

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 June 2008

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

LEGAL PROFESSION BILL

The **Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister Assisting in Early Childhood Development) (11:02)**: I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: FRANCHISES

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:02): I move:

That the 65th report of the committee entitled 'Franchises' be noted.

Franchises are one of the fastest growing sectors of the Australian economy, expanding at about 11 per cent per year and representing about 4 per cent of GDP. Most people will have had the experience of purchasing something from a franchise and, in some of the larger shopping centres, it is increasingly difficult to find outlets that are not part of one franchise chain or another.

The attraction of franchising for those often small mum and dad investors who become involved as franchisees is a desire to operate and own a successful small business, a desire that beats inside many of us. Franchising speaks to these ambitions and says, 'If you bring the investment and the enthusiasm, we will provide you with a system, the support and the capacity to make your business succeed.' The truth is that, sometimes, enthusiasm and hard work are not enough and, even more disturbingly, cannot be enough given the agreements to which some franchisees find themselves a party.

That is not to say (the committee and its witnesses were at pains to make this observation) that all franchises—and, indeed, the franchise system per se—are without merit or are not capable of producing an excellent product with all parties satisfied that their contribution is adequately rewarded—far from it. However, the truth revealed by the committee's inquiry is that too often a franchise agreement made with a promise of due reward for investment and effort ends with devastating financial and personal consequences that fall disproportionately on franchisees.

A franchise can be defined as a continuing commercial enterprise whereby the franchisor grants the franchisee the right to conduct a separate business which is indelibly and publicly linked with the identity of the franchisor. Essentially, a franchisee is buying the right to operate under the name and system established by the franchisor. As a result, the franchisor has the capacity (and rightly so) to protect the integrity and reputation of their brand through the terms of the contract agreed by the franchisee. As the committee discovered, this contract forms the hub around which revolve most of the critical problems afflicting the franchisee sector.

The committee heard some truly disturbing evidence from people who entered into these agreements in good faith and then found themselves in financial positions that were not and, indeed, never seemed designed to be sustainable. It is also true to say, however, that many people did not, or perceived themselves as unable to, obtain adequate financial and legal advice going into these arrangements, and they paid the price for it.

Yet, even in these latter instances, the committee found flaws in the current regulatory regime which, if addressed properly, could provide real assistance to those seeking to undertake all the necessary due diligence even if, as is often the case, they lacked experience in the business world. The current regulatory regime for franchises is mainly focused at the commonwealth level through the Franchising Code of Conduct, which operates under the authority of the Trade Practices Act. There are also some interfaces with the state legislative and regulatory regimes.

The committee's investigations and recommendations apply across the jurisdictional divide and are designed to provide tangible changes to the state sphere where possible, while encouraging commonwealth reform through ministerial representation at national councils and the like. I will not recount to the house a detailed description of all the evidence received, except to say that the inquiry was extensively and enthusiastically supported by large sections of the franchise sector.

The committee received about 50 individual submissions and conducted 10 hearings, many of which were videoconferences with interstate experts from the academic and business sector. The range of problems canvassed by the inquiry can perhaps best be described by looking at the broad sweep of the committee's recommendations and their focus on the provision of relevant information to potential franchisees, the codification of their rights and the encouragement of a more active role on the part of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC). These recommendations include:

- compulsory federal registration with the ACCC of all disclosure documents;
- full disclosure of franchisor financial reports, with no exceptions;
- full disclosure to potential franchisees of the risks of failure;
- publication of the names of those who persistently breach the code;
- penalties for insufficient disclosure;
- amending the code to include a duty to act in good faith;
- amending the code to require parties to a franchise contract to consider goodwill or other exit payments;
- a range of alternative dispute resolution processes, including bodies such as a franchising ombudsman or franchising tribunal;
- recognising franchisees' interests on the leases between franchisors and landlords;
- encouraging the ACCC to pursue test cases in the courts to refine and strengthen existing, but largely underused, legislative protections for franchisees; and
- enhanced education campaigns at state and commonwealth level.

I recommend that all interested members obtain a copy of the report from the parliamentary website to read the range of views and issues raised in the report, as they are too extensive and, in some cases, complex to be adequately addressed in this speech.

As I said previously, the committee received extensive written and oral submissions, and it thanks all those who contributed—from professors and peak bodies to the mass of individual franchisees who wrote in with their often distressing stories of financial and personal suffering—and helped to produce what the committee hopes will be a real contribution to the necessary reforms needed in this important sector of the South Australian and national economy.

Franchising is an important method whereby South Australians and, indeed, Australians go about their daily life and business. Franchisors are large employers of Australian employees, and they are also large wealth generators. I applaud and encourage entrepreneurship; I am a big believer in it. Many members of my family are entrepreneurs, as, indeed, were my mother and father. They had their own businesses and, with little or no formal education, they were able to make their way in the world through business. It often surprises them that I am in the Labor Party!

However, I also see the real-life impact of mum and dad investors who are entering a new type of business. Thirty years ago, people bought a corner deli, a snack bar, a chicken shop, or a taxi, and they were left to their own devices. These people knew that through hard work they could make their businesses work either through government regulation, market demand, or whatever it might be. What has now been laid on top of this, in my view, is the ability to go out and buy a job through a redundancy payment, savings and house mortgages. Laid on top of that is a contract with a master franchisor who has the idea and the system. What the franchisees do not understand is that the market economy, in terms of what they sell and what they purchase, is regulated by a contract rather than the free market.

A very basic example of this is that if you sell a certain amount of produce and you are running short, you go out and buy some more. No business person worth their salt would go out and buy products that are not selling. This is just one example of what can happen to franchisees who are required to go out and buy products at a set price, despite the fact that they can get it cheaper somewhere else, through the master franchisor. They are also required to make certain minimum payments. This takes the entrepreneurship out of franchising. The entrepreneurship is often left to the master franchisor rather than the franchisee. I think that, if we want to encourage a bit of flair, ingenuity and more entrepreneurship, we need to allow franchisees to know exactly what they are getting through these agreements.

In conclusion, I would like to thank my fellow committee members for their contributions to the inquiry, with particular mention to the member for Light for his efforts in bringing this issue to the committee's notice and enthusiastically supporting its prosecution. I think it is fair to say that many of us in the committee were largely unaware of the impact of franchising on small mum and dad investors, and it is a credit to the member for Light and his constituents that he has come forward with this issue. I would also like to thank the staff of the committee, the Executive Officer, Paul Lobban, and most particularly our researcher, Ms Anna Nobis, who was taken on by the committee specifically to produce this report and who provided a piece of work that is a credit to her. Given the above, and pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends to this parliament that it notes this report.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (11:12): I wish to speak in support of this motion to note the report. On Thursday 29 March 2007 I made a speech in this house, and stated:

I am a great admirer of small business, especially those mum and dad businesses that not only provide valuable services to the community but also provide the mums and dads and their families with a sense of independence and fulfilment. Small businesses require a lot of sacrifice, hard work and commitment. Small businesses are also consumers and, like ordinary consumers, are sometimes subject to appalling and predatory behaviour by other businesses. Like other consumers, they suffer injustice at the hands of corporate villains whose behaviour is both unethical and reprehensible.

Today I would like to acknowledge two former business owners and a current business owner in my electorate—Ashley Orr, Julie Robertson and Brad Skuse—for their courage in speaking out against the oppressive behaviour of their franchisors. It was their testimony that gave impetus to this inquiry. Two weeks after this inquiry was established, the WA government established a similar one, headed by a very successful former franchisee, Mr Chris Botham. That inquiry arose from a great injustice imposed on local WA franchise by international franchisor Yum Foods International.

That inquiry reached conclusions similar to ours, and reported a week before the report of this inquiry was tabled in this place. The WA Minister for Small Business, in her comments to the parliament, stated that her inquiry recommended changes which included requiring franchisors to explicitly disclose franchisees' entitlements or lack of entitlements to goodwill and other compensation if agreements are not renewed, and requiring franchisors to conduct pre-expiry reviews with franchisees at least 12 months before the expiry of an agreement. The report also recommended that the federal government amend the Franchising Code of Conduct to make it compulsory for parties in dispute to attend mediation procedures and to ensure that mediation agreements are enforceable, with prescribed penalties set out for non-compliance. That inquiry heard a great deal of the evidence, as did our inquiry. In fact, our inquiry reached similar conclusions but we went a bit further. It is an interesting topic of discussion around the world, and the provincial government of Manitoba in Canada is currently exploring similar territory to our own inquiry.

The recommendations of the inquiry are very important, for both economic and justice reasons. In terms of economics, franchising is worth about \$128 billion to the Australian economy on 2005 figures. There are 960 franchise systems, 93 per cent Australian-based, and over 62,000 franchises in Australia. They represent 14 per cent of our national GDP, and 420,000 people are employed in franchises. It is the fastest growing small business format.

It is for this reason that it is important to ensure that we have the legislative framework to make sure that it operates correctly. In regards to justice, the stories we heard clearly indicate that regulation has not kept up with some of the shonky practices of those rogues and predators who have entered the industry—not to build the industry but to exploit those within it. To put it in perspective, mum and dad franchisees have less protection from the harsh and oppressive behaviour of their franchisors than many workers do under the industrial laws.

The laws are federal laws, with some state laws in the area of retail tenancies. The challenge for the inquiry is that we need to have national laws. As mentioned, we held 10 hearings, received 46 written submissions and heard from a range of people, including academics, franchisees, the Franchise Council of Australia and the Franchisees Association of Australia Incorporated. Of all the witnesses we heard, the Franchise Council of Australia was the most hostile.

One area in which I strongly disagreed with the Franchise Council of Australia—and which was supported by most other witnesses, if not all—was its assertion that it was the only true representative of the franchise industry for both franchisors and franchisees. Given the evidence received by the committee to the contrary, this assertion borders on misleading and deceptive behaviour by the FCA.

The inquiry looked at three key areas of the franchise relationship, namely, precontract, the contract period and when the relationship breaks down. We looked at areas dealing with disclosure, registration, transparency, competition and efficiency. Our view was that investing in a small business should be no different from investing in the sharemarket, yet people who invest in small business have a lot less protection than those who invest in the sharemarket. For example, the disclosure document put out by a franchisor should be treated similarly to those put out by companies, or a company prospectus, so that the franchisee knows what they are buying and what risks are attached to that.

In terms of the precontract requirements, our inquiry found that better disclosure and registration of disclosure requirements would improve transparency in the industry and would actually help competition in the industry so that people would know what was on the market and could compare one product to another when purchasing. Also, it would lead to greater efficiency in the industry and actually weed out those who are not competitive. At the moment, there is no way for people to compare various products available on the franchise market. This disclosure would also help with research. People could collect data, which would be a basis for future public policy in this area.

In the precontract area, the committee also heard evidence about the need for training. While a lot of training occurs for franchisors—and the FCA actually does quite a good job in this area—training for franchisees is not adequate, and we recommend that money be put aside for training. The only course available for franchisees is one offered in the United States of America, which looks at the whole gambit of the franchise industry.

In terms of the contract period, the committee looked at issues dealing with good faith and fair dealing, unconscionable behaviour, penalties for breaches, and leases. It was quite clear from the evidence that we received that provisions are needed in the franchise code for franchisors and franchisees to be required to deal in good faith and deal with each other fairly.

That proposal to make it a statutory requirement was opposed by the FCA but supported by all other witnesses, from my recollection. It is interesting that the FCA opposed it even though it agreed that there is now an implicit requirement in the law to deal in good faith, but they wanted the right to write that away.

The third part we dealt with was when the relationship breaks down or the licence expires. Again, we were of the opinion—and our recommendations reflect this—that there should be good faith dealing, exit payments, or goodwill; and, to remove the ambiguity at the end of the licence period, we believe it should be a mandatory requirement that the disclosure documents should mention that up-front.

My understanding is that the Small Business Ministerial Council is looking at the possibility of changing the franchise code of Australia to include a good faith provision. This is very important because members may be aware that recently the Kleins jewellery franchise went through the hoop and brought down a number of franchisees. Frank Zumbo, an associate professor of the University of New South Wales, who has studied Australia's franchising sector and who also gave evidence to the committee, said that he had been in touch with several Kleins franchisees in recent times and he has heard allegations of 'breaches of the franchise code, bullying, and mismanagement by the franchisor'. This is the sort of evidence the committee heard.

Now that Kleins has collapsed, franchisees want answers as to what went wrong. The major issue about Kleins is that, even though a lot of Kleins franchisees were aware that the franchisor was going down, because of the nature of their agreements they could do nothing about it.

I take this opportunity to thank the presiding member for his support on the committee. I also thank the other committee members who supported the inquiry. We came to a unanimous position on the recommendations. In particular, I would also like to thank Dr Paul Lobban, the executive officer, and the researcher, Anna Nobis, who did a great job in helping us research and write the report.

I strongly commend the recommendations to the house. Hopefully, the federal government will take up our recommendations. If there is no federal action, I think that in 12 months' time we should revisit this matter in this state and look at whether we (as a state) should take on the recommendations ourselves. While I am hopeful that the federal government will act, if it does not then I do not think this is an area of activity that we can leave unlegislated.

Time expired.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:23): It is my pleasure to also make a contribution to this, the 65th report of the Economic and Finance Committee. I think it is fair to say that it was enlightening for all of us who were involved with the committee to actually hear the evidence and read the submissions from people who had made the effort to put in written comments about their relationship with franchises and how it affected them—some in a positive way, but many, unfortunately, in a negative way.

Indeed, it is important to recognise the role that franchises play when our presiding member, in introducing this report, reflected upon the fact that franchise turnover represents 4 per cent of the nation's GDP. An enormous amount of dollars is involved, so it is important that parliaments across the nation ensure that legislation is in place that will allow franchises to operate, but operate in an appropriate manner that will support those who are risking their future financial opportunities in life and who want to create a future for themselves. It is important that the legislation is there.

I offer my sincere congratulations to the member for Light. While the presiding member has reflected upon this, the member for Light probably does not want to admit to the fact that he was the one who drove us towards the carrying out of this investigation. That said, it did not take too many comments from him to convince the committee of the merit of it.

It was obvious to us that the member for Light had received some concerns from constituents within the Light electorate who were very worried about what had been happening to them. So, the member brought the attention of the committee to this and we, I think, in just about record time, resolved to undertake an investigation, and it has proved to be worthwhile for all of us.

It is refreshing to see that there are a lot of people out there who actually want to make a contribution to the parliament and submit evidence. Many people came forward, some with what you could say is a vested interest, because they are part of the master body that represents franchisees and franchisors.

However, the majority of the submissions that I made a real effort to read through and review were from families, the independent operators, who were really committing to their financial future by borrowing money, using (as the presiding member said) a redundancy payment from an industry in which they no longer worked, but committing themselves to what they hoped would be a bright future which, sadly, in too many cases was taken from them.

It really did reinforce the fact that in some cases there were enormous financial losses, but it also created enormous pressure on families. As part of the evidence, we had the opportunity to read and hear about pressures brought about by tremendously long working hours in an effort to try to make franchises work. Unfortunately, that was creating divisions in relationships and within families, and I think that is very sad. People were commonly working between 70 and 100 hours per week trying to make their franchise work. However, it was beyond them, no matter what they did; it was leading to divorce and bankruptcy within families—and that is a great shame.

As matter of principle, I strongly support the fact that businesses should be allowed to operate and grow, availing themselves of every possible opportunity: that is the basis of the capitalist economy under which we in Australia operate as a nation. In my youth, having left school, I obtained a job and worked within local government for a number of years, but I was envious of the people I grew up with who had taken a risk in life and left jobs to run their own business, operating a newsagency, nursery and those kinds of things. It was not part of a franchise, but those people showed that they wanted to be in charge of their lives.

Franchises are exactly the same. You make an enormous financial commitment and often sign a contract to say that you will purchase a certain amount of product per week which you have to sell. Even if you cannot find a market for that product, you still have to purchase it.

There are a lot of issues involving franchises that need to be improved, and disclosure is one matter that did concern me. It is impossible to have legislation in place to prevent people from making silly decisions. We emphasised to the people to whom we spoke the need for them to ensure that they investigated their franchise options thoroughly and that they undertook as much training as they could so that they did not go in blindly.

However, it is interesting (and I hope I am correct in saying this) that in some of the submissions we received, even when that advice was available, it was not at the required level: training was taking place on the job working at another franchisee's operations and people were never provided with the full financial disclosure of previous franchisees, perhaps even at the same

premises. They had to try to make the best possible decision but were pressured into making that decision sometimes within a restricted time frame and without an opportunity to get good advice.

Many people who were apprehensive spent a lot of money getting good legal or financial advice. Those who might have talked to a trusted acquaintance who gave an objective assessment on the matter would still say, 'Yes, I am still going to do this.' Sadly, it has come back to affect these people seriously, which is a great shame.

Another thing which concerns me is the churning that is occurring within franchise industries. It seemed that some unscrupulous master franchisors did not necessarily care about the people who purchased and worked in their franchises. They just wanted somebody to operate the franchise licence and the franchisor to receive a revenue from it. If the franchisee went broke then that was another licence that the master franchisor had available to sell to some other unsuspecting people who would be risking their financial future.

There needs to be legislation that allows full disclosure to occur so that people who go into it have the chance to obtain as much information as they can about the previous history of the franchise, including information on what the turnover has been in the area and what the financial projections are, and to have it independently audited in order to have a say about it.

I was also concerned about the leasing arrangements that exist in some shopping centres. I am certainly not casting aspersions or making criticisms about every operator but undoubtedly, from what we heard, some master franchisors who have a lease with a shopping centre operator will make premises available to the franchisee at a certain cost above what the master franchisor is paying. So, the master franchisor is gaining a revenue not only from the franchise licence and the products that the franchisee is selling, but also from the premises. Really, the master franchisor has no negatives here and is in a position to make a lot of money. Indeed, it is obvious to us that some have made a lot of money without necessarily giving support to the franchisee.

It is important to note that, in some cases, the relationship breakdown between franchisee and franchisor had made things impossible for them. I do not want to cast aspersions as to where the responsibility for that lies, but there was a very clear message in the submissions made to us about it. I certainly hope that members of this house and, indeed, of parliament take this opportunity to read the report. All the submissions, to some degree, called for a review of the legislation, and it was pleasing to note that a federal committee had investigated this, although as I understand it, the terms of reference for the committee were somewhat restricted to what they might have been. However, we were aware that the Western Australian parliament was also conducting an investigation into franchises at the same time, and a lot of the submissions we received were also made to the Western Australian parliament.

I sincerely commend the report to all members. If you want to be out there dealing with the issues in your electorate (and franchises exist across the nation; you do not have to be based in only a metropolitan area to have people running franchises) and if you want to be in a position to provide the greatest possible support to the people who live in your communities, it is important that you have some awareness of franchises, because it is a growing industry.

We heard one amazing story of a very large franchise operation in Western Australia, with something like 60 stores—

Mr Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am corrected by the member for Light, and I thank him for that: it is 50 stores. The master franchise was held by an operation in America, and it suddenly decided that it did not like the Western Australian franchise operator. The operator was gradually going to be driven out of business. That group had millions of dollars tied up in the operations of a very successful fast food industry. I could not believe it. The operation had a 20-year history of success in Western Australia, had obviously developed new stores as it had gone along, had added to its stock of stores, and had provided employment opportunities for thousands of people across Western Australia, but a decision was made in American that, 'No, you are no longer going to have that opportunity.' Gradually, as each franchise lease came to the end of its life, the operator was told there was no opportunity to renew it. It is disgraceful that that can happen in this nation, or indeed the world.

I hope the parliament takes up the challenges the report recommends. A lot of work needs to be done in the future, but I sincerely believe that if we take action on it we will improve opportunities for Australians.

I also want to commend the parliamentary staff. The committee's presiding member, the member for West Torrens (Mr Koutsantonis) was committed to this inquiry. He attended all the meetings, he was very aware of the issues we were discussing and, when we had video-conferencing, he was fantastic on questioning. We also relied a lot upon the member for Light, who made sure he reviewed every submission, and I appreciate his effort in that regard. It is important to note that this report is supported by all members of the Economic and Finance Committee. It was a unanimous decision: there was no debate among opposition members of the committee regarding any form of minority report. We recognise its importance and we certainly hope that the parliament pursues the recommendations it contains.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:34): I speak in support of the motion and of the report. There are some things the state government can do, and it can do them quite quickly under the Retail Tenancies Act, to help not just the franchisees but also all small businesses which become victims of what I would say are aggressive leasing arrangements in major shopping centres, in particular. A section in the report states:

Franchisors in turn complained to the committee that especially with regard to large commercial shopping centre landlords they suffer a disparity of bargaining power.

I think that is a very important and fundamental problem that we need to address if we are serious about supporting small business and encouraging enterprise in South Australia. It is something at which the Minister for Consumer Affairs might like to look.

One problem mentioned in the report that was causing some difficulty—and, in fact, substantial financial loss to franchisees—was when the franchisor held the head lease, for example; yet it was the franchisee that held the personal guarantee to make sure that lease was paid.

There may be situations where the franchisor may very well not be paying that rent, for whatever reason, and then the franchisee may find themselves actually locked out of that shop by the landlord, even though they have been paying their rent to the franchisor as a lessee (or sub-lessee, if you like) of that lease.

I think that is an area that we certainly need to address, as well as the fact that in the major shopping centres all the turnover information of those small businesses must be surrendered to the shopping centre management. That is an argument that will go on for infinity about who is responsible for the goodwill or for the success of the shopping centre. Is it the managers of the shopping centre or is it the businesses who, collectively, are making the shopping centre a destination—somewhere to go?

That is a debate that I do not think we will ever be able to answer but, certainly, the landlords have the upper hand in the area of lease renewals in this instance, where they get around the protections that are there at the moment by not renewing your lease, or by dividing a shop into two that may have been a single shop and making the existing tenant then rent two shops, which includes additional fees for marketing and other costs. Of course, they are then paying marketing costs as franchisees not only for the shopping centre on top of their lease but also to the franchisor; so it is a double-dip. Often it is a mark-up on the rent that the franchisor is paying that the franchisee then pays.

That is fine if it is in the world of free enterprise. We are not here telling people how they should be running their businesses or how they should be able to make a profit, but shopping centres use the turnover information to determine what your rent renewal should be when your lease comes up for renewal every two or three years. They are not very long leases in the major shopping centres, because they are very attracted to using that information to keep pushing your rent up. So if you run a very successful business, they will then look at your turnover figures and say, 'Look; you're making more money now than you did when you first moved in, so we want a good share of that, because our argument is that, as a shopping centre, we're responsible for the goodwill that you're producing in building that business. We're responsible for the profit that you're making in building that business because they're coming to this shopping centre.'

They have completely discounted the fact that you may have run a very tight ship, that you have found a product that sells well, that is priced well and that is in demand, and that you are at the beginning of an upward wave of a particular product. For example, you may have started up a mobile phone shop when mobile phones were considered a luxury and there were not very many of them around and, of course, as more and more people were buying mobile phones, your business was growing and your brand was growing. You took a risk going in there in the first instance, by making a significant investment in mobile phones, for example, so you should be there for the long

haul, you should be there for the benefits. But under the current leasing system that our major shopping centres are allowed to have, they argue that they are entitled to the growth in your business.

They are claiming that they are responsible for that solely and wholly and so, consequently, your rent will go up from its original base rate to reflect the increase in your turnover. It is based on turnover: it is not based on profit, so you may very well be in the business of a high turnover-low profit product; however, the shopping centre will be saying, 'Your turnover has grown enormously since you've been in that position; we want some of that action and so, consequently, we're going to put your rent up.' They will not tell you what other people are paying, so it is very hard to determine what is fair and reasonable. You will know only that, after all the work that you put in over the past three years in increasing your profits, you are going to have to give a big portion of that to the landlord.

If you do not agree and do not renew your lease then your goodwill is virtually gone, unless you have a brand that people will recognise outside the shopping centre so that you can open up in a strip shopping precinct. I do not believe that issue was addressed in the report, but I would like to see some action in relation to it.

It appears that the report strictly covers franchises, but there are also interesting arrangements that some people might describe as franchising. A very large furniture and electrical chain in Australia has a very interesting way of operating its franchises. If a new store is to be opened, a salesperson or someone from outside the business might be approached and asked, 'Would you like to run our new business for us?' When they ask about the terms and conditions, they are told to start up and incorporate their own company. They are guaranteed a minimum salary (which might be \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year) and payments for a mobile phone until they get the shop up and running and they are told the profits will be split 50/50 on anything above that.

It sounds like a good deal. There is a safety net and the potential to earn hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. Of course, what happens in reality is that they build up the business in what may be a high-growth housing area, so there is a lot of demand for the products. They build up a substantial turnover and earn maybe \$250,000 a year as a shop manager/investor in the shop. They are taking a risk by buying products outside the product range and negotiating deals with their clientele. But, overnight, head office might say, 'Thank you, pick up your company and take it off to Wagga.' All of a sudden a person's income could drop overnight to the minimum \$40,000 and there is no goodwill for the shop manager/investor in that situation.

I know people go into that situation willingly and take the risk. They learn valuable lessons about running a business, but it is another example of how some of the larger chains can take advantage of others to benefit themselves.

Motion carried.

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:43): I move:

That the regulations made under the Fisheries Management Act 2007 entitled Pipi Units, made on 13 December 2007 and laid on the table of this house on 12 February 2008, be disallowed.

These regulations are about changing the manner in which a fishery (partly in my electorate and partly in other electorates) is managed. It is an interesting fishery. It is largely the Lakes and Coorong fishery of which there are some 29 licensees. It is what is known as a mixed-species fishery. The fishers fish for a number of species, and a number of those fishers have endorsement on their licences to fish for cockles. Also, three marine-scale licences have cockle endorsements on them. I understand that a total of 32 licence holders have cockle endorsements. All of the 32 also have endorsements on their fishing licences to target other species within two separate fisheries.

Generally, in fishery management (and this is the case to date in both the fisheries, I understand, but particularly the Coorong and Lakes fishery; and my understanding is more of that fishery than the marine-scale fishery), the management technique has involved regulating the amount of effort that can be put into the fishery. Certainly, this has been the case with regard to cockles, concerning which we regulate where fishers can fish, when they can fish and how they can fish. When or if there is pressure on the fishery under those circumstances, the regulations are basically changed to reduce the effort and consequently reduce the pressure on the fishery.

