre Peninsula, which for too long has been reliant on the River Murray.

The government has been keen to make the point that it has to do full environmental studies for desalination, but when it came to announcing the Wellington weir it just came out with it. Do not worry about the 30 000 people south of Wellington, do not worry about how it has affected their mental health, and do not worry about the fact that they know they can survive through a drought, but they do not need the threat of a weir. It is time the government came out—

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: That's good. It is time the government finally scotched this weir. It made a stuff-up when announcing it. It suggested a \$20 million weir. It must have had a small envelope when it was doing the numbers. The government finally came out—

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Well, they should have turned it over again. The government finally did some costings. The engineers were given the full documentation of what was found in the 1930s and the 1960s, or whenever previous surveys were done. Basically, it is too hard to build a permanent structure. It would be a \$110 million structure and it would cost \$25 million to pull it out. The government needs to quit this Stone Age technology while it is ahead. It will have its monument: it will have the new hospital.

I commend the government for allocating \$54 million to the program to deliver nine new filtration plants to 15 communities along the River Murray. That is a step in the right direction. The Clayton pipeline to supply the town is a \$5 million project and it is fantastic for those people in my electorate. I acknowledge that, under pressure, the government found out it could lower the major pumping stations at Murray Bridge and Mannum by spending more than \$5 million on the pumps below Lock 1 to enable water to get through to Adelaide and other country areas. What we have to remember in relation to the Mount Bold announcement is that there will be no extra water for Adelaide unless it comes from the river. The government has done nothing to wean Adelaide off the Murray.

Some \$14.1 million has been allocated over four years for road maintenance. That is about \$3.5 million a year—and that will not go far. I commend the government for the Keeping Them Safe in Our Care project and building the new Murray Bridge Police Station—which is long overdue and which would have been necessary whether or not the prisons were built there. There is \$2.9 million over two years to commence building the new police station in 2009-10; so we could probably safely say that we will not see it until 2015. I commend the government for putting up this project, the total cost of which is \$9.5 million. I would like to think that it includes courtroom facilities, as well, because they badly need an overhaul.

As announced last year, whether or not we like it, the new Yatala is coming to Mobilong and a new women's prison is being built there, as well, at a cost of over \$500 million, including the other correctional facilities in Adelaide. There are significant resources for the state's correctional system—and I am sure Murray Bridge will be part of this—including \$24.4 million for staffing requirements. There is also \$3.5 million for security upgrades for prisons.

The government has announced it will source 20 per cent of electricity requirements for government agencies from green power by 1 January 2008. This includes \$331 000 in 2007-08 to purchase 20 additional mini wind turbines for use

on buildings to demonstrate the potential of this technology. I think the government needs to go to Cape Jervis or Yorke Peninsula to see real wind farms and what can be done. I think more of this technology needs to be used.

We need more ongoing community engagement and communication on water security and River Murray drought issues. It is pleasing to see that irrigators have been given a 1 per cent allocation. There needs to be constant monitoring and scientific investigation into water quality and salinity of the River Murray. In relation to the river, we need to manage the six icon sites, including Chowilla, the Lower Lakes, the Coorong and the Murray Mouth. We have been told there will be drought relief measures for people paying NRM licences. Obviously, NRM programs will have to be cut because this money is not getting backed up by government funding. We have the Save the River Murray levy, which is used to fund specific measures aimed at improving the long-term security and quality of South Australia's water supply. I do not know what has happened: either we are not paying enough or it is going in the wrong place. I have already mentioned the lack of water security.

I want to speak about the environment program. The government is spending \$13.8 million throughout the state and \$10.8 million of that program is the continuation of asset management, asset replacement and capital development. There is \$1.7 million for the upgrade of roads in national parks across the state, and \$1.3 million is for the upgrade of infrastructure in visitor facilities on the government farm precinct and other buildings. I think more money should be spent on active land clearing in our large national parks. I believe that parks like Ngarkat and Billiat need a 60-metre area chained around the edge. The government says rolling is too dear—the young shoots will still come through—but that will take the effect of a crowning fire right out of the system. I acknowledge that there is an ongoing program of road improvements in rural and remote areas.

Education is a big item in the budget, and we are seeing WorkCover levies tearing our schools apart. Students in my electorate attend 18 government schools, although not all of them are in Hammond. From what I can see in the Eastern Fleurieu—the five school campuses around Strathalbyn—\$240 000 in funding will be lost by those campuses having to pay their own levies. I believe that the 18 schools that are servicing my area will have to find roughly \$1 million, which should be funded by the government. If the government wants to privatise education, it should come out and do so instead of raping it.

This is a budget about debt, disappointment and delay. It avoids water infrastructure in the middle of our biggest water crisis. It gives up on public transport. There is disappointment for families and for the aged, schools, small business, and those most in need. The fees and charges being increased include the emergency services levy, River Murray licences, natural resources management levies, supply charges for water, River Murray levy, speeding fines and motor vehicle registrations. These have all increased disproportionately to the CPI. Major projects are years away and health care services are centralised, based on what is best for the budget, not what is best for health. It will drive away from communities those people who want to assist in hospital management. Education budget cuts announced in previous years are still being implemented. The new prisons are still around five years away. Labor has deserted the mentally ill, the disabled, teachers, nurses, doctors and families.

Under Labor it is the country-city divide. Rural health services have been stripped, regional infrastructure is in decline, and our food producers, who were facing zero allocations, are not facing much better than that at the moment. We are seeing public sector reform and the cutting of waste, but the budget says nothing about making government more efficient. It confirms that Labor has accidentally increased the size of the Public Service by more than 10 000 employees, which would be costing the government around \$600 million annually, without explaining how that growth will be contained.

Planning for an economic downturn and a changing climate is just not happening. Diversification and resilience, both in economic and environmental terms, are essential for South Australia's future. This budget invests little—in fact, almost nothing—in diversifying our energy sources. I do not support the bill.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Tonight in the debate about the South Australian budget for the next financial year, I wish to talk about the area of corrections. Over the years I have had the opportunity to be involved with Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Service, and also a number of indigenous prisoners who have finished their term and are looking for housing and education. However, I have never really had the opportunity, until recently, to find out about the Department for Correctional Services, and I must pay tribute to the minister—the Hon. Carmel Zollo in the other place—for making sure her committee has been educated in this area. I also commend her predecessor, the late Terry Roberts.

The department has made a number of changes, particularly over the last five years, and I think that these changes or reforms are particularly important. When this government came into office, our correctional facilities and programs had suffered eight years of neglect and, having been through those institutions, one thing that you never see is a plaque bearing the name of a Liberal minister who was responsible for bringing new facilities on line. It is also worth remembering that when we came into government we were the only Australian state, apart from Tasmania—which has a very interesting penal history—which did not offer any sex offender treatment programs in our prisons which, in my view, was a simply disgraceful state of affairs, and that has been corrected by the Rann Labor government.

The good news for members in this house is that a sex offender treatment program, called sex behaviour clinic (SBC), was piloted at Yatala Labour Prison and in the community in 2005. In January 2007, an additional prison-based SBC program commenced at the Port Augusta prison. Some 67 offenders have undertaken or are undertaking that program. It would be known to everyone in this place, and certainly in the public, that the Rann Labor government has consistently pursued a policy on law and order which, I am told, has resulted in more criminals being locked up in our gaols. As a consequence of that, the preceding eight years of stagnation in our corrections system and the need for increasing capacity led the government to announce the construction of several new prisons at Mobilong and Cavan during last year's budget.

Funding was approved in that budget for the recruitment of consultants to assist in the development of tender documents, and the government expects those new facilities to come on line in 2011. I will go through some of the funding that has gone into this area: \$96 million will go towards a 150-cell new women's prison to replace the existing 92-cell

Adelaide Women's Prison—members in this house who have not had the opportunity to visit the prison will not understand the need for a new facility; and \$315 million will be spent on a 760-cell new men's prison to replace the existing 341-cell Yatala Labour Prison. The new women's and men's prisons will be collocated adjacent to the existing Mobilong prison near Murray Bridge. We are talking about an investment of \$411 million in total. An amount of \$27 million will be spent on constructing a new pre-release centre, with 60 male, plus 20 male-female cells to replace the existing 60-cell males only Adelaide Pre-release Centre, and it is likely to be sited at Cavan—\$438 million in total. This will be the first female pre-release facility in South Australia.

In this budget, the government has provided an additional \$3.4 million for 125 prison beds across the state. Security in our prisons has improved and there is an allocation for further security upgrades in this budget. Perhaps the greatest step towards reducing crime both inside and outside the prison four walls has been the creation of a joint Department for Correctional Services and SAPOL investigations unit. A review of police correctional service investigation models conducted during 2006 has resulted in an agreement between SAPOL and the chief executive officer of the Department for Correctional Services to support the implementation of an integrated correctional services investigation section. The section will comprise six police officers and two corrections intelligence officers. The section will be responsible for: investigation of criminal offences occurring within correctional institutions or connected to the prison population; investigation of drug activity within and entering correctional institutions; investigation of escapes and coordination of returns and extraditions; investigation of deaths in correctional custody; and coordination of intelligence exchange between agencies.

The development of an improved intelligence exchange system will enhance the monitoring of violent and sex offenders and the volume of crime offenders who may impact on community safety. The enhancements will complement the creation of the Australian National Child Offender Register and afford the provision of pre-release notification intelligence packages to police local service areas. This is a really important national initiative and, having been involved in the initiation of the register and South Australia being one of the main initiators, I am pleased to say that it is very good to see that we now have this in place. Furthermore, the section will approve existing partnership arrangements between police and community correction officers in the management of prisoners subject to an order of sanction upon release. A more coordinated and robust approach has the potential for identifying any breach and/or the reoffending by an individual, which has a direct benefit on support of crime reduction initiatives.

Finally, as the Attorney noted during question time yesterday, the Rann Labor government, unlike its predecessor, is serious about the interests and needs of the victims of crime. Unlike those opposite—and the Attorney reported the figures yesterday—we do not just pay lip service to this area: we implement policies and programs that benefit victims. I have to say as a local member that I have been very impressed with the support that the different constituents whom I have represented have had from the victims of crime staff. I put on the record my appreciation of the compassionate way in which they have supported various constituents who have come into our electorate office. I know that a number of other members in this place would also share in that appreciation.

The department has been actively working to engage victims of crime in a range of initiatives that have been implemented in this area. The Victims Services Unit maintains a confidential victim register that enables victims to access specific information about prisoners whom they are registered against—supported by section 18D of the Correctional Services Act 1982. Registered victims are advised of a prisoner's proposed participation in resocialisation programs; whether they are being considered for home detention; when they achieve low security classification; and upon the prisoner's release. Again I must say that, from experience in the electorate of Ashford, this has been very important information. Registered victims may influence the conditions that apply and the locations at which offenders are able to live or visit when released into the community to avoid any accidental contact.

The unit also assists in the coordination, assessment and facilitation of victim offender mediations. In addition, there is a victim awareness program. The department offers this program as one of the six core programs to offenders. Although all the department's programs have a component focusing on victim related issues, the program is specifically aimed at raising awareness of the impact of crime generally. The program provides opportunity for offenders to acknowledge the impact that their crime has on victims and also the wider community. Over 450 victims of crime have chosen to register with the department to receive its services and support, and these numbers have steadily increased in recent years. There were 380 registered victims in April 2005. Clearly, more victims are choosing to register and receive information.

On behalf of our government and certainly the minister, I thank victims for doing that and give credit to the department for its efforts in this very difficult and sensitive area. Corrections is not the most glamorous of departments. It is certainly a well-known department but, unfortunately, many of us, including me until recently, do not have a lot of information about the great work that it is doing. I must say that, under the direction of the late minister, Terry Roberts, and now minister Carmel Zollo, I think that the reform that is happening is most impressive, and that is one of the reasons why I want to talk about this within the context of the state budget. I also pay tribute to the caucus members who have taken the area of corrections on as an area they wish to make sure that they make a contribution to.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Police (Hon. Paul Holloway), the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. G.E. Gago), and the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. Carmel Zollo), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): One of the things that has made our state great is the amount of voluntary work put into

so much of our life and society. There has existed a strong ethic that we help our neighbours and those less fortunate than ourselves or those going through a difficult patch, for whatever reason. It has been reinforced by the great Australian culture of mateship. There is no way that any government can pay for all this voluntary work. However, I well remember one union official, who was standing for state parliament in 1993, saying at a meeting in Port Lincoln, 'If a job is worth doing, it is worth being paid for.' In regional Australia our very survival depends on the volunteers, and this statement was a shock to me and everyone present. I doubt whether any one of us had ever thought that the work we all did for our communities should or ever would be paid for, but that it was worth doing despite this we never doubted for a moment. However, perhaps this attitude helps to explain why this Labor government budgeted for 1 971 public servants but has actually employed 12 065 since it came to office. This has to be in the vicinity of an extra \$1 billion in unexpected wages costs to taxpayers.

The Labor way of doing things leads to enormous bureaucracies that siphon off funding so that the supposed actual recipients of assistance become beggars in their own society. Non-government organisations have strict accounting laws they have to comply with. Government agencies are not as accountable as NGOs are required to be. Government agencies are focused on obeying and/or appeasing their superiors, especially the minister. Programs that succeed start with the needs of the individuals or group. This government focuses on who controls the money and property and on administration.

Today, I had lunch with the Hon. Ann Bressington, who told an amazing story that illustrates the points I am trying to make. It related to the SOS villages. She is reported to have said that a classic situation was the takeover of the SOS village for children in foster care at Seaford Rise. Although the minister for Families SA publicly takes the stand that SOS handed back the villages to the state, the director of SOS, Mr Ellis Wayland, and the SOS mothers, tell a very different story. The long and the short of it is that, while SOS provided family-centred care services for children, with a solid family structure and routine, it cost that organisation \$750 000 a year to run the facility at Seaford Rise. It cost taxpayers absolutely nothing at all.