It has been decided by the minister and the government to change the management structure and move from an effort-regulated fishery regime into a total allowable catch, or a quota fishery with a total allowable catch. I want to make it quite clear that the opposition has no problem with the move of the management structure from an effort-based fishery to a quota-based fishery, which is easier to manage. The management can react much more quickly to changes in the fishery, it is more cost effective and I think that, ultimately, everyone comes out a winner. I do not have a problem with the fundamentals; it is the way that we have moved from being an effort based fishery to a quota-based fishery.

A quota-based fishery allows the opportunity to use two quota systems. You can use what is known as an Olympic quota system, where there is an overall quota. You fire the start gun on a certain date when the fishery opens; and when the total quota has been caught you close the fishery. That is an Olympic-based quota fishery, which I do not think anyone likes or enjoys. It upsets the way in which you market the product out of the fishery, and I do not think it maximises the output from the fishery to anyone—least of all the state but, more particularly, the individual fishers.

It is proposed to have an individually-based quota allocation, a tradeable quota, made to individual fishers. That is the way the government has moved, and I do not have any qualms with that either. Where I start to fall foul of what the minister has done in these regulations is the way in which he has apportioned the quota amongst the individuals in the fishery. Let me start off by saying that a significant number of the 32 fishers have not been out cockling. They have not been active cocklers. They have no, or very limited, catch history—to all intents and purposes, they have no catch history.

I think the government did the right thing in recognising that, notwithstanding that, their licence had a value because of that cockle endorsement. In fact, I have been given evidence that fishers who do not have a cockling history have paid substantial sums of money to buy a licence, particularly because it has a cockle endorsement. In fact, one fisher I know, who basically fishes Coorong mullet in the fishery, bought a second licence specifically for the cockle endorsement. He still fishes only Coorong mullet. His effort in the Coorong mullet fishery has not increased due to his second licence. He bought the licence purely because of the value to him to hold the cockle endorsement, and the government has acknowledged that.

The government has said, 'We understand that there is a value in having that endorsement on the licence; and, as a consequence of that, when we distribute it, we have to give some of the quota to each licensee.' Then it becomes very difficult to work out how to distribute under those circumstances, because some people will get a tradeable quota on their licence when they have not been actively fishing. Of course, others who have been actively fishing in that particular fishery as a consequence of that may see their ability to catch the amount of cockles they have been catching in recent times diminished. So, it is a two-edged sword that cuts both ways and I am not suggesting that it is easy to come to a conclusion. When the minister responds, in whatever form, he will say that he set up an advisory panel to take evidence, that it gave him advice and that he then sat down with all the fishers and talked to them about the decision he was about to make; that he had further discussions and made some modifications, and that that is the basis on which he made the decisions.

I acknowledge that that process happened and that the minister had a difficult job. However, I believe the advisory panel at some point said that it did not have the wisdom of Solomon, that it was quite difficult and threw its hands up in the air and said that it was too difficult. On page 17, the advisory panel report states:

We would caution against paying too much attention to the extent to which a licence had been exploited since it became known that the fishery was likely to move to a total allowable catch. Some people may have increased their catch of cockles or entered the fishery only in order to claim a larger allocation of entitlement, but without any real intention of participating in the industry.

The advisory panel said that it was given evidence that some people had knowledge that there was a move towards a total allowable catch, and some people alleged to the advisory panel that this caused some individuals to increase their effort to make sure that, if the allocation was based on historic catch, they had a larger allocation than they otherwise would have had. It continues:

Several persons claim to have been frustrated in efforts to exploit their licences by a variety of personal circumstances. Whatever period is examined to assess past effort and likely future intentions must take into account these anomalies.

The advisory panel further states:

In the end it was our view that the various personal problems we were told about were so widely spread that very little could be done to remedy one except at the expense of the other.

That is the point at which the advisory panel acknowledges that it was not going to get it right and that there were issues there and that it was not able to come up with a solution. I believe that it was constrained by its terms of reference at that point. It acknowledged in its report that it was not going to get it right, that there would be anomalies, and in that acknowledgement it was implied that some people would be affected and receive a lesser allocation than they would otherwise have obtained.

That is the crux of the problem we have before us because, in moving from an effort-based fishery to a quota-based fishery, at least one fisherman (and a number of fishermen have approached me) who recently bought into the fishery will be seriously disadvantaged. He believes that not only will he be seriously disadvantaged but also that it will break his business and cause financial ruin for him.

That is the problem created by this change and I implore the minister at least to take on board the circumstances of that individual. It is not right or conscionable for a government to take a decision which will cause the financial ruin of an individual through no fault of his or her own, as is happening in this case. I believe the minister is well aware of the circumstances as this individual has written to the minister on a number of occasions.

It becomes even more complicated than this because the cockle fishery itself is changing dramatically. Traditionally, cockles were fished to supply the bait market (a low value market) with a value in recent years, I am told, of about \$1 a kilo. We had fishermen on the beach off the Coorong fishing for large quantities of cockles and selling them as bait. A few years ago, with the support of the local fishermen's association, which obtained a federal grant to support this, it developed a market for human consumption for the cockles. Before cockles can be sold for human consumption they have to be purged as in their environment they get a lot of sand in them, which is not palatable.

So, this market has been established over a period of years, and a number of fishers have been working towards producing product for this market. They have made some investments in putting in purging tanks, they go and fish, put the fish in the purging tanks and then sell them to the human consumption market. Some fishers, I understand, grade their fish and then on-sell them to someone who has already established the infrastructure to purge the fish, and there is a three-stage marketing situation.

I understand in the previous cockling season (I am talking about the 2006-07 fishing year) about 40 per cent of the total catch was sold to the human consumption market. I have had to do a few calculations on the back of an envelope, because one of the submissions to the advisory panel suggests that the bait market was still worth about \$1 a kilo but, when you took into account that 40 per cent of the fish was sold to the human consumption market, the total value of the fishery came up to about \$3.50 a kilo. I did a few sums and said that the human consumption market must be worth somewhere between \$8, \$9 and \$10 per kilo—of that order. I am told that in the most recent season that value has increased to probably \$12, \$13 or \$14. So, suddenly, the kilo value per fish for a substantial portion of the fishery has increased dramatically.

I believe this is where the minister has an option to make a political decision to overcome the anomalies without financially disadvantaging people. The person who has been most severely disadvantaged—and I will use his name because he has given me permission to do so—is Steve Alexander, and I think he has written to virtually every member of the parliament. Steve came into the fishery recently. He bought his licence before an investment advice was given by the department to say we are going to change the way the fisheries are managed, which I understand was given in January 2007. Steve bought his licence before that but was unable to go and work the fishery, because he had to get some more capital behind him, and that took about 18 months. He then went into the fishery and fished diligently but only supplied the human consumption market, so he was not fishing for bait. While he was doing that, it appears that a number of other fishers were supplying some of their fish to the human consumption market and the bulk of their fish to the very low value bait market.

Under the quota system that has been established by the minister, all fishers have been, by and large, allocated quota based on their historic catch, irrespective of whether that catch was destined for the human consumption market or the low value bait market. So we are establishing catch history, by and large, on the low value bait market, whereas those people as we move forward will be able to put all of that quota into the human consumption market, so they will get a huge windfall as they go forward and will be financially just as well off with a much smaller quota

than what they have received under these regulations. Therein lies the main argument that we can actually resolve the anomalies that have been caused because of the nature of the change in the way the fish have been marketed.

There are a couple of other issues, and one of them is that I believe the department actively wants to have the fishery contained to as small a number of fishers as possible, and I have a concern with that, and I think in some way that may have driven some of the decisions that have been taken. One of the reasons I make that claim—and I know I am rapidly running out of time—is that the Director of Fisheries has written a letter detailing a lot of the things that have happened, and one of the things he says is that all cockle fishery management costs will be based on the allocated quota units. Since that letter was written, the department has met with the fishers to organise cost recovery—

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think the minister knows what I am going to say.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.J. McEwen.

Mr VENNING: Mr Speaker, I bring to your attention the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 June 2008. Page 3583.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (12:01): I thank members on both sides of the house for coming to hear the budget reply—and there they all go: the member for Mawson, the member for Taylor—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition knows that that is highly discourteous.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Speaker, I am speaking to the budget and I had hoped that the government would pay me the courtesy of listening, as we did when the budget was tabled.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Premier is absent, the Treasurer is not—well, here he is; good. I thank the Deputy Premier for entering the chamber.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport will take his seat.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Consumer Affairs!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: It took seven budgets for the Rann government to decide that it needed to take some action—not action now, as the Premier claims: it is action some time in the future, in a time frame far, far away. After two terms and eight years, they want the taxpayers to trust them to take action. By its own words, the government shows that it cannot be trusted. In two separate acts, one under the cover of political darkness and the other in the bright lights of political embarrassment, the government has shown its true colours.

In the key areas of health and water security the Rann government's duplicity has been exposed. And who should take responsibility for this breach of public trust? Is it the health minister, who slipped in his cuts to country health when he thought no-one was looking? He is not here. Is it the Treasurer, whose own words on *Stateline* last Friday night exposed the Mount Bold reservoir promise as a con?

The one person who should take responsibility for the health cuts, the Mount Bold backflip and the crisis of confidence in education is the man who fronts the taxpayer-funded good news advertisements on radio and television. He is the flimflam man: the man who claims other people's achievements as his own results. The man who told the parliament this:

When we see a politician in a taxpayer funded ad, it's just a cheap way of doing party ads.

The opposition has exposed this Premier for what he really is: he is a Premier who heralded a tramline and then shut a hospital. He is a Premier who unveiled a reservoir expansion and then slipped it back into the bottom drawer. He is a Premier who promised a joint venture with BHP to produce water—do you remember the headline—water by the river load to the Eyre Peninsula, and then sent his Treasurer out to back away from the deal.

He is the Premier who promised an extra 400 police by 2010, but admits in this budget he cannot deliver. He is the Premier who promises a transport revolution but delivers little more than a troubled tram extension. He is the Premier who claims to have started a mining boom—he started a mining boom: it is all him—but, in reality, he just changed the name of the Liberal's mineral exploration incentive scheme.

In the past week, high profile economic analysts, Phil Ruthven and Saul Eslake, have cast doubt on Mr Rann's description of the state economy and his much promised boom. Mr Ruthven told ABC talkback radio of a boom that was premature and overstated. Mr Eslake told the Defence Teaming Centre in Adelaide just last week that our state is hampered by high taxes, lower than average growth, below average export orientation and below average productivity and educational attainment.

These independent assessments show that our 'Good News' Premier is the modern day equivalent of the emperor parading through the streets convincing all that he is a grand and great ruler. But, as a ruler, this Premier does not measure up. Our Premier has no clothes. He is the Premier who promises a pot of gold but delivers human misery along the length and breadth of the River Murray.

One of the greatest deceptions in our political history was revealed just 24 hours after the budget was delivered—and I am saddened that the Treasurer and Deputy Premier has fled the house. I hope he comes pack, if he is listening, because it has to do with his comments—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The minister is interjecting from the floor.

The SPEAKER: Indeed, the minister should not do that, but it is highly discourteous for the Leader of the Opposition to refer to whether or not members are in the chamber.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In last year's budget statement one of the headline items was the doubling of the Mount Bold reservoir—remember the headline—yet in this year's budget there was no mention of Mount Bold. Had it suddenly fallen off the agenda? That was put to the Treasurer by me in the ABC studios of *Stateline* on Friday afternoon. He made this response:

It's not gone. The Mount Bold Reservoir, as we explained in last year's budget and at the announcement, will follow the completion of the desalination plant.

He repeated the claim a minute later when he said:

It will follow the completion of the desalination plant, exactly what we said a year ago.

A year ago, the government had no plans for a metropolitan desalination plant—none. The desal backflip with pike would not come for another three months. At no stage in any statements by the Premier, the water minister, or the Treasurer has the Mount Bold expansion ever been conditionally linked to a desalination plant.

It was on 11 September last year (three months after the budget) that the Premier finally agreed with the state Liberal's policy and announced a desalination plant was likely for Adelaide. In his expansive statement on the project he said he expected this:

Fresh water would connect directly into our main water supply.

At no stage did he conditionally link the Mount Bold project to the desalination plant. Has the Treasurer reinvented his memory since last year's budget? What a goof-up on *Stateline*! Or was the commitment to double the size of Mount Bold never genuine from the outset? Either way, the Premier, through his Treasurer, has been caught red-handed in his attempt to deceive the public. Trying to explain away the absence of the Mount Bold project from this budget by rewriting last year's budget says everything about this government's reliability. If you cannot believe its last budget, can you believe this year's budget? Will it be in next year's budget?

You cannot trust the Treasurer; you cannot trust the Premier. There is no action now for the future, just an eye on the next election date. It is all about buying your way into another term and hoping that the South Australian people will be suckered in. Let there be no doubt that come the next election there will be no desalination water available for use in Adelaide, no expansion of the Mount Bold reservoir, no tramline to Port Adelaide, no AAMI Stadium or Entertainment Centre upgrades, no new hospital. Instead, there will be nothing more than promises cast in some cases so far out into the future that the government hopes no-one will remember them. A year ago it hoped we would forget Mount Bold, but we have not. We will remember.

I offer a challenge to the government today. Last year it commissioned a review of the Mount Bold reservoir expansion conducted by GHD Ltd in Sydney. The review was completed in December. Table the review in full. By his own words, the Treasurer has exposed the government's water security strategy as a fraud. A Liberal government would do better.

Let's talk about water. The state Liberals are already on the record with a 19-point plan to secure our water supply, yet we have nothing from the government. This is the number one issue in South Australia, in case you have missed it, which apparently from the budget it is clear you have. A Liberal government would take the step, so earnestly resisted by the water minister, to invest \$350 million to \$400 million in stormwater infrastructure for capture and reuse. The minister claims it is a local government responsibility. What a cop-out! Secondly—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: We'll get to you in a minute, just be patient. We're coming. The minister claims it is a local government responsibility. What a cop-out! Secondly, there should be an immediate increase in the planned capacity of the Glenelg to Adelaide pipeline, presently earmarked for wastewater recycling alone. Increasing the size of this pipe would allow for a range of uses along the pipe route, including stormwater, not just at its destination. It is time to get a greater sense of urgency about further investment on wastewater infrastructure.

The timetable for Adelaide's desalination plant reflects the Labor government's desperate hope that it might rain and save it from having to make decisions on that matter. This government is praying it will rain. It uses every excuse it can to delay full commitment to desalination. Believe it or not, in 2008 this government still does not know if it can or will add to the BHP desalination plant; it still does not know if it can or will definitely build a desalination plant at Port Stanvac; and it still has not produced one single definite plan to increase water storages, and this is this government's seventh budget.

What is it definite about? It will increase water rates and rake in billions. Show me the money, it says to South Australians—their money. It is time the Rann government showed us the water. This government claims it needs to raise water prices to pay for any new water infrastructure, yet it cannot explain facts in this budget that show it has ripped \$2 billion in dividends from SA Water over seven budgets which have not been used to build water infrastructure. It has gone into general revenue—\$2 billion of tax; one-third of everyone's water bill.

On the more serious note of the human cost of this drought, the opposition is amazed and concerned that this budget makes no provision for further emergency funding from the state government to assist Riverland and Lower Lakes food producers and their families through the coming crisis—and let me say that it could get a lot worse before it gets better for these people. The government needs to explain why it continues to ignore what is happening in this key region of South Australia.

There is also no long-term River Murray/Lower Lakes infrastructure program of work to address concerns about leakage; pipelines in the Lower Lakes precincts; and river works, including salt interception, ferry crossing works and other works—nothing. On water, this budget fails; it fails the people of the Far North, the West Coast, the Riverland and the Lower Lakes. It fails to act on today's crisis and tomorrow's challenges.

The next pressing issue in South Australia is health. Do we need any proof of it after thousands of teachers and hundreds, if not thousands, of health workers have protested, have gone on strike, and have raised concerns? The words of one of the resigning QEH specialists yesterday says it all, when they said, 'With all the problems in the public health system, it is just impossible to work there any more.'

The government's focus for more than a year has been on building an iconic hospital we do not need in a location better suited for other uses. The Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital plan has already started to suck health dollars and other services into its vortex. Country health is being gutted to pay for this new hospital. If you want a clear symbol of where this plan is taking our health system, visit the demountable in the car park at the Lyell McEwen Hospital; that is for the pregnant women of the north and the north-east. Go and have a look: it is an insult. Make no mistake: the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital is an unnecessary, expensive, private construction and leasing deal that will suck money out of the annual health budget—more than has ever been imagined—until 2046. It is the single biggest debt commitment of any government project in our history, and it must be tested at an election. Have the guts to put it to the people of South Australia. If it is such a good idea, let us see how it stands up.

The half a billion dollars that can be saved as a result of a rebuild of the Royal Adelaide Hospital could be reinvested into doctors' and nurses' wages, particularly in country health. Why would you move a central teaching hospital away from the university research and medical training facilities? It is a question that has confused the doctors and the nurses who work, teach and train there. The 'Marj' is the wrong idea in the wrong place at the wrong time. It is a city-centric idea that forgets where the patients are and where the patients' families are.

A Liberal government would not close the listed country hospitals set out in the Country Health Plan, salted out in the depths of the afternoon on budget day. Local communities need to approve any closure of a country hospital. Clearly, they have not been consulted. This government's priority is to build yet another tram extension. Our priority is health services and ensuring that South Australian families have a doctor and a nurse available when and where they need them. The Premier should be judged by his own words. In his 2002 election campaign speech, he promised that he was going to end 'patients on trolleys in [hospital] corridors' because such occurrences, he said, amounted to 'a genuine health crisis'. It got worse under Mr Rann, much worse.

In the words of emergency department doctor Robert Dunn, half of emergency department patients are today at risk of adverse outcomes because of overcrowding and poor resources. The same doctor told Channel 10 on Monday this week that it was an everyday occurrence for people to be in corridors and on trolleys, including one case of a patient who remained there for five days. In the Premier's own words, 'This is a genuine health crisis.' And what is he doing about it? What has this budget done about it? Cuts, cuts and more cuts.

Let us talk about education, because Premier Rann tried to label himself as 'the education premier'. Ask the 5,000 teachers who were outside parliament yesterday what they think of the education premier. I heard a few of them. It was not very glowing, let me tell you. Even we had never seen such a big crowd of angry teachers, even when we were in government and the Labor Party had nothing else to do but to go out and whip up anger and angst amongst the unions.

Guess what? The unions are angry all on their own. They are out there organising themselves. They do not need us out there to tell them that this Premier is a phoney on education. He likes to hand out Premier's prizes and medals, but yesterday he was given a prize of his own as the Premier who stopped listening. This Premier is so busy promoting himself that he has forgotten to listen. He is like a radio on squawk: it is permanently transmitting, but it never receives.

We play a game on this side of the house where we nominate how many times the Premier will name-drop during question time. He loves to surround himself with big names. He reminds me of an episode of *Frontline* on the ABC several years ago—I used to love the show—called 'Mike get the big names'. It is a comic saga of Mike Moore, the hapless presenter of a current affairs show, who thinks he gets all the big names on his show. Blissfully unaware that he is being used by the big names to promote their own wares, he bores his friends with tales of how he gets the big names.

You can see the Premier in his office with the Treasurer. They are not talking about Randall Ashbourne. Their conversation is going like this: 'Kev, I get the big names. I got Robert F. Kennedy Jr. He's a big name. I nearly got Arnie Schwarzenegger. He's a big name. I missed the plane. I would have got Ted Kennedy. He's a big name. I got Al Gore. He's a big name. Nothing to promote, he's just a nice guy, a big name. I get all the big names.'

You can see the Treasurer rolling his eyes as he counts the cost of keeping Mike Rann in the company of those big names. How much did he pay for Robert F. Kennedy Jr? I think it was \$700,000. No wonder there is no money for health and education. Yes, Mike gets all the big names, and meanwhile he cannot be bothered speaking to the head of the education union,

Correna Haythorpe, and, let me tell you, she is a big name and getting bigger. Compared to the whimpering ex-union officials in this parliament, she is a very big name. She is good, and she is coming after you guys. She is after your seats. The money spent on Mike's big names would be better invested in education.

The budget under invests in education. The budget heralds an education devolution. Forget about the revolution: it is an education devolution by Mr Rann with little in the way of initiatives or improved education outcomes. Strike action by teachers again demonstrates—and this is an important point: please listen—that salaries and wages are the key cost driver going forward and that industrial relations are being mismanaged. It is about salaries and wages. It is not about iconic buildings. It is not about bricks and mortar. The government's super schools' PPPs warrant scrutiny, and they are going to get them.

With full costs not fully disclosed in this budget and more debt lying there in the out years, this budget strangles small schools by depriving them of funding in a complex formula that appears aimed at sending more than 100 schools to the wall. Our education system needs a rethink. It needs direction and a plan for the future. We commit to undertaking that task.

Since he has just come back into the chamber, let me turn to one of my favourite subjects, and one of my favourite ministers, and mention public transport. For years, this government has been exposed for ignoring the increasing problems that have beset an ageing public transport network. 'Fix it, Pat' has become part of the local language and idiom, as Pat Conlon became a symbol of late buses, overcrowded trams and derailed trains that slipped, slid or just ground to a halt.

There was no greater snapshot of this government's failed grand achievements than yesterday's group of schoolteachers who were unable to get to the rally because they were stuck on a tram that had broken down on South Terrace. There it is: a symbol of all that has been achieved.

Last February, we outlined our master plan for Adelaide and sparked intense debate on the city's future needs. We identified the need to modernise the train fleet and dispense with the obsolete diesel train fleet. We resolved in principle to electrify the metropolitan train fleet. The government followed our lead, but it lacked the substance of our plan. In the budget—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You're making it up, mate.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You have been making it up for seven years, as you have gone along, Pat—not very well.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Oh, he's upset! This will be good.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —I have listened and heard it three times. I don't mind the Leader of the Opposition referring to me—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members of the opposition will be quiet.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —but he needs to respect the electors in my electorate and refer to me by my electorate.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. It is a standing order that members be referred to by the title of their electorate or, in the case of ministers, they may be referred to by their ministerial title. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Rann Labor government borrowed heavily from the American concept of new urbanism to roll out transport-oriented development along transport corridors, thereby reducing the reliance on the motor vehicle and increasing public transport patronage. In the budget, the government rolled out its so-called 'transport revolution' but, on closer examination, it looked more like an extension here and there and a raft of long-term commitments funded by future debt.

On close examination, it is revealed that we are talking about an 800 car park and ride facility two kilometres from the city at the Entertainment Centre. Why? The opposition is advised

that, a few weeks earlier, the Treasurer had been there and discovered that people parked there free of charge. He wants them to pay.

Mr Williams: He'll fix that!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: He will put a stop to that. If you have been parking for free at the Entertainment Centre, the party is over. The Treasurer is on your case. By the way, of course we do not need trams to access a park and ride facility when buses already service the same route and do the same job. For some reason, we need trams to do that now.

The government's one-man passion to copy the US city of Portland has already seen us replace the Bee Line bus with a tram. We gained nothing: all we have achieved is to make access for the Glenelg-bound travellers more difficult by putting the Bee Line customers on the tram.

Here we go again! Yesterday in question time, our bumbling, fumbling transport minister could not even tell us whether the next extension would mean that we lose a lane of traffic on the already heavily used Port Road. He admitted that there was still work to be done on the design: 'We know that it is going to cost \$162 million, but we just haven't done the design yet.' It is a bit like saying, 'I want to build a house, but I just haven't done the design yet, but I'll go to the bank and ask for a loan.'

Earlier in the day the minister was on ABC Radio and could not even explain to listeners how his trains and trams would be able to handle varying gauges, voltages and track conditions. In other words, this transport revolution was spun together in a paddock as a response to the state Liberals' master plan for Adelaide. Everybody knows this because the industry has told us. None of these things were on your agenda in February; they all just fell out there in a panicked response to the fact that you no longer have control of the agenda in this state.

To quote the words of one disgruntled Labor backbencher in the corridors yesterday, 'You're right; this has been pulled together out of nowhere.' They are already telling us what happened; they all know. Your own caucus knows what happened in cabinet. So here we go again! Get ready for more budget blow-outs and delay! I just cannot wait for the Minister for Transport to get his hands on this electrification and tram program. Could it double? Could it triple? Could it quadruple? We will open a book. We will get the shadow minister for racing to open a book. We will take bets on the blow-outs and see who is responsible for the most.

One thing will be clear: the South Australian public will be the losers. The minister for stuff-ups has more to turn his hand to. Heaven help us all! The focus of this government's transport announcement, by the way—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, he needs to refer to me by my seat. I can sit through his personal invective—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The minister has made the point.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The point of order is that I am quite happy with his personal invective; he has been doing it for years—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —but he needs to do it according to the standing orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The minister does not need to debate the point of order. The standing orders require that a member be referred to by their seat. Convention allows that a member may be referred to by the office they hold, in the case of the minister, but respect is required at all times.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On a point of order, a moment ago he threw the word 'moron' across the chamber, and that is okay. If it is all right for him—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no debate in raising a point of order.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will come to order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The focus of this government's transport announcement is to go west of the city where a transport link already exists. It is an area well serviced by rail and bus. Yet, since coming to office in 2002, the Rann government has announced land releases everywhere except west of Adelaide. Here is some free advice for the transport minister: stop, you're going the wrong way; turn around and go back! Let me explain. The budgeted cost of the tram service to the Entertainment Centre is \$162 million. In this budget, \$30 million is set aside to commence works in 2009-10. This includes 'acquiring new light rail vehicles and subsequent works for connection to the Outer Harbor line'. Little information is provided in the budget on costings for trams to be built outside the forward estimates. I wonder if they will ever happen—fantasy trams.

Using the government figures, the cost of the extension of the Entertainment Centre per kilometre is \$64.8 million. Based on the figure of \$64.8 million per kilometre, the tram extension proposed by this government from Clark Terrace on the Grange line to West Lakes will cost \$149 million. The tram extension to the Outer Harbor line, which loops around St Vincent Street, is approximately 1.6 kilometres. On the basis of the government's own figures, it would cost \$104 million. The tram extension from the Outer Harbor line to Semaphore is approximately 1.2 kilometres, so add another \$78 million. The total of these four extensions is \$498 million, and that is without the blow-ups and the blow-outs, and it is in today's dollars. This figure does not include land acquisitions (and wasn't that successful on Anzac Highway/South Road?), additional rolling stock and upgrades for new stations and associated works, or the usual budget slippage. There is a better way to spend this money.

The Liberals' plans are more sensible, structured plans which deal with the immediate needs and which propose a broader sense of city and suburbs. We propose a vision where we can maximise our connection with the city as a workplace and a place of recreation and entertainment. Our City West vision is alive and well. If I were premier for this budget deliberation, I would have resisted the \$162 million tram to the Entertainment Centre and its concurrent \$50 million refurbishment, sold the remaining land at the site and used the combined proceeds to relocate the Entertainment Centre to City West in place of the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital. Are we tarting up something that ultimately will need to come in to the city? That is a vision which has genuine economic benefits for a key part of the city business district and which drives other prospects for that area.

The \$100 million to be given to the SANFL for AAMI Stadium—which was not even dreamt of four months ago—falls well short of the significantly greater sum needed to genuinely reinvent West Lakes into a world-class international sporting precinct. We believe that the \$100 million probably delays the inevitable move to a city-based stadium. The \$149 million for the West Lakes tram extension, which the transport minister opposed on the record in the house, brings the government's commitment to \$249 million, which would make a significant contribution to a new city stadium—\$249 million—most of which the transport minister opposed on the record and said was a stupid idea. Now he is out there trying to sell it. Look at him!

We do not rule out the West Lakes site for our main stadium if a further investment is made, but the now mounting cost of that option reconfirms our view that the case for a city stadium is compelling and preferable. In the two examples above, the several hundred million dollars saved would be an irresistible carrot for private developers to propose joint ventures in the area. We dare to have a dream, not just a tarted up plan for the next election. It still astounds me that the Premier this year ruled out as madness a tram extension to the AAMI Stadium, and the transport minister ruled it out, not once but twice. The U-turn is so complete, it is dizzying. What will they do next?

We oppose these tram extensions in their entirety, including the Entertainment Centre extension and those to all other proposed destinations west.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will say it again for the transport minister. We oppose the tram extensions in their entirety, including the Entertainment Centre extension and those to all other proposed destinations west. You have got a very clear point of difference. These areas are already well serviced by bus and train.

We would enhance bus services west and recognise that the greater need is in the north, south and east. The needs are in Tea Tree Gully and Modbury, Norwood, Campbelltown, Paradise and Newtown. They are in Blackwood, Hawthorndene and Aberfoyle Park, and south to Brighton,

Hallett Cove, Lonsdale and Noarlunga: in the places where most South Australians live and go to work. How many people from the north, south and east will use the tram extension to the Entertainment Centre?

Our main focus will be the resleepering and electrification of the north-south access from Gawler to Noarlunga; it is the foundation of our rail network. After that is complete then we will move on to electrification of the Outer Harbor line. We support an extension of the Noarlunga line to Seaford, with a subsequent feasibility study for a further extension to Aldinga, and we will have more to say about that later.

We propose a feasibility study on the extension of the Gawler line north to the Barossa and enhanced bus services to interconnect with the rail line across the network. We support resleepering of the Belair line, new rolling stock and upgraded infrastructure and bus connections, particularly in the hills. We support a feasibility study into the redirection of freight rail to the north of Adelaide, with a view to removing freight traffic from the Belair line. We propose additional bus services and Go Zones by purchasing extra buses and expanding the contracts to ensure improved services in the northern, north-eastern and southern suburbs.

I am making it very clear in my response today where our priorities lie. The government's priority lies out west: trams. Our priority will be bus services and other services in health and education for the forgotten south, the neglected north and the expanding east and Hills—not trams. We know where people live and we know where the needs are greatest. The government has lost sense of its priorities; it has stopped talking to people and it has stopped listening.

In addition, we propose further services on the O-Bahn and upgraded stations, along with new bus services to Mount Barker and the Hills' greater precincts. Our transport plan is joined at the hip with development of the City West area and understanding how the north-south spine of our urban spread is serviced. Our strategy is an integrated transport and development strategy.

Let me now move to the bitter pill that the Treasurer has difficulty swallowing: the debt pill. The budget papers reveal that the former Liberal government reduced Premier Rann and Treasurer Foley's State Bank debt from \$11.6 billion in 1993 to \$3.2 billion in 2001. Under Rann Labor's economic mismanagement, debt is forecast to blow out, yet again, to \$5.2 billion by 2011-12. This is a debt blow-out of 58 per cent since Labor came to office; debt that should be used to finance public infrastructure and investment that will add to the productive capacity and competitiveness of South Australia's economy. However, there are grave concerns that Mr Rann's debt is not being used to fund such investment.

The latest national accounts publication from the ABS indicates that since 2004 the South Australian public sector, together with local government, has actually decreased its investment in capital works. In essence, not enough has been done for seven years, and now we have got a basket full of promises. It is unclear for what purpose state debt is being generated. The government has gone out and spent windfall revenues on shopping and it has nothing left to spend on infrastructure. Furthermore, rising debt exposes the state to further risks, higher interest rates and global economic uncertainty.

The budget debt brings the figure to \$5.2 billion; almost double the 1993 Labor State Bank debt of \$3.4 billion and almost half the total debt the current Premier bequeathed to the state when he was a senior figure in the Bannon and Arnold Labor governments which crippled this state with \$11.6 billion of total debt. They know how to spin the story of debt: they have done it before; they are doing it again. We have been here before with Premier Rann—here we go again! The spike in South Australia's debt can only worsen as the international credit crisis raises the cost of capital for debt financing of South Australia's infrastructure projects. The former federal treasurer, Peter Costello, in a speech to the Menzies Research Centre on 1 June 2007, advised that the states were:

...not funding investments from their revenues. The states are borrowing, drawing down from savings rather than adding to them and, in this respect, adding to pressure on monetary policy.

He is right. The windfall from the GST revenue and property taxes has been used on recurrent expenditures—15 ministers, for a start, in a state that used to have 10. It has not been allocated to investment. That is why our state has insufficient operating surpluses to fund planned infrastructure spending and is now engaged in debt finance. On two of three used accounting measures this budget is in deficit.

If Mr Rann and Mr Foley had put aside the \$3.7 billion of windfall tax and revenue gains this government has received since it has been in government—money it did not even expect to

get—and put it into an infrastructure fund or its own future fund, there would be no need in this budget to borrow to build electrified rail; there would be no need to borrow to build a hospital; and there might not even be a need to borrow to build a desalination plant. Instead, it spent the \$3.7 billion windfall and is now having to go to the bank to cover the gap.

That leads me to the question of tax. This budget shows that from 2001-02 to 2008-09 South Australian general government taxes will increase by at least 65 per cent. The government has received an unforecast tax windfall of \$3.7 billion from its first two terms. The majority of this windfall is due to unexpectedly high GST and property tax collections. The Rann Labor government's claim about the amount of tax relief provided since coming to office is nothing but a furphy. First, they do not subtract new taxes, levies and increases in taxes since Labor came to office; moreover, \$531 million of their claim is the tax relief package resulting from the GST negotiations with the then federal Liberal government.

This relief package was originally negotiated by the former state Liberal government. We negotiated that, but the government is trying to claim the credit for it. The relief package was originally negotiated by others but members opposite, like sucker fish, are trying to take the credit. Labor's approach to tax reform is like every other policy it has—piecemeal. A complete review of state taxation is needed and the review must be followed by action.

In summary, Labor's seventh budget creates more problems than it solves. It is a desperate attempt to create an illusion of infrastructure activity but it fails to target the state's most critical needs. Previous water security strategies have been abandoned, with no replacement. Previous major announcements on health have been deferred, with their true cost unknown. Regional South Australia has been abandoned. The world now ends at Gepps Cross and the Toll Gate. The claimed revolution in transport is partly catch-up and partly window-dressing. A genuine, integrated transport plan would be much different to this combination of short-term fixes and duplication of previous mistakes. This is a budget that is not only out of touch with the state's needs but it is also out of touch with the reality of our state's economic performance.

In the same 24 hours that the Treasurer bragged about business confidence, two independent sets of figures showed exactly the opposite. The ABS national accounts showed an 11.5 per cent drop in business investment over the 12 months to March 2008, and the Sensis Business Index showed a similar slump in business confidence. And just as the Treasurer was telling the budget lock-up that our population was growing at a fast pace, annual population figures showed an alarming drift of South Australians interstate.

South Australia continues to lag behind national growth in gross domestic product, population, employment, exports and business investment. Nothing in this budget acts to reverse the ongoing deterioration of water and transport infrastructure. The true cost of the headline act from last year's budget, the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, is now an unknown, a debt factor not recognised in this budget. It is still waiting there for others to pay long after these people are off in Italy or in retirement or working for BHP (if anyone is silly enough to employ them), while its hospital time line has slipped by at least a year.

In the meantime, money that should have been spent on services is destined to fund a system on the never-never. The so-called 'first home owner's bonus' will never see the bank accounts of home buyers, because it is outstripped by the nation's highest level of stamp duty. Remember the big announcement? We were going to giveth \$4,000 and we were going to taketh away \$16,000 in stamp duty for an average first-time buyer. This Treasurer giveth with the left hand and taketh away with the right!

Labor has had ample opportunity to implement a dynamic program of economic infrastructure and community development for the future of this state. There is nothing in this budget to excite the taxpayers in March 2010, making for a total period of eight years of missed opportunities. Bags of promises, bags of reviews, bags of summits; but nothing much that you can touch, nothing much that you can see, nothing much that you can feel, nothing much that you can use. In this period budget revenues will have risen by 67 per cent. Heavens, it is heading towards \$15 billion! When it came into office this government was getting just over \$8 billion, yet it is saying it is doing a good job because it is balancing the budget. Two gorillas in a VW could balance this budget, and so could Billy the goose—anyone could balance this budget, there is so much money in it, except the current Treasurer. He sweats at night trying to work out how he is going to pay the bills with this budget. My, my! We can do better.

In the same period that he has been trying to balance his cash-flooded budget, hospital waiting lists have grown, the emergency in our Riverland with the water crisis has been ignored,

housing affordability has slumped to record lows, violent crime levels have risen—we have bikies in shoot-outs on the streets of Adelaide, the gang of 49—and the transport system has become the butt of national and even international jokes. The fact is that decisions made in this budget about the electrification of rail and tax cuts should have been made seven budgets ago when the Rann Labor government first came to office.

It has done nothing but tax and spend. Expenses are out of control, the Auditor-General has confirmed that, saved each year by windfall revenues. Mr Rann now wants to con South Australians into believing he deserves a third term. His basket of promises, late in his second term, seeks to redefine a 'do nothing' Labor government. Treasurer Foley's budget No. 7 has been too little, too late. There will be no budget No. 9. In March 2010, South Australians can deliver their verdict. Frankly, they deserve better.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:55): In May 2006, Treasurer Foley announced to South Australia that the state budget was under such financial pressure as a result of public health costs in this state that he would have to delay the budget for 2006 until September. He would need to get some advice from some financial guru in New South Wales. That is how difficult was the situation facing South Australians.

We now know that in the same month the Premier and the Minister for Health were meeting to plan a \$1.9 billion hospital build down the other end of North Terrace. That is the truth of it. The truth of it was that they delayed the budget because of their own financial mismanagement when, behind closed doors, they were developing a plan to build a \$1.9 billion hospital, which we do not need, down the other end of the street.

Come the 2007 budget, what did we have? The day before the budget, we had the Premier wheeled out, 'Razzamatazz Rann', with the big announcement, the glossy brochures, the lovely models, the website pages, and all the plan for the big new hospital. Modbury Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Repatriation General Hospital all got a belting but, of course this was overshadowed by this magnificent, new, suddenly affordable, massive hospital.

This year, in the 2008 budget, we actually see the other side of the ledger, and the other side of the ledger is that country health is gutted. Minister Hill, an hour and a half after this parliament got up last week, after the big announcement of the budget—infrastructure and all the grand plans of the government—slipped the Country Health Care Plan onto the website. What a despicable act of deceit not even to have the guts to produce that plan while the parliament was sitting.

It was nothing like the year before, with the metropolitan health plan, big new glossy hospital, and Razzamatazz Rann out there. What has happened this year? This year it is sneakily posted onto the website without a word. If it was such a damned good idea, why is the minister out there now, with paid advertising, trying to convince South Australia that this is an important initiative for the future wellbeing of people in the country and for the health of the whole plan for the management of public hospitals in this state? The reason is that it is not a good idea. This is a despicable act and a stab in the back for country people in this state.

What is the plan? The plan is to enhance four hospitals first, and they are conveniently in three locations where the only representation of the government is: in Whyalla, in Berri and in the South-East. They get the enhanced hospitals. They had to have a fourth, and they could not completely ignore Port Lincoln, because 35,000 people live there. That is their idea.

The second part of the equation is that 43 hospitals have to decrease their services down to GP Plus centres. What about the fourth level? This is absolutely hysterical. In Andamooka, Leigh Creek—the list goes on—they do not even get a GP Plus centre: they just get someone who flies in and flies out every now and again—an absolute GP minus. That is the plan. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00]

LIQUOR LICENSING HOURS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 333 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to require licensed premises located in Glenelg to close no later than midnight.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 126 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to continue funding of Country Health SA services at existing hospitals and health facilities in rural SA.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SHARK PATROLS

168 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (31 July 2007). What has been the cost of providing Shark patrol services for 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Finance, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): The Minister for Emergency Services has provided the following information:

In 2004-05

Aldinga Aero Club (Fixed Wing) \$60,925

In 2005-06

UniSA (Fixed Wing) \$109,690

Surf Life Saving SA (Rotary Wing) \$92,600

In 2006-07

UniSA (Fixed Wing) \$165,891

Surf Life Saving SA (Rotary Wing) \$115,363

In 2007-08, \$312,000 has been allocated for summer shark patrol services.

LEVEL CROSSINGS

307 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (20 November 2007).

1. Where were safety improvements undertaken in country areas as part of the Level Crossing Safety Program, and what was the cost and benefits of each improvement?

2. What outstanding safety improvement programs are still required in country areas?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy): The Minister for Road Safety has provided the following information:

The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) has completed the following safety improvements at crossing sites in country areas.

Crossing Location	Safety Improvement Work	Benefit	Total Cost
Mattners Road, Balhannah	Widen junction, left turn lane, escape area and yellow box marking	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking*.	\$152 000
Mannum Road, Murray Bridge	Widen junction, left turn lane, escape area and yellow box marking	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking.	\$156 000
Wenzell Road, Balhannah	Widen junction, escape area and yellow box marking	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking.	\$139 000
Callington RS Road, Callington	Removal of embankment	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$80 000
Eclaire Mine Road, Callington	Removal of embankment	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$80 000
Back Callington Road,	Removal of embankment	Lessen risk of restricted	\$80 000

Crossing Location	Safety Improvement Work	Benefit	Total Cost
Callington		sight distance.	
Dawkins Road, Two Wells	Left turn slip lane and yellow box marking	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking.	\$67 000
Yatina Road, Aldgate	Left turn slip lane and yellow box marking	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking.	\$130 000

*Short stacking occurs when a heavy vehicle (truck) stops at an intersection/junction after the railway crossing and the length of the vehicle encroaches back over the railway tracks.

DTEI has included the following crossing sites in country areas for safety improvement works for the remainder of the 2007-08 financial year.

Crossing Location	Safety Improvement	Benefit	Estimated Cost
Hayman Road, Two Wells	Activation and escape area	Lessen the risk of restricted sight distance and short stacking.	\$350 000
Dutton Road, Mt Barker	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$170 000
Wenzel Road, Balhannah	Activation and escape area	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance and short stacking.	\$330 000
Thevenard / Bergman Ceduna	Yellow box marking and signage upgrade	Lessen risk of short stacking.	\$5 000
LeBrun Street, Pt Lincoln	Yellow box marking and signage upgrade	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking.	\$2 000
Fenchurch Street, Goolwa	Vegetation management and signage upgrade	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$2 000
Shepherd Avenue, Pt Lincoln	Vegetation management and signage upgrade	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$2 000
Institute Road, Cummins	Yellow box marking and signage upgrade	Lessen risk of queuing and short stacking.	\$2 000
Alexandrina Road, Mt Barker	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. B-double route.	\$180 000
Bethany Road, Tanunda	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. (B-double route)	\$180 000
Bowmans Road, Bowmans	Realign road approach	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$50 000
Blakiston Road, Littlehampton	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance.	\$180 000
Mallee Highway, Yappara	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. (B-double route)	\$240 000
Mallee Highway, Jabuk	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. (B-double route)	\$240 000
West Terrace, Wolseley	Activation, with boom gates	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. (B-double route)	\$275 000
Alawoona Road, Veitch	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. (B-double route)	\$240 000
Spoehr Road, Balhannah	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance and queuing	\$200 000
Collins Street, Jamestown	Activation	Lessen risk of restricted sight distance. (Over-dimensional route)	\$240 000

SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE PROGRAM

366 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (18 February 2008). What are the number of staff, salaries and on-costs which are subsumed by the department in directly supporting the Government's Sustainability and Climate Change Program?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change): I have been advised of the following information:

Sustainability and Climate Change have 14.4 FTE's and the budgeted expenditure for salaries and on-costs for the 2006-07 financial year was \$1.905 million. In addition, there are 4 FTE's within Sustainability and Workforce Management Executive Office whose roles include working on the Government's Sustainability and Climate Change Program. Sustainability and Workforce Management is one of three Groups with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

SPEEDING FINES

421 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (8 April 2008). For each year since 2002, how many motorists were detected speeding and how much revenue was raised by the use of speed cameras, laser guns or other means, respectively, in each of the following default ranges—60 to 69 km/h, 70 to 79 km/h, 80 to 89 km/h, 90 to 99 km/h, 100 to 109 km/h and greater than 110 km/h?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations): The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

CALENDAR YEAR 2002

TOTAL OF NOTICES ISSUED AND NOTICE VALUE CALENDAR YEAR 2002		
SPEED RANGE	TOTAL NOTICES ISSUED	TOTAL VALUE OF NOTICES ISSUED
60 - 69 km/h	1,515	\$263,222
70 - 79 km/h	157,117	\$19,374,878
80 - 89 km/h	15,083	\$2,263,199
90 - 99 km/h	12,261	\$1,762,044
100 - 109 km/h	5,087	\$685,716
110> km/h	6,341	\$898,023

CALENDAR YEAR 2003

TOTAL OF NOTICES ISSUED AND NOTICE VALUE CALENDAR YEAR 2003		
SPEED RANGE	TOTAL NOTICES ISSUED	TOTAL VALUE OF NOTICES ISSUED
60 - 69 km/h	52,040	\$7,198,652
70 - 79 km/h	99,295	\$12,775,546
80 - 89 km/h	12,317	\$1,925,496
90 - 99 km/h	9,561	\$1,407,139
100 - 109 km/h	4,316	\$638,886
110> km/h	17,348	\$2,768,397

CALENDAR YEAR 2004

TOTAL OF NOTICES ISSUED AND NOTICE VALUE CALENDAR YEAR 2004		
SPEED RANGE	TOTAL NOTICES ISSUED	TOTAL VALUE OF NOTICES ISSUED
60 - 69 km/h	72,821	\$10,050,614
70 - 79 km/h	111,671	\$14,580,484
80 - 89 km/h	15,212	\$2,363,402
90 - 99 km/h	9,510	\$1,478,930
100 - 109 km/h	5,367	\$805,121
110> km/h	25,569	\$4,239,079

CALENDAR YEAR 2005

TOTAL OF NOTICES ISSUED AND NOTICE VALUE CALENDAR YEAR 2005		
SPEED RANGE	TOTAL NOTICES ISSUED	TOTAL VALUE OF NOTICES ISSUED
60 - 69 km/h	94,272	\$13,599,154
70 - 79 km/h	99,949	\$13,754,136
80 - 89 km/h	12,720	\$2,049,152
90 - 99 km/h	13,023	\$2,016,166
100 - 109 km/h	5,565	\$901,030
110> km/h	28,268	\$4,799,795

CALENDAR YEAR 2006

TOTAL OF NOTICES ISSUED AND NOTICE VALUE CALENDAR YEAR 2006		
SPEED RANGE	TOTAL NOTICES ISSUED	TOTAL VALUE OF NOTICES ISSUED
60 - 69 km/h	76,536	\$11,862,745
70 - 79 km/h	95,414	\$14,269,306
80 - 89 km/h	11,973	\$2,077,981
90 - 99 km/h	9,985	\$1,663,072
100 - 109 km/h	4,668	\$799,016
110> km/h	28,638	\$5,132,671

CALENDAR YEAR 2007

TOTAL OF NOTICES ISSUED AND NOTICE VALUE CALENDAR YEAR 2007		
SPEED RANGE	TOTAL NOTICES ISSUED	TOTAL VALUE OF NOTICES ISSUED
60 - 69 km/h	100,866	\$15,547,709
70 - 79 km/h	111,671	\$16,891,349
80 - 89 km/h	15,171	\$2,575,035
90 - 99 km/h	101,33	\$1,629,984
100 - 109 km/h	4,057	\$694,684
110> km/h	30,621	\$5,608,497

The total of notices issued includes detections by traffic safety cameras, laser devices and 'other means' which incorporates detections by *follow and time* method and mobile radar devices.

The total value of notices issued is the expiation fee only; it does not include the Victim of Crimes Levy or any corporate fee that some notices may attract.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (14:02): I bring up the 297th report of the committee on the Veterinary Science Project.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:03): I bring up the 21st report of the committee.

Report received.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Para Vista Primary School (guests of the member for Florey) and students from Mary MacKillop College (guests of the member for Norwood).

QUESTION TIME**COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN**

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): Will the Premier guarantee that no-one will die in the country or the city, who might otherwise have lived, as a consequence of his planned closure of 43 South Australian country hospitals and the resignations—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: No, I am not. It is about people's lives. It is about their safety and their life.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will not interject and the leader will not respond to interjections.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I repeat the question. Will the Premier personally guarantee that no-one will die in the country or city, who might otherwise have lived, as a consequence of his planned closure of 43 South Australian country hospitals and the resignation of dozens of doctors from our metropolitan hospitals?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:05): The Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to the excitement of the masses, has just given his budget reply. Yesterday, apparently when he saw five or six—

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No. I will answer it the way I want to answer it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. This is nothing about the budget reply speech: it is clearly about country hospital closures.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Yes, the Premier needs to speak to the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He had to call a quorum to get his own members in the chamber to listen to him.

Ms CHAPMAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, the Premier is clearly disobeying your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay, the substance of the question is this: there are 699 more doctors now than there were when you were in cabinet—699 more doctors. Under the Liberals, there was cut after cut—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to our hospitals and our health system. All you did was cut hospitals and health, and what we have done is put an extra 699 doctors into the system—699 more than when you were in government—and 2,500 extra nurses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will come to order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Billions of dollars more are being invested in our health system compared to when the Liberals were around. There is no-one more phoney than the Leader of the Opposition when it comes to public health and public hospitals.

The SPEAKER: The member for Norwood.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood.

BROWN HILL WIND FARM

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (14:06): Will the Premier inform the house about South Australia's newest wind farm at Brown Hill?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:06): I promise members this: I will never call a quorum to get my own supporters into the gallery to support me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is how bad things are on the other side of the parliament.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They had to have the ringing of the bells—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will take his seat.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, that is the second time the Premier has deliberately defied your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not need theatrics. The Premier will answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, sir. I am delighted to answer this question. I would have liked to have had more notice, but, never mind. This is controversial, I know that. I know what I will say, and I do not want anyone to think that I am dodging these issues at all. I will not run and hide. I will pull the sock out that the *Tiser* put in! Okay. South Australia is taking a leadership role in the development of renewable energy in Australia. Wind power in particular has been a great success story for our state. I had the pleasure of opening AGL's Hallett Stage 1 wind farm last week, along with the outstanding local member, Graham Gunn. I should use his proper name, but I am very pleased and proud to call him my friend and colleague.

He is the grandfather of the house, I am the deputy grandfather of the house and the member for Wright is the grandmother of the house. And congratulations; she is a beautiful baby. I saw the picture the other day; it is fantastic. AGL's Hallett wind farm, which I had the pleasure of opening last week along with Graham Gunn, will bring South Australia's share of the nation's total installed wind power capacity to around 53 per cent—8 per cent of the population of Australia, 53 per cent of the wind power.

The \$250 million Hallett Stage 1 project includes 45 turbines with a capacity of 95 megawatts. I am told that this will be able to provide electricity for around 50,000 homes and will avoid hundreds of thousands of tonnes of carbon emissions being released into the atmosphere. I must say that it is quite something to take in the view of these majestic turbines in the Mid North landscape of South Australia. I know that every member would agree that not one wind turbine was operating six years ago. We now have 53 per cent—billions of dollars worth of investment in wind farms. What a difference a change of government makes! At the opening I was told by AGL's Managing Director, Michael Fraser, that the Mid North of South Australia is regarded as being one of the best areas of wind prospectivity in the nation.

In fact, it has been described as the hub of Australian wind farm investment. He also told me that, with the completion of Hallett stage 2 at Hallett Hill and the proposed development of Hallett stage 3 at Mount Bryan, as well as Hallett stage 4 at North Brown Hill, AGL would have

invested more than \$1 billion in the region—\$1 billion of investment in the Mid North. He also mentioned the possibility of Hallett stage 5; and, according to AGL, that means more than 400 jobs will have been created by 2010. I want to congratulate the energy minister. Some people regard me as the greenie in the cabinet, but I know that sitting to my right is a minister—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Over one. Two to your right.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Two to my right is a minister who is a genuine greenie from way back. In fact, I would encourage him to look at lunar power because of the tidal currents we have in South Australia. Altogether, there are currently 261 wind turbines operating in South Australia. This is a great investment in the local community, not only with construction and ongoing jobs but also for the reliable income that the wind turbines generate for local farmers.

Another investment in the community is the establishment of a regional centre of operations, office and stores facilities, by Suzlon Energy. I am told that Suzlon Energy is ranked as the fifth leading wind turbine supplier in the world. People would know that Suzlon Energy is based in India. In fact, from memory, it is based in Pune, which is about three hours' drive from Mumbai—in fact, very close to where we have been working with the Maharashtra government and Indage Holdings Limited on a wine research centre, which I think is going to have great benefits for the wine industry here as we sell South Australian wine into the Indian marketplace by lifting the interest of wine in India—which has nothing to do with Suzlon Energy.