Once the government took over this village, it was estimated to cost taxpayers about \$5.1 million per annum. To me, that has to be one of the biggest puzzles of all time. SOS is an organisation found in 132 countries around the world. It is accredited by the World Health Organisation and the United Nations, and it is known for the level of care, the family values and the family environment it offers to children within its care. Ms Bressington had a newsletter that outlined the takeover of the SOS village and picked out points that were relevant to this government's spending. It stated how it now actually costs the taxpayer more money but there are diminished services to vulnerable children. The sale of the village homes, on a walk-in walk-out basis, achieved a surplus of some \$1.3 million over the initial cost. However, the newsletter states:

Financial services are not, however, our mission. Our mission is to provide children under state protection and guardianship with an alternative to state institutional and bureaucratic care—to provide them with a 'mother' and a secure, normal family home and to give them a chance to enjoy a happy and caring family environment so they come to terms with their past traumas and face their future with hope.

We have been reliably advised that the cost to FAYS for this first year of ownership of our village (capital and operating) will be \$5.1 million. This is 700 per cent more than it would have cost SOS in the same year! Or, expressed another way, if FAYS had given us the whole of our annual operational funding to run the village in that year, they would have saved the taxpayer \$4.35 million, as well as keeping 25 South Australians in their jobs and the children in their supportive and happy village community. What a price to pay for ideological agendas and political correctness!

The reason SOS handed back this village to the state is not, as the Hon. Jay Weatherill stated on ABC last week, I believe, that it could no longer cover the cost of that village. It was because of the requirements that the state put on that village to remain operational. For example, SOS parents were told that they could no longer take their children to the beach because there was no qualified lifeguards employed by SOS.

Carers were put on contracts where they had to be paid time-and-a-half and double time rather than the \$40 000 flat rate that they were quite happy to receive from SOS as payment to be stay-at-home mothers. They were also told that cooking meals for these children was not within their carer's job description, so catered food was brought in for the children. They were also told that, as part of their carer's agreement, it was not suitable for them to do the housework, so cleaners were brought in. I heard that one of these parents wanted a single bed moved from one room to another. Under her carer's contract, she was not allowed to pull down the bed and move it herself. The state had to bring in furniture removalists to move a single bed from one bedroom to another. These are the reasons SOS could no longer sustain management of that village. It was not because it was not a well thought out, well funded operation, but because the state—and, as SOS put it, unionism at its worst—affected its ability to operate and deliver the services it had been providing for a very long time on a worldwide basis.

It would be fair for the average reasonable citizen to ask how this could happen and how this could be considered sound financial and moral management of an ever-increasing problem, given that we hear of children being kept in motels and bed and breakfast establishments because there is nowhere else for them to live. Indeed, by now, the SOS village organisation would have been prepared to fund yet a second village in South Australia to cope with the demand and to work with Families SA to provide care and support for these damaged children. But, no, we are the only state that will not allow such a service to operate freely. It is interesting to note also that SOS took its concerns to the international tribunal, which ruled against its not having to unionise. This is the sort of expenditure of government moneys that causes me grave concern when we know that there are children out there who could be living in homes and being cared for at no cost to this state whatsoever. We hear that we have a shortage of foster carers, yet there was a not-for-profit organisation prepared to wear the cost of caring for children and providing them with the love, structure and stability that every child needs. The story sounds disturbingly familiar.

Of even greater concern is the lumping together of all families and individuals who have a disability. The services required by a paraplegic are vastly different from those required by a mildly intellectually disabled person. Bureaucracy is not noted for its ability to accommodate differences. This is not the way to achieve outcomes, let alone positive outcomes, for the disabled. The first step in solving a problem is to define the problem and to clearly identify the needs. Client-focused services produce results. That is where government effort, expenditure and decision-making should be directed. The Hon. Ann Bressington told me that the

money we allocate is the people's money and it is our duty to spend it to the best advantage of the people. I know that we can do better and that we have the political will and the focus. We have seen and heard the discontent of our constituents and the hardships they face, and we require our system to provide the best outcomes. The government services available to people with a disability have to be families caring for as many of these people as possible and it has to be a topic of dissent for years. It was one of the policy areas at the last state election where this government made promises that things would improve.

Mr Robbi Williams is the Chief Executive Officer of the Julia Farr Association, a non-government agency working on disability issues. The association continues with the work that was being done by the Julia Farr Services and he spoke of the changes to the delivery of services to the disabled in an article in *The Advertiser* on 1 June 2007 as follows:

Almost one year on from reform, it appears that there is still much work to complete the arrangements and tell people what the plans are. This means an anxious waiting game for people with a disability and their families, for several reasons. First, it is known that South Australia is not a high performer across Australia in disability funding, and there are no signals about when this might change. Second, the costs of the substantial restructure across the department may have created additional financial challenges. This means its own services may have first call on any new funds that become available. The present reforms appear to have their focus on formal chain of command issues, and the relationship between structure and efficiency. This approach tends to reduce people with a disability to the status of technical problems to be solved, and can result in people being treated like objects or commodities. If these reforms are genuinely about improvements for people with a disability, then the voice of people with a disability and their families must be authentically woven into the new arrangements.

Time expired.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): I rise tonight to talk about mental health services and to say how pleased I am to see the very significant investment that has now come to pass over the past six or so years in terms of mental health services in our state. I congratulate the government, the current minister, the Hon. Gail Gago, the chair of the Social Inclusion Board, Monsignor David Cappo, and all of the people who have served on the board and in the Social Inclusion Unit who have had a part in this and, modestly I congratulate myself for my part in the first stage of that in the last term of government.

I have been interested in mental health ever since I came into this place and, certainly as the shadow minister for health, I became acutely aware of the suffering and the appalling lack of services and fragmentation of services that existed here in South Australia. That was brought home to me by many discussions and visits as well as through policy development with a whole range of stakeholders. It was also absolutely clear through the national mental health reports that would come down on a yearly basis that showed the appalling lack of services in South Australia. In fact, we had, over the time of the last Liberal government, a real stagnation in effort to remedy the situation. In 2000, a report by Peter Brennan was scathing in its assessment of the mental health system that existed and in the way it had gone down over the last decade. Thankfully, it has now been reversed. People with a mental illness have significant human rights issues, which means that they are some of the most vulnerable people in our community.

Since coming to office, the Rann government has injected millions of dollars. As a result of the efforts made in the first

term, we have the new Margaret Tobin Centre at Flinders Medical Centre, with 40 adult mental health beds. We have a new centre at the Repat General Hospital, with 30 mental health beds. We have had more than \$19.9 million for an additional 56 mental health workers to support GPs and therapy for children and young people. We have employed almost 100 additional mental health workers across the system as a result of a \$10 million investment in late 2005. We put a \$25 million allocation into the non-government sector to start the setting up of services in terms of community-based support and rehabilitation which, by the way, was an area in South Australia where we really had fallen so far behind the rest of the country.

That was only last term. Now we have stepped it up again. The Social Inclusion Unit, led by Monsignor Cappo, did an extensive consultation and planning exercise in terms of taking the mental health reform process in South Australia further. In February 2007, another \$43.6 million was committed for the next five years. That includes the building of intermediate care facilities and recovery centres, which was done in conjunction with the federal government. It provided more funding to community services with access to services for about 800 people with chronic and complex needs, and it provided nearly \$2 million to place eight mental health nurse practitioners in regional areas over the next four years. Now, finally, in this budget there is a further \$50.5 million, including an enormous amount of money to go into the non-government sector not only to cover the services set up by the initial \$25 million grant, but to extend them right throughout our community.

That has been a tremendous effort, which has resulted from the government working very hard and actually putting its money where its mouth is. The government has not just said that mental health is a problem, which is what happened in the nineties: it has actually done something about it. People will see right across our state, over the next year or two, these new services rolling out. I am particularly pleased that in my own electorate to be—once the boundaries are changed—I will have a recovery centre built. Last week I had the pleasure of being taken to see the new recovery centre in Lurline Street, Mile End. It is a fantastic facility. It is in the electorate of the member for West Torrens, and he must be so proud of what has been achieved in his electorate for people with mental illness.

I was pleased, because when I was minister I purchased that property from Ashford Hospital. The hospital was vacating it because it was moving services, and they had this property which they sold to us for a good price. With over \$1 million—I do not know the exact amount—it has been upgraded to a superb facility. It looks like a set of apartments. The old building, with its wide verandas painted blue, has cream walls, and it is a beautiful facility. It is now being filled with people who are very close to finally returning to living independently but requiring support and help for about three to six months. There are 20 beds in that facility.

As I said, I am so glad that one will be built at Elizabeth East. There is also one being constructed at Noarlunga. I am looking forward to the first sod being turned at Elizabeth East, and I think that that will be within a few weeks time. Congratulations to everybody concerned. The centre in Lurline Street, Mile End, was the first of these recovery centres and, as always, there is some community unrest about anything to do with mental illness. That just shows the incredible amount of fear and prejudice that people with mental illness have to live with. That project was handled

very well, and I want to commend John Trainer, the local mayor, who gave it his whole support, and also his councillors. We were able to work through the issues, and minister Gago continued that with her staff. Monsignor Cappo went there and had a public meeting. We will continue to work through those issues, and I know that this facility will be a success. Again, congratulations to everybody involved.

There is still more work to be done. Obviously, we still need to look at the forensic situation, and we need to look at some more secure rehabilitation facilities. We also need an amended, updated and revamped mental health act, which I know will come forward. I think we can at last say that South Australia is not languishing at the bottom of the heap in terms of mental health services as it has done for so long in the past. It has required a committed effort by a whole lot of people, but we are getting there. We must never forget that one in five people suffers from a mental health problem. If we ourselves do not have a mental health problem at some stage during our life, it will be someone in our family or in our friendship group. It is amongst us, we need to deal with it, and we need to provide a whole range of services to successfully enable people to recover and to go on and function in our community.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I wish to focus on a few issues that are occurring across my electorate. I understand that trying to determine a budget is very much about looking at many competing priorities and then trying to make sure that funds are available for all of them. I know that it is a near impossible task. Let us hope that very soon I will have the opportunity to be part of a team that will be doing that.

With respect to education, I wish to highlight a letter that I received from the Moonta Area School, which is a great school, within the Goyder electorate. It has published a letter in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* and has also written to the minister. The school is very concerned about the recent announcements. I wish to quote from a letter from Mr Travis Skipworth, the chairperson of the governing council. The letter is addressed to the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith, and it states:

I am writing on behalf of the Moonta Area School Governing Council to express my deep concern to the proposed cuts to our school's operational budget in 2008. In particular these cuts will impact upon:

- Mentoring Programs
- Alternative Pathways development
- Delivery of Youth Opportunities
- Provision of technologies to support learning and collaboration between schools
- Strategies to address learning difficulties
- Our capacity to develop and upgrade our physical resources.

Our members would like you to explain why the parents of this school should pay for the inability of the government to financially manage and resource WorkCover efficiently. We would also like to know why the school is to be denied the opportunity to use the interest accrued after the prudential management of our funds. We have conscientiously saved our funds over time to upgrade facilities and equipment, so is it now the direct intention of the government to purposely run down the facilities of our school? These proposed cuts not only undermine the model of Local Governance and our capacity to financially manage this school but also our ability to work towards our vision for Moonta Area School.

I attended the school's presentation function in December last year, and they are a wonderful bunch of children from reception through to year 12. However, Moonta Area School is symptomatic of all the schools in my electorate that have been contacting me because they are very concerned about how the announcements in the budget will affect them.

Representatives of three of the small schools have contacted me and said they are worried that they will lose their small school grant. I do not believe that is the case, but have they put it in writing to me. The parents, who are very focused on fundraising, are wondering why their efforts now have to go into supporting recurrent expenditure costs instead of ensuring that they have better facilities for their children. They want the money that they raise to go to the children, not towards helping the government to balance its budget.

It would be a surprise to me if members opposite were not concerned about this. Schools are something that we all have in our electorates, and it is certainly an issue that will cause a backlash. When they go doorknocking and speak to people in their communities, all of them will talk about the fact that the decision the government has made in regard to schools is a disgrace, and they will be putting pressure on the minister and the Treasurer to try to change it. I acknowledge, however, that the budget includes an allocation for one of my schools—the Kadina Primary School—which, again, is a very good school. It will receive \$1.8 million for a project that is to be completed by December 2008, with \$1 million of that \$1.8 million dollars being spent in the next financial year.

I am still waiting on an announcement in regard to aquatics programs. That is an issue that we have highlighted for the last nine months, since the previous budget was brought down. I spoke to the minister today and impressed upon her the fact that the Port Vincent Aquatics Centre, which is in my electorate, still does not know what is going on. It closed down for the winter recess three weeks ago, but I had one of the staff members on the phone to me today saying, 'We've got schools booked in for the third term. What is happening? Are we able to continue with that booking, or do we have to tell them that aquatics programs no longer exist?'

The 11 aquatics centres across South Australia deserve better than that. They want to know what is going on. The government has said that, if it does pursue the closure of the aquatics programs or the revision of them from 11 centres down to three, it will save only \$2 million. The children who attend those facilities are worth more than that. The life skills that they learn from those programs are worth more than that. It has been proven that drownings in South Australia have decreased, and I think that the investment being made in the aquatics programs is contributing towards that.