Following the opening of the Hallett Wind Farm, I travelled to Jamestown to turn the first sod on this \$1.5 million regional operation. I invited the member for Stuart to join me. I am advised that the company has three other contracts in place in South Australia—at Snowtown, Clements Gap and Hallett Hill, which in total will bring Suzlon's contract value to more than \$750 million. Given the contracts are within 80 kilometres of each other, Suzlon Energy has committed to a long-term presence in the community.

I am told that by the middle of 2010 South Australia will have around 860 megawatts—that is, 860 megawatts—of wind generation capacity in store, which represents around \$2 billion worth of investment in clean, renewable energy production. As I say, what a difference to six years ago when there was not one wind farm and not one wind turbine. Now, in 2008, with just 8 per cent of the nation's population, we have gone from around 47 per cent to 53 per cent. I want to make this prediction today: I believe that by next year we will have about 20 per cent of South Australia's power coming from wind power and solar power combined, which will put us into a world leadership position.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Health. During the consultation that the government undertook to prepare the Country Health Care Plan, did any of the 43 hospitals ask to be GP Plus centres and, if so, which ones?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:13): I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for her question, because it gives me an opportunity to counter the big lie that was part of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. Members would remember Goebbels, who established the notion of the big lie back in the 1930s and 1940s: if you say something often enough, people might start to believe it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: And big enough—a big enough lie!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: And big enough. A big enough lie, the big lie. So, the first question from the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier, of course, was about closing the 43 hospitals. That is a statement that has been made on a number of occasions now by the opposition. It is a complete fabrication: it is untrue. Now the question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, of course, reinforces that, because her question is based on the assumption that those hospitals will remain open as GP Plus health care centres. The question was about consultation. Let me inform the house about the consultation process.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I can't hear a word you are saying, Isobel. Let me inform the house about the consultation process. South Australia's Health Care Plan 2007-2016 was released in June last year and included the commitment from the South Australian government to develop a

country health care plan to improve the provision of and access to health services for country residents. The consultation process since that time has included the following—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member for MacKillop might care to ask me a question, and I would be delighted to answer it. However, I would not like to respond to an interjection, of course, because that would be disorderly. The consultation since that time has included a workshop on 2 August 2007 with local board chairpersons and chief executive officers to begin to explore both the interrelationships of health services and the possibilities of repatriation of activity to country from metropolitan hospitals; and a leadership forum on 4 October 2007 for senior managers from across country South Australia exploring repatriation of services from Adelaide to country from the perspective of differing sized communities.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Speaking loudly and attempting to drown me out means that members opposite do not want to hear the facts. I would say to people listening to this debate: judge for yourself who is trying to get the message across and who is trying to drown out the message. During November—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask any number of questions you like, member for MacKillop: I would be delighted to answer them in detail. During November 2007, over 100 clinicians from across country South Australia attended a workshop at which participants identified the important factors to be considered in the implementation of the statewide GP Plus health care strategy in country South Australia along with potential inpatient activity at the four general hospitals—Mount Gambier, Berri, Whyalla and Port Lincoln—and also the Centre for Excellence in Aboriginal Health at Port Augusta Hospital.

Consultations with resident specialists, general practitioners and senior health staff were undertaken in Berri, Mount Gambier and Whyalla, including Port Lincoln and Port Augusta services, from late January to February 2008. These sessions provided important insights into the opportunities that the development of the general hospitals provide in better supporting clinicians and services in those areas and some clear indication of the enablers for this development. Local consultation sessions about the GP Plus health care strategy through site visits were organised—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —in collaboration with respective divisions of general practice. Visits took place to Port Pirie and Mid North, Ceduna, Yorke Peninsula, Port Lincoln, South Coast, Adelaide Hills, Riverland, South-East, Goolwa, Murray Bridge, Barossa and Riverland. The visits included Dr Michael Taylor, Kevin Eglinton, Country Health SA, Chris Seiboth, SA Divisions of General Practice, and members of the project team.

A workshop was held with over 70 local board chairs and members, directors and executive directors from across country South Australia, including an update on plan progress, national directions and the transition to health advisory councils on 5 March 2008. A workshop for the statewide clinical network chairs, country representatives on the clinical networks, members of the Country Clinical Governance Committee and country representatives on the clinical senate was held to share information and consider the directions of the plan on 4 April 2008. Country clinicians participated in a range of statewide clinical workshops organised through the Statewide Services Strategy Division. George Beltchev, Chief Executive of Country Health SA, and Dr Nigel Stewart, Chief Consultant, Country Health SA services plan—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —utilised opportunities and regular meeting times to consult with the Rural Doctors Association SA, the Rural Doctors Workforce Agency and the Australian Medical Association SA regarding the Country Health SA services plan, particularly in relation to developing service profiles of general hospitals. The plan is also discussed regularly at the Rural Doctors Liaison Forum which, in addition to the medical agencies identified above, includes the Royal

Australian College of General Practitioners, the Rural Divisions of General Practice, the Australian College of Rural and Remote Medicine and South Australian Divisions of General Practice.

Update briefings about the plan were provided at Country Health SA executive meetings, CHSA Board, Services Committee and Clinical Governance Committee. The plan project team included the plan working group, CHSA clinical advisers for medicine, nursing/midwifery and allied health, representatives of the Statewide Services Strategy and Communications sections of the Department of Health and an adviser from the South Australian Ambulance Service.

Nine task groups for the plan were established and contributed overarching principles and a framework for more detailed service descriptions. These included mental health, early childhood, older persons, GP Plus health care strategy, patient journey and transport, workforce, Aboriginal health, infrastructure and dental. A monthly communiqué sent by the board chair of Country Health Services of South Australia includes updates on the planning process.

I know that was long, but I think it is important to demonstrate to the house that there has been extensive and thorough discussion and consultation, and there is more to come. We have extended the period of consultation on this plan to the end of July. I invite all members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I invite everybody associated with country health to participate in that consultation process.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr RAU (Enfield) (14:20): Is the Minister for Health aware of any support for the Country Health Care Plan?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:20): I thank the member for Enfield for the question and I thank him for his support, too, for the plan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am aware of some support for our plan. There is some criticism, I acknowledge, but there is also some support. I am particularly grateful for the support of Stuart Andrew who is, I understand, a prominent member of the Liberal Party in the Riverland and a former chair of the local country health board. In a letter dated 17 June, a copy of which I have, to the editor of *The Independent Weekly*, he wrote:

Dear Sir

The late British PM David Lloyd George once wrote that 'a politician is someone with whose politics you don't agree: if you agree with him he is a statesman'.

By that definition, it is my judgment that Health Minister John Hill is both. Although I support his attempts to reform country health services, my pedigree alone—

I think that means that he is a member of the Liberal Party—

would suggest that I don't agree with his politics!

Minister Hill has been unfairly attacked by the Opposition, country media and elements of the Rural Doctors Association. The proposed large injections of funds into four regional centres—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He's a Liberal.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, a Liberal.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: A smart Liberal.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A smart Liberal—

(including the Riverland) will realise the same objectives as the previous Liberal government tried to accomplish—in its case, by encouraging seven country regions to voluntarily rationalise their medical services.

This is a man whose brother is a former federal member of parliament and Speaker of the house and whose cousin is a former Liberal member representing the area, so he knows that by a different approach the former Liberal government was attempting to do the same thing—not openly or transparently, not on the public record, but by stealth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The letter continues:

Lamentably, Hillary and Barack were more collaborative than most of the hospital boards back then.

Maintaining the status quo—four fully equipped Riverland hospitals within a 20 kilometre radius (excluding Waikerie)—would have meant diminished rather than improved services overall.

That was the Liberals' plan. He goes on:

This is a 10 year plan. Peripheral hospitals are not about to be closed overnight. In our region, almost all surgery is carried out by resident surgeons and not our GPs. The invaluable resource of our having four resident specialists at Berri, with the prospect of a terrific regional facility, outweighs the benefits of well-staffed but underutilised peripheral hospitals.

Yours faithfully,

Stuart Andrew.

That is from a man who I think is the president of the local branch of the Liberal Party—or he may have been; he may not be now. He probably will not be in the future, but nonetheless he has been.

That is not all I am aware of. I am also aware of other positive comments about the country health plan. For example, in the member for Schubert's electorate, the *Barossa and Light Herald* of 11 June 2008 carried the headline 'Hospital back on the agenda: the state government to fund business case for study for new regional hospital'. The member for Schubert said he was pleased to see the hospital plans move forward. In the member for MacKillop's—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, we had trouble yesterday, Ivan. We don't need to go there again. In the member for MacKillop's electorate, from the Mallee area, *The Border Times* of 12 June carried the headline 'No change for hospitals'. Chair of the Mallee Health Service Board, Kathleen Gregurke, said the three sites listed as GP Plus emergency hospitals was nothing different from before as they had already moved to this type of model. She believes the very positive impact for the Mallee residents is the large rebuilding of services at Berri and the addition of services to the Murray Bridge hospital. And I quote:

For us the outcomes of the budget are positive with no negative impacts. It is business as usual, but in a way we have increased services. If someone wanted a hip replacement 20 years ago they would have to go to the city, whereas now they will be able to go to Berri, closer to home.

She continues:

I am really quite positive, because the Liberals were saying small hospitals would close and we aren't.

The *South Eastern Times* of 10 June reports 'Enhanced services for Millicent hospital'. Even the member for MacKillop said he was pleased that the services would not be cut from Naracoorte and Millicent hospitals. In the electorate of Chaffey the *Murray Pioneer* of 12 June reports—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I know they're excited about this; this is such good news, Mr Speaker, but I think if they just listen to the facts. The *Murray Pioneer* of 12 June reports:

New operating theatres, a new obstetrics unit and a new accident and emergency room are among the features of this expansion.

This is under the headline: 'Berri's \$41 million hospital expansion'. The story continues:

This redevelopment will see beds increase from 44 to 65 and means country communities in the Riverland will be able to access more health services closer to where they live, so over time they will no longer need to travel to Adelaide for health care services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In the member for Stuart's electorate, I am glad to say that some parts of the media do understand the plan and are scotching some of the nonsense put about by the member for Bragg. *The Burra Broadcast*, that wonderful journal, on 12 June under the headline 'Hospital to stay' reports:

I have it on good authority that nursing staff are delighted to be keeping their jobs after Minister Hill said that no country hospital would be forced to close.

We move now to the members for Flinders and Giles.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What is happening on the Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Eyre Peninsula, thank you very much—I know you have a keen interest in the Eyre Peninsula. In the *Adelaide Now* website Dr Scott Lewis of Wudinna comments:

Did the reporters actually read the health plan before writing this article or do they just accept the inaccurate scaremongering that is going on? To say that country hospitals would do nothing but basic first-aid is grossly misleading.

There is that word again, Ivan.

Most country hospitals such as mine will see little to no change in services.

That is not from me; that is from the doctor who runs the service at Wudinna. On local ABC radio, Wendy Holman, Acting Chairperson of the Lower Eyre Health Services, Cummins and Tumby Bay said:

Well, I have already been made aware that the community has reacted fairly strongly because they have the idea that the hospital in Cummins is going to close—

and where would they have got that idea from—

That is not our understanding. There will be a change to services over time which we do not know exactly how much that time involves and we are going to ask those questions. The community itself I guess has got a bit of information directly from the media and I know that some of the media has been related to the opposition's statement on the whole issue, so therefore I would caution being a little bit careful as to what it actually means without having the full picture of what is happening to our services.

The *Whyalla News* of 9 June headline reads: 'Whyalla hospital gets \$15 million funding boost'. On 12 June the editorial said:

This means an increase in services that patients now have to travel to Adelaide to receive. There is no doubt that this is a good thing.

The page 1 story had a quote from local councillor and hospital board member, Merton Hodge, who said:

I think it is a very important announcement and a good announcement. It is very vital for any services that will benefit country areas to be introduced. It stops people from having to go to Adelaide which is very expensive, and opening up these services in Whyalla means that people from the west coast, for example, can get there much quicker.

Again, on 12 June:

Whyalla Hospital funding to establish oncology treatment centre. The \$15 million extra capital funding will upgrade the hospital so it will provide more general surgery, high dependency emergency care, specialist services and more, and the new capital works will also help build an oncology unit and provide chemotherapy and other cancer treatment to the region.

We know the study last year showed a high incidence of cancer in the Whyalla area. One of the things that we wanted to do was to increase the level of service in this area.

AMBULANCE FEES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Did the minister take into consideration the extra burden of transport costs, particularly ambulance fees, when reviewing the Country Health Care Plan when he approved an increase last week in the ambulance fees as published in the *Gazette*? The new charges as published in the *Gazette* last week are: emergency 1 callout fee \$712; emergency 2 callout fee \$513; non-emergency fee \$158; and the per kilometre charge is now \$4.15, GST free if paid by the local patient. But \$4.15 per kilometre!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:30): Once again the Deputy Leader of the Opposition demonstrates her staggering ability to connect disparate facts and to make some sort of false point. Of course, ambulance service fees have gone up; they have gone up for everyone. We have to increase the fees so that we can sustain the ambulance service. This is a service where demand is growing. One of the consequences of the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask me a question. I am happy to answer any of your questions, but at least listen to the answer. The demand for ambulance services is increasing—that is why we have put extra resources into the budget—and, sadly, the fees have also gone up. I point out parenthetically that, if one takes out ambulance insurance, of course one does not pay those fees: one pays a small annual sum, and I would encourage everyone to do that.

Ambulance services are under increasing demand. We are restructuring the way ambulances services work to make sure that we can provide better services. But, as it relates to the country, there are three points to make. The first is that none of the emergency services in country South Australia will change. If anything, they will be improved, because we are building a state retrieval service which will reinforce the existing good emergency services there, so, that is a non-issue because it will not change. Secondly, we have 550 people from country South Australia in Adelaide hospitals on average every day of the year. That is because the services that they need cannot be obtained in the country. So, as a matter of fact, lots of people now travel to the city. Under the plan that we are proposing, there will be more services close to where people live so that there will be fewer trips by country people to the city. That will actually reduce the demand on the ambulance service.

The third point—and I had a conversation yesterday with the member for Goyder about it—concerns the review that we are doing currently of the passenger assisted transport (PAT) scheme, which has also been under increasing demand over recent years. We have been running a trial on Yorke Peninsula. The member for Goyder can tell those on the other side that it has been going very well. In fact, he came to see me yesterday—and I am sure that he will not mind my saying this since he has been on the record publicly—to ask that it be extended. We said that we would do that at least until the end of the year while we go through the proper review processes.

If we can get that trial to work on a larger scale, it will actually provide a much better country transport service for people needing medical attention. One point that I will accept in relation to this issue is that we do need to make better connections between the various communities—between the larger hospitals and the smaller towns. I agree with that, and that is one of the things that we are certainly working on.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:33): Can the Minister for Transport advise whether he is aware of the suggestions for public transport development other than those suggested by the government?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:33): I can, sir, because you would have to live under a rock somewhere not to know that just last week we announced the greatest improvements to public transport the state has ever seen, and a lot of work is going into it. It was an announcement that I must point out was met with almost universal praise.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Let me think: who opposed it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Let's see: who didn't like it? I was very disturbed to find out—in fact, I rang my chief executive that evening—that they were not our ideas at all, because the first thing that, of course, was said about our plan was by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What did he say?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Leader of the Opposition said, 'I've pretty much designed this budget.' He said, 'They are our ideas'—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What was that again?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'I've pretty much designed this budget. They are our ideas'—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: On trams it is.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Oh, on trams it is? 'They are our ideas; they will always be our ideas'—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Of course, trains; he has helped me with my next quote because, yes, it is on trains. This is what he said—and I want people to hold in their minds the

words that he said, because this Leader of the Opposition hopes that people do not remember the day before. He just hopes—

An honourable member: Because he doesn't.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Because he certainly can't himself. He said this:

We have been calling for electrification of rail for years, we said we would do it in my master plan for Adelaide, we reiterated it several times.

I thought, 'Hang on, I'm pretty sure, even though it is a bit tiresome, that I read his master plan, his press release on it, his speech on that day to the Press Club, and I do not remember it.'

There is another thing I want people to remember on this—and you know you have an opposition floundering on a bank like a gasping fish when the first thing they say about a budget is how good it is, 'It's all my idea.' Apparently it is not anymore. But remember this: the first mention of the electrification of rail is in the 2005 infrastructure plan, when we announced we would look at it. Having looked at it, I am very happy to say, three years later, that we have realised we can pay for it, and we are doing the program.

I digress to something Neil Smith, who runs Torrens Transit, says: 'Give us a better public transport system than Western Australia', which is currently considered to be the best. Here is what the master plan actually says, what this man hopes people do not remember. The press release on public transport states:

The current system is an embarrassment—

he is entitled to that view—

a comprehensive transport plan will be released in the near future.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: A plan.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: To be released.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Remember what he said: 'We said we would do it in my master plan for Adelaide.' Okay, we will go to your master plan, and here it is:

Our plan joins the needs of road users to the needs of public transport users.

I think that is very important. The roads should go to where the buses and trains are. Very important; well thought out. It states further:

If we build more tram routes they will link to all other components of transport.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, I am.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am, and as soon as you're quiet I'm going to continue, because I haven't got to the good bit yet. Remember—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Remember: he said he'd do it, and he reiterated it several times:

Our rail system needs urgent attention and already our shadow transport minister is working on options for electrification of light rail. We will announce more details of the major public transport plan in the coming months.

We told people in 2005 we were studying it. So I thought, 'Well it's not there, perhaps it was in his speech to the Press Club,' because he reiterated it over and over. Here it is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, here it is:

Extensive plans for modernising our rail fleet will be detailed in the future.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We copied it? No, we didn't copy it, we didn't release plans 'in the future'. We have released plans now; funded plans for the best public transport system in Australia. But what he does indicate that would come in their plan—and listen to this carefully because what he did say in his great visionary speech was:

The tram is here to stay, the money has been spent, but let's not make any more mistakes. Let's get our passenger transport priorities correct.

His priorities: buses, then trains, then trams. That is what we were going to get when they eventually released a policy: buses, then trains, then trams.

I thought to give him the benefit of the doubt: maybe they did it earlier, because one of the other things that he said about our budget was that we should have done this six or seven years ago, and he would have done it. We remember those glorious four weeks when he was a member of the previous government.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: He's reading our plans.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am reading your plans.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: This is fantastic.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Then why are you protesting so much?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Look up to the media.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am. I am waiting for the bit where the Leader of the Opposition actually did say, 'We said we would do it in my master plan for Adelaide.' We said, 'We would do it.' We said, 'We would do it—details to be released later.' It is a bit like the South Sea Bubble prospectus (for those who know anything about law).

But, given the benefit of the doubt, we will look at the opposition's 2002 election policy. For six or seven years we should have done it, but all we can find is \$2 million for a community bus trial. What will they do? They will do a detailed business case for electrification. It is something we started a year ago, so they had to say that, didn't they?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: William Shakespeare said it so well: methinks he doth protest too much. The truth is that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will wait. Everyone on this side feels the hurt, feels the pain. Look at the anger and feel the pain. Of course, we do know that Marty did believe that we should look even more closely—sorry, the Leader of the Opposition. I apologise and withdraw.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I have a point of order. Mr Speaker, the minister spent most of this morning asking you to correct members on this side for using inappropriate titles. Since the minister has just called me Marty—mind you, I love him being cuddly like that—I ask you to correct him. He cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have apologised already.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. I uphold the point of order. All members know to refer to members by their titles, not their names, whether it be their Christian name or surname.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I did apologise, sir. I will refer to him as the Leader of the Opposition and I pray he stays Leader of the Opposition for as long as is humanly possible. Since Thursday last week, when these were all his good ideas and his budget, he has probably had a think about it and thought, 'That's probably not the best line to run on a government budget.' Now he is saying, 'They are my ideas, but they are bad ones.' At least we are getting a little insight into his condition. 'These are all my ideas but they are terrible!' What we do know now is that, while they are his ideas, he does not like them anymore because there will be no tram extensions anywhere. That is what we now know.

The proposition of the Leader of the Opposition is that there should not be a tram extension to the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, because the only reason we intend to build it is that two weeks ago—one week before the budget—the Treasurer went to the entertainment centre and found that parking was free, so came to me and said, 'Quick, build a bloody tram extension. Damn it, they are parking for free!' Can I say that Kevin would have thought of something cheaper, like those little boxes where you buy tickets. He would have thought of something cheaper.

What a dopey comment! But he has said 'no more tram extensions'. I do not know what Rob Gerard will think about that. I would think there would be a bit of value added to that Clipsal site as a result of a tram extension. No doubt, the Leader of the Opposition will be having that conversation soon.

We also heard a lot from the Leader of the Opposition about how we say something and then do not do it. We know that he opposed the tram extension and we know he opposes all the new tram extensions. It is interesting to go back to 1997.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You know you are going well when members opposite mention the State Bank. This document states:

To progress our bold plans to achieve the highest standard of transport services, a Liberal government over the next four years will prepare a 10-year investment plan to do [inter alia] the construction of a new rail link to Football Park and the shopping centre at West Lakes...and an extension of the tramline north of Victoria Square.

Mr Speaker, it is an interesting date—

Mr Pisoni: What were you saying about the GST about that time?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Oh, I don't know; I was always a Keating fan! Mr Speaker, I just want people to remember this: the next time this guy goes out and says, 'I've already said this,' go and check, because this bloke—I am sorry, the Leader of the Opposition—believes that everyone has got an attention span as long as his, which is about as long as a goldfish's, as far as I can ascertain. I do not mean to be mean to him, but his reply speech today was the most unpleasant pile of personal invective. I guess that, when you steal a bloke's ideas, he thinks that is the way you behave, but you just cannot make it up. People will check. Believe it or not, I will check. People will check.

The truth is that the first people to put electrification of rail on the agenda was us in 2005 in the Infrastructure Plan. In 2008, to have a fully-funded program to give us what one independent person says will be the best public transport in Australia, I think is good government, it is good policy, and I am sorry it was not their idea.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Health. Which of the four general hospitals in the Country Health Care Plan will my constituents of Snowtown be expected to access for their general surgery and specialist services? Snowtown, and many other towns in my electorate, are over three hours from any of the general hospitals announced in the plan and have no access to public transport. The plan claims that the four general hospitals will 'allow some services country people currently access in Adelaide to be provided at a country general hospital reducing the distance country people need to travel'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:47): I am prepared. I found this map at home from the days when I used to go camping and the population of South Australia was then 880,000, but the map does have the same towns on it. In relation to Snowtown, I draw the attention of the house to an article in *The Australian* of a few days ago which indicated that there were very few services now in Snowtown. So, where would someone go now if they lived in Snowtown for anything that was at all significant? They would probably go to Adelaide. However, under the plan that we are proposing, they would be some 40 kilometres or so away from Clare, which will be a country community hospital with expanded services. They would be slightly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am sorry?

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Haven't you read the plan?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have, indeed. We are putting a country community hospital in Clare. They would be reasonably—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome will come to order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I actually cannot hear the honourable member's interjection, but I think the basis of it is that Clare would have reduced services; well, he is wrong. Under our proposal, Clare would be a country community hospital and have expanded services. I think the problem is that the opposition has got so caught up with its own rhetoric about this that it does not understand what is in the plan. We are saying that we will have four major general teaching hospitals across South Australia, and then there will be a dozen hospitals in the larger communities that will have expanded services, and Clare will be one of those.

My guess would be that that is the closest, but they could also go to Port Pirie, which is a bit of a distance. Crystal Brook, of course, which will be a GP Plus, will continue while the current arrangements are in place. I would say that there are a range of places where people could go where they would have better access to health services than they have now. That is the big point I think people in the country need to really look at. They should not listen to the rhetoric of the other side, which is trying to score political points for its own benefit in terms of winning votes in the country, but actually look at what this plan does.

It means that 85 per cent of country people will have access to better hospital services within an hour of where they live, and 96 per cent of country people will have better access to hospital services within 90 minutes of where they live. I invite people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the deputy leader for a second time and I warn the member for Hammond. There is a big difference between interjecting and trying to howl down a minister on his feet. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I repeat the point that the proposition we are putting forward for consultation at this stage does create better health institutions in the country, and the 16 or so of the hospitals which are either the general hospital or the country community hospital will have expanded acute services—expanded hospital services. What it means is that 96 per cent of people right across country South Australia (and that includes the most remote parts of the state) will be within 90 minutes of better hospital services and 85 per cent will be within an hour of better services. That seems to me better than having to travel to Adelaide. Now, 550 people have to travel to Adelaide to get access to services. Under our strategy they will not get all the services in the country—I am not pretending that for a moment—but they will get better services in the country.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome) (14:50): I have a supplementary question. I ask the minister: what extra services will be delivered at both Clare and Port Pirie? The minister's own plan identifies that Clare and Port Pirie may have a list of services which they currently already have.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:50): I think that is a fair question, because the plan does—

Mr Williams: They are all fair.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, they are not all fair questions at all. I think that is a fair question, and really that is part of the process of consultation that we need to go through, because in each of those locations—no, don't nod your head. Member for Frome, the point I make is we—

Mr Williams interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This is a 10 year plan, which was the point I made in the beginning, and the point that Mr Andrew made in his letter to the paper. This is a 10 year plan. Nothing is going to change overnight. We want to build up services in those communities over time. Obviously, now that we are going through the detailed planning process, we need to work with the communities about the cocktail of services that best suit the needs of the community. They will change over time as the community ages, as people are more likely to have children, or whatever the needs of a particular community are.

But let me give you a flavour for the services that we would want to offer—and improved services in these areas. In Port Pirie, for example, in the country community hospital, we will enhance services in line with community needs, and this is the range of areas where we would want to improve services: obstetrics, surgery, acute medical inpatient beds, 24 hour emergency response, voluntary mental health admissions on site, community-based mental health care, primary care, palliative care, day rehab and early childhood services. That will be for the Mid North area and that will relate to all the other hospitals, also, and we will expand services there as we can, as the capacity is made available from the overall budget that we have. In relation to Clare, essentially the same kind of smorgasbord of services would be put in there.

But, of course, you cannot do all of the good things and none of the difficult things. You have to do it all, and it has to be managed over time. This is why we are talking to the community about how various bits of it will fit into the overall strategy and the time frame for bringing those services into the community. The overall goal or strategy is to improve services for country people so that fewer of them have to go to the city. We want to improve primary health care services for country people, because we know the primary health of people in the country is not as good as it is in the city. There is a range of reasons for that, but more people in the country smoke, more people in the country are obese, and there is a whole range of other factors.

There being a disturbance in the Speaker's gallery:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I hear laughter from the gallery. Let me point out the statistics that we have, and I am happy to have them checked. In relation to diabetes, for example, a regular self-reporting survey undertaken by the SA health department shows that 1 in 11 people living in the country are being diagnosed with diabetes. That is compared to 1 in 15 in the metropolitan area, and that relates to a whole range of factors, but access to primary health care is one of the factors.

The obesity epidemic among children will exacerbate: we know that. The number of South Australians who are obese has almost doubled, rising from 11.5 per cent in 1996 to 22 per cent in 2006—these are statistics that are done on the basis of objective research—and obesity is ahead of tobacco as the number one preventable cause of death in South Australia. In the country the obesity rate is almost 6 per cent greater than in metropolitan Adelaide—25 per cent compared to 19 per cent.

In relation to smoking (this survey was done in 2007), 18.2 per cent of people in Adelaide smoked and in the country it was 24.2 per cent. So, the health circumstances in the country are not as good as the circumstances of people in the city.

This government's goal is to improve health services for country people, because we think that at the moment country people have a second-class health system. I think that if those who are attacking this plan are really saying, 'We want to keep the status quo,' they are demonstrating on the other side that they are true conservatives. They want to maintain things as they are. The hard decisions that improve circumstances and improve the health of country people are something they do not want to embrace because that will upset their political applecarts. It takes courage and bravery to take on these issues, and that is what we are doing.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (14:55): My question is also to the Minister for Health. Which of the four general hospitals in the country health plan will my constituent, who lives in Mannum who has a heart condition and who should not live more than 20 minutes from a hospital go to, now that the hospital will be turned into a GP Plus centre?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:56): The point I—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Our proposition is that, in the Mallee/Coorong area, a country health hospital will be established at Murray Bridge. Also, of course, the Berri Hospital will be re-established. A broader range of services will be provided at the Murray Bridge Hospital. Karoonda, Lameroo, Pinnaroo, Mannum, Meningie, Tailem Bend, and so on, will provide emergency responses in line with community needs. So, in terms of emergencies, services will be provided there. There will be more services in some of the other hospitals, which I have described, which will be able to look after people situated at Mannum.

I say to the member that what we need to do and what we are attempting to do over the next six weeks—and, indeed, over the next number of years—is to work with the doctors and communities in those country towns to establish the best pathway for them so that we can build this set of connections to help that community. I would say to the member: think about it rather than react so aggressively before you have been through the consultation process.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Health. What do I tell a mother of a six year old child with asthma living in Bordertown (it is near the Victorian border on your map there, John) who may need urgent emergency treatment for the condition, now that the hospital in Bordertown will be downgraded to a GP centre? Currently, patients such as the one I referred to are treated at their local hospital in Bordertown, which is within 10 minutes. For emergency cases time is critical, and children such as this will be at least an hour from the closest hospital at Naracoorte.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:58): Of course, if what the member said were true, that would be a difficulty. But it is not true. We will not be changing the emergency services. How many times do I have to say it? We will be sustaining and building on the emergency services. Reality and facts just do not come into it. The emergency services will not be changed.

The argument put by the opposition that there will be no emergency services is plainly not true. However, if it was an absolute emergency—a red hot emergency—what would happen is what would happen now: a helicopter or a plane would come and take the child to an Adelaide hospital. That is what happens now in country SA, and we want to build up the services so there is more of a chance that a broader range of country hospitals would be able to supply that service.

Let me give another example to the member for MacKillop in relation to, say, chemotherapy at Penola. Chemotherapy services will be increased in the four country hospitals. South Australia's Health Care Plan will build on a chemotherapy project that is already upskilling and training country health practitioners, so that chemotherapy will be more readily available to patients in rural and regional locations. For example, currently—

Mr WILLIAMS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am not medically trained, but I do not know what chemotherapy has to do with asthma.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The Minister for Health was answering the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member was asking a hypothetical question about the delivery of services to patients in the country. I am giving a different hypothetical about a different service, but the point is precisely the same. Let me give you an example. Currently, a patient from Penola—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Tell her the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —who may—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport will come to order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A hypothetical question: a patient who might live in Penola who needs chemotherapy services would now have to travel four hours to Adelaide for specialist-based chemotherapy services. That is what they would have to do now. It is our intention under the Country Health Care Plan that this patient would be able to have treatment in Millicent or Mount Gambier with the expansion of the services. That is only 35 minutes from home. That is the kind of example that I can give you about where the services will be improved. In relation to emergencies, there will be no negative change.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:01): What provision has the Minister for Health made for an increase in the passenger assisted transport scheme for rural residents who will have to travel further under his country health plan? Where a country resident has to travel and stay overnight for health services, what provision has the minister made for extra accommodation allowance? The opposition is aware of a South-East man who has been sent a cheque for \$1 under the PAT scheme. He has had surgery at Mount Gambier and has had to travel to Adelaide twice for follow-up treatment.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:01): The member for Hammond was not in breach of the standing orders by referring to the Minister for Transport as the owner of that scheme. The passenger assisted transport scheme is under enormous pressure, as we all know. A range of things—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, they are the rules that were in place when you were in government. If you didn't change it when you were in government, I think it is a bit rich attacking us for not having changed it either. We are actually trying to change it. As I pointed out earlier, the member for Goyder came to see me yesterday about a trial which is working on the Yorke Peninsula and which is actually providing more transport opportunities to a broader range of people who are currently not covered by the PAT scheme.

The point in relation to the PAT scheme is that we will try to expand it. The commonwealth government has announced that it is looking into it as well, so I hope there are more resources available for people because I realise that it is an issue. The reality is that, if we put more health services in country South Australia, fewer people will have to travel to Adelaide so there will be less need for long-distance travel and less need for overnight accommodation. It will not disappear but there will be less pressure on families to travel. That is what our commitment is; that is what we want to work with the community to achieve.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Health. When a young child in Marion Bay on Yorke Peninsula falls and needs emergency surgery, where will the parents take the child and, if road ambulance transport is not available, will the minister give an assurance that an air ambulance retrieval will be made available at no additional cost?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:03): That is precisely the arrangement, as I understand it, that is in place now. The hypothetical question that the member is asking is based on the assumption that there will be a reduction in emergency services in country South Australia. That is categorically not true, and I give an absolute undertaking that we will not reduce emergency services in country South Australia. We want to strengthen the emergency services in country South Australia.

We have embarked on the development of a state retrieval service, because at the moment we have a number of separate trauma services in South Australia which do not operate at optimum level. We want to integrate them and we want to make sure that the ambulance service, the flying doctor service and the two trauma services at Flinders and Adelaide are integrated in such a way that we can provide a broader range of services to people in the country and to all people in South Australia. That is what we are attempting to achieve and that is the basis of this plan.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:04): I have a supplementary question. By virtue of his answer, can the Minister for Health assure that there will be no reduction in the number of GPs within regional South Australia to provide emergency services?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:04): Come in spinner. I apologise to my colleague who wants me to speed up, but there is absolutely no way I can let that pass without giving a full and frank explanation to the house. The idea that I somehow or other control GP—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, I know; I understand that. The idea that the state government controls the supply of general practitioners to country South Australia is an absurd one. We attempt to help by funding the Rural Doctors Workforce Agency—\$15 million over the next three years. Let me tell the house about the current arrangements in country South Australia in relation to doctors.

There are currently shortages of medical practitioners in country Australia and South Australia and, like many other jurisdictions, we recruit from overseas. Currently in country South Australia there are 445 doctors in general practice; 296 of those have full registration allowing them to practise as general practitioners; 34 are resident specialists, which means they provide a series of specialist services; but approximately 23 per cent of the total (that is, 104 doctors) in country Australia are overseas trained doctors, and some of these can practise only in limited geographical areas due to the limitations placed on their entry visas by the federal government.

The Country Health Care Plan will make no difference to these arrangements whatsoever. The only reason that we have doctors in many small remote country communities is that they are conscripted there as a result of the immigration arrangements that have been put in place. I think it is shameful, but that is nonetheless the reality of it.

We do not currently produce enough doctors in Australia, as a result of federal government policy to reduce the number of doctors-in-training places and to restrict the Medicare arrangements. Fortunately, the Howard government in its last year increased the number of training places. That will, over time, have an impact, but not in the short term.

We also know that something like 40 or 45 per cent of clinicians in South Australia will retire in the next 15 years. That puts enormous pressure on the supply of doctors at a time when the demand is going up. So that is why we have problems getting access to GPs, not because of actions by this government. Of the 43 hospitals which will become GP Plus emergency hospitals, all are designated as areas of need for the purpose of priority placement of doctors.

All those GP Plus hospitals are designated as areas of need. Of these 43 sites, 29 are designated as districts of workforce shortage by the commonwealth. This means that they can recruit international medical graduates for those areas with limited registration to work only in that area. That is how the system is being worked now: 13 sites already have overseas trained doctors with limited registration, making a total of 18 such doctors.

I could go on, Mr Speaker. I will not, but let me say that the issue of the supply of GPs, I believe, will be strengthened by our plan because, with larger training centres—all of these general hospitals will become training hospitals or teaching hospitals—more doctors will be able to train in the country, and we know that if people train in the country they are more likely to pursue careers in the country.

If they are more likely to have support, they are more likely to have interesting and complex cases. That is what is going to make reform happen in the country; that is what is going to deliver more doctors to country South Australia.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (15:07): I direct my question to the Minister for Health. I ask the minister which of the four general hospitals in the Country Health Care Plan will service the mining industries and isolated communities such as Andamooka and Leigh Creek—

Mr Koutsantonis: That's in South Australia, Marty.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —now that Andamooka and Leigh Creek will be reduced to fly-in/fly-out services. I point out to the minister—he does not need to look at his map—that Leigh Creek is 150 kilometres north of Hawker.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Can I say to the Deputy Premier, I can fly into both of those areas without a map. I bet he can't.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I know the Minister for Health—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart will take his seat. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:08): I have to take issue with the member for Stuart. I am sure the Deputy Premier could fly, but I doubt if he could land, though, without help. In relation to the question about mining, Roxby Downs of course is going to be subject to huge growth, as we know, and there is a lot of planning around that particular community—we comment in this report about that—but our intention would be, over time, to expand the services in Roxby Downs.

Leigh Creek, for example, has 11 beds, and I am told that on average it has a 12 per cent occupancy rate, that is, 1.3 people on average in that hospital. Over half the hospitals in our state, of course, have fewer than six patients on average in attendance on any given night and six hospitals have fewer than one, so we are providing a lot of resources to some communities which are not actually using them.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As I said to the member for MacKillop any number of times, you can put any questions you want to me and I will attempt to answer them. I am currently answering the member for Stuart's question. Under our plan, of course, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Roxby Downs hospitals will be strengthened, so there will be major improvements to the services for people in that part of country South Australia.

MOUNT BARKER HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why is the Mount Barker Hospital to be downgraded under the government's country health plan when it has to take additional patients from Gumeracha and Mount Pleasant and has the fastest-growing population in the state?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:11): I thank the member for her question, but I would like her to point out to me where in this document that is said.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No; I did not say where the hospital is; I said where in the document is the claim that she makes? Just point out to me in the document where the claim that you made is, because it is not in there. In our plan, we have identified three hospitals in what we describe as peri-urban areas—I think most geographers would call them peri-urban—Mount Barker, Gawler and Victor Harbor. All of those areas are growth areas: the population in those districts is expanding, and we will have to put more services into those—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Each of those communities is expanding, and we will have to increase the level of service. In our country health plan we have noted that, and we have said that we will have to work on it as the population expands. They are each linked to a major metropolitan hospital, each of which is being developed at the moment. We want to make sure that our planning is appropriate to the growth of those communities. We will do a lot more work on those three, including Mount Barker.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome) (15:12): I did not see a lot of government members out there on the steps of Parliament House at 1 o'clock. What we saw out there today was a perfect opportunity for the minister and his colleagues actually to hear what country people really think of his country health plan. I am not so sure if the minister has a version that has been doctored by the bureaucracy, because today he kept saying things which are not consistent with what is in the publicly released plan, and that is obvious when you look at what services will be available in places such as Port Pirie and Clare.

Today we heard five speakers out there who very eloquently put forward the opinion of country people. Alison Edwards, who is a rural doctor at Port Broughton, has made her disgust very evident through the media over the last week or so. She is running a smallish hospital at Port

Broughton. If you look at a place like Port Broughton, as Alison knows, many people have invested and bought their houses there because it has a working hospital. Well, Port Broughton might not be any orphan but, like many of the other 40 hospitals, it is at real risk of losing its doctors.

It is all right for the minister to say that emergency services will remain in those 40-odd hospitals, but he has given absolutely no guarantee that those hospitals will have doctors, and he has given no indication whatsoever of what backup is available and whether, if any of those hospitals lose their doctors, they will not close as working hospitals.

Steve Holmes also spoke. He is the President of the Rural Doctors Association of South Australia. Steve is a GP at Clare and, like Alison, he very accurately portrayed the situation of the doctors involved. Steve is in one of those areas where the minister says that we are going to have all these extra services. If you look at the hospitals that will be downgraded around Clare, and then look at Clare Hospital, and if you look at the number of beds that will be closed in those feeder hospitals and add them to what has already been dealt with in Clare, you will see that there are not enough beds in Clare. If you go to Port Pirie you will see the same situation: there are not enough beds in Port Pirie, and there is no budgetary consideration whatsoever to increase the number of beds in those areas.

It is all right for the minister to say that we have got about 0.6 of a bed here and 0.6 of a bed there, but the overall situation is such that the number of beds he is closing is way over the actual numbers that are spare at any of the 11 facilities that he says have been upgraded. The health plan does not say 'upgraded'. The health plan actually says that they may keep some of the services they currently have. I do not know how that is an upgrade; I cannot see that at all.

Peter Sharley spoke on behalf of the state AMA and Peter Rischbieth, who is the national President of the Rural Doctors Association, also spoke. These guys really understand the situation. They have worked hard, not only in their own communities, but they have got out there and represented country people on a state and national stage to ensure that our interests are looked after. Helen Colliver, who is the President of Women in Agriculture and Business, spoke very well on behalf of country women and how they feel about what the minister is trying to do.

There is great concern out there. It was obvious from the number who had driven a long way and from the number of buses that came to Adelaide that these people are very fearful of what services are going to be available in their towns. They are worried about their own health, they are worried about their parents in many cases, their children and their grandchildren. This government has deserted them.

The minister tries to make light of it but, fair dinkum, there are 40-odd towns out there that are at real risk of losing their hospital, because one thing that the minister has not explained is why doctors will stay if he closes a lot of services. Some will stay through pure loyalty, but doctors are there to provide a range of services. All of a sudden most of those services are going to be taken from them and, quite frankly, this government is just trading on the good faith of those doctors who will stay, take a cut in income, not be able to do what they have trained to do and just sit there and help the government out with 24-hour emergency services. It just will not happen. We will lose many doctors from those hospitals. If we lose doctors out of those 43 hospitals, the government has not made clear what its back-up plan is to ensure that those hospitals do not actually have to close.

VIBE ALIVE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:17): I acknowledge that parliament meets on the traditional land of the Kaurna people and, in this time between Reconciliation Week and NAIDOC Week, I would like to advise the house of a great event recently held in Murray Bridge and a forthcoming event to be held in Port Augusta. Both are the result of a great organisation called Vibe Alive. The Murray Bridge event was a Vibe 3on3 event featuring basketball and a hip hop challenge. It was my pleasure to attend on behalf of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. It was held on 10 and 11 May at Murray Bridge High School. This was the sixth visit to Murray Bridge and a record crowd was on hand for the activities.

Vibe 3on3 has been to many locations in its eight-year history. Communities that have been included are Alice Springs, Broome, Kalgoorlie, Nhulunbuy, Mildura, Coober Pedy, Kununurra and Weipa. All the communities visited have enjoyed the event immensely and all have asked for Vibe to come back to them. Participants register on the day and are provided a healthy breakfast and a barbeque lunch on both days. Local key agencies are involved in getting the word around to

the communities so that everyone can come along. Teams are made up of three to four participants and all receive a gift pack on registration.

I was able to meet Vibe Australia's managing director, Gavin Jones, and his fantastic team on the day, after being made aware of Vibe's activities by the producer, Mayrah Butt, who is a dynamic person and who is also involved in the New South Wales Calisthenics Association. I take a moment to congratulate her on her role in that sport's showcase event last weekend.

There is really good news now for Port Augusta because Vibe Alive will be in town between 3 and 4 September, which is not far away now. Vibe Australia is an Aboriginal media, communications and event agency that publishes the magazines *Deadly Vibe* and *In Vibe* and produces the *Deadly Sounds* radio program and the Deadly Awards and also looks after the website vibe.com.au. It also runs Vibe 3on3, which is in its ninth year nationally.

Vibe's objectives are to encourage young indigenous people to participate in healthy team-building activities and encourage young people to express themselves as a means of building self-esteem. It also provides a means for young people from different indigenous communities to come together, learn about each other and to have some fun. It provides a positive forum in which people can discuss health, social and lifestyle issues and encourages the cultural development of young people in the community. It also promotes reconciliation at a local level. Various indigenous role models attend each Vibe event. Their roles are to speak at the opening ceremony, award prizes and also to spend time with the young people of the community and encourage them to reach their full potential.

Previous Vibe role models include Olympic hurdler, Kyle Vander-Kuyp; high profile footballers, Nathan Blacklock and Preston Campbell; former Harlem Globetrotter, Dwayne Cross; and Vibe's very own in-house uber role model, Claude Williams.

Vibe Alive is a festival for young people of all backgrounds, promoting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island cultures, encouraging tolerance and team work and celebrating what it really means to be a proud Aussie. It is a perfect place to catch up with friends from all over the area and to make new ones.

Vibe Australia involves participants in music, sport, art and dance in a high energy, youthful, friendly setting. Participants have the opportunity to meet their role models, learn about healthy living and career options and boost literacy and numeracy skills. Every Vibe event promotes a healthy lifestyle, free from drug and alcohol abuse and misuse. They are smoke-free and encourage completion of a full secondary education.

Vibe Australia is committed to increasing training and employment opportunities, and encourages all young Australians to reach their full potential. Vibe welcomes everyone—indigenous and non-indigenous, students, teachers, parents, extended family members, community and youth groups, government and non-government organisations—so it will be a packed venue; and I hope the weather is kind for everyone who participates at Port Augusta Central Oval.

Teams of eight boys or girls or teams of four of each gender will compete in three divisions for years 5 to 6, 7 to 8 and 9 to 10. Teams will compete in all areas—sports, dance, singing and art—and take part in healthy workshops, careers expos and spelling bees in order to earn points for the chance of winning great prizes.

I hope all members will do their best to get involved with the Vibe activities this year. It is not something that is local to the city area. Of course, as we know, these sorts of events are held in the city far more regularly but, as someone who has attended events at Port Augusta and Murray Bridge on more than one occasion, I commend it to everyone. I thank all the participants who make it such a successful event, as well as the organisers who have made it possible for so many young Australian children to have the opportunity to grow in both their sport and recreation and career objectives.

KAPUNDA HOSPITAL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) (15:22): This morning I had the opportunity to attend a large gathering of my constituents at Kapunda to discuss the Country Health Care Plan. One of the recommendations in that plan is to take obstetrics away from Kapunda. An article in *The Leader* of Wednesday 18 June headed 'State award for Kapunda Health Service' states:

The staff of the Kapunda Health Service held a morning tea on June 3 to celebrate receiving the Johnson & Johnson 2007 Midwife Hospital of the Year Award for the second time. The Kapunda Health Service has been recognised as being the maternity hospital with the best and highest ratio of midwives versus birth rate having been nominated by new mothers, their families and members of the community. The award recognises commitment to

providing a safe place, an abundance of choice and overwhelming support for women and their families. The midwives and nursing staff acknowledged past maternity clients and their families for nominations and recognition of their excellent service.

The article includes a photograph of Jo Liersch, Sharon Saegenschnitter, Sue Kelly, Deb Trotta and Sharon Steinert (from Johnson & Johnson).

This really does bring into focus the fact that thought has not been given to this proposal. This hospital is providing an excellent service and is supported by the community. In the past couple of years the community raised funds to put in a helipad. The former health minister would know that there was no government money whatsoever. The Rotary Club organised it. Members should go to the hospital to look at the honour board. On that occasion, the local doctor, Dr Lecons, made a very considered speech. He said:

In 2007, 73 babies were born at Kapunda Hospital. This will increase with time. In 2007 we performed 395 operations. The disciplines included general surgery, neurology, orthopaedics, ear, nose and throat, gynaecology and gastrology. We have an average of 10 patients a day in the hospital. We have a capacity for 24 acute inpatients if required. We provide other services, but every service that I have mentioned would be lost if the Kapunda Hospital becomes a GP Plus emergency hospital as outlined within the Country Health Care Plan.

In terms of staffing, we are very strong. Whilst there have been recent issues with the recruitment for local doctors to Kapunda, we are now in a very strong position. Amongst our GPs we have a general surgeon, three obstetricians and two anaesthetists available to us. The success of our recruitment has been entirely due to the availability of procedural work at the Kapunda Hospital.

When you have a good program and a good facility, why would you want to change it? Why would you want to change a service that has been so well supported over generations? Those communities believe that those hospitals belong to them. It was a sad day when they took away their boards, but amalgamation really meant elimination. I will make available to the minister a copy of this letter, and I mention the minister's bureaucrats, including George Beltchev. I doubt whether poor, old George, in his bureaucratic ways, can get much right. He certainly has not got this right.

I really would not give him a second chance—fail once, give someone else a go. Country people absolutely support their hospitals, and if you want to get them offside or get them stirred up, start to remove health services. I am someone who lives 650 kilometres from Adelaide; I actually understand a bit about distance. For the benefit of the minister, Leigh Creek is about 260 kilometres from Port Augusta. The other Saturday night we were at Blinman. Some lads were enjoying themselves and one fell down a pit. They had to get the ambulance and take him to the hospital at Leigh Creek because you could not have got to Hawker. Fortunately, it was so wet, the road would have been impassable. Let us just take a step backwards. Why do you want to make things difficult for people?

Time expired.

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:27): As a trade unionist, I was very pleased recently to attend two functions organised by our local trade union movement and the progressive movements in South Australia with regard to foreign aid. Both these functions were to raise money for projects in Vietnam and Timor-Leste. Members of this house would probably be aware that, over the years, the Australian Trade Union Movement, through the ACTU, has organised a number of functions (particularly redevelopment functions) through its body called APHEDA. The first function for APHEDA was directed at setting up services for AIDS and hepatitis C support treatment in Vietnam.

The night also celebrated the life of one of the Miscellaneous Workers Union organisers, Terri Daktyl, who was killed recently in a motor car accident. Terri was a trade union official more recently for the Miscellaneous Workers Union, but, over the years, she had been very active in raising money for APHEDA. She was also part of the trade union group which earlier this year cycled around Vietnam to raise money for the different APHEDA projects in Vietnam. The other function I attended, along with the member for Little Para, was also organised by a number of trade union people, and the campaign for East Timor and the Aloia Foundation were significant at that particular function.

One of the guest speakers was the recently retired president of the New South Wales Legislative Council, Dr Meredith Bergman. Not only has Dr Bergman decided to put her time in retirement into the area of overseas aid but also she has been identified as an AusAID ambassador for women. She knows the area of Timor-Leste very well and it is very close to her heart. As members in this chamber would probably know, East Timor has the highest fertility rate in the

world, around 6.7. I am not entirely sure how that rate is worked out because, as I understand it, most women have at least eight surviving children at any one time and give birth to at least 12, in many cases. As we also know, unfortunately in the undeveloped world, pregnancy and labour are still a life-threatening part of a woman's life, and those women still tend to have many children. Because of the culture and religion in many of those developing countries it is understandable, considering the mortality rate of children being very high, that one would continue to have children.

This leads me to the debate that is currently being held about access to family planning information. On one level there have been many debates within Australia but, as the Prime Minister said recently, it is important that we look at population control mechanisms. Today, I am really referring to the debate that is going on with regard to overseas aid and the guidelines that have been put on AusAID funding, as I understand it, forbidding aid being provided that gives out information on family planning services, including abortion. The people who support these guidelines tend to emphasise the issue of abortion, but, as I understand it, Senator Harradine, who was at the centre of these guidelines being put in place by the previous federal government, was referring to family planning in general and getting information. My own view is that information and services should not be tied to one person's political or ideological view of family planning. I think that is totally unacceptable.

I think that the subjects of the development aid should be able to decide how the aid is distributed wherever possible, not the giver. So, to have these strings on the overseas aid that we provide is particularly serious, in my view. Again, after the country makes a decision about overseas aid, it is also important that the people who are receiving the aid (and in this case I am particularly talking about women and children) have a choice about the information and support services that they get. By that I mean I think it is important for women to be able to aware of what family planning services are available and, if they choose, to take advantage of those services.

Time expired.

COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:32): I rise today to make a few comments about the destruction of country health as overseen by the current Labor government. I note minister Hill was quite keen to portray headlines in country papers that allegedly show that people are not upset about the Country Health Care Plan. Well, I have *The River News* of 12 June stating 'Hospital services will go' and containing the following comments:

[Rural Doctors Association of South Australia] president Dr Steve Holmes says what the South Australian government's Country Health Care Plan will really do is destroy hospital and health services in small rural communities across the state.

He says it also threatens to drive doctors and other rural health professionals out of country areas and rip the heart and soul from small towns.

Since news of the plans was released, some doctors have already threatened to leave rural towns.

Also, *The Murray Valley Standard* of Murray Bridge on 13 June stated in an article:

The Rural Doctors Association is questioning how the state government created its Country Health Care Plan, which will see six Murraylands hospitals rebadged with a new title.

The hospitals at Mannum, Meningie, Tailem Bend, Lamerook, Karoonda and Pinnaroo will become GP Plus emergency hospitals—

and I note that these are all hospitals in my electorate or servicing my electorate of Hammond—along with more than 30 hospitals across the state.

The Murray Bridge Hospital will remain the health care 'hub' for the region, as a country community hospital.