With respect to exceptional circumstances funding, I acknowledge that the government is contributing towards that, as are our federal colleagues, and I believe that the minister has supported every exceptional circumstances application that has been submitted by regions throughout the state. That is very commendable. Being a regional person, he understands the difficulties for regional communities and, no doubt, has pushed quite hard for this. However, it is important that that support continues, because the individual farmers and the businesses in those communities will struggle equally to emerge from the effects of the drought. Living through it is hard enough, but trying to trade their way out of the depression they have experienced for three out of the last five years, and the difficulties attached to trying to make an honest dollar in the farming sector over the last few years, will mean that they need more support from us.

I want to talk briefly about roads. I note that the government has committed money in the budget towards things such as rural freight improvements, rural road safety (with rest areas being worked on) and overtaking lanes to the tune of about \$4 million in the next financial year. Road maintenance

is a real worry to me. There is only \$14.1 million over four years, which is \$3.5 million per year. That is only a fraction of what is needed. With respect to flood damage, I note that some support has come through, with \$23.5 million going into the Outback areas roads. However, they are state responsibilities, anyhow, and \$5 million came from the Local Government Disaster Fund to assist with respect to the roads in council areas that were damaged by the floods earlier this year. However, overall, it is still not good enough. As part of our election campaign, we were calling for a \$200 million injection into road maintenance. That has not materialised. The RAA supported our call, but it has not materialised. More needs to be done in that area.

It has been suggested to me that this is an opportune time to talk little more about schools. I agree with that, because I am continually told by the minister, whenever we ask questions during question time, that something like 37 per cent more is being devoted by this Rann government towards education. Frankly, that argument does not hold water any more, because the schools that I am talking to and the schools that are talking to all the shadow ministers have said that they are sick of the fact that suddenly they are being forced to pay a 1 per cent levy for WorkCover, in addition to paying for the first four weeks of a claim and the four weeks of the replacement teacher and staff member.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: They are completely new issues that I am raising.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Never. The possibility is that this might cost individual schools up to \$10 000 for every WorkCover claim. Also, they are being told that suddenly they are up for a 25 per cent cut in the funding available to them for water and electricity. I hope that schools will express themselves and parents will express themselves, and the minister and members opposite will receive a lot of information about this, because I know we are. We are putting up a fight for them. Let's hope that people at the ballot box on 20 March 2010 change their minds.

Mr Williams: They will know.

Mr GRIFFITHS: They will know. In regard to health, I want to talk briefly about what is happening in Goyder. I note that the only money I can see is some money that has been provided for hot water services at the Wallaroo, Maitland and Minlaton hospitals. In recognition of the fact that the government has decided to put a focus on Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Berri and Mount Gambier when it comes to regional health, I want to try to impress upon the government that there are 416 000 people who live in the regions—27 per cent of South Australia's population. They deserve an equal share when it comes to the provision of health services. At the moment they are not getting it, and this budget is espousing something that will slaughter them even more.

However, there are some great opportunities happening in our area. Wakefield Waters development at Port Wakefield, with 3 000 allotments, has major project status declaration. I certainly hope that goes through the process and gets up soon, because it will be fantastic for the Adelaide Plains region. There is The Dunes development at Port Hughes, and Greg Norman (the Great White Shark) will be there on Saturday. I believe that the Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition will also be in attendance. Retirement living has become a focus in our area as well. There is the Copper Coast Lifestyle Village at Moonta with 75 homes, and a new development which has started at Kadina which

will have 150 homes built. On the Adelaide Plains there are great opportunities for chicken farm development, and the Primo abattoir rebuild and, hopefully, expansion. The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries certainly understands the importance of those developments in the Goyder area, and I trust that his support will always be there, as it has been with the efforts that have gone into rebuilding after the fire.

For all that, water is a critical factor for us. We need to get more water into the electorate. It comes from a source that we all know, the River Murray, but let us make sure that we have scope for expansion of my region. The Adelaide Plains-Yorke Peninsula region is a wonderful part of South Australia and it needs a lot more going for it. By nature, I try to be a positive person and look at where there are good things, but my dilemma is that much more needs to occur—not just for Goyder but across all South Australia. The challenge for the government will be to correct that in future years.

Time expired.

Mr PISONI (Unley): I would like to spend some time discussing the implication of the budget for my electorate of Unley. As we know, the devil is always in the detail of budgets, and this budget is certainly a budget of debt, disappointment and delay for the people of Unley. It will be felt by all households and businesses in my seat of Unley. The average Unley household faces higher charges to register their car. If they leave that at home, they will find increased bus fares, on top of last year's increases, and a government intent on delivering them the insecurity of a growing debt. For the residents of Unley those State Bank alarm bells are ringing again. My constituents are well informed. They know that the rivers of gold and buckets of cash have been flowing to this state Labor government through the GST, the property boom and all the state-based taxes they were supposed to get rid of in exchange for the GST but have kept in place. They are looking around them and asking, 'Where has all the money gone?' We keep hearing about more money for this and more money for that, but what the people of Unley are interested in is outcomes.

In my seat of Unley we see disappointment at the failure to upgrade infrastructure and the continuing delay in implementing identified and long-needed improvements, such as the Unley Road upgrade. I survey new constituents when they come into Unley. When asked about the tram extension, it turns out that 90 per cent are against the project. Unley people would rather some of the \$31 million was spent to fix run-down infrastructure and public transport that they need and will use. There are none of minister Conlon's infamous infrastructure blow-outs in Unley, for the simple reason that there are no infrastructure projects happening in Unley. Household and businesses are regularly inconvenienced by bursting pipes in Unley streets. It is inconvenient for householders and costly for interrupted businesses. Just last week, Park Street had the fourth of its major bursts in six months, two of them just a day apart, and that was in the very week of the budget. Each time the hotels and restaurants on King William Road cannot operate, they lose money. Water supply charges are up 7 per cent but the pipes that carry the water are continually bursting, while SA Water returns record profits to the government in dividends. SA Water has distributed \$1.6 billion of dividends to this government in six years.

Despite Transport SA, the City of Unley, Planning SA and the Unley Road Traders Association finalising community

consultation on the upgrade and the pre-planned work going into the Transport SA estimates for 2003-04, the Unley Road upgrade fell off the radar when Labor came to power in 2002. So we had a situation where there was a combined agreement through all stakeholders using Unley Road—the commuters, the traders, the residents, the council and the community groups—favouring the cheaper of the three models that were put forward after the consultation process to upgrade Unley Road to make it safer and still keep the village atmosphere that makes it a very attractive place to visit and live. Despite all that, the government decided to pull the funding and we still have no idea when the upgrade of Unley Road will happen.

Despite the cost savings and convenience of upgrading in conjunction with powerline undergrounding, which has since been completed by the council, we still have no improvement in the infrastructure on Unley Road. But, thankfully, the Howard government has allocated funds from the AusLink Black Spot program to improve safety for the notorious Unley Road/Young Street intersection and other black spots on Goodwood Road.

Unley Road and its community continue to be overlooked by this government. The schools of Unley continue to struggle with smaller classrooms. Many of the schools in my electorate are old and they are on small areas of land. Representatives from Goodwood Primary School were telling me the other day that they are having difficulty keeping the kids active because of the small amount of land it has. Representatives from Parkside Primary School have told me that they are using three classrooms which are under 48 square metres. I have been advised by the minister's office that 48 square metres is the minimum classroom size for students in this state. However, when new classrooms are built they are much bigger than that. We are seeing disadvantages for our successful inner suburban schools where there is a lot of parental input, where parents contribute money. They have fundraisers and they are very active on governing councils, but they are being punished by this government. The schools in my electorate now have to find hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to top up workers compensation payments for teachers and pay part of the wages of teachers.

An interesting story has been told to me about something that happened at the Unley Primary School governing council meeting a couple of months ago. The headmaster was offered an extra allocation of a teacher. Of course, being the keen and successful headmaster that he is, he said, 'We will take another teacher. What's the catch?' The catch was that the teacher was on WorkCover. He thought that the school could work with that, but then he was hit with the bill for taking on the teacher on WorkCover. It is unbelievable. The school council was furious about that situation; they had been conned. The department offloaded its responsibility for this worker's rehabilitation and handed it to the parents of Unley Primary School. In the end the parents of Unley Primary School are the ones who will pay this WorkCover cost, as will the parents of other primary schools in my electorate. They will be paying for it; it will come out of their pockets in either higher school fees or more fundraising events. Instead of fundraising events paying for extras for the school—the pleasant things we like to see in schools such as extra computers, sporting and playground equipment and rebituminising of basketball courts—we will be seeing fundraising to pay WorkCover levies. It is an absolute disgrace. I was pleased to hear our leader tell the house

yesterday that that decision will be overturned by a Liberal government.

Constituents in my electorate are on long-term WorkCover claims and are not able to return to work, due to inadequate claims management and poor rehabilitation processes. They are not able to be paid a lump sum payout or leave the system. One of my constituents has been on the system for nine years and is frustrated with not being able to be rehabilitated or moved on, simply because of a lack of interest in his condition. He is condemned to drift in limbo in a dysfunctional system which is overseen by a complicit minister who is not willing to address the problems or confront the unions.

Unley and its strip shopping areas, such as King William Road, Unley Road, Goodwood Road and Glen Osmond Road, are hubs for business, small businesses in particular. Relief for small business is long overdue and would be welcomed in Unley, but there is little in this budget for my business constituents. The payroll tax threshold is still the lowest in Australia, restricting their growth and causing many to avoid employing extra staff. A bakery owner contacted me just a few weeks ago. They are very frustrated at the fact that after buying a third shop and setting up a third bakery, with a combination of full-time and part-time staff they have been hit by the payroll tax threshold levy. They are now reconsidering their options. Are they really in the business of expanding their business? They are thinking seriously about what to do—whether to hold onto the shop (which is marginally profitable) and sack the staff or continue on and hope they can get through to the next round of consideration for adjustments in the payroll tax levy.

We have the highest WorkCover levy in Australia at 3 per cent, record stamp duty and tax grabs, which are punishing the very immigrants who built this community. Those who came out in the 1950s saw real estate as their salvation and a way of providing for their future. The government is now collecting 75 per cent more in land tax than when it came to office. We are seeing people who planned for their future punished for doing so.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I understand that there is an opportunity for one of our members to speak for 30 minutes; I also understand that will not be me. For the benefit of the house, I point out that I will have to disappoint my colleagues and that I will contribute for only about 10 minutes. I took the opportunity in my response to the budget to talk about a couple of things pertaining to my shadow portfolios. There were some about which I did not get the opportunity to speak. Unfortunately, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries is leaving. I know it is discourteous, as well as out of order, to note that a member is out of the house but, in relation to agriculture, the farmers of South Australia are going through a most difficult time at present due to the drought in South Australia over the past year. Services provided by the state of South Australia were severely diminished some 15 years ago in the wake of the collapse of the State Bank and other financial messes left by a former Labor government. All services were severely curtailed. The one service in South Australia which has not been rebuilt since those days is Primary Industries and Resources SA. That is one of the very few agencies of government which has not been rebuilt and which continues to deliver service at a rate that was necessitated by the collapse of the State Bank. As I have said, it has not been rebuilt.

It is a great pity that at this particular time when the farming community is suffering so much and needs every little bit of help it can get—and also considering the largesse of revenue that has flowed into the state coffers in recent years—the government has not seen fit to rebuild the Department of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries to provide the sort of services that used to flow to the people in that sector, and to help rebuild and ensure that our farming community and our farmers are at the cutting edge. As I have often argued, the problem we have is that a lot of the work and the flow of information now picked up by the farming sector comes from private enterprise and, of course, it is not the fair, independent, full and frank information that our farmers should be receiving.

I would like to spend a little time talking about the impact of the budget on my particular electorate, as I note that a number of my colleagues have done in respect of their electorates. Of course, the two great impacts of this budget are in the areas of health and education. As I think I said yesterday, I thought that this budget would be a defining moment for this government; a moment when the government could have taken a major step in rebuilding South Australia to get it punching at or above its weight. Unfortunately for South Australians, that just has not happened, and we are about to live the reality of mismanagement on a gross scale. That is impacting principally on health and education.

I know my colleague the shadow Minister for Education will take the opportunity to address some education matters pertaining to his electorate in a few minutes. However, can I say that in my electorate there are about 29 public schools and two private schools. By and large, the public schools are serviced—as all country schools are—by relatively young teachers. The nature of the teaching profession is such that to get into the Education Department as a permanent teacher, quite often a young teacher is obliged to accept a posting in a country area. Therefore, I think the relative numbers of young and inexperienced teachers in country schools far outweigh the percentage that you find in city schools, so that is one disadvantage that country students face in the first place. I have a number of schools in small and relatively isolated communities, and one of the issues we have is that the department, in its wisdom, has been selling public housing. There is now a number of communities where the government used to own what was known as teacher housing, and now they have sold those houses.

We have schools in my electorate that advertise for specialist teachers in maths, science—a whole range of disciplines—but cannot attract teachers because there is no housing. I have one school in particular where the principal of the school has had to take in other teachers coming into her school as boarders in her own home to ensure that she got the staff that the school required. I think that it is outrageous that a state government could contemplate delivering education services under those circumstances.

I was delighted to see that the Millicent High School—the school that I attended for my secondary education—was to receive a substantial amount of funding—\$3.3 million—over three years. However, it has taken a very long time for that money to come through. That school—probably like the majority of the schools in my electorate—is desperate for capital works funding. The amount of capital works funding that has flowed into schools in general, I would suggest—but certainly into schools in my electorate—has been abysmally low and, considering again the largesse of revenue flowing into the state Treasury, it is a disgrace. The standard of the

infrastructure in our schools is a disgrace. Millicent High School will at last be able to upgrade a number of its facilities and get rid of buildings which were probably unsuitable for teaching students 10, 15, 20 years ago, redevelop other areas of the school and put their students into a fine learning environment. That is long overdue.