[Rural Doctors Association] of Australia president and Murray Bridge general practitioner Dr Peter Rischbieth said he was concerned about the pressure put on 'hub' hospitals to cater for patients coming from outlying areas for treatment. 'If more and more of the patients have to travel to Murray Bridge, how will that affect the workforce there,' Dr Rischbieth said. He said many South Australian doctors had called the RDA to complain about the impact of the health care plan. 'This has been devised by metropolitan bureaucrats and imposed on rural communities,' Dr Rischbieth said. 'We believe this decision has been done without proper consultation with rural clinicians.'

Dr Rischbieth and RDA of South Australia president Dr Steve Holmes met with Health Minister John Hill on Tuesday to put 11 questions to him about the consultation and decision making process that led to the plan. The RDA has given the government a week to reply to questions.

I note the heading in the *Murray Pioneer* of 11 June, 'More hurt for 'other' hospitals?'. The Minister for the River Murray, the member for Chaffey, signed off on this plan in cabinet. The article states that Berri will get a \$41 million expansion, but they will be left with bandaid centres at Waikerie, Renmark, Barmera and Loxton.

As a country member, I am really concerned about what is happening to country health in South Australia. Recently, I was very impressed when I stayed at Wilpena Pound for a couple of days. One of my lads was sick and we had to go to Hawker to seek the help of the hospital and the local doctor. There was another family there with a young lad who needed the same assistance. On a Sunday morning, a doctor who had been based at Hawker for only two weeks was more than happy to come out and provide that service. Where will that service be in the future?

I thought that was exemplary service in a country hospital—far better than that received by my father-in-law, who recently had to attend the emergency department in one of the city hospitals and wait for hours by a door that was being opened and closed all the time before he could receive proper care.

It is a fallacy to think that any of the 550 beds that are needed by country people will be taken away from the city. This measure will mean that more people will go to the city for health care. Where will the people from Clayton and Milang down on the lakes go? There will be nothing at Strathalbyn: it will be a bandaid centre. People will go to Mount Barker, and that will be overcrowded, and straight through to Adelaide.

In the Mallee there is the Australian zircon mine at Mindarie and there is the mine at Strathalbyn. They are heavy industries, and there will be no hospitals in sight. There will be a bandaid hospital at Strathalbyn, and Karoonda basically will be shut down to become an aged-care centre. How will we attract doctors to the bush? We have had plenty of trouble in the Mallee in recent years in attracting people to Pinnaroo, Lameroo and Karoonda, where we have excellent services. With the downgrading of services, will we see it in the future?

Time expired.

PENSIONS

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley) (15:37): Today I rise to speak on the matter of pensions and the interface between the Italian and Australian pensions. In doing so, I acknowledge that many members of the community are struggling to cope with the increased cost of living, and this is particularly difficult for pensioners, whose fixed incomes do not cope with the rising costs of living and the CPI.

I know this from firsthand experience. My parents are aged pensioners, and I have met with many constituents, including one this morning who told me that the Australian aged pension barely covers basic expenses. It is a subject about which I have written to the federal minister many times.

Thankfully, some of our citizens who migrated to this country are able to supplement their pension by claiming another pension from their country of origin, such as Italy. INPS, the Italian equivalent of Centrelink, provides a pension payment to those who contributed to Italy throughout their working lives. The Italian government does a commendable job in supporting its senior citizens, both those residing in Italy and those living abroad. I understand that about 50,000 Italian-Australians living in Australia (obviously) receive the Italian pension, for which they are very grateful.

However, a problem has arisen for hundreds of constituents who are fortunate to receive both pensions. For recipients of the Italian pensions on very low incomes, the Italian government offers an additional pension payment. Translated, we will call it an integration payment. This integration payment is currently means tested at the level of about \$9,600 per single pension. This means that if someone makes less than \$9,600 they receive the whole amount of the integration payment. If they receive an income between \$9,600 and \$19,202, I believe, their integration payment is likely to be reduced, and if they make more than \$19,202 they receive no integration payment although they still get some pension.

Why does any of this matter? It matters because in 2000, with the introduction of the GST, the federal government introduced the Pension Basic Supplement—an additional \$15.30 per fortnight, at that time, or nearly \$400 a year for pensioners. I understand it is currently about \$18.80 per fortnight. While it is rare to encounter a constituent who is complaining about an increase in payment, the GST supplement has ironically left many constituents financially worse off. How? The

additional \$400 a year payment has resulted in these constituents' income rising above the threshold cap for the Italian government and, as a result, they have lost a significant portion of their Italian pension. They also have to pay back quite a significant debt which has been accumulated.

In 2003, INPS sent letters to those who were overpaid to start paying back many years worth of overpayments. Despite the fact that it has taken the Italian government many years to notice the overpayments, it is now demanding pensioners pay back large sums of money and, in some cases, many thousands of dollars. I have been informed that about 10,000 Australians, as at February 2008, are affected by the situation.

I acknowledge that my constituents are fortunate to receive two pensions. However, in my view, they have been caught in an administrative bungle whereby a helping hand from the federal government is now causing a financial hardship. A possible solution lies in amending the definition of the payment from 'supplement' to 'allowance' which means it would not be treated as income. It is also worth noting that I am not alone in seeking the need for reform. Mr Vincenzo Papandrea, the President of COMITES and President of Patronato Inca-CGIL in Adelaide, has appealed to the Italian government in a case in which he is asking to review the pension of a client based on the claim that any payments as supplement should not be considered part of the income.

I intend to write to the federal Minister for Human Services, Senator Joe Ludwig, asking him to investigate this matter and I look forward to him looking upon this matter favourably.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (POLICE SUPERANNUATION) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 29 April 2008. Page 2956.)

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

We reject the amendments which, in effect, provide for the board to nominate a class or combination of class of investments based on ethical investments and saying that consideration of the impact of the investments on society and the environment be made available to members. We reject that. That is a very broad definition of what might be an ethical fund. I accept that there is a growing view amongst people that they would like to have access to ethical funds. That may be something that the government will consider at some further point.

We would possibly give consideration to having a product available for members should they want a particular ethical fund but, given the problems in creating an ethical fund (by definition, what is ethical and what is not) and given that the success of Funds SA and the whole scope of merging various funds into Funds SA is to give us some scale for purchase—remember, Funds SA is a manager of managers and we have conservative, growth, balanced and cash funds—to try to configure an ethical fund from the available products is not something that I am particularly keen on doing.

Having said that, I am looking at whether or not we can make a product available through Super SA, whether there are options available to us, so, short of creating such a product ourselves, we are looking at whether or not we can contract with a current provider of an ethical fund that can be utilised or purchased through Funds SA or Super SA. Therefore I reject the amendments.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I wish to make a brief contribution to this motion. When this was debated in the house, the Police Association was keen for the bill as presented to be supported and that is why we did not move any amendments to it. It was during the debate in the other place that the Hon. Mark Parnell moved these amendments. After ongoing discussion within the Liberal Party, it was decided at that time to support the amendments as they related to ethical and superannuation options.

I remember that debate occurred in the house when the member for Ashford moved that the Economic and Finance Committee investigate options for ethical superannuation. Being part of that committee, I have had the opportunity to review the reply to that suggestion. I am unsure who they came from, but two letters were provided to the Economic and Finance Committee that alluded to the fact that, as part of the review of managers of the various funds under the control of Funds SA and Super SA, consideration should be given in some cases to the ethics involved in the various companies that they might decide to pursue and for fund options.

Based on previous discussions with Mr Pryor from Super SA, I understand that less than, I think, 2 per cent of people who are members of the Triple S superannuation scheme actually

decide consciously to make an investment choice. Most choose the default option, which is a middle of the range risk approach. I am aware also of a poll being conducted by which people could seek the opportunity for an ethical option within the government superannuation scheme, and a reasonable number of acknowledgements were made on that website.

Certainly from the discussions that I have had since the amendments were supported in the other place, we acknowledge that the government has some concerns about this. The Treasurer has pointed out that there is a cost associated with following this option, and potentially that cost would have to be borne by all members of Triple S and other government superannuation schemes. I am pleased, though, to hear that the Treasurer will ensure that some investigation takes place to provide an option for ethical superannuation in the future. However, in considering all these issues and given the importance within the Police Association for the bill to be passed through parliament as quickly as possible, the opposition has decided not to debate the point and it will support the government in its position at this stage. We look forward to a further review in the future.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I thank the member for that. I had better retract my earlier comments about the amendments and the quality of the legislative output of the upper house. In this instance, it was bad.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS (ANIMAL WELFARE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly without any amendment.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (DRUG DETECTION POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (VICTIMS OF CRIME) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 10.30am on Thursday 19 June 2008 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the 1st floor of the Legislative Council.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2008) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2008. Page 3508.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:55): I am the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition on this bill. It is a pleasure to provide a brief contribution and recognise that this is part of the reforms announced by the Treasurer in the budget on 5 June. It is fair to say that his changes to the first home bonus grant are important ones for all young people in South Australia who are looking to achieve that dream of owning their own home.

There is immense financial pressure, there is no doubt about that, and it is certainly a concern for all in this house as to where the next generation of property owners will come from, with the amazing increases that we have had in valuations over the last few years. That stimulates a lot of opportunity but it puts enormous pressure upon our young people to actually endeavour to own a home.

The change, as I understand it, will increase the threshold to \$400,000, for the full amount of \$4,000 of the bonus to apply, and then on a gradually sliding scale to \$450,000 with a loss of \$8 per \$100 expended above the \$400,000. I think that is how it is calculated.

We have done some comparisons between the South Australian scheme and other states. It is fair to say that it is not the worst; that is true, I acknowledge that. I also acknowledge that the Treasurer has responded to questions in the past about the affordability of housing for young people, at which time he recognised that we are not the worst, but we are not the best either. Certainly I am aware, from figures that I have reviewed recently, that first-home owners make up a seemingly ever decreasing percentage of the market.

In 2002, I think they represented something like 20 per cent of home purchasers, whereas now, or it might have been 2007, they are down to about 13 per cent. Any initiative that supports young people in purchasing a home is an important one. Certainly it will not provide a full rebate to those people for the cost of stamp duty. We know that from the median house price of around \$364,000, I think it is, stamp duty costs of about \$16,000 will be levied, but any move that does this is a help. My understanding is that it is an improvement upon the previous scheme that was in place.

I now move forward to the payroll tax changes that are also part of this bill. That is also a positive step. I think that all groups would acknowledge that there has been intense lobbying for many years to increase the threshold. Minor adjustments have occurred in previous years. They have been resisted for some time. The Treasurer on this occasion has resolved to increase it from \$502,000 to \$552,000. We know from last year's budget announcement that a drop in the rate from the previous \$5.50 per \$100 to \$5.25, and then to a further \$5 per \$100 is an improvement.

Certainly Business SA, in its representations made to us and from what it has produced in recent years, has called for an increase in the threshold to \$800,000. While increasing to \$552,000 this year it will go up to \$600,000 next financial year. However it is interesting: when the opposition held their tax summit on 12 May, it was put very succinctly to us by one chap who said that within his industry, which from memory I think was electronics, once upon a time to meet the payroll tax threshold you had to have about 20 employees, whereas now with the increase in wages costs, you only need eight.

An ever increasing number of small businesses are being burdened with payroll tax. I understand from reading the information provided by the Treasurer's office that some 300 businesses will no longer have to pay payroll tax as a result of the increase in the threshold. I am sure those businesses would appreciate that. In the past six years there has been an increase of 3,000 businesses across the state that have had to pay payroll tax.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: So 10 per cent of relief comes through to those businesses, with something like a 40 per cent increase in the number of businesses paying payroll tax. The change is important. From our perspective I acknowledge that there is a never-ending supply of priority projects on which revenues must be expended. The Treasurer and any future treasurer will face enormous challenges in ensuring that they have a revenue collection method that is fair and equitable to everyone.

We repeat the fact that major industry groups would prefer an increase in the threshold. At the tax summit I led a discussion group which included Peter Vaughan, and he pointed out the request for an increase to \$800,000 and his position that, as part of some economic modelling that had been done, while there would have been a loss of revenue from it, it would have caught up quickly through the economic growth it would have stimulated. The Treasurer shakes his head. Accountants can put a spin on things. It would be interesting to see what happens in future years.

I confirm I am the lead speaker for the opposition. We recognise that any adjustments to stamp duty for first home buyers and payroll tax for the important businesses that exist in South Australia are progressive moves and on that basis we indicate our preparedness to support the bill.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (16:02): I welcome the opposition's support.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

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

Page 3—

Lines 29 and 30—Delete 'market value of the home to which the eligible transaction relates' and substitute:

consideration for the eligible transaction

Line 32—Delete 'market value of the home to which the eligible transaction relates' and substitute:

consideration for the eligible transaction

The amendments address a limited situation that could arise—not that one would ever expect someone to do this but you never know—where a house is sold, for example to a relative, for a relatively low price—well below the property market value—in order that the related party can access the First Home Owners Grant and the First Home Buyers Grant. That would be pretty sneaky, but we anticipate one or two people might attempt to do something like that. It should have been in the original bill, so I move these amendments.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The amendment was provided to us at the start of question time. I have not had a chance to consult with anyone but, given the wording of it, the explanation provided by the Treasurer and my own interpretation of what it means, I think it is appropriate.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 10), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (16:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

This further demonstrates that this government is a well-oiled, slick machine which just hums along with its processes. We have it all together.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3604.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:06): What other possible reason could there be for the Country Health Care Plan to be published 1½ hours after the budget was released last week and after the parliament got up? The Minister for Health would have us believe that it was because the government needed an extra six months longer than it had indicated, namely, by December 2007, to consult with the public. It needed extra time so that is why they needed the extra period. I will come back to that.

I will give another explanation. It is because the government had to get rid of the critics. Who are they? They are the hospital boards of the hospitals across South Australia—the people who have been responsible (until the Health Care Act abolished them) for the services provided in their hospitals, the employment of people in their hospitals and the management of assets in their hospitals.

These three very important responsibilities were quarantined and protected under the act from interference by the minister. How do you get rid of the critics, the voice piece of these boards? You abolish them. And that is exactly what the Health Care Act did. In addition to that, legislation was passed previously making the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health the employing authority for the more than 20,000 employees in our hospitals and health department—and to ensure that came into operation with the transfer of responsibility in the Health Care Plan, that had to get through.

That is actually the real reason. The government had to silence the people by getting rid of the advocates who were appointed as the board members. That is another reason, I suggest, why the government snuck that out in between. It axed the boards and it had to gag the workers (because, of course, they will be employed by the department) to ensure that there is silence against the tide of anger.

If he had been out there today on the front steps of Parliament House, the minister would understand that the country people of South Australia do not accept this, and they voiced that very clearly. If he has people at the Kangaroo Island Hospital and the Kapunda Hospital and people at the proposed rallies all around South Australia, the minister will get a very clear message that the country people will not be silenced over this.

His idea of consultation, which he claims was the basis for the delay in the introduction of this plan which is ongoing, is utter nonsense. It is simply not accurate to suggest that there is consultation. If members opposite do not believe me, listen to this. Just this week, Dr David Senior, an experienced general practitioner and a member of the government's Clinical Senate (the advisory group to government representing clinicians across South Australia), resigned. He has made public that he strongly believes that the Clinical Senate, this body of clinicians and bureaucrats, has been misled by the so-called consultations over the last few months. Such is the depth of concern that has been raised that this doctor has resigned from the one remaining voice, I suppose, of the clinicians to the government that they have been misled about this. He is a highly respected doctor, and I commend him for being brave enough to come forward.

Secondly, Mr George Beltchev, the head of Country Health SA, stationed at Port Augusta, is going to all these public meetings around South Australia and telling people what they will get. There has not been any consultation. The list of people that the minister announced today as having been consulted is not accepted out there. This is not consultation.

Thirdly, Dr Tony Sherbon, the Chief Executive of the Department of Health, and one of the second senior bureaucrats, Dr Panter, have been scheduled already for a national conference in September to tell Australia about the success of the reforms in restructuring in South Australia. I have received an invitation to the conference. So, it is utter nonsense that the minister comes in and tells us that the government will still be consulting about the Country Health Care Plan. That is absolute rubbish!

The government already has a national conference organised to replicate this disaster around the country. It is little wonder that Dr Peter Rischbeith of the Rural Doctors Association has called for the Prime Minister to intervene in South Australia to ensure that this plan is axed, because he knows that this is not consultation and that this will not work. The minister had the opportunity today to tell us of just one of the 43 hospitals that is about to be downgraded to GP Plus centres that has asked for it. He had that opportunity, but, of course, there is none.

Not one mother has rung me and said, 'I live in the country with a sick child, and I want you to get rid of services at my local hospital.' Not one doctor has rung me and said, 'This would enhance the teaching opportunities and workforce for South Australia and medical services for country people.' Not one nurse has rung me and said, 'Close my hospital so that I have to get in a car and drive miles to the next town to keep my job.' Not one resident in South Australia has rung me and said, 'This is an important initiative. We want to donate the services of our hospital. We want to cut the budget to enable the state government to build the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital.' Not one. The minister was not able to identify today one person who has come forward and said, 'This is what we want for the country.'

The final and really cruel twist in this is that the minister talks about staying out there and consulting. We know that the budget papers were approved in cabinet a month ago. They were signed off, proof read, printed and presented here last week. This health plan has been identified in and referred to in the budget papers that are weeks old. There is no excuse for this not being there. And talk about consultation. The figure allocated for country health acute services in this year's budget—printed and approved by this government for 2008-09—is \$250,518,000, which is less than in 2007-08.

Why is this so important? Because even to maintain the same level of standard of services in the country, even if the government were to transfer some to the four hub hospitals and cancel some in the others (and let us assume that was a good idea), why is it that the minister can announce that less money will be spent this year, not even any provision for what is necessary just to keep up with the increase in salaries and wages of these people? This is what exposes the lie of the government that it is out there still consulting about this. It has done the work, it has made the decisions, it has added up the money, and it has featured it in its budget. It is there in black and white.

This consultation is bureaucratic bull-dust, and the minister needs to be brought to account for this. It is totally unacceptable that the very doctors who are relying on having hospitals so that they can continue to treat patients in country South Australia, so that they can continue to teach the next generation of health professionals, today delivered a very clear and repeated message, namely, if there are no hospitals in these towns, there will be no doctors, there will be no future workforce, there will be no towns, and there will therefore be no provision for the future wealth of this state.

One-third of the population lives in country South Australia. If any pinhead in the Department of Health had looked at a map of South Australia they would have known that most country people live east of Port Augusta and north of Keith and would have realised what a stupid idea it was to put these four hub hospitals outside of the zone within which it is easier for them to get to rather than go to Adelaide.

One-third of them live out there in the country of South Australia, yet they are given in this budget one seventh of the acute hospital care budget. The budget this year will be \$3.8 billion. In rough figures \$1.8 billion will be spent on some public health, policy work and bureaucrats. The other \$2 billion will be spent on acute care hospitals. Of that, \$1,780 million will be spent on the eight or so hospitals here in metropolitan Adelaide and only \$250 million (one-seventh of the total acute care budget) on 68 hospitals out in country South Australia. Is that fair? Is that equitable? No, that is a disgrace!

So, for the government to say this is a health care plan that will enhance and provide better health for South Australian country people is an absolute furphy. It is a gross misrepresentation of what they are about to slash and burn in the country, and they must be brought to account for it.

The government says it is necessary to do this because of the cost pressures on government for the provision of health services. I want to remind the house that this is the seventh budget of the government and, notwithstanding its mantra about this, the total health budget as a percentage of the total state budget has gone from 24 per cent to 29.2 per cent. Where is this ever-exploding proportion of the budget? Education, incidentally, has stayed about the same. It has actually dropped a little bit since the member for Taylor was minister for education, but that is hardly surprising since we have fewer children coming into our public school system and we have more people using the public health sector. That is logical. The alarmist mantra of the government is not met by the fact that there is an explosion of health costs that are going to ravage and haemorrhage the state budget balance, and that is simply not replicated.

The second thing the government says is that there is already a shortage of workforce in country regions so they need to change the model. We would also look at this. We understand that in some areas there are shortages. But we have looked at the city as well, and there are shortages here. Of course, there will be a heck of a lot of shortages come 2016 when they have build the Taj Mahal on the western end of North Terrace and they cannot staff that.

So I say that it is not acceptable to replicate one set of health workers with another set and say, 'We are missing a doctor or a nurse here.' If they cannot get them to the country, how will they get the other people—the dieticians, the counsellors and the other allied health service people who will advise us how to keep healthy so that we improve the health profile? It is simply not going to happen. It will evaporate, and it will be another excuse for them then to wind down the GP Plus emergency centres, because there will be no GP left, and there will be no-one else going out there to provide the advice and counselling in the education centre role they want. Meanwhile, the staff who are actually already out there, thousands of them, will have to drive miles to get a job in another town.

The other thing the government says is that the bed occupancy rate is really low in country hospitals, that it is 40 per cent to 50 per cent, on average, of bed occupancy rates. So, if a hospital has 10 acute care beds at any one time, perhaps only four or five patients are in them. Well, wake up Mr Hill, Minister for Health. He should go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Modbury Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to name a few, and see the rows and rows of corridors where there are empty rooms. There are beds in storage that are not being occupied. In fact, if the minister was honest, he would know that his own hospital at the Royal Adelaide, when his government came to office, had 850 beds, operational. It is down to 650. He is out there pretending what a good bloke he is going to be by opening an 800 bed hospital in 2016, but the truth is we are going to get fewer beds there.

It is an absolute insult to country people to think that they have beds open that have a major operational cost in their budgets, to think they will have all these nurses sitting around reading *Women's Weekly*. It is just an absolute nonsense. It is an absolute insult to these people to think that they are wasting all this money. They are some of the most efficient and best-run hospitals in the state and if the minister was not listening to those mindless morons in his department he would understand the basics about the provision of services and that, when you close services, you do not have them in place—and bear in mind his Berri and Whyalla enhancements are not even going to be ready for 2010-11 while he slashes in the meantime.

But any brainless dimwit, any complete pinhead, would understand that if you create this problem we will have more people turn up in the city. He says it would be a good thing to get them back out in the country. I agree with him, but his program on this is going to be devastating for country people but also will create a massive increase in the number of people in the city. You already have to wait, on average, 6½ hours in an emergency department in a metropolitan hospital. How much worse is it going to be? You already have to wait over three years on the public elective surgery list to get a hip replacement. You already have to wait 37 months to get a set of dentures on the denture list. It is not going to make it better: it is going to make it worse. And these people are going to have to line up behind that. So the bed occupancy rate is not valid.

The final thing the government says is that people out in the country smoke more, are apparently fatter, have poorer health, and have more chronic diseases. I agree with that. The data is there, and it is true. But do they think that the local GP, or the people who are working in allied health, are not actually already giving advice on these things? Of course they are. When someone comes in and has a problem with smoking, doesn't a doctor say to them, 'Look, mate, you are going to have to give up smoking because this is a problem'? Of course they do!

So, saying that these people have to have primary health care is fine, but not at the expense of acute care. Clearly, from what the minister has repeated today, country people are older, sicker and poorer—and they have to put up with the drought in the meantime—and he is going to take away their acute care services because he says they need to learn to give up smoking, lose weight, change their diet and all those other primary things, as though this will be some panacea with respect to health.

I have piles of letters in my office from people who are outraged by this proposal, and when the first child dies because they have an asthma attack and cannot get help, and when the first person has a heart attack, those letters will go straight to the minister, because those deaths or any medical trauma that concerns country people will go straight to his desk.

The minister will pay a political price for this ridiculous program which he wants to impose on country people, who, I remind the house, constitute a third of the state's population. They are out there paying taxes, as the minister knows. They are out there creating wealth for this state. The Premier barks every day about the mining future of this state, and what is he doing? He is ravaging the infrastructure that is the very chance of keeping the country alive.

Time expired.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (16:23): This is my opportunity to respond to the 2008 state budget. There is a lot of good in it, and it is particularly pleasing to see the commitment to the development of public transport in South Australia. There are certainly some visionary elements to it. I always said about the tramline along King William Street that it was a waste of money unless there could be some more appropriate and valuable destination than simply going to the casino on North Terrace. It is good to see that the government has a plan in place for the development of the tramline to make it more useful and thus of better value for the taxpayers of South Australia.

It is good news to see the plans for electrification of the rail lines in Adelaide. Of course, this is where some questions need to be asked about where we are heading. In particular, we do not yet have a commitment to extend the rail line to Seaford and, ultimately, beyond Seaford. That is what we need. I have taken up that issue, although it does not directly have an impact on voters in the Marion and Reynella areas that I look after. However, it is a worthy thing for a very substantial part of South Australia's population. I suppose there is an indirect benefit to the people in my electorate, because if we have more commuters from south of Noarlunga travelling by train it will take pressure off the roads, and we certainly need that. Every day it seems that congestion around Adelaide is increasing, particularly in relation to trips into the city.

In that respect, I note that already there has been a shift to public transport as a result of petrol price rises. There are a couple of interesting aspects to that. It is interesting that, at the same time as more people are turning to public transport, there are price rises for those who wish to use public transport. I think that is a retrograde step. I realise that the bus services, in particular, have to pay for their fuel but, at the same time, if we are genuine about encouraging public transport as a solution to the rise in petrol prices and the ultimate crisis that may develop in relation to oil supply, we need to be serious about encouraging commuters.

When I see price rises with respect to public transport at a time like this I sometimes wonder whether the government is sincere in wishing for more commuters, because more commuters using public transport will put a strain on the system and it will require even greater public investment. I will give a couple of examples. I have seen many more people waiting at the

local train stations on the Noarlunga line over the last year or so, and that demonstrates to me in very practical terms that more people are switching from car to rail where they can conveniently do so.

In that respect, the redevelopment of the Oaklands station was something of a fizzer. It was deemed an interchange whereby masses of people would alight from buses and cars and then catch the train into the city. It is nice to have a new railway station but, apart from that, all it has really been is two extra bus stops on Morphett Road, and those bus stops are adjacent to one of the busiest intersections in the south-western suburbs. So, it was not all that it could be.

The other vignette that I would like to offer relates to people I know who intended to catch the O-Bahn into the city earlier this week. They drove first to the Tea Tree Gully interchange, but every car park for the interchange was filled. Because they did not want to walk 1,000 metres or so to catch the O-Bahn, they thought it was just as quick and easy to drive to Klemzig or Paradise. So, they went to the Paradise interchange. After a quick drive through there they saw that every car park was taken.