On my best reading of the budget, that is the only school in my electorate which has any significant capital funding. I shall tell the house a little story about one of the other schools in Millicent—the Millicent North Primary School—which a little over 12 months ago received some \$600 000 to \$700 000. The local paper questioned my federal colleague, the Hon. Patrick Secker, a member of the federal parliament, as to why he put out a press release about this \$600 000 to \$700 000 grant to the Millicent North Primary School as it had already been announced no fewer than three times by the state government. It turned out that all that money actually came from the commonwealth government—it was commonwealth funding—but it only came to the attention of our local community when the federal member finally made the announcement about the money as it was actually flowing and the works were being done. That is what is happening in our schools: the commonwealth government is putting large amounts of money into state education to cover the lack of expenditure by the state government, and the state government is claiming credit for it.

I move now to health and indicate that in my electorate I have a number of hospitals of varying sizes; from quite small hospitals—such as Penola and Kingston—to relatively sizeable hospitals serving communities in Millicent, Naracoorte and Bordertown. The Naracoorte Hospital received a significant contribution to capital works this year, amounting to about \$1.5 million. However, that money will merely keep the doors open; the infrastructure of that hospital is in such a state that it is barely able to keep the doors open. If you saw the boiler that operates the hot water system and provides hot water throughout the hospital, including the theatre suites, you would not believe that it could do so. You would not believe that, in a modern society such as we supposedly enjoy here in South Australia, this boiler could be providing hot water to an essential service; to an accident emergency department in a public hospital.

It is outrageous that a hospital like Naracoorte can go on operating from year to year not knowing when it will have to shut its doors because the infrastructure will literally collapse. The reality is the lack of funding in our health system. We hear that \$34 million (I think) is going towards building up services in four regional centres. All that money is coming out of the regional health budget and will impact greatly on the way we deliver services to country people, who already suffer from lower health outcomes than their city counterparts. Again, it is outrageous that we have a government, knowing full well that country people have a lower health outcome statistic than their city counterparts, that would then cut it even further. The Minister for Health puts his hand up and says that he is doing wonderful things for country health: it is another outrage.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Before we pass the state budget this year, I have the opportunity to say a few words on any subject, and I cannot think of a more important subject than suicide—suicide prevention and post-vention. Many members would not be so familiar with the term 'post-vention'. It means after the act and it refers to care for those who are left behind after a suicide. I had the intensely emotional experi-

ence of dealing with a number of families in my electorate over a period of about six months who had been in this situation where they had lost an adult son to suicide. It was quite extraordinary that I had so many instances in such a short space of time. I found that, in each case, families had problems not just coping emotionally but they had problems with government agencies. They had problems waiting 18 months to get a Coroner's report.

They had problems also from police who did not communicate as well as they might have following the suicide. They had problems with ambulance personnel who would come to a scene and then walk away because it was outside their jurisdiction—that is, no longer a live person. I also heard of stories of insurance companies or superannuation companies refusing to pay up until they had a coronial report. In other words, it created huge complications in winding up the financial affairs of the suicide. I responded to these problems by writing a series of letters to ministers and just about everyone I could think of associated with these problems. I wrote to the Coroner, the Police Commissioner and, as I say, a number of other people. The responses were interesting. Some paid lip service to improving the way they did things.

Some of the information I received was genuinely informative and helpful to the families who were going through these difficulties. For example, I learned how behind in the workload the forensic science laboratory is. It is actually the forensic science laboratory that causes the delays with the Coroner. I acknowledge the problem of getting adequate forensic pathologists to cope with the backlog they have but, at the end of day, it does come back to money and it comes back to a government reluctance to spend money on the forensic science laboratory. No matter what improvements there have been in the past few years, they are still way behind when it comes to the workload they have.

When you deal with a family who has gone through a suicide, you have in front of you the emotional impact of that lack of government spending. One of the extraordinary things I found out about suicide is that we have a road toll which is less than the suicide toll, yet we have so much advertising about the road toll. We have so much research undertaken into how to prevent accidents and deaths on the roads, yet we do not talk about suicide. The Premier, Mr Rann, is very proud of his state plan. It contains a range of promises of things that will be done by 2050 and so on. I wrote to the people who were seeking feedback on the draft strategic plan, and I suggested that we count the number of suicides in South Australia as a measure of our health as a society. That suggestion was rejected.

The things I have talked about can be fixed by government measures, with the exception of the insurance companies. We will have to find another way to deal with them. I have suggested, for example, that the police should carry with them a suicide kit. I have been informed that they do carry a homicide kit, in the sense that they carry around information which is given to families who have suffered the homicide of a loved one, but the suicide of a loved one carries particular emotional problems with it. There is always the devastating question why: why did it happen—and the guilt associated with that sometimes. It seems to me that specific information about how to cope with suicide ought to be carried by police because very often they are the ones who inform the family.

I have spoken about improving funding for the forensic science laboratory. I think generally bringing the topic out into the open a little more would also help. Another part of

the solution is to encourage teachers to undertake suicide prevention training before they can register to teach. There is a program called applied suicide intervention skills training. It costs \$220 for a two-day course. It could be taught in conjunction with first aid. It seems to me that teachers particularly who deal with so many young people at risk would benefit from such training. But there is also community training. The Hon. John Dawkins in another place has highlighted the work of CORES, a community education project which encourages people to look out for signs of potential suicide in those around them.

One sad thing I have to report is that, of all the letters I wrote to police, to the Coroner and to various ministers, there was one minister who never responded, one minister with whom I sought a meeting. A meeting was arranged; she did not show up, nor she did not respond in writing. That was the Minister for Mental Health.

Perhaps the ultimate reform, in my view (and I have suggested this to government), is that there should be what I call a 'suicide squad' or what in Baton Rouge, in the USA, is called LOSS (Local Outreach to Suicide Survivors). It is a government-funded team which does two things: it goes out to the scene of a suicide to help the family clean up; and, secondly, it informs the family of what to expect; what government agencies can and cannot offer; what time frames can be expected in terms of getting a report from the Coroner; and where families can receive counselling. I should stress that one of the most devastating aspects of facing the suicide of a loved one is coping with the suicide scene. In our system, such as we have at the moment, it is essentially the responsibility of the next of kin to clean up afterwards. You can imagine how utterly devastating that can be under the circumstances.

In summary, a lot more can be done at state government level. There is an excellent non-profit organisation which assists those families who have faced the suicide of a loved one. The federal government has provided money to that agency for the Living Beyond Suicide project (\$345 000 of federal money) to support, among other things, a full-time staff member, who in turn will train volunteers to help other families through the ordeal. There is a lot that the state government could do, and I hope particularly that the Minister for Mental Health could show a little more leadership on this issue.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Before I make my contribution in this 10-minute grievance debate in response to the budget, I congratulate the member for Mitchell on his remarks on suicide. Having had the experience in the last two weeks of having to tell my son that one of his best mates suicided, and knowing the devastation that has caused within that friendship group and the families concerned, I can only concur with everything the member for Mitchell has just said. It has a devastating effect not only on the immediate family but also on other families who may be involved in the incident. I congratulate the member for Mitchell on a splendid contribution.

I wish to touch on a topic that has angered my electorate as a result of this budget. About two weeks ago, I attended a meeting of all the primary schools, the chairpersons of the school councils and the principals, or representatives of those groups, to talk about the impact of the proposed cuts to education being implemented by this government. I know that, when politicians speak, people often think that they exaggerate the argument. For the record, I wish to read a

letter that was sent out to a school community (in this case, the Craighburn school community) by the chairperson of the school council. Similar letters have gone out to every school in my electorate, written by the school council chairs. I have never seen them as angry as they are about this particular issue.

I think that this letter from the Craighburn school council chair summarises pretty well the circumstances in which the government finds itself and in which the schools now find themselves as a result of cuts in the education budget. The letter reads:

Dear Parents,

Last Thursday, several thousand people comprising parents, teachers and principals, rallied on the steps of Parliament House to protest some impending cuts to school funding. I joined members of our staff and was part of the rally. The Government has instructed the Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) to make cuts to their overall budget. As a result, a number of 'savings efficiencies' are about to be levied on schools. The results of the 'savings efficiencies' will have major negative impacts on all public schools including Craighburn.

The Finance Advisory Committee of Governing Council has been briefed on the nature and implications of these cuts for Craighburn. They include handing over costs for the management of WorkCover to schools—previously managed by DECS, reductions in the amounts of interest paid on school investment accounts, further reductions in the use of energy and water and costs for replacement of staff on WorkCover and their initial medical expenses.

At Craighburn the total cost of the 'savings' to be taken from our revenue will be approximately \$50 000-\$60 000. It must be understood that this money is not being withheld from additional funding—it is being drawn from payments already made to schools to support current operations and programs. Of the total school funding at Craighburn, over 90 per cent goes directly to the payment of wages, asset maintenance and utilities costs. There is a very small and carefully managed discretionary budget remaining for curriculum support, ICT, student resources and other student programs.

In order to fund the estimated cuts of \$50-\$60K to our funding for next year for Craighburn, we will either have to find this money from our discretionary budget or raise the materials and services charge for every student by \$100.

I repeat: raise the materials and services charge for every student by \$100. The letter continues:

Governing Council is outraged at these proposals. On their behalf I urge you to make your thoughts and opinions known so that these 'savings efficiencies' are not implemented.

That is a typical primary school. Blackwood High School has written a similar letter and this has gone to the Premier himself. It states:

Dear Mr Rann

The Blackwood High School Governing Council has been advised by the principal that the Department of Education and Children's Services will impose a number of changes that will impact negatively on the resources available for the administration and curriculum of the school. I understand that these changes arise from the 'efficiencies' imposed by the state government budget on all government departments.

The governing council is so disappointed that DECS has chosen to pass these 'efficiencies' onto schools. I understand that DECS has advised the Minister of Education and Children's Services and government MPs that government schools can afford a reduction in their operational budgets.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We wonder if the funds that some schools are holding in the SASIF accounts have clouded the issue. Even though our school has explained the commitments for which we need to hold funds, such as replacing equipment and other curriculum resources in a timely and cost efficient manner, and to pay for accounts that the DECS has yet to present, our holdings in the SASIF account could look like we are not spending money that is intended for our present students. In our view, we are using the public funds and funds collected from parents prudently.

As Premier, with your eye on the big picture, you may not be aware of the detail of how resources are distributed to government schools. Contrary to DECS claims that schools get a 'global budget',

a school's resource entitlement is made up of a series of grants tied to various inputs such as staffing, utilities, maintenance, targeted funds for Aboriginal students and students with learning disabilities and so on. You can see the detail in the attachment that explains the resource entitlements for Blackwood High School.

In 2007, BHS has just over \$7.6M available to cover the expenses of the school and its 1 000 students. About 7% or just over \$500 000 is collected from the parents or earned through interest, hire of facilities and so on. These funds, plus a small amount of grants totalling \$180 000 in the Resource Entitlement provided by Government, are the only discretionary funds available for the curriculum and administration of the school, the rest being targeted for specific purposes.

The so-called efficiencies being imposed by DECS can only come from the school's discretionary funds, that is, the funds that will pay for curriculum and administration expenses to the school. Thus far we have identified a total of about \$76 000 reduction arising from the work cover levy of 1% of the school's salary budget, about \$65 000 in the mooted changes to the rules about the level of funds in the SASIF account that can earn interest, about \$11 000. Other planned efficiencies, of which we can only estimate to be about \$32 000, are the proposed cuts to the utilities grants for savings on electricity and water.

The efficiencies that are required by DECS in the government's budget have already affected our students. DECS withdrew the Be Active Lets Go funds, which has reduced our funds to support students to take up sport by \$7 000. We have already seen a 25% reduction in the number of teams that the school has put into the competitions in term 1 and 2 because we had to pass these costs onto the users. We know that the funds to support the aquatics program and the instrumental music service are also under review.

The Governing Council strongly objects to the changes and the amount of funds that schools can earn in the SASIF account. Some years ago, schools were able to join forces and invest their cash flow so that it earned extra funds for schools' programs. SASIF was introduced to provide a protected investment option and has served us well. The funds that this school holds in the SASIF includes the money collected from parents that we need to pay the curriculum and administration expenses totalling \$700 000 and planned upgrades to curriculum resources that we have been putting aside over the years. If the interest on funds collected from parents is to go to the DECS coffers, then the Materials and Services Charge is essentially a tax.

The council also objects to having to pay the workcover levy. The Chair of the council's Financial Advisory Committee has advised me that the DECS explanatory notes about the oncosts that are part of the school's salary budget already include workcover costs. As the salary grant is tied by an industrial agreement, the levy will need to come from the operating budget which will result in the cut in the curriculum and administration budgets at the school. In the first year, that will impact on our plans to

- replace the year 9 maths textbooks, (\$10 500)
- buy another trolley of laptops so that students can take advantage of the wireless computing platform. . . (\$25 000)
- increase our supply of robotics equipment as part of our attempt to upgrade our technology. . . (\$7 500)
- put projectors and curtains into four classrooms (\$20 000)
- replace worn out furniture. . . (\$15 000) [of which \$7 000 was given by the parents]
- supplement the professional development grant for our staff. . . (\$25 000).

In further years, as our savings for planned upgrades are eroded, all curriculum budgets will need to be reduced.