One of the issues with the Paradise interchange is that, if the car park proper is full, people have to go quite some distance to find another suitable place to park a car. They then drove to Klemzig, and all the car parks there were full as well. So, they ended up driving into the city, anyway, and parking there. To me, that was a true story that demonstrated that there already needs to be greater investment in the existing rail infrastructure if we are going to have it work to the extent that people wish to use it.

Moving on from the rail issue, there are many positive aspects to the budget and we are seeing the results of the stream of GST money starting to assist the current Labor government. Because of the political cycle, the past two budgets have been more austere and we are starting now to see the use of that money with an eye to the 2010 election. It would not have been credible nor realistic to leave all of the big-ticket items to the budget just before the election, particularly those where there are long-range plans which have to be implemented if there is to be any sign of reality before the election hits. No doubt, next year, particularly in the current programs involving teachers, police, social workers, nurses and the like, there will be huge increases in next year's budget. I refer to this background to the current budget because it helps to explain why there is such a commitment to infrastructure. As I have said, that is positive.

However, I want to highlight one area which appears to have been neglected. With all the fuss about improvements to public transport and building super schools in the northern suburbs and so on, one area which seems to be neglected is the mental health sector. Last year, there was a significant allocation in the state budget and the government claimed that it was fully implementing the Cappo report which was sorely needed in the mental health sector. It does not seem to be the same sort of commitment in this year's budget to what is still just as much of a problem.

The detail may be there but it certainly needs examination in the committees that examine the budget because the budget papers, on the face of it, do not seem to provide the mental health sector what it needs. We have seen improvements over recent years—for example, the establishment of the Margaret Tobin Centre at Flinders Hospital—and it is great to see new premises like that operating, but to balance that we also have the impending closure of Glenside.

Leaving aside those big-ticket items, we also need to see development of more halfway houses, or what I call safe and secure accommodation, for that relatively small group of young men who are prone to violent or at least antisocial behaviour. I think we need to continue to have some sorts of institutions for people with mental illness for their own protection and that of others. They do not need to be big institutions like we used to have 50 to 100 years ago. They do not need to be institutions which lock people away out of sight, out of mind, but they do need to be small and transparent with around-the-clock staffing, so that people who rely on medication to maintain an equilibrium are able to enjoy a relatively open lifestyle, perhaps even with paid employment while being able to return to a safe haven of an evening. That is something that I will keep pushing for.

In summary, there is a lot of good in the budget. I have only highlighted a couple of areas. Some areas like mental health need close examination to see whether the government is really keeping up to its previous promises. On the whole, we welcome the GST stream of money which is finally seeing quite definite benefits for South Australians.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:35): Budget speeches are always an interesting procedure to go through, because there are inevitably some good things in the budget, and there

has to be, because you just cannot have \$15 billion to spend and not be able to do something good. So, I am the first to acknowledge that.

I am still looking at the moment for some of the details of what I consider to have been fairly good announcements. I was quite excited about the transport announcements when I was first hearing about them—and I was hearing about them a long time before the press releases and the budget day speeches. I have been getting snippets for months now about what the government has been proposing. Unfortunately, my initial excitement and optimism has been dashed somewhat when it comes to looking at the detail because, with any budget, the devil is in the detail.

This is a budget where lots of opportunities have not been lost as such but have certainly been postponed in many ways. It is a budget where a lot more could have been done to reprioritise projects. The government cannot duck from the fact that it has the financial resources in its budget to fulfil a lot of what I would consider to be more high priority projects and some that it has put up as grand plans and visions. The staggering figure of \$15 billion, compared with what we had in 2001-02 when we had about \$8 billion is amazing and, as the member for Mitchell said, the GST income has been something which, although opposed by the Labor government initially, has really helped out.

The GST windfall, had it actually been put not into recurrent spending—and I am no economist, but I know you just cannot keep spending money on recurrent spending all the time—you have to think about infrastructure, and whether it is a house or a business or running the government infrastructure, you really do need to put money aside for new infrastructure. Nobody will say that infrastructure has been given the priority that it should have been over the last number of years by governments of all shapes and sizes, federal and state, and now there are opportunities with future funds in the federal sphere and infrastructure funds that we are seeing now.

There should have been money put aside in the state budget for future investment in South Australia. Had that been done, I am reliably informed, you would not be going on the never-never to pay for hospitals, you would not be having infrastructure that is planned 10 years out and then a lot of the spending is not in the current budget figures. You would be able to actually pay cash for it and that is a delightful position to be in if you can do it.

When I was running my own business as a vet practice, somebody said, 'You have to adopt the overdraft mentality.' That is okay, provided you have the income to pay for it but nobody wants to do that. You want to try to avoid that because, to me, interest is lost benefit to your business unless you are able to build the business through judicious judgments of when to borrow and when to clear debt.

What the government has been doing here unfortunately has been using windfall gains to pay recurrent expenditure and has not been using it to fund infrastructure benefits and we are now going into that overdraft. I remember back in the mid-eighties we were paying 23 per cent on the overdraft; interest rates are nowhere near like that now but let us hope that the government debt does not get to the stage where the AAA credit rating is put in jeopardy.

We should be able to afford building a hospital. We should be able to afford building a new transport network. We should be able to afford building a desalination unit without having to go deeper and deeper into debt, and I would encourage the government to look at their priorities and look at the way they are taking South Australia because the debt is increasing. By 2012 it will be about \$2 billion, I am told.

The other interesting thing to look at in terms of how this government is managing the economy is to look at the revenue-raising efforts that the Commonwealth Grants Commission examine and report on each year. The Commonwealth Grants Commission ratios indicate that South Australia levied its tax revenue bases more severely than any other state or territory during 2006-07, which are the latest figures available, and according to tables put out there by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, South Australia was judged to have taxed more severely than the national average by 12.58 per cent.

There is lot of money coming in the GST. There have certainly been huge windfalls in land taxes and property taxes. I would have thought that the government would be able to have the cash income to manage the economy without going to the credit card, without going into debt, and certainly when you look at the facts and figures on various areas of income revenue for the state, one particular interest for me as shadow minister for transport is motor vehicle taxes.

In this year's budget they are predicted to be \$435 million, and then if you add the GST from fuel it is about \$1 billion. I understand that \$26 million is brought into state coffers every time there is a 1¢ increase in the price of petrol. So there is a lot of extra money coming in at the moment, and with petrol prices roaring up, there are going to be some real issues for this government to face and that money that is coming in on GST is something that hopefully they will use very wisely and not just for recurrent payments.

When the budget first came down, I was getting snippets from all sorts of sources. Disaffected public servants would say, 'Have you heard this?' and they are just trying to do their job. The most bizarre one I got—which was very accurate, but the source was bizarre—was from a golf course from interstate where a friend of mine was playing golf with somebody there who said 15 new train/trams were being ordered.

The information is there. It is a bit like the Marj; we found out about the Marj a couple weeks before it came out. This transport initiative is one that has been out there for a little while and certainly I would love to be able to support it wholeheartedly but unfortunately it is not a plan, it is a proposal. There are so many things in here where the priorities are not quite right and where the figures do not stack up.

My initial excitement has certainly been tempered by what has actually come out. The minister today said that they had been investigating this since 2005 (and I am happy to correct it if that was wrong). The government has certainly been investigating it for a lot longer than that. I was actually shown original plans for electrification of the Adelaide rail system by a chap at Trott Park who phoned me up and said, 'Would you like to come and see these?' and there were pencil and ink drawings from 1923, if I remember correctly, and that included underground going up from the railway station up North Terrace and then up King William Street, almost shades of the MATS plan that we had back then.

The next plan that I have got hold of was done by the Director-General of Transport in June 1988. The conclusions for that one, and I quote from page 27:

The analysis shows that there is little justification on either economic or financial grounds for proceeding with electrification. The only economic case that could be made for switching to the electric would be if all the cost estimates obtained for this study were seriously an error and there was a doubling of the economic costs of oil in the 1990s.

Well, how true has that become. The cost of oil is going to put enormous pressure on public transport, and so having an integrated public transport plan—buses, cars, taxis, trains, trams—will be so important because people will not be able to afford to use their cars as frequently and as much as they would like in the future. With petrol prices predicted to go to \$3 a gallon, according to one of the oil industry experts, it will be very interesting to watch how governments all over the world, and particularly here in South Australia, handle the issues.

Let us just talk about the 'transport vision' as the Treasurer called it. It is a vision. It is a long way off; you would need binoculars to see the end point to this vision, but at least it is an idea that is there. I certainly do not believe that it is a six-year plan, since 2005. The 1988 plan was there; it knocked it. There was a plan from 2004, and I am not sure who the minister was then, whether it was minister Wright or Conlon who was the transport minister then. That was done by the department of transport and urban planning. This was towards \$30 million—the transformation of Adelaide's urban rail passenger system and new concept options. That was on 5 December 2004, and it discussed the electrification of rail and various options. That was another investigation. The latest was the Halcrow-Pacific investigation from March 2005; so there have been a number of plans.

I cannot remember the actual docket number, but I have seen a copy of the docket regarding the amount of money that was in the Whitlam federal Labor government policy. A submission was put to cabinet to provide money for electrification of rail. I think it was in 1983. I do not know where that money went. There was money for Adelaide and Brisbane. Brisbane obviously did its electrification; we did not. There have been some missed opportunities in the past by both sides in this place, but now the money is there and we have a proposal. But is it a plan? I am not so sure. I hope that a plan is being developed and that the government is able to really do something.

I have a lot of questions. I am happy for the minister to know which way I am going to go in the estimates committee. I have a lot of technical questions for this minister, and I hope that his advisers can give me the answers, because there are so many questions about the transport initiatives in this budget. I will go through some of them now and emphasise how a lot has been

promised, but the delivery will be a long way away and the timelines and costings, in some cases, not there.

Last year, I think \$121 million was announced for the resleepering of the Noarlunga train line and some parts of the Belair line. It has not started yet and I understand that it will not start until April next year. I am very disappointed that it is not yet underway. You cannot buy these sleepers off the shelf at Bunnings, we know that, but you are given warning about trends, you do know about depreciation, and you do know about the money you have to spend so that you can factor it into your budget expenditure and also into the ordering of materials.

In a moment I will talk about some of the forecasts that have been given to the government over the years about train and tram capacity. It is interesting to see how it apparently seems to be surprised by what it was told years ago—'Oh, we didn't know that it was going to happen.' The electrification of the Noarlunga line will not be completed until 2014. You cannot do it overnight, I know that, but I would have thought that you would be able to do it before then. There is no mention of extending the line to Seaford other than some land acquisitions in the Aldinga area. In the 2004 report by the department of transport and urban planning, there was talk of extending the line to Seaford and the budget requirements that would have to be put in place. So, the government was told about it then. It has been raised on numerous occasions since then.

The electrification of the Outer Harbor line will not commence until 2011 and then, as I understand it, it will go only to Port Adelaide. The Gawler line once again comes last with resleepering and track and rail upgrades not finished until mid-2014, and there will be an eight-year wait for electrification in 2016.

The north-south corridor is absolutely vital. There is no mention at all of the complete resleepering or the electrification of the Belair line. Obviously, the complications with freight coming through from the Eastern States is an issue, but there is no mention of getting freight off the metropolitan Adelaide railway lines other than the \$3 million of federal money for a study that is in the brochure on the TransAdelaide website.

The relocation of the Adelaide rail yards is still in the budget and \$157 million has been carried. It was supposed to be completed in June 2010. Now we see that it will not be finished until 2011—12 months later. I am just waiting to see what the actual cost of the soil remediation will be, because there is everything in that soil. There is diesel plume underneath, but above there is arsenic, PCBs, cyanide, and so many chemicals that it is almost like a toxic waste dump.

As for the trains, we have the oldest diesel rail fleet in Australia and yet we are keeping 50 of the old 3000 class trains, which can be converted to electric—no problems at all. You can rip out the motors because they are diesel electric and power them with overhead wires. They are being refurbished at the moment, but the refurbishment, as I understand it, involves taking out seats, giving them a bit of a tart up and recovering them. With respect to travelling by train into town from Gawler and Noarlunga, taking out the seats will not do much other than allow a few more people to stand in them. It will marginally increase the capacity.

One constituent who phoned my office to complain about overcrowding was told by the passenger service attendant, 'Lady, you buy a ticket; you don't buy a seat.' That is an atrocious attitude and I certainly hope that it is not one that the government shares. The government was warned in August 2005—going on three years now—when current capacity would be reached and maximised. For the Noarlunga, Outer Harbor and Belair lines, that is to happen in 2009-10, some of them in 2009. The Gawler line is due to reach capacity in 2008-09, so that is within six to 12 months. If you ask people on the trains now, they would say it is ahead of schedule. The government was warned about that. It is an indisputable fact that the government ignored those warnings, though, because it has done nothing to increase the capacity on the trains.

In terms of the new trams, it is interesting that the government says, 'Well, they have been too successful; they are overcrowded.' Yesterday morning, I came into parliament on one of the old rattlers. I left Glenelg at 7.20. It was not a coupled set, just a single tram, which surprised me because, unlike the new ones, the old ones can be coupled. By Beckman Street—not even halfway—it was at crush capacity; you could not move. What did I hear over the radio, because you can hear the radio transmissions on the old trams quite clearly? A conductor, presumably in a following tram, said, 'I'm retreating to the rear cab for my own safety because the passengers are becoming very angry at the overcrowding.' That situation is absolutely deplorable.

What is the government's answer to the increased demand on that line? It will lease four more Flexity Classics—exactly the same as we have in service. You cannot couple them together,

so there will be four more trams whizzing backwards and forwards up and down on that line. That is not the answer.

In the 2004 report, the government was warned to expect a 50 per cent increase overall; 25 per cent with the new trams and 25 per cent with the extension; and in June 2005 it was warned to expect a 30 per cent increase with the introduction of new trams and a further 25 per cent increase with the extension to North Terrace. Where were the 8,000 Bee Line passengers going to go? I do not know. This is not a well thought out plan.

These are narrow bodied trams. We are going to have wide bodied trams running down Port Road. How many lanes? We do not know. How are they going to turn around at Bowden-Brompton? We do not know. How are the switching mechanisms going to work from standard gauge to broad gauge? Do they change the bogeys on the old trains to standard gauge? The switching is going to be so expensive, and then you are going to run diesel into Adelaide Railway Station. You are going to have to maintain the exhaust fans there. There are so many technical things that I hope to have answered in estimates.

I want this to succeed, but unfortunately I think it is a very ill thought out proposition that the government has put up. It is not something about which I can say, 'Good on you, government.' I wish I could say that, because the government has the money, the power and the opportunity, and South Australians deserve that.

I will go on to the \$29 million for the new ticketing system in this budget. How is this government going to do it for \$29 million? I hope it can. I will tell you what has happened. Queensland got it up and running at last for \$137 million; not \$29 million. New South Wales has just pulled the pin after spending \$95 million on a \$350 million tram ticketing program because it was not working. The best one—and I hope minister Conlon is listening to this—is Victoria, where the government did not tell the truth. It said that it spent \$500 million, but the Auditor-General's report which came down in February states that the Victorian government spent \$1 billion on its new ticketing system.

I hope that this government has some links with the Western Australian SmartCard ticketing system, which I understand is working satisfactorily. How well I am not sure, but I hope it is not like the TRUMPS motor vehicle registration system which was pulled in but which is still not working. How long do we have to wait down at Marion? I note that there is money in the budget to improve the Marion depot for the Department of Transport, so that you can register your car without having to wait half an hour. Let us just hope that a new ticketing system does work out. New buses: we need 50 new buses today; not 20 leased now and then 20 more and another 20 later. Those 50 new buses need to be integrated into the train system, but I do not see any real plans for that.

As for roads, most of the money that is being spent at the moment is federal money. There is very little money being spent on roads. I will have a lot more to talk about in estimates. I will have 2½ hours with the transport minister, and I look forward to a full and frank discussion on this because there needs to be a lot of detail given. I hope that he is willing to work with me and ensure that South Australians do get the transport plan they deserve, because they are certainly paying for it. One further indication of how much they are paying is that last year they paid over \$40 billion in speeding fines alone; fifteen and a half million for travelling between 60 and 69. I do not condone it, but it is interesting to see where the money is going.

Time expired.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (16:55): According to the Premier on budget day:

Symbolism is so important in basically bringing the people with you.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, 'symbol' means 'a thing standing for or representing something else'; and 'symbolic' means 'a mark or a token'. Perhaps we could say 'an emblem or a gimmick', or, as what we were given in the subsequent budget was so expensive, we could say 'icons or monuments', although the \$1.9 billion Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, which was obviously last year's icon, appears to be missing this year.

The Premier knew more than we did when he spoke, but it was prophetic, for what we were given in the subsequent budget was certainly more symbolic than nation building, as it should have been at a time when we need to build the foundation of the economy for the future prosperity of our state.

The government's profligacy in pursuing symbolic acts, using taxpayer funds for depreciating liabilities instead of income-earning job-creating assets, is nowhere more obvious than

the \$100 million allocated on a whim (after saying that they would not be providing funds) to an upgrade of AAMI Stadium. AAMI Stadium will continue to be a drain on taxpayers because of the government's short-term expediency and symbolism as opposed to long-term economic planning for the state's benefit. The lost opportunity cost of giving away this money for a stadium upgrade instead of using it for something worthwhile is not just limited to the \$100 million, as there is a compounding effect caused by having to pay interest on this debt-funded gift at the current government rate; and that is forever. Interest for one year at 6 per cent is \$6 million, but in 10 years this compounds to a massive \$179 million.

This is money that could have been spent on health, education, or any of the other much needed infrastructure that underpins real economic development, jobs and prosperity for the future. Instead, the government announced the downgrade of 43 hospitals; eight of these in my electorate. The negative multiplier effect on the communities of these 43 small towns will spell their death knell as their populations spiral down. Of the total health budget of \$3.8 billion, only \$250 million is to be spent in regional South Australia. That is about one-seventh of the health budget, when we have about one-third of the population. The country people are angry and they have reason to be.

Symbolism does not build anything, let alone a nation, and it certainly has no compassion or community building elements. Nation building is the basis for prosperity, advancement, equality, innovation and the means to do all those things that lift the quality of life of ordinary people while helping those in less fortunate circumstances. Profitable income earning assets are the rock on which national prosperity is built, and it is the government's job to facilitate these by providing the necessary underlying infrastructure requirements.

Liberal premier Tom Playford knew this. He put in the underlying infrastructure that could not be afforded by the industries that followed and brought jobs, prosperity and self-esteem to the people. He understood the massive positive multiplier effect particularly in regional areas that the judicious use of taxpayers' funds expended by the government on infrastructure can have. He also understood the foolishness of only investing in the small part of the state where the majority of the people live: the city of Adelaide.

It was no surprise to hear the Treasurer in the first seconds of his budget speech talk of 'a significant transport investment program worth nearly \$2 billion over the next decade' which will 'redefine our city's public transport network' and 'help South Australia increase its public transport weekday traffic to meet the State Strategic Plan target of 10 per cent by 2018'.

But there is nothing in this budget to provide the roads, railways, ports or airports to underpin the much touted mineral boom that will remain as exploration only, unless it has the underpinning infrastructure to value add and export. Only when the mining companies can value add and export will they be able to provide the millions that this government is expecting in royalties to pay for the expenditure it is undertaking. It is spending money before it has the income to pay the bills, despite having received billions of dollars more than it expected from GST income and the highest property taxes in Australia.

When something is called an investment it infers there will be a financial return of income to enable funding for this city transport plan and our health, education and criminal justice systems, to secure our water supplies, and for public sector funding and tax relief that the Treasurer talked about in the next paragraph of his speech.

The transport plan is not an investment but, rather, straight expenditure, as is the \$10.3 billion or so to be spent across the public sector and invested in new capital projects over the next four years. Again, these are not investments that provide a financial return. They are very large debt-funded expenditures on long-term depreciating liabilities that will have to be replaced over time. They should be labelled as such so provision for the necessary income to pay for them is understood by the public. The provision of income must be allowed for in the budget for capital, interest and depreciation.

Much of this state's revenue comes from rural and regional South Australia, from agriculture, fishing, aquaculture, tourism and, latterly, mining. This is where much more of the state's revenue should be spent, rather than propping up uncompetitive private enterprises (such as car industries) or gimmicks which may induce a 'feel good' feeling (such as AAMI Stadium) and which have no substance. It should not be spent on symbols which may present a face that may be good to look at but which have no depth; for example, trams and solar panels to provide energy (that they already have) on government buildings and at the airport and showgrounds. This is a Labor forte—spending money without supporting the sources of the revenue.

Labor's ignorance and neglect in not providing underpinning infrastructure but expending money on depreciating liabilities is steadily running the state, once again, into debt. *The Advertiser* reported that Standard & Poor's has warned the Treasurer that the debt level is rising to the point where the state's AAA credit rating is at risk.

Thevenard port, despite being only 8.2 metres in depth and being able to take only small ships, still handles grain, salt, gypsum, and, soon, zircon and kaolin. The port has handled a greater tonnage than Port Lincoln in the past couple of years, although grain exports through both ports have been cut due to the drought. Nevertheless, exports through Thevenard will increase because of its closeness to mining opportunities and a proactive community.

It is proposed to deepen the port to 10.7 metres, although it should be deepened to 20 metres to enable it to take Cape size ships (which are now considered the industry standard) if we are to be competitive with the rest of the world. Cape bulker ships are now the world industry norm for the export of many minerals, including iron ore in particular.

The multiplier effect of spending money on this port (if it can be adequately deepened) would be enormous. The \$150,000 ports plan for Eyre Peninsula on which I was briefed this morning provides no solutions to the ports issues. The full document will not even be released to the public—but the executive summary adds nothing anyway.

Centrex Metals' mining is imminent, with overseas contracts in place but no port available from which to export the minerals. The government appears to be bending over backwards to accommodate BHP Billiton, which seems to be the only company the Premier and his ministers can see. Port Bonython is the cheapest option for BHP Billiton for the location of the proposed 80 gigalitres per year desalination plant (according to a spokesman for the company). It is also proposed to have an oil refinery and a tank farm to hold fuel at Port Bonython. It could also be the major port for the export of iron ore, unless OneSteel allows mining companies to use Whyalla.

However, the associated port facilities—such as a jetty around two kilometres in length (longer than Port Germein in its heyday)—will be expensive for a state government, irrespective of what or how much private funding is involved. Instead a long-term sustainable, environmentally friendly future could be a fact with Thevenard near Ceduna and another port at Cape Hardy on the eastern side of Eyre Peninsula between Port Lincoln and Port Neill being used as a multiuser export port capable of handling the largest cape bulker ships.

Both ports will be needed to handle the amount and variety of ores that will come from the area. The Western Australian port of Esperance has been extended already and is now looking at further expansion in order to handle the tonnages companies want to export through that port; and I expect a similar need on Eyre Peninsula. Adequate and appropriate planning now would ensure that the whole state benefits from our minerals resources.

The other major component associated with mining is water. Here again, symbolism, inaction and ignorance and a lack of concern for the environment, sustainability and climate change are the actions of this government. This is evident in the government's support for BHP Billiton's proposal to site a desalination plant at Port Bonython. The saga of Labor's bungling continues in that we now find that this plant will not produce the potable water espoused to supply the Iron Triangle towns and Eyre Peninsula.

Yesterday the Treasurer advised that it may be possible to spend another \$50 million for additional purification. This can be added to the dumb decision to extend the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline from Iron Knob to Kimba at a cost of \$48.6 million to deliver 1.4 gigalitres of water from the suffering River Murray and away from those whose livelihoods depend on the Murray. Some \$100 million will be squandered, while private enterprise was stopped from building solar thermal desalination plants at Ceduna and Port Augusta, which could have provided water at no cost to taxpayers or the environment as the salt was to be used by Cheetham Salt rather than be returned to the sea.

The National Party's Minister for Water Security, backed by her fellow Labor ministers, justified this pipeline on the Eyre Peninsula by saying that the water came from unused water allocation. Now, if the allocations were previously unused it meant that the water was not coming from the Murray, but now that they are being used the water is being taken out of the Murray. I am pleased to see some people are beginning to wake up to the disaster that a desalination plant at Port Bonython, with the hyper-saline waste going back into Spencer Gulf, would be.

A desal plant at Cockburn Sound in Western Australia supplying Perth with water has been limited to one-sixth capacity on at least two occasions recently when the oxygen in the sea fell to

dangerously low levels. A scarcity of available oxygen spells death to sea life. Cockburn Sound has greater sea movement than in the top of Spencer Gulf, therefore the potential damage to the marine environment must be considerably greater in Spencer Gulf, which also has regular dodge tides. Whyalla residents are at last realising that the giant cuttlefish, which occur in aggregations here like nowhere else in the world, are threatened. One may define the limits of a sanctuary. However, the salt movement in the sea cannot be contained by imaginary boundaries. No-one knows at what salt concentration cuttlefish stop breeding and start the road to extinction.

The top of the gulf is the nursery for many species of fish, including prawns. The potential to wipe out the multimillion dollar prawn fishery is one of the many acts of unsustainability that the Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change and his government are pushing. Once upon a time there was a very profitable prawn fishery in Gulf St Vincent. We do not want to see the same problems in Spencer Gulf that occurred there. Surely it makes more sense to avoid environmental disasters than attempt to repair them after the event. In any case, once species such as the giant cuttlefish become extinct, they cannot be replaced from somewhere else.

The Minister for Water Security and her Labor colleagues were dragged kicking and screaming to agree to a desalination plant to supply some of Adelaide's water, thus reducing the take from the River Murray. We may see something happen on that score if we live long enough. The Cockburn Sound plant in Western Australia, which is similar to the proposed Port Stanvac plant, cost under \$500 million. However, the South Australian plant is estimated to cost about \$1.5 billion—three times as much by the time it comes on stream. The difference is that private enterprise became involved in Western Australia, and the South Australian plant is wholly the project of the government-owned monopoly, SA Water—the same body which prevented the desalination plants proposed for Eyre Peninsula and which approved the \$48.6 million pipeline to Kimba to bring water to Eyre Peninsula from the River Murray.