That is just a sample of the cuts that are going on in every school across the state. The important thing for South Australia to remember is that the government has done this deliberately; it has done it over a nine-month period, and every Labor member is rock solid committed to it because not one of them has spoken out publicly or in this place against it.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Before I comment on other things, I want to correct the record in relation to a comment made by the Attorney-General after I made my contribution this morning in relation to the budget. During question time, the Attorney suggested that it was a bit strange that I had stated that I did not know what was in the submission from

the DPP as to how much money he needed, and I then went on to say that I believe it was about \$3 million. I want to clarify that to make it quite clear that what I was saying was that I did not see that submission. Of course, the Attorney had the benefit of seeing the submission and he certainly has not showed it to me nor has the DPP shown me the submission or a copy of it or discussed with me specifically what he said in his budget. However, I do have it on good authority that the amount being sought by the DPP currently—whether or not it was the amount in the submission, I do not know—to bring his office into line is about \$3 million.

Enough of those topics, though, because I really want to talk about a couple of other things important to my electorate and, in particular, as other speakers have mentioned, the issue of what this government is doing to schools is of paramount importance. I believe it is going to be an issue which will damage this government, hopefully enough for it to lose the next election. I certainly believe that the issue has the capacity to do that and, particularly, in the Hills. In the Hills, of course, we are quite close to Adelaide for the most part and within the 80 km/h limit from Adelaide, but we have a number of small schools. In my view, small schools are great places to educate children. They will invariably have dedicated staff who work very hard, they also invariably have a very involved parent group, as do some of the larger schools, I concede. But the smaller schools create a nurturing environment and that nurturing environment is, to my mind, a profoundly important element in the education of our young people.

It seems to me incomprehensible that this so-called education government is proposing to build these super schools that it is planning for the northern suburbs (and, no doubt, for elsewhere in due course), at the cost of the closure of our small schools, because they seem self-evidently to be the places where we will breed the social problems of the future. When I think about the small schools around my electorate and look at what they will now have to bear because of the various impositions of this government, I am really concerned about how long they will last. I have no doubt that this government's intention is that people eventually will be forced to say, 'Well, this school has to close,' and the government will want to say, 'Well, it wasn't us that closed it. They requested closure.' However, when you take away Vacswork, music classes and all sorts of activities within a school, and when you take away from the small schools the \$30 000 small schools grant and then have the audacity, on top of that, to impose what this government is imposing with respect to WorkCover, it is just extraordinary to me that government members are not hanging their heads in shame.

To say that the government can shift its WorkCover burden from itself, as the employer, for a start, is extraordinary. The government is the employer. No other employer is allowed, under the law, to shift their WorkCover obligations onto anyone else. However, this government is making all the schools pay 1 per cent of their salary by way of a WorkCover levy and, in addition, requiring them to meet the cost if someone is unfortunate enough to have an accident or be injured at work. It is shifting the cost so they have to pay the first four weeks of the person's WorkCover absence, and also the first four weeks for any replacement teacher who may be engaged.

That will have a profound impact on the funding of the small schools and, in particular, schools throughout the electorate of Heysen, because there are so many small

schools. My fear is that, not only will that damage the education prospects for our young people, but it will also damage the very communities in which those schools are found, because a lot of them have the school as their focal point. For instance, the town of Mylor has a wonderful little school. Its school motto is 'small school, great kids', and that is exactly what it produces. It is really a charming school with a dedicated staff, and is very central to the community of Mylor.

I recently attended Australia's Biggest Morning Tea fundraiser at the Mylor hall, and the school students came along and performed. They are very intertwined in the activities of the community at large, and the community is very much involved in assisting the school and making sure that the young people in it are nurtured as members of the community. That is what we want. We want to raise people who not only have academic qualifications but who also become citizens of this great state and this great nation.

I want to move on from schools to another issue that has been mentioned by the leader in his speech and by a number of other members, that is, the issue of payroll tax. Payroll tax, to me, is quite iniquitous and a dumbfounding idea, in terms of any government that is trying to grow an economy. Why would someone want to be in a situation where, if they wish to employ people, they will move into a tax bracket and, therefore, decide not to employ someone because of the extra tax burden that will be imposed on them? It makes no sense at all. I am constantly approached by business owners around my electorate (and a number of them have approached me since this budget was brought down) regarding the issue of payroll tax. Payroll tax as a whole, I believe, is a bad thing. However, when one compares our payroll tax regime with the payroll tax regime of other states, it seems to me to be quite stupid of this state government to fail to address improvements that could lead to growth in our economy.

It has already been pointed out more than once that the threshold at which people begin to pay payroll tax is something like double in Queensland what it is in this state. In this state, with a \$504 000 wages bill, a person will enter into the payroll tax bracket, whereas in Queensland it will be \$1 million or more. That means that a person does not have to have very many employees in this state before they will face that issue of payroll tax, and it quickly becomes evident that, if you want to employ someone extra, it will cost you not only their extra wages but a whole extra tax burden. All sorts of incentives are built into that system for us not to increase our staff levels and, therefore, not grow our businesses and not make the economy of this state—which, after all, is based on small business—more sustainable into the future.

I also want to touch on the issue of the hospital. At first blush, when I heard about the proposal to build the hospital in the railway yards west of the Morphett Street bridge, I thought that it was probably a pretty good idea, because those railway yards are a very dead spot, in terms of things not happening in the area. They are a bit of an eyesore as one crosses the Morphett Street bridge, and there must be better things we can do with it. However, as I further contemplated the possibilities, it became more obvious from talking to people who work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for instance, that removing services from the Modbury, Queen Elizabeth and Repat hospitals will have several downsides and not very many good sides.

The Minister for Health asked during question time this afternoon (in a rhetorical way, I guess): what is it that is inconsistent with the minister's plan and with the leader's

conceding that there needs to be a streamlining and simplification (I forget the word he used) of our acute care services? There is nothing wrong at all. What the Minister for Health misses out is that they do not all need to be in exactly the same place. The idea is that, if we rationalise all our services, we could have, for instance, a single renal unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and all the people who need that type of treatment can go there for it. We need, perhaps, only one renal unit for a population our size. We might need only one burns unit. We might need only one of all sorts of units, but they do not all need to be located in the same place.

One of the major downsides is that everything will be located in the one place, not only to the detriment of metropolitan Adelaide but also to the vast detriment of all our regional areas. Country health is being sadly neglected by this government. In particular, it is making it more and more impossible for mums to give birth to babies, which is a normal process. It is becoming increasingly obvious that, if someone wants to do that in this state, they will have to come into the Women's and Children's Hospital or an Adelaide-based hospital in order to do something as normal and natural as having a baby, because the more central they make the services the less likely we are to get the specialists to go out and provide any services in the regional centres.

Time expired.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): Before I call the next speaker, I would appreciate it if members on both sides of the house perhaps eased back their chatter. It is a bit disruptive to members who are on their feet. So I would like a little bit of decorum on both my right and left. I call the member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Of course, the most important people to have listen is the Hansard staff, and they always do. In speaking tonight I acknowledge the work of the Premier, ministers and their staff and departments in preparing this budget. When planning state budgets, much like a family budget, it is important to learn how to economise when necessary, to save for the big ticket items, and borrow when necessary and prudent. These elements are part of the bigger picture in providing for day-to-day living while keeping an eye on the future.

Access and equity remain important ideals for me. During my first campaign I adopted the motto 'Community counts', and mentioned more than once that we live in a community, not an economy. I remain mindful of that maxim every day and seek to ensure I speak for the residents of my electorate at every opportunity here in this place and in every other forum available to me.

As with most situations in life, things are in a constant state of change and situations do not always end up being as black and white as we might like them to be. In recent times we have all come to better understand climate change and the necessity for sustainability. Life is changing in our use of water, power and petrol. Everyone has come to understand just how far a tank of petrol really does go, and there is a fine distinction here between the cost of something and ensuring the availability of a resource. In learning to balance that concept, we come some way to understanding balancing the state's budget. What that means for the electorate of Florey is, as usual, there are some pluses and some minuses.

Overall, the expenditure required to keep the state running may not always mean we see obvious results in our local areas. Everyone uses roads and hospitals, everyone benefits

from a strong economy generating jobs, and everyone needs access to services, and that is where the bulk of expenditure is required, keeping our day-to-day living requirements sharply in focus. If there were unlimited amounts of money available, I am sure there would be no shortage of projects identified as necessary and essential. The question therefore becomes a matter of emphasis in policy and priority.

Immediate and obvious outcomes in this year's budget for Florey schools are grants for major works—\$3.1 million to the Heights School and \$2.2 million to Modbury High. This substantial investment in our young people will reap great future rewards. These are the big expenditure items—part of the commitment by this government over its time in office to strengthen the public school system. At the other end of this portfolio some decisions have caused concern and comment this week. I will be doing all I can to understand these measures and will represent my community's view at every opportunity and be part of the discussions currently happening and continuing around these decisions.

Another announcement for Florey is the \$12 million allocated for improvements at the Modbury Hospital. As part of the new South Australian Health Care Plan this is welcome. However, there are other aspects of plans for Modbury that are less welcome. The minister has assured me his bold and exciting vision for the future will meet the needs of the state and will deliver a brand new, state-of-the-art hospital in the city, one of three general acute care facilities. These hospitals will be complemented by the works carried out at major hospitals, one of which is Modbury, which over the years has taken many health reforms in its stride because of its great staff and strong community links. This challenge will be no different and, with the future promise of a GP Plus centre not far away, another phase of health care in the North East begins. Mental health plays a big part in our area via the Woodley House facility, and we look forward to continuing improvements there.

In Florey we will also work towards identifying and having projects within our area given the priority we feel they deserve. There are many priorities on my wish list that I could mention. However, every part of South Australia has a wish list, too, and the reality is we are all competing for recognition. Within the State Strategic Plan we have a blueprint for a future we can see the results of and measure. We all need to work hard to see that planned promise delivered for the future benefit of all residents of this great state. There are hundreds of projects in this state—all important, some more so now as they are ready to go and others needing nurture so they will deliver well into the future. Working together, I am sure this government will ensure the very best outcome for the people of South Australia.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am also pleased to further contribute to the debate in relation to the progress of the 2007-08 state budget. I want to make some comments in relation to the manner in which the government has shown a real failure in properly managing the finances of this state. We have seen where the federal Treasurer has made some comment in relation to the way the states, pretty well right around the country, have gone about managing their finances, and the vast majority of them (all Labor governments) have taken exactly the wrong steps in the way they should have structured their financial matters. What I am saying is that the Treasurer has observed that, when you are experiencing really buoyant economic times, it is an outstanding opportunity to

save some of that money, put it into reserve, or else pay off debt. That is exactly what the federal government has been doing over the last 10 years since it has been in office. It has paid off all its debts, so it does not have to make any interest payments. It has paid off \$9.6 billion worth of debt in the last 10 years since it has been in government. So it does not have any interest payments to make and, the way the economy is cranking along, it is able to save money. We have seen that government establish the future fund for future liabilities.

It would have been good if this current Labor government had adopted that same philosophy and strategy to plan its affairs so we did not see the glaring example of WorkCover being in such an absolute financial mess, with liabilities trending towards \$1 billion. The Treasurer, the Premier and the ministers have failed the South Australia community in that they have not taken advantage of the buoyant economic times the state has been experiencing. The actual money is being spent on the burgeoning Public Service, where we have seen an increase of almost 10 000 public servants above those originally planned a number of years ago when the government first came to office. That is where the money has gone. The government has lost control of the ever ballooning number of public sector employees. All the surplus cash has been soaked up in paying the wages of approximately 10 000 additional public servants. It is not hard to do the maths on this. I guess conservatively their average salary would be around \$50 000, so 10 000 by \$500 000 is \$500 million. That is a significant amount of money. That is where all the money has gone—in paying additional public servants—and that is why the Treasurer now has to borrow.

The government should be saving in good times. It should save for a rainy day so it has the money to spend on infrastructure, and the like; for example, on the new hospital and the ever increasing blow-outs in the Northern Expressway and the debacle in which the Minister for Transport is involved in relation to roadworks on South Road through Port Road and Anzac Highway. That is where the fundamental mistake of this government has been made. It has not taken advantage of the good economic times that the nation has been experiencing.

I would like to comment on the electorate which I have the pleasure to represent in this place. I have spoken about these issues at length in the house on previous occasions—and I will continue to speak about them until they are resolved. While I mention only the more significant issues that need immediate attention, there is a myriad of issues in the electorate that need to be addressed. Specifically, I want to talk about a second freeway interchange that is a real requirement at present at Mount Barker. I know the newly elected Mayor Ferguson has been to see the Minister for Transport about this issue recently. Basically, she was told—as were previous mayors, the CEO and me indirectly—that the state government is not prepared to allocate any funds to assist with building and constructing a second freeway interchange at Mount Barker. I invite the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for Transport—anyone on the front bench of the government—and any backbenchers of the government to come to the hills—to hop in their car and drive up the freeway; it is only half an hour up the freeway—and have a good look around Mount Barker and witness first hand the extent of the residential development that is taking place. It is the greatest developing area in the country, other than a couple of coastal areas in the nation. It is the fastest developing inland district in the nation at present.

What do we see? We see requests for this Labor government to provide the infrastructure for which it is responsible—and we see those requests continually being refused. We see requests for the freeway interchange and infrastructure in and around the township of Mount Barker to deal with the significant developments taking place continually refused. As a result of those refusals, the council, in order to allow the extent of land to be developed, has had to go to the developers and negotiate a contribution from the developers to cater for the demand for improved and newly-required infrastructure in and around the town. Obviously, the market determines the price of these new residential blocks; that is normal economic activity. What happens is that the cost is passed onto the consumer or the purchaser.

The government through its refusal to contribute to that necessary infrastructure is passing its responsibility through the council to the developer and the purchaser. What is one of the fundamental purposes of a government? It is a rhetorical question. The answer is to provide the infrastructure necessary for a community to function properly. They continually refuse to do that so the user ends up paying. Those people who are looking to purchase new land in the Adelaide Hills are the ones who have to pay for the infrastructure costs because the government is not prepared to meet its responsibility. That is one issue.

Also, I want to talk about the Nairne Primary School crossing. I have spoken at length about this issue in this house, and, again, the government refuses to allocate any funds to see what is really a safety issue for the children in our community in that township of Nairne; it refuses to see what is an unsafe situation remedied.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I wish to expand on my comments made earlier this evening in regard to the 2007-08 budget, and I refer to the areas of health and education. Regarding health, it is the same old pattern where the spending sounds good: a big new hospital in the city centre, and improvements to four regional hospitals—which is great if you are connected with one of the four regional hospitals getting the improvements. What happens, for instance, if you live at Pinnaroo and need immediate access to the upgraded hospital in Berri? You will have to travel on a road at 60 km/h, so perhaps we will need more spent on rural road maintenance to be able to access these regional centres. Lamerook Hospital in my electorate will be pleased to get a new solar-powered hot water service augmented with gas, at around \$150 000, as part of 10 regional hospitals having access to this upgrade, and that is welcome news. It is an environmentally-friendly service no less.

If it were not for this government's record on health and education, we might well believe that it had changed its city-centric approach to infrastructure. This government has a history of trumpeting its big-ticket projects, making big, bold unilateral announcements and expecting the public to fall at their feet with gratitude. Then they talk about full consultation after the announcement. It is called shoot first; then you only need to talk to those left standing. In its clumsy attempt to streamline country health services, minister Hill has succeeded in getting rid of many of the most capable and

dedicated people in local communities who have guided country hospitals for decades, and he now wonders who he will get to fill the advisory committees.

Other examples of shoot first can be found if we look at education, with aquatics and music programs being threatened. 'This is how it is going to be, and you can put your opinions in that box over there!' First, we get the big announcement about a substantial new investment in education: super schools and the like. Then comes the public backlash which is duly swallowed up by surveys which are meant to appease the masses but which never seem to affect the original decision. Then, as the months go by, come little bits of bad news: the program cuts, the funding cuts, the staffing cuts, the fee increases, the cost shifting, and nothing worse than what we are seeing now with the workers compensation cost shifting. How long will it be before this socialist government asks students to present a current public liability insurance certificate at the gate before they are allowed into public school premises? And when the staff, parents and education community object, all the minister can do is express her disappointment that they marched rather than talked. If their opinion really mattered, why not talk to them before the big announcements?

The sum of \$2.9 million to be spent on Lameroo school is great news for that school. There will be improvements made to the gymnasium and their school science laboratories over, I think, three years; but it still leaves the local school with some doubts and anxieties as to when all these projects will be finalised.

I want to address another good part of the budget, and that is the \$18 million in 2007-08 to address the impact of the drought on regional and rural communities, including an extension of state-based concession programs to drought-affected families, increased mental health services, natural resource management levy relief (the only problem with that is that it will mean that programs will be cut—and I know the order has gone out from the minister to cut programs), and support to deliver business plans.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I think you might want to talk to your partner in the other place, minister. I have very good information that a directive has been given to some individual NRM boards to cut programs.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I did not name a particular area. These measures are in addition to exceptional circumstances. Drought relief support, which was announced in 2006, also included increased financial rural counselling services. It is very pleasing to see support for rural areas when they really need it. I must admit that we may need to have a look at national funding for exceptional circumstances. I do not think that many people have been able to jump through the hoops on dryland farms, and I think irrigators are having a real battle to access it, as their bad years have not yet come. Their two bad years will be the next financial years—2007-08, 2008-09 and the one after—because I believe that even though they have just come out of 60 per cent allocation for water, dairy farmers and people with orchards, etc., probably still have reasonable incomes, but it has made them ineligible to access the funding.

I get back to my favourite subject of water security for this state. The simple fact is that we do not seem to have water security because we have had to reduce the amount of water to irrigators this water year to 60 per cent of their allocation. We are up to enhanced level 3 restrictions, and there are

going to be temporary closures of 29 wetlands and backwaters, including Lake Bonney. We need standpipes around the lower lakes, and we need dredging works, not just for irrigators, but for marinas and other people with interests on the Murray.

We are well aware that there is a risk that the low flows will continue for a long time to come. As I have said on several occasions in this place, there is still the threat of the temporary weir south of Wellington. The government may even have to look at the acquisition of additional water entitlements. They will need to find federal funding for many of these programs. The River Murray is still expected to keep the state afloat, as we have seen through the government's proposal for the Mount Bold reservoir. The only way to top it up will be by using water from the River Murray. Desalination is finally on the move with the government, but that is still five years away. There is a very innovative scheme at Salisbury (which is a great triumph for the environment) on reusing stormwater, yet the government opposed the Liberal Party's bills late last year in the other place to make better use of stormwater, sewerage mining and rainwater usage. I note that these bills are being reintroduced in this house.

The barrages at Goolwa have come under the spotlight, with salt water leaking constantly into the lakes. Last minute measures are proving of little help and we are now faced with having to wait—however long it takes—for a major flow down the Murray to push a lot of this salt water out to sea. Perhaps we will see the first desalination plant built on a freshwater island. Again the pattern emerges that locals feel that they are being ignored until the crisis hits. My one closing statement is that we are always told that there is no money for water infrastructure to wean the state off the Murray, but over six years \$1.61 billion is being milked out of SA Water into general revenue.

Mr KENYON (Newland): I note in the budget that there was an increase of around \$8 million for the government's very successful PACE program. I congratulate both the minister in another place and the Premier for their contribution to that program because it has been a tremendously successful program, as I said. In the past few days, some further evidence of the success of that program has been released. For instance, the trend estimates in mineral exploration expenditure came out and South Australia and Western Australia were the largest two contributors: Western Australia, 9.2 per cent and South Australia, 18.9 per cent—an excellent result.

In relation to the seasonally adjusted estimate of mineral exploration expenditure, the largest increase in this quarter was South Australia—up \$30.6 million (53 per cent). As a slightly amusing aside, I indicate that Victoria showed the largest decrease of \$12.7 million. In original terms, the mineral exploration expenditure decreased around the country, with Western Australia having the largest decrease, but South Australia was the only state that increased its exploration—up \$7.4 million (12.5 per cent). Again we see Victoria drop away, which can be amusing in its own way. That is all I wanted to point out. We have seen well over \$230 million worth of mineral exploration, and PACE has played a big role in that. As a result of spending \$30-odd million over the course of seven years, it has had some massive dividends. It is an excellent example of what a government can do if it is smart and targeted in what it is trying to achieve.

I would also like to note the complete lack of passion that has been displayed in contributions from members opposite. It is a case of almost following the lead of their leader and delivering flat, disinterested, pro-forma contributions to the debate. It pretty much says to me that there is not much to talk about. They have not much to complain about, even though that is what they like to do, and they are following their leader and just delivering a pretty uninspiring performance. I point out that there were a couple of exceptions: the former leader, the member for Davenport, I thought did quite well. He got stuck in a bit, which was amusing. I thought the member for Goyder made a nice measured statesman-like contribution, talking away there and keeping himself in the game. That was good to see.

I commend the budget. I think it is another excellent budget. The sixth one in surplus is an achievement in itself, especially after coming in for 10 or 11-odd years at zero.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I realise that I am the lead speaker, but I will not be using the full time. I was saying in my contribution earlier this evening how concerned I am at the amount of money the government wastes on its own excesses, especially the amount spent on the Premier's and ministers' offices and their public relations outfit. I raised the matter of the 300-odd people who are employed by the government—the Premier and the ministers—to do their public relations (their spin teams) compared to the opposition's eight which really does beg the question about fairness and equity. I think it is a disgrace while the assets of our state fall into disrepair. I do not want to be political, but they are falling into disrepair, especially our roads.

I say to all members that we will be judged one day. I do agree with my leader: this is a budget of debt, because the government is going deeper into debt—it cannot dispute that. It is a budget of disappointment because we had high expectations, particularly in the infrastructure areas. A lot of these larger projects, which we welcome, are eight to 10 years down the track and, in some cases, subject to two elections. In many cases, they will not be delivered. I am very disappointed. This really is a budget light on new ideas, innovation and direction, but heavy in government excesses. The message about it does not seem to get out. The government waffles and bullies the media. Why do we not hear the Premier and Treasurer Kev on the ABC's Matt and Dave show? Is that because they ask hard questions? All I can say is: why not?

What about the other journalists? 'Give us a positive spin or you won't be included in the news headshots or invited to doorstep interviews'! Even the RAA was harassed last year when it criticised the state of our roads and commented on the Australian Automobile Association's survey in which some of our major roads rated only two or three stars out of five. It has come out this week commending the government for its new road maintenance program, obviously covering its tracks and trying to win back its favours. I say: what program? The sum of \$14 million over four years is a disgrace. I welcome the money spent on the Outback roads, on the road widening programs and on the roadside rest areas. I welcome that, but it is really a small drop in a huge bucket when it comes to the massive amount of money that is required. I am grateful for the capital works that are being done in the Barossa, small though they are. I am grateful but, as I said, there are not enough. We want more on our road improvements, and there could at least have been mention of the Barossa hospital. I certainly live in hope about that.

This state government needs to be unmasked for what it is: a very poor financial manager. I say again: how much is it costing the taxpayer-funded budget for the ads on the TV and in the paper? I wonder whether we will know that. I want to know how much it is costing when we see those political ads. They are blatant political advertising, even to the point of saying 'spoken and authorised by Mike Rann'. Really, do you think that is fair when we are all paying for it? Add to this the NRM debate, the WorkCover blow-out (which we do not seem to have an answer for) and the almost \$1 billion of liabilities, and the stripping of our schools, which we have heard about today. I think the issue above all others is the difficulties created for our schools in relation to the loss of the \$30 000 small schools grant, which affects seven of my schools, and now we are seeing the WorkCover levies lumped on them. We have also seen the aquatics and music programs taken from them. No wonder morale is low. What is the excuse and what is the reason? What are you trying to do here?

On the other hand, you turn around and forecast building four new super schools. That is wrong. I am happy that the government should build one super school. By all means, trial it and, if it is a success, build the others, but do not build four at once. I have been around a while and served on school councils. Over the years, we have had these educational experiments, and many times they do not work. One was the famed open space system in schools. Do members remember that? We started to build open-space schools. What happened to those? It was not long before we started to close them where we could. Nuriootpa Primary School cannot be closed because it was built on the spoke. I believe that we spent a lot of money on a failed concept. So, I say to the government: be cautious. If you want to go to super schools, that is okay. I do not believe that, in this case, big is automatically beautiful, particularly because if you have a problem you have a big problem. I wonder about the whole concept, and I would like to see some of the discussions and reports that were put to the government to make this decision. It certainly does concern me.

I want to comment today on the speech made by the member for Mawson. I have heard a lot of speeches in my time here, but this one really took the cake. I could not believe that this guy really believed what he was saying. He said that the previous government left the state in economic shambles. Well, nothing could be further from the truth than that. In 1993, we had an election. The Labor government left this state in total shambles and, at the election, the people spoke with a very strong voice and reduced the then government to 10 members in this house—the smallest representation in this place ever—because of the State Bank and other issues. A lot of good members of parliament lost their seat because of that, and some were friends of mine. I have some tenderness about that matter. That is what happens when you have bad government: you lose control. It was out of control, and we were still paying the price for what happened. I do not believe that members of parliament should get up in here and say things they know not to be true.

The Liberal Party won the election so well that we could have formed our own opposition; in fact, we had members sitting on this side of the house. You would not recall that, sir, but the Acting Clerk would. I jokingly said one day, 'Why don't we form our own opposition?' We could have, because we had enough members. I still reckon that we should have, because it would have been very interesting to form a breakaway of the Liberal Party and form an opposi-

tion. We could have had the whole trappings of government, but we did not do that.

Mr Koutsantonis: The trappings of government?

Mr VENNING: That is what you have called it. To change tack and talk on a positive note, I am pleased to report excellent progress on the restoration of the old Hill and Son original Adelaide Town Hall organ, which is now being restored in the Soldiers Memorial Hall in Tanunda. The Organ Historical Trust of Australia is doing a magnificent job. Mr Steve Kaesler, a local enthusiast, and the society are doing a wonderful job. It really now looks like an organ again. However, funds are a problem and, if we could find a couple of hundred thousand dollars, it would certainly get the project finished and operating in quick time—hopefully, inside 12 months.

It has been a huge project, as some of the critical historic action was discarded when the organ was electrified in the early sixties when it was still in the town hall. Many would say that it was ruined by doing that; in fact, so ruined that it was taken out and replaced by the current organ in the late seventies or early eighties. It was condemned to a shed in the Adelaide Hills when the organ society got hold of it and eventually decided to move it to the Barossa. It is now being faithfully restored and recreated according to its original plans. I have to say that the artwork is fantastic. Some members would have seen it. If you go to the hall and see the organ now, you get goosebumps just looking at it because it is a magnificent instrument—the king of instruments. When it was built and installed in the 1880s, it was the largest organ in the Southern Hemisphere. As I said, it certainly was the king of instruments.

It is returning to its former glory, and it gives me goosebumps just to gaze at this magnificent instrument. Hopefully, it will sound as good as it ever did and will be something the late and great organists of Adelaide, Dr Peters and the late Roland May, would be proud of. I look forward to going to opening night. I plead with the Minister for Tourism or the Minister for Environment and Heritage: are you able to help with the last amount of money to finish off the project? I would think that \$200 000 would do that. Over \$300 000 of volunteer money has already been spent, not to mention the huge amount of money of in-kind donations by local businesses and people who have gone into this project. The member for Light would know. I single out Ahrens Limited from Sheoak Log which has totally rehoused the footing of this organ in that building. It has made a new floor and it has put the organ in a steel frame—a job running into thousands of dollars. The community is right behind the project and we want to get it finished.

I am pleading with the government because this would be money well spent. It would be a fraction of the money the government is spending on political advertising. Do something like this and it will be money well spent, and it will be there forever for our enjoyment, our families' enjoyment and that of our descendants, because this is a wonderful instrument, this Hill and Son organ. I think it is a superior instrument and I am very pleased that it will now be saved forever in the wonderful Barossa Valley.

Finally, I want to discuss briefly my ongoing concern at what is happening at Nuriootpa High School. I raised this matter in the house two weeks ago and nothing has changed or happened. I appreciate the discussion with the Minister for Education and Children's Services in this house yesterday, and I enlightened her as to how I saw the problem. How can a much respected teacher, Mr Kevin Hoskin, be punished by

being removed from the school before he has been found guilty of any offence? Staff morale is very low and it is almost seven weeks now. I urge the speedy resolution of this impasse and I urge that Mr Hoskin be immediately reinstated to the school. I remind the house that Mr Hoskin, as the member for Light would know, pioneered wine education for secondary schools. It is now used across Australia and the world. He was Barossa Winemaker of the Year in 2005. No wonder the community is quite concerned, as am I.

In conclusion, most farmers, although not all, have their crop in already. Despite many difficulties getting the crop in because of the lack of moisture, the bigger problem has been the lack of fertiliser. You would not believe that there has been a shortage of fertiliser. Farmers have been waiting four to six weeks to get their fertiliser. I cannot believe that this would happen. In the old days it would never happen because we got our fertiliser early. With finance the way it is and banks and everything else, farmers bought it as they wanted it and, of course, it was not there. The stockists did not carry it and some farmers had been delayed four to six weeks waiting for fertiliser.

Anyway, most of the crops are in and they look pretty good considering the minimal moisture level that most of those crops are in. They have come up pretty well. There is a long way to go but the most positive fact is that the current price of feed barley is \$250 per tonne which is a very good price. One is tempted to forward sell but even I am hesitant to do that because, if you fall short, you have to do what we call washing out that contract; in other words, you have to buy barley at the going price to pay your contract out, which could be in excess of \$350 or \$400 per tonne for feed barley. But it augurs well. I think it pays to be positive because not only do we need the rain for our farmers for the crops to continue but also we need rain to replenish our water stocks. Here's hoping. Those with faith think it will rain one day. I am positive it will, and it is getting closer every minute.

This ends the budget process, and we have gone through this budget in the past week pulling it apart bit by bit. I only hope that what is positive in the budget will be positive for the sake of South Australia and all the people who live here, because, as I said to the member for Light and his son yesterday in the corridor, 'It is we who are here to make the laws, but it is those who follow us who will pay the price for what we do or do not do.' Let's hope that we can leave them some positive things and some assets that they can be proud of. As the Hon. Tom Playford left it for me and my generation, I hope that we will leave it for the member for Light and his son's generation, and mine as well. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to be in this house and to speak on this budget, which is the 17th budget debate to which I have spoken.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Thursday 5 July 2007, in accordance with the timetables as follows:

APPROPRIATION BILL
TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A
27-29 June & 2-4 July 2007
WEDNESDAY 27 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Premier
Minister for Economic Development
Minister for Social Inclusion

Minister for Arts
 Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change
 Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management
 Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts
 House of Assembly
 Joint Parliamentary Services .
 Legislative Council
 State Governor's Establishment
 Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
 Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
 Office of Public Employment
 Auditor-General's Department
 Arts SA
 Minister for Education and Children's Services
 Department of Education and Children's Services
 Administered Items for the Department of Education and Children's Services

THURSDAY 28 JUNE AT 11.00 AM

Treasurer
 Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

FRIDAY 29 JUNE AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Industry and Trade
 Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
 Office of the Venture Capital Board
 Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation

MONDAY 2 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation
 Minister for Ageing
 Minister for Disability
 Minister for Housing
 Minister for Families and Communities
 Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
 Department for Families and Communities (part)
 Administered Items for Department for Families and Communities (part)

TUESDAY 3 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Emergency Services
 Minister for Correctional Services
 Minister for Road Safety
 Department for Correctional Services
 Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 Administered Items for Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 South Australia Police (part)
 Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)
 Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade
 Minister for the River Murray
 Minister for Water Security
 Minister for Small Business
 Minister for Regional Development
 Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
 Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)

WEDNESDAY 4 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for State/Local Government Relations
 Minister for the Status of Women
 Minister for Volunteers
 Minister for Consumer Affairs
 Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B
 27-29 June & 2-4 July 2007

WEDNESDAY 27 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Transport
 Minister for Energy
 Minister for Infrastructure
 Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 TransAdelaide
 Attorney-General
 Minister for Multicultural Affairs
 Minister for Justice
 Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Courts Administration Authority
 State Electoral Office

THURSDAY 28 JUNE AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Tourism
 South Australian Tourism Commission
 Minister for Tourism
 Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing
 Minister for Industrial Relations
 Minister for Finance and Government Enterprises
 Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
 Department of Treasury and Finance
 Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
 Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 Administered Items for the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)

FRIDAY 29 JUNE AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Health
 Minister for the Southern Suburbs
 Department of Health (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Health (part)
 Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)

MONDAY 2 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Youth
 Minister for Gambling
 Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education Minister for Science and Information Economy
 Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (part)
 Department of Treasury and Finance
 Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
 Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Independent Gambling Authority

TUESDAY 3 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Forests
 Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
 Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 Minister for Mineral Resources Development
 Minister for Police
 Minister for Urban Development and Planning
 Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
 South Australia Police (part)
 Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)

WEDNESDAY 4 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Environment and Conservation
 Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse
 Department for Environment and Heritage
 Administered Items for the Department for Environment and Heritage
 Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
 Environment Protection Authority
 Department of Health (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Health (part)

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Ms Ciccarello, Ms Fox, Mr Griffiths, Mr Hamilton-Smith, Hon. S.W. Key, Mr Pederick and Ms Thompson.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Ms Breuer, Dr McFetridge, Mr Pisoni, Mr Piccolo, Mr Rau, Ms Simmons and Mr Venning.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (WATER RESOURCES AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

South Australia has long been at the forefront of water management and this Bill continues this tradition. This Bill stems from debate that commenced more than a decade previously. The 1994 Council of Australian Governments water reform framework and subsequent initiatives recognised that better management of Australia's water resources is a national issue. This ultimately led to the development of the Intergovernmental Agreement on a National Water Initiative (NWI), which identified that the improved management of water resources can be facilitated by separating water ownership and the associated regulatory approvals that govern use. South Australia is a signatory to the NWI.

Water property rights may be comprised of several individual components and the term 'separating' is used to describe the unbundling of these components into clearly specified, stand-alone rights or instruments. Separating the different elements of water licences will provide greater flexibility to water users by providing access to a broader range of tradeable components. Greater clarity will also be provided to buyers, sellers and other interested parties. In turn this will lead to lower transaction costs and more efficient resource allocation.

Interstate Water Trading

A key driver for this Bill is the advent of interstate water trade across the southern Murray-Darling system. A pilot tagged trading scheme is already in operation, and will be replaced by a permanent scheme from 1 July 2007.

The trading system must be underpinned by compatible legislative arrangements in each State. A key component is that the legislation must allow for the use of water purchased from interstate without owning a licence in the State of destination. While Victorian and New South Wales legislation allow this, the South Australian legislation does not. A person must hold a South Australian water licence to be able to take and use water in the State. This Bill will address this issue.

The Separated Water Rights Scheme

This Bill proposes a new entitlement system that would separate water rights into five components, specifically:

- (a) a water access entitlement, endorsed on a water licence;
- (b) a water allocation;
- (c) a water resource works approval;
- (d) a site use approval; and
- (e) a delivery capacity entitlement.

The characteristics of the proposed components are as follows.

Water Access Entitlement

Under the new scheme the water licence will provide the water access entitlement to the holder of the licence. The water access entitlement represents the ongoing interest in a specified share of a consumptive pool of water. As with the current water licence, the water access entitlement will be separate from the land title. Water access entitlement holders will be able to mortgage, permanently trade, give, bequeath or lease their entitlement. Permanently trading the water access entitlement would represent a permanent transfer of the right to that share of the water resource, as well as the water that is allocated to that entitlement in future years. Water access entitlements will be recorded in a publicly accessible register of entitlements. South Australia's register of existing licences, the

Water Information and Licensing Management Application (or WILMA), will be upgraded to cater for the new system. The upgrade will also be designed to make WILMA compatible with the water access entitlement registry systems in other states and territories.

The Act will also establish the concept of a **consumptive pool**. This is the proportion of the water resource that is available for consumptive use. The water allocation that is assigned from the consumptive pool will be based on the share or proportion of water access entitlement expressed on the licence. The consumptive pool will be defined according to rules established in the relevant water allocation plan. The Bill provides for annual announcements of the amount of water available from the consumptive pool for allocation.

Water Allocation

The water allocation will be a right to take a specific volume of water for a given period of time, but will not extend beyond 12 months. An allocation may be granted by the Minister under the terms of a water licence, or under the terms of an Interstate Water Entitlements Transfer Scheme (IWETS). This is similar to the water allocation under the existing system. However, there will no longer be two types of water allocation ('holding' and 'taking'), or a need to convert from one type to another. Instead, the water allocation may only be used if a person holds a current site use approval, water resource works approval and, where applicable, a delivery capacity entitlement. The water allocation will be personal property and will be tradeable, subject to any restrictions in the relevant water allocation plan.

Water Resource Works Approval

The water resource works approval will enable the taking of water at a particular site and in a particular manner. The water resource works approval will be location-specific and will not be tradeable separately from land to which it relates. The approval represents the right to construct works to take water and/or the conditions under which the works must be operated and maintained. For example, the works approval could specify the size and location of a pump, the frequency with which it may be used, or the construction and ongoing operation of a well or a dam. Some aspects of the current water affecting activity permit could form part of the works approval. It will not be necessary to hold both a works approval and a water affecting activity permit for the same works – it will only be necessary to hold one or the other.

Site Use Approval

The site use approval will enable the use of water at a particular site and for a particular purpose. A person may only use water at a particular site if he or she has a current site use approval. However, a person will not need to hold a water access entitlement or water allocation to obtain a site use approval. The site use approval will be specific to the land where the water is being used and therefore will not be traded separately from land.

Existing water licences endorsed with a 'taking' allocation typically have conditions attached that define how the water may be taken and used, and the parcel or parcels of land to which it may be applied. The conditions are designed to manage the impacts of water use on other users and the environment. These conditions will now be indicated on the site use approval or water resource works approval and will be consistent with the relevant water allocation plan.

Delivery Capacity Entitlement

The delivery capacity entitlement will represent the holder's ongoing right to access a proportion of the capacity of a water distribution system, whether this is a natural system or built infrastructure. It may be used to prioritise access to capacity of a water distribution system when the total demand for water delivery at a certain point in time exceeds that system's delivery capacity. A holder of a delivery capacity entitlement will be able to forgo the right to extract water at a time of peak demand, and trade that right to someone who has an urgent requirement for water. The delivery capacity entitlement is to be specific to the point of extraction, rather than to the water access entitlement. It will be personal property and will be a tradeable entitlement.

Not all water systems will require delivery capacity entitlements to effectively manage capacity constraints. Consequently, the Bill allows for the establishment of this entitlement to be identified through the water allocation planning process.

Furthermore, the Bill does not allow this entitlement to apply within private irrigation infrastructure. Capacity constraints within systems will continue to be managed through private contractual arrangements.

Water Allocation Plans

The Bill recognises the high degree of diversity inherent in water systems in the State. This entitlements approach must be sufficiently flexible to meet the management needs of water systems as diverse as the River Murray, Great Artesian Basin, and the Clare Valley surface water system. Each of these systems, and the multitude of others, carry with them their own unique issues and challenges. Consequently the implementation of the system is strongly linked to the water allocation plans relating to each resource. The water allocation plans will establish the nature of the water access entitlement, the rules around how consumptive pools are determined, the conditions on taking and use, whether there is a need for a delivery capacity entitlement, and any rules around transfer of entitlements.

This approach not only ensures that the application of system meets the management requirements of the resource, it also allows for significant community input through the consultation processes of the plan.

Levy Provisions

There are consequential amendments to the levy provisions. Under the new arrangements levy debt can be counted as personal debt, rather than merely a charge on the land. The current power in the existing legislation is that levy debt can be a first charge on the sale of the land. This power is being expanded by the Bill because under the new arrangements it is possible to own entitlements, and therefore be liable for a levy, in situations where no land is involved. In such circumstances, it would be impossible to collect unpaid levy. Consequently, the existing powers for levy collection have been expanded to define levy debt as personal debt. In this way unpaid levy can be recovered through normal civil recovery processes rather than enforcing the unpaid levy against land.

Currently the water levy can be raised against the quantity of water endorsed on the licence, the quantity of water used, the area of land it where it is applied, or the effect on the environment. Under the separated arrangements these powers have been brought across to the new entitlements. Flexibility in determining the levy has been increased by allowing for either a fixed charge over the relevant entitlement or approval, or a scalable charge based on what the entitlement or approval grants. It should be noted that these amendments do not increase the size of the levy. The levy is still determined through the normal planning processes. It merely provides additional flexibility for regional NRM boards to manage how the levy is raised.

Water Registry System

Currently, water licences are recorded in WILMA. However, under the Bill new systems and processes need to be developed to provide a secure and reliable record of water entitlements to the public, and provide better market and resource information for both intrastate and interstate trade.

The Water Register will be the conclusive record of ownership, description and extent of water entitlement.

Minor Amendments

The Bill also include a series of minor administrative amendments to correct spelling mistakes and incorrect references, delete a reference to committee that has ceased to function, recognise Intergovernmental Agreements under two other Acts, combine financial reporting into a combined financial statement, and ensure that properties are not divided by a boundary for levy collection purposes.

Transitional provisions

The current licensing approach will continue until water allocation plans have been amended to take into account the new arrangements. The Government will set a timetable for the amendment of these plans, and converting water rights into the new entitlements and approvals. It is not intended that the transition to the new scheme will significantly alter current licence holders entitlements. For example, there will not be a reduction in the amount of water to which a licence holder is entitled under the terms of their existing licence. As far as is reasonably practicable, the existing conditions applying to a water licence will continue under an appropriate water management authorisation without amendment.

The Bill establishes a two-stage process for the separation of water rights. Stage 1 makes minor amendments to the legislation to facilitate the State's participation in interstate water entitlements trading by 1 July 2007.

These amendments create the facility to allow the taking of water in South Australia through an approval issued by the Minister, without the need to hold a water licence. This mechanism allows the issuing of an approval to impose conditions on extraction and site use, to manage the impacts of water obtained on account of an

interstate entitlement. The existing licensing arrangements associated with taking and holding allocations are retained during these processes. The other minor amendments within the Bill will also come into force at this time.

Stage 2 is the establishment of the separated water rights regime. The Act will be amended to replace the existing taking and holding allocations with the new separated rights framework, and associated registry, levy and planning provisions. The commencement of this stage is delayed to come into effect until the registry system has been developed and water allocation plans amended. These processes are expected to take some time to complete. The successful passage of the Bill will create regulatory certainty, so that these processes can proceed with a complete understanding of the legal framework that will apply.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Natural Resources Management Act 2004* to facilitate interstate trade in water entitlements

4—Variation of section 100—Interpretation

5—Variation of section 101—Declaration of levies

6—Variation of section 104—Liability for levy

7—Substitution of section 107

These amendments will facilitate the application of the levy provisions of the Act to allocations of water under the terms of an Interstate Water Entitlements Transfer Scheme (as the Act will now allow for such allocations without attachment to a South Australian licence).

8—Amendment of section 112—Recovery rights with respect to unpaid levy

This clause will allow any unpaid water levy to be recovered as a debt under the Act. Currently, the Act provides for the recovery of a levy through the imposition of a charge on land. This scheme may be less effective in some cases where allocations are not attached to licences. An ability to proceed directly to debt recovery will avoid a more complicated process.

9—Amendment of section 115—Declaration of penalty in relation to the unauthorised or unlawful taking or use of water

These amendments are primarily concerned with allowing the imposition of a penalty on the holder of a right to an allocation of water under the terms of an Interstate Water Entitlements Transfer Scheme who takes water in excess of the relevant water allocation.

10—Amendment of section 127—Water affecting activities

These amendments will reflect the fact that water may now be taken under an allocation of water under the terms of an Interstate Water Entitlements Transfer Scheme.

11—Insertion of section 146A

New section 146A will provide for the creation of a new form of entitlement, an IWETS authority, to facilitate the interstate trading of water allocations into South Australia.

Part 3—Amendment of *Natural Resources Management Act 2004* to address administrative matters and revise water entitlements

12—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

These definitions are primarily associated with reflecting changes that must be introduced under the Act to allow the separating or "unbundling" of various aspects of the authorisation and control of water entitlements.

13—Amendment of section 5—Territorial and extra-territorial operation of Act

It will need to be made clear that the Act may operate extraterritorially to give effect to an intergovernmental agreement.

14—Amendment of section 38—Annual reports

This amendment will facilitate the combined reporting of the financial affairs of regional NRM boards and NRM groups.

15—Amendment of section 53—General powers

This amendment corrects a clerical error.

16—Substitution of section 56

The relevant regional NRM board or boards for an NRM group will assume responsibility for the accounts of the NRM group. It will now be possible to incorporate the accounts and financial information of a group with those of a board, and to conduct a combined audit.

17—Amendment of section 57—Annual reports

This is a consequential amendment.

18—Amendment of section 76—Preparation of water allocation plans

These amendments are associated with a revision of the water entitlements and authorities under the Act. A water allocation plan will now be required to include a provision to identify, or to provide a mechanism to determine, the water that will from time to time be taken to constitute a relevant water resource (the **consumptive pool**). The plan will also set out the relevant method that will be used to determine the basis upon which a water access entitlement under a licence will be determined.

19—Amendment of section 80—Submission of plan to Minister

This amendment is consistent with the situation under which funds for the implementation of an NRM plan of a board are raised under the relevant regional NRM plan under Chapter 4 Part 2 Division 1.

20—Amendment of section 81—Review and amendment of plans

These amendments streamline the operation of section 81 so that relevant periods under subsection (7) may be specified in a relevant notice.

21—Amendment of section 89—Amendment of plans without formal procedures

It is proposed that a plan may be amended under section 89(2) of the Act in order to achieve greater consistency with the provisions of the Border Groundwater Agreement, the Lake Eyre Basin Intergovernmental Agreement, or other relevant intergovernmental agreements.

22—Amendment of section 92—Contributions by constituent councils

These amendments will provide specific support to a scheme established under the regulations in association with the determination and operation of a regional NRM levy to determine the status of land where the land is divided by the boundaries of 2 or more regional NRM boards or by the boundaries of 2 or more councils.

23—Amendment of section 100—Interpretation

24—Amendment of section 101—Declaration of levies

25—Repeal of section 102

26—Amendment of section 103—Special purpose water levy

27—Amendment of section 104—Liability for levy

28—Amendment of section 106—Determination of quantity of water taken

29—Substitution of section 107

30—Substitution of section 112

31—Amendment of section 114—Refund of levies

32—Amendment of section 115—Declaration of penalty in relation to unauthorised or unlawful taking of water

These amendments are all consequential on the proposal to provide for new forms of entitlements and authorities under Chapter 7 of the Act.

33—Amendment of section 124—Right to take water subject to certain requirements

These amendments reflect the fact that a water allocation will now exist in its own right.

34—Amendment of section 126—Determination of relevant authority

35—Amendment of section 127—Water affecting activities

36—Amendment of section 129—Activities not requiring a permit

37—Amendment of section 130—Notice to rectify unauthorised activity

These amendments are all consequential on the proposal to provide for new forms of entitlements and authorities under Chapter 7 of the Act.

38—Repeal of section 140

The provision for the constitution of the Water Well Drilling Committee is no longer required.

39—Substitution of Chapter 7 Part 3

It is proposed to replace Chapter 7 Part 3 of the Act with a new scheme that will provide for new forms of entitlements and authorities in relation to the management of water.

New section 146 will retain the concept of a water licence, and subsection (2) will set out the nature of the entitlement under the licence (which will relate to the relevant consumptive pool or pools defined by the relevant water allocation plan).

New section 147 sets out the procedures for applying for a water licence and the grounds on which the Minister may refuse to grant a licence.

New section 148 sets out the requirements as to a water licence. A water licence will take effect when registered on The Water Register.

New section 149 sets out a scheme for the variation of a water licence.

New section 150 sets out a scheme for the transfer of a water licence, or of a water access entitlement, or part of a water access entitlement, under a licence.

New section 151 confirms that a water licence may be surrendered, subject to obtaining the consent of any person who may have an interest registered against the licence.

New sections 152, 153 and 154 will allow a water allocation to exist as a separate interest under the Act. A water allocation will arise by virtue of a water access entitlement under a water licence or an Interstate Water Entitlements Transfer Scheme.

New section 155 (Reduction of water allocations) is based on section 156 of the Act as it currently stands.

New section 156 will allow for the variation of water allocations (see section 147 of the Act as it currently stands). New section 157 will facilitate the transfer of water allocations.

New section 158 will recognise that a water allocation may be surrendered.

New section 159 will relate to the requirement to hold a **water resource works approval** if a person proposes to construct, maintain or operate any works for the purposes of taking water from a prescribed water resource.

New section 160 sets out the requirements for a water resource works approval.

New section 161 provides for the variation of a water resource works approval.

New section 162 will require consultation on an application for a water resource works approval, or for the variation of such an approval, in cases specified by the relevant water allocation plan.

New section 163 will allow for the cancellation of a water resource works approval if the relevant works are not, over a period prescribed by the regulations, constructed or substantially completed, or used, or used to a significant degree.

New section 164 confirms that a water resource works approval attaches to the site to which the approval relates.

New section 164A will relate to the requirement to hold a **site use approval** with respect to the use of water taken from a prescribed water resource.

New section 164B sets out associated requirements for issuing site use approvals.

New section 164C provides for the variation of a site use approval.

New section 164D will require consultation on an application for a site use approval, or for the variation of such an approval, in cases specified by the relevant water allocation plan.

New section 164E will allow for the cancellation of a site use approval in prescribed circumstances.

New section 164F confirms that a site use approval attaches to the site to which the approval relates.

New section 164G will relate to the requirement to hold a **delivery capacity entitlement** if a water allocation plan so requires.

New section 164H sets out associated requirements for issuing delivery capacity entitlements.

New section 164I provides that a delivery capacity entitlement may be applied to any aspect of the taking of water at a point of extraction, but cannot be directly applied to any part of an irrigation system that distributes water after extraction.

New section 164J provides for the variation of a delivery capacity entitlement.

New section 164K sets out a scheme for the transfer of a delivery capacity entitlement.

New section 164L confirms that a delivery capacity entitlement may be surrendered.

New section 164M facilitates the recognition of intergovernmental agreements associated with water entitlements under the Act.

New section 164N is comparable to existing section 155 of the Act.

New section 164O is comparable to existing section 164 of the Act.

New section 164P is comparable to existing section 162 of the Act.

New section 164Q is comparable to existing section 163 of the Act.

New section 164R provides that decisions on certain applications or variations associated with water management authorisations will be subject to the law, and the provisions of the regional NRM plan, in force at the time that the decision is made (including, if relevant, at the time that a decision is made on an appeal). An exception to this principle will be that there has been a delay in a determination by the Minister exceeding a specified period (after taking into account any delays while the Minister has been waiting for further information or an assessment).

40—Amendment of section 167—Allocation of reserved water

41—Amendment of section 173—Water recovery and other rights subject to board's functions and powers
These are consequential amendments.

42—Amendment of section 174—Preliminary

This amendment will ensure that there is no doubt under Chapter 8 that the assignment of a particular class of animal or plant to different categories depending on the relevant locality in the State can be varied or revoked.

43—Amendment of section 178—Sale of contaminated items

The reference to "animal" in the penalty provision under section 178(1) is superfluous. An incorrect cross-reference is also being addressed.

44—Amendment of section 179—Offence to release animals or plants

Subsections (1) and (2) of section 179 provide offences to release declared animals or plants. Subsection (3) provides a defence, but that defence is expressed to apply only to subsection (1). It should also apply to subsection (2).

45—Amendment of section 202—Right of appeal

Various consequential amendments need to be made to section 202 of the Act.

In addition, section 202(3)(a) provides that an appeal against an *order*, or the variation of an order, under Chapter 9 must be made within 21 days after the order is *issued* or the variation is *made*. The provision should also refer to reparation authorisations. Furthermore, it is proposed that the 21 day period run from the time that the relevant instrument or notice is *served*.

46—Amendment of section 211—Compensation

These are consequential amendments.

47—Amendment of section 226—NRM Register

It is proposed to create a special part of the NRM Register to be called *The Water Register*. Schedule 3A will set out specific provisions with respect to The Water Register.

48—Insertion of Schedule 3A

This schedule sets out a scheme for the registration of certain entitlements. A new scheme is to be introduced for the lodging of applications for the registration of the transfer of a relevant entitlement (clause 7).

Clauses 8 to 13 will make provision for the registration and enforcement of security interests over water licences and water access entitlements.

49—Amendment of Schedule 4—Repeals and transitional provisions

Related amendments are to be made to Schedule 4 of the Act.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Consequential amendments must be made to the *Ground Water (Qualco-Sunlands) Control Act 2000*. A scheme is to be put in place for dealing with transitional arrangements associated with new licensing arrangements.

Mr GRIFFITHS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY (CHILDREN IN STATE CARE) (CHILDREN ON APY LANDS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

New clause—After clause 7 insert:

7A—Insertion of section 11A

After section 11 insert:

11A—Report of Minister in response to Commissioner's report

The minister must respond to each report of the commissioner as follows:

(a) within three months after receipt of the report by the Governor, the minister must make a preliminary response indicating which (if any) of the recommendations of the Commissioner it is intended be carried out; and

(b) within six months after receipt of the report by the Governor, the minister must make a full response stating—

- (i) the recommendations of the Commissioner that will be carried out and the manner in which they will be carried out; and
- (ii) the recommendations of the Commissioner that will not be carried out and the reasons for not carrying them out; and

(c) for each year for five years following the making of the full response, the minister must, within three months after the end of the year, make a further response stating—

(i) the recommendations of the Commissioner that have been wholly or partly carried out in the relevant year and the manner in which they have been carried out; and

(ii) if, during the relevant year, a decision has been made not to carry out a recommendation of the Commissioner that was to be carried out, the reasons for not carrying it out; and

(iii) if, during the relevant year, a decision has been made to carry out a recommendation of the Commissioner that was not to be carried out, the reasons for the decision and the manner in which the recommendation will be carried out; and

(d) a copy of each response must be laid before each House of Parliament within three sitting days after it is made.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.16 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 21 June at 10.30 a.m.