The two wind farms on Eyre Peninsula produce more power than can be used in the region. The additional wind or solar energy plants can provide the power for desalination as well as for the mining. The government should immediately facilitate the desalination plant at Ceduna, provided that the company (or another one) can be induced to take that up again. The original company has now gone to Queensland where it is building desalination and solar power plants. The AcquaSol project at Port Augusta should be facilitated as a matter of urgency. A third desalination plant at Cathedral Rocks to use excess power from that wind farm should be built. The sea's action and energy along that coast is sufficiently dynamic to disperse waste without damage to the environment.

The environmentally damaging plant proposed for Port Bonython should be scrapped. The pipeline to Kimba can be reversed and the excess desalinated water from Eyre Peninsula can be sent through to Whyalla. The old world is disappearing and new industries are being born to meet the crisis of change, whether the change comes from global warming, the depletion of fossil fuels or some other cause. Addressing this future requires action, not a few symbols set up to anaesthetise the masses. To this end, *The Advertiser* article of 10 June 2008 titled 'Carnegie Mellon—An Expensive Failure' is enlightening. Again, Labor goes for headline-catching bursts without long-term realisation of value. Why spend millions of dollars importing overseas organisations when we already have the infrastructure and can compete at a world level right here and now?

Again, it is more of the symbolism that this government loves. Instead of trumpeting our successes on a world scale or trying to lift us to the world level, the Premier imports someone else's public profile as a symbol. The budget is a mishmash of empty symbolism coupled with a renouncement of projects that are supposedly already in the pipeline. This includes the redevelopment of the Ceduna Hospital. That may or may not happen, going on past actions of this Labor state government. The announcements cover the next four years thus giving Labor time to forget this and gradually drop it off the agenda.

There have been many plans over the years for the redevelopment of the Ceduna Hospital, but nothing has happened yet. What does this Labor government do? It gives us symbols, meetings, conferences, seminars, media releases and plenty of talk but no action. This state's water crisis is a microcosm of this government's stupidity, its lack of financial and economic nous and, most of all, its sophistry in attempting to explain away its inadequacy. A dictionary gives the meaning of 'sophistry' as a subtle, tricky, clever but generally false method of reasoning. This budget is full of it.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:13): Now that the Minister for Health is in the chamber, I will take the opportunity to mention a couple of health matters which I had not intended to speak

about. For a longer version, I suggest the minister go to the grievance debate from yesterday when I spoke for a whole five minutes about health. However, I will give him a very brief overview of what happens in country hospitals. The minister's report says that the Millicent Hospital has a 50 per cent occupancy because it has 35 beds and an average of only 17 are occupied. The reality is that his department funds the Millicent Hospital for only 28 beds, so there are seven beds which cannot be counted. Just like he has wards at the Royal Adelaide Hospital locked away with no nurses and no staff, the exact same thing happens in country hospitals, and, if you are unaware, minister, your bureaucrats are snowing you when they tell you the occupancy rates of country hospitals. They are just snowing you.

If you are aware of it, then you are trying to snow the public. That is the reality; that is what is happening out there. Also, minister, your GP Plus hospitals cater for an overnight stay. If you are going to be there any longer than overnight you are shipped out. If you have a medical condition that will require more than an overnight stay (and this was argued on the front steps today), in some hospitals it will cost more in transfers to get people down the road for an hour, an hour and a half, via ambulance to the next hospital than it would to keep them in some of these small country hospitals.

Minister, you are being snowed, and you are snowing the public of country South Australia. Do not for one moment think that the public of country South Australia will walk away from this issue—and this is why the people of Bordertown in my electorate are so up in arms about this—because they know exactly what happens when you downgrade the services in hospitals. You lose your doctors and GPs, and that is what the minister failed to understand in the answers to the questions that he gave here today.

I know, minister, that you are not so thick that you are not aware of that. I know that you are not that thick. I hope I am right on that, minister, I really do, because some of your colleagues are thick enough, and I would not pay them that compliment. One of them is the Treasurer. He is leading this state into disaster, and I will explain why. This is his seventh budget, and he has been doing it for a number of years.

Members will be well aware that I call this borrow and spend. That is what this Treasurer does: borrows and spends. He has had an out of control budget now for six years and he is trying to get it back into control through huge borrowings. This has been coming for years, and we on this side have been talking about this for years. It is of no surprise to us. The unfortunate thing is that when the public of South Australia wakes up to the spin that emanates from this government and understands how thick this Treasurer is, it will be too damn late. We have been there before, and we are heading back there again.

I refer to Budget Paper 3, page 1.1, 'Fiscal strategy and budget priorities', where it states:

Fiscal strategy

The government's primary fiscal targets are to achieve:

- at least a net operating balance in the general government sector in every year.

This Treasurer used to say, 'We will have a budget surplus', but he did not say, 'We will use net operating balance.' He used to say, 'We will use net lending' or 'We will use the cash measure', one of the two measures that most governments use. But, suddenly, when they ran into a deficit, which they did a number of years ago, he changed his tactic and said, 'We will use the net operating balance figure', because he can get away with it a bit longer. There are only two dot points in the government's key fiscal strategies. The second dot point over the page states:

- net lending outcomes that ensure the ratio of net financial liabilities to revenue continues to decline towards that of other triple-A rated states.

They are fine words. That is what this Treasurer is hoping to do, so he prints that in his budget on the second page, hoping that no-one will read any further—they will flick the page and read something else.

The reality is that he is not achieving that. That is not what is happening. If you study the table below, you realise that the ratio of net financial liabilities to revenue is going up. And you have to read another whole page. You have to keep reading and reading, almost to the bottom of page 1.3, where he admits:

The ratio of general government sector net financial liabilities to revenue is forecast to increase across the forward estimates reflecting the growth in net debt associated with high levels of investment in capital projects.

I will talk at some length about the high level of investment in capital projects, because even this budget does not actually put aside the sort of money that the government has claimed it is spending in its TV ads (in its daily diatribe of spin). Certainly, the last few budgets do not, and I will come back to that in a moment.

One of the things we have continued to highlight on this side of the house is that this budget has been out of control because this Treasurer has been unable—I do not know whether he is unwilling but he is certainly unable—to control the growth in the public sector and, in my opinion, that is what is causing the majority of his problem. We know that the public sector has grown enormously under this government, and we know it has grown enormously in an unbudgeted way. We know that the government has budgeted to put on some more doctors, nurses and police officers. We know that, and we accept that: that is part of the budgetary process.

This government has allowed the growth in the public sector to balloon and explode. We continue to have a public sector where the percentage of our budget spent on employee expenses is considerably above the Australian average. There is only one state which is above the South Australian rate of expansion. In South Australia 46.7 per cent of our total budget expenses is spent on employee expenses. The only state that is above that is New South Wales, where it is 49.5 per cent.

I do not think we should be trying to copy New South Wales, to be honest. My understanding is that New South Wales, on most economic measures, is the one state that really has been dragging back the national averages. South Australia is up there but, because of our relative size, we do not have much impact on the national averages. But we are certainly right up there and, in fact, even worse than New South Wales on most of the economic indices.

In Victoria that figure is 38.5 per cent, in Queensland it is 38.8 per cent, and in Western Australia it is 40.4 per cent—considerably below South Australia. That is why those states have been able to invest in infrastructure over the years and have not had to rely on what this Treasurer is going to rely on over the next couple of years, and that is large borrowings.

I wish the average man in the street would understand that the net financial operating balance surpluses that this Treasurer is claiming are there only because they are underpinned by large borrowings. In the next budget period (2008-09) we will have a net operating balance of \$160 million. That sounds pretty good, and the Treasurer goes out there and puffs out his chest and says, 'Look how good I am.' Fiscal rectitude, I think he calls it.

To achieve that, he happens to be borrowing \$548 million; half a billion dollars. It is a little more the next year and a little more again the following year and then it drops back to \$460 million the year after. That is \$2 billion, in round figures, that this Treasurer will be borrowing in the next four years. And this budget does not even list all the liabilities that are accruing to the state. The liabilities that are being accrued are not listed because of the DPP contracts which have already been signed and which will be signed over the next few years.

I heard the Minister for Water Security on the radio this morning talking about water security (and I want to talk more about that). She suggested that this government is investing \$3 billion in water security in South Australia. I can tell the house that the \$3 billion is not listed in this budget. There is \$96 million for some initial works on a desalination plant for Adelaide south of Adelaide, and that is the only infrastructure to provide water security to this state that appears in this budget. However, the Minister for Water Security is out there on the airways claiming that this government is investing \$3 billion. Well, it ain't in the budget: it is a falsehood. When you add those sorts of numbers to the figures that appear in the budget, if the government can ever purchase those things, it gets even worse.

Let me talk a little more in depth about water, because I think water is the main game in town at the moment. The government has failed. I will be repeating myself a little, because this has gone on for a long time and the government keeps making the same mistakes. This government decided some years ago that it would not spend money on water infrastructure—that it would pray for rain—and it has continued that policy. That is the key policy of the government; pray for rain. That has been its policy for at least the last three years, and it continues in this budget.

We are currently experiencing a drought across south-eastern South Australia, low flows in the River Murray system and low flows through the hills catchments into our hills storages, and this low rainfall event has been with us since at least 2003. I can understand the government's not noticing that for a year or two—and, to be quite honest, South Australia was insulated from it for the first couple of years.

However, in 2005 the then minister (who happens to be the current Minister for Health) released the Waterproofing Adelaide policy. That policy document indicated that, under drought conditions, Adelaide would run out of water not today but some time last year. There is a graph on page 14, I think, if anyone cares to look at the document, which shows Adelaide's water supply under drought conditions and Adelaide's water demand, and the trend lines cross in 2007. However, with continuing drought conditions, the government did nothing and it continues to do nothing.

What the government has done (and this is the problem for South Australians with this government) is to go out week after week and announce major projects, and that puts the journalists off the scent. It keeps them at bay, and every time they raise the issue the government says (as the Minister for Water Security said this morning on ABC Radio), 'But, boys, we are spending \$3 billion on water infrastructure.' Show me the money, minister—because the only thing that is available from her government is press releases. I can pick up the press releases and I can read what the minister tells people she will do, but she is not doing it. She has refused to do it and she continues to pray for rain.

Let me run through some other matters—and this was just over 12 months ago, at the time of last year's budget. Members will remember that at that time the government still had not come on board with the idea of building a desalination plant for Adelaide but it had started to say, 'We are building the biggest desalination plant in the southern hemisphere in the Upper Spencer Gulf.' Both the Minister for Water Security and the Premier have been guilty of saying 'we' are building this huge desalination plant.

The reality is that the Deputy Premier was literally flushed out when he had to admit that the government was not building it—in fact, the government did not even know whether it was going to be associated with BHP. He did not even know whether the water coming out of BHP's proposed desalination plant would be of drinking quality. He made a ministerial statement yesterday in this house and said, 'We have been involved in these discussions since 2006.' That is two years ago, and he still does not know what is happening or what BHP's proposals are. For two years he has had the opportunity to go out and say to the people of South Australia, 'We are building this huge desalination plant.' This government has kept running out and saying that, knowing full well that it was not the truth and it was not their intention.

I cannot believe that the Deputy Premier has been talking with BHP Billiton for two years and that he found out only a week or a fortnight ago that the water produced from its proposed plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf would not be suitable for SA Water—because that is what he has told the house in the last week or two. If the Deputy Premier has been talking with BHP Billiton for two years and has only just found that out, I suggest that the government gets someone else to talk to BHP Billiton, because the Deputy Premier—what did I say he was earlier?

Mr Pisoni: Incompetent.

Mr WILLIAMS: 'Incompetent' is a damn good word, because it describes him very well. I note that BHP Billiton has released a press statement on this matter, because I think it has been a bit miffed by the Deputy Premier. It has expressed some surprise at this matter being raised in the parliament and the Deputy Premier's comments. For goodness sake, someone over there give the Deputy Premier a tap on the shoulder and tell him it does not matter that he would not be able to get a job in the private sector because it is time for him to leave the public sector because we are sick of him here.

As to the Mount Bold reservoir, at budget time last year, on 7 June from memory, *The Advertiser* carried a major article about how the Premier and the water security minister had been there with the TV cameras, etc. They had all the print stuff mocked up about how they were going to increase Mount Bold so that *The Advertiser* could print it. Yet, 12 months later it is off the agenda. Again, here is this government going out and telling the public what it wanted the public to believe it was going to do when it obviously had no intention of doing it.

That is the problem with this government: it keeps telling fibs. It goes out and says, 'This is what we are going to do. We are spending all this money. We are going to save you,' but it has no intention of doing it. Mount Bold is not happening now. The water security minister is now saying that they are going to double the capacity in the Hills somewhere but she is not sure where. The Deputy Premier is still saying that they will do something at Mount Bold. It is total confusion but no intention. It is an \$850 million project, yet we were advised very shortly after that announcement that you would not do that job at Mount Bold for under \$1.3 billion. That, I believe, is the same

advice that was given to the government shortly after it came out with its presumptuous statement about Mount Bold. That is why it has disappeared.

As to the desal for Adelaide, where is it? At last there is \$96 million in the budget. I repeat that I was in Spain a few weeks ago where I spoke to some of the companies that manufacture major desal plants around the world and I visited a desal plant being constructed in Barcelona. I talked to a lot of water people in various parts of Spain. I put to one of these big companies the question: how long would it take you to build a desal plant in Adelaide? This company said, 'We are very interested in Australia. We are shortlisted to build a new desal plant in Perth. That is not far from you. We want to build our business in Australia.' I asked how long it would take to build it. They said 18 months to two years tops, including ordering the materials.

What does our water security minister say? Six years. Why does she say six years? So that she can go on radio and say that she is spending \$3 billion when she does not have the authority to spend \$3 billion and when she has no damn intention of spending \$3 billion. That is what is happening. That is why this budget is yet another dud from a dud Treasurer and that is why South Australia continues to go backwards under this government. That is why, in less than two years, the people of South Australia will pass judgment, and I sincerely hope they get it right this time because I do not think they can afford to go much further with this government and this Treasurer.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:33): It is my pleasure to follow my colleagues who have so eloquently put their perspective on the budget.

Mrs Geraghty: That's not what we say.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My position might not be agreed on by all sides but it is from my side. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his contribution earlier today. I think he certainly expressed the thoughts of many South Australians who are not necessarily happy with the budget that was brought down some 12 days ago.

I want to talk about a lot of things in my contribution—I will not touch on health just yet; perhaps I will talk about that at the end—and I want to recognise the fact that in the 27 months or so that I have been a member of the house this is the third time that a budget has been presented. Each time I have taken it, I have tried to read as much of it as I possibly can in order to understand it all and I have tried to get a grasp of it. It is a challenge; there is no doubt about that. Anything that controls the revenues and expenditure of \$13.5 billion is an enormous amount and it takes a lot of work to put together, but you have to make sure you get it right, too. So, I want to go through a few things from our perspective that we feel are not as good as they could be.

I have a lot of concerns about what the future financial position of South Australia will be. The Treasurer stands up all the time and talks about the AAA credit rating and the need to preserve it and what he has done over his six years in government—his seven budgets that he has presented and the fact that the budget is always in surplus. The problem is that the method that he uses to determine whether it is in surplus or deficit is not what he said he was going to do initially.

In 2002, the Treasurer stated that Labor would use net lending as the measure of its budget results. But now, conveniently, because it has become quite difficult to maintain a surplus—and, in fact, it is in deficit by this proposed budget of \$548 million—he has gone to the net operating opportunity which shows a surplus of \$160 million. The other method of measuring financial performance is cash deficit. Even the budget papers themselves identify the fact that the cash deficit will be \$530 million for the 2008-09 financial year. The net lending deficit and the cash deficit both identify that over the forward projections of the budget the deficit figure will be something like \$2 billion in total. That has to be a concern for every South Australian out there who worries about the future financial viability of their state.

I want to talk about revenues. When the Liberal Party unfortunately lost the February 2002 election and Labor came in, the budget of the state then was a little over \$8 billion. Now we find that in 2008-09 it will be \$13.3 billion but it has actually increased by \$4.7 billion—just imagine what that capacity can do. The question that other members of the opposition and I am asked continually is: where can we actually see the benefit of that increase in revenue? People in regional South Australia are not seeing it and many of the people in metropolitan South Australia are not seeing it either, so a lot of questions are to be asked.

People do not mind paying taxation when they can see the benefit but there have to be obvious signs of it. They do not want to continually hear about visions, scoping projects, pre-feasibilities and feasibility studies. They want to hear about action on the ground. They want to see

that action on the ground and they want to see whether their money is being spent appropriately and whether they have the chance to benefit as a society and a community from that. We are not sure whether that has actually happened.

From 2002-03 to 2007-08, the government will actually collect a massive \$3.7 billion more than it expected to receive. GST revenues make up \$2.1 billion of that; other state taxations make up \$1.6 billion. Just imagine if there had been a bit of forward vision like that shown by the previous Howard federal government where funds had been put aside into future funds to actually pay for liabilities and, importantly, to actually have funds there to build our nation. As a state, South Australia has had this opportunity, but it has not taken it up. It needs that sort of vision; it needs to ensure that financial responsibility exists.

This is of great concern to me having come into this place from a local government background where every dollar really had to be accounted for quite stringently. If you did not expend what you said you would and if you did not complete projects that you were going to do, you had to report against that and be accountable to the community against that all the time, but now, it seems to me, it is a case of income being underestimated and expenditure overestimated.

That creates the capacity suddenly to find dollars in the budget to actually do some additional work, but it leads me to ask: where is the budgeting responsibility? Where is the fiscal control that ensures that, when a budget is published—and an enormous amount of work goes into it—it truly does represent the state's vision over that 12 month period and over the forward estimates period of an additional three years?

I have asked that question of the Auditor-General during his presentations to the Economic and Finance Committee and it has just surprised me. The previous Auditor-General actually submitted a statement in his 2006-07 report, as follows:

Net operating balance surpluses were achieved after revenue windfalls (unbudgeted) allowed for funding of initiatives and expenditure pressures to be addressed...This implies a need for very strong control and reporting over future spending.

The Auditor-General has raised this point and, certainly, members on this side of the house raise this point all the time that they want to see financial controls in place, but it does not appear as though it is getting any better.

It is amazing to me that we had a budget adopted only 12 months and one week ago which showed, I believe, a \$30 million surplus. The Mid-Year Budget Review upgraded that to a \$90 million surplus—remembering also that expenditure had increased by, I think, \$450 million during that financial year—but now we find that the estimate result for 2007-08 as included in the budget papers for 2008-09 showed that it was going to be a surplus in the current financial year of \$373 million, a 12-fold increase on what was shown in the original budget that was set down only 12 months ago.

This really does demonstrate that the Treasurer is not listening to what the Auditor-General said in his 2006-07 report and that we need to ensure that things improve in the future. I can give you an assurance that a Liberal government from 21 March 2010 would do that.

Credit rating has to be a concern for all South Australians. As I mentioned before, the Treasurer stands up with great pride and talks about the AAA credit rating. We on this side know that our AAA credit rating was only able to be achieved through some amazing decisions being made in the period between 1993 and 2002 after a Liberal government inherited a disgraceful state financial position primarily caused by State Bank debt where you had \$11.6 billion in liabilities and \$3.6 billion of that related to the State Bank. That created some enormous challenges but, through hard work and difficult decisions, it was improved enormously.

We now have a credit rating that I think is seriously exposed. We do know that the ratio of South Australia's net financial liabilities to revenue in this budget paper is identified as being 70.4 per cent. That is clearly in the upper echelons when you compare it against all other states. The budget papers identify that Tasmania is the next highest with 54.2 per cent of net financial liabilities to revenue, and it is interesting to note that Tasmania's credit rating is AA+. It is not AAA; it is AA+. A reduction in credit rating creates additional costs associated with borrowings. The Treasurer certainly cannot afford that because we know that borrowings are projected to increase for government debt out to, I think, \$1.98 billion by 2011-12.

There is a lot of pressure on this budget. The government has probably brought forward projects that it did not want to do yet in answering initiatives that have been announced by the

opposition. That has forced them to go to areas that they probably would have wanted to preserve until later in the electoral cycle, but it has created some great challenges. We know from answers by the Treasurer to questions in the house on pressures on investments that the state is in for a bit of a rocky ride on its \$13 billion of funds that are under investment. We have done some sums just as they relate to Funds SA. The prediction is that that will probably lose \$351 million. Admittedly, these estimates are two weeks old, but we also know that the pressure on the stock market over that period has actually been even more pronounced with a reduction in the market. Let us hope it picks up, because, for South Australia's future, it needs to improve.

The Motor Accident Commission again projected figures two weeks ago that it might be losing \$140 million, while WorkCover, through its loss of investments, was another \$41 million. In total, that was \$532 million in loss of investments. The pressure is only going to get tighter.

I have talked about net debt being \$11.6 billion in 1993 down to \$3.2 billion when the election of 2002 handed government to Labor, but we know now that, with government debt and non-financial public sector debt, it is actually going to be \$5.2 billion by the end of the 2011-12 financial year. That is amazing when you consider that state government debt as it currently stands is, I believe, about \$82 million but, again, enforcing the fact that with the borrowing program that will be in place—and many members of the opposition have voiced their concern about the borrowing program by the Treasurer—it will be \$1.98 billion by 2012 that the government itself owes as a debt.

I am a believer in debt to some degree. I have, personally, a financially conservative nature, but I understand that debt really does need to be in place to fund important infrastructures. However, you have to look at the capacity of the revenues to actually pay for it. You have to look at the capacity of the property owners and the taxpayers in South Australia to pay for it, too. Budgets are predicted to improve. I know the Leader of the Opposition is quoted quite often as saying that over the forward estimate periods this government will be bringing in by 2011-12 something like \$15 billion per year. That is \$15 billion out of the pockets of taxpayers in South Australia and Australia, and you need to make sure you spend it appropriately.

Another issue on which the Leader of the Opposition has been quite outspoken is this \$3.7 billion in windfall revenues over the last seven years. Of that amount, \$2.1 billion comes from GST. Labor did not want GST. The Premier was quoted on 5DN in 2001 as saying it was a 'lemon deal' for South Australia. It has turned out to be something very different from that because it has actually given the state revenues that he could not have imagined. It has allowed—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Unley tells me that it is sweeter than lemonade. That is a great term, I like that. But to have that \$2.1 billion that you have not considered as part of each budget cycle and then blow it does nobody any good. A lot of the additional amount of \$1.6 billion that is coming from South Australian taxpayers has come from property taxation. I want to highlight one aspect of this. I am rather surprised when I look in the 2008-09 financial year budget and find that land tax from private property will increase from \$223 million to \$306 million. That is \$83 million extra in one financial year and an increase of 37.5 per cent, and it has not hit the airwaves. I have not heard of people up in arms about it. Obviously, when the bills start coming out it will be very different.

The government and the opposition reacted quite interestingly about four years ago to land tax increases then, and this affected everybody who had coastal properties, second homes or investment properties, and it puts a lot of pressure on the economy to pay for this. To increase it by 37.5 per cent in one year is amazing. And to put it down purely to the fact that valuation increases justify it is not appropriate either. There is always an ability to adjust the rate to which land tax is levied to create some savings for the people who are paying the bill. These people will start to scream.

We have already started to get letters from people who are concerned about the fact that the consolidation legislation, which went through last year, reduces the ability to minimise land tax by holding lands in different names and companies. That was intended to create additional revenue of \$5 million. We have heard some amazing stories. Since that was brought in, the land tax of one property owner in the metropolitan area, who contacted the opposition, has increased from \$14,000 to \$124,000. That is just one of many stories that people across the state will be telling. Interestingly, from the 2000-01 financial year through to 2008-09, taxes on properties increased from \$731 million to \$1.577 billion, or 116 per cent—amazing.

I acknowledge the fact that an adjustment has been made to stamp duty costs for first home buyers. I enforce the fact that first time buyers made up only 30 per cent of the market in the last financial year, compared to 20 per cent six years ago. The pressures out there on young people to buy their first home are immense. They want to live a lifestyle and, importantly, they also want to have assets. They rely very heavily upon their parents to support them. Parents will want to start spending their inheritance pretty soon. They do not want to leave it all to their kids; they want to make sure that they too have a good lifestyle.

Very large property valuation increases are making it extremely hard on young people. These are the young people we want to keep in South Australia. It is making it very hard for our young people to come up with that money to buy that first home. Let's hope that it gets better very soon, because everybody should be entitled to that right. We want to make sure that people have great careers in South Australia. We want to make sure that people have the opportunity to have a family in South Australia, to live here, and enjoy the lifestyle that we have enjoyed over our time. But let's make sure—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Hammond says that you might have to live in the city for that, and I will refer to this later. Our definition of what this state budget does for regional people is that it actually abandons them, and I got a bit angry about discussions about country health. But we will come to that a bit later.

On employment growth, the minister will stand up and say that there are 777,800 people working in South Australia, and 15 continuous months of employment growth. But the reality is that, if South Australia actually kept up with employment growth as it occurs across the nation, there would be another 25,900 people in employment. We currently have 41,100 people unemployed, including 4,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 19 who are out there looking for a job and cannot find one, and have to put up with 25 per cent youth unemployment rates.

The unemployment rate overall in South Australia is 5 per cent. If we had managed to keep up our employment growth opportunities as they related to all of the nation that additional 25,900 people in work would have meant that our unemployment would have been down probably with the rate that Western Australia now enjoys. Let's not talk about mining booms; let's talk about mining discoveries and the research that they are doing. Let's actually make sure that jobs are created in the state and that we get flow-on effects from that because we certainly need it.

I want to highlight unfunded superannuation liabilities for a while. The 2006-07 financial year result for unfunded super was \$5.075 billion. At the end of this current financial year 2008 this is predicted to be \$6.91 billion. That is an \$1.84 billion increase in one financial year. I know that there have been some negative returns from investments; I understand that, but suddenly we have this impost on superannuation liabilities that will be a noose South Australia's neck for the next 40 years.

I am told that there is a plan in place, and there has been for some time since the Liberals came in '93, to fully fund superannuation by 2034. I know also from looking at the budget papers that superannuation liabilities will be around the \$6.9-\$7.1 billion mark out over the forward estimates; so it is a great challenge for the Treasurer to ensure that that becomes funded.

I want to focus very briefly in my closing minutes on public sector blow-outs. There is a variety of figures out there about the increased numbers in the public sector. The Commissioner of Public Employment has referred 17,000 additional public sector employees and the budget papers that we have been able to review identify 12,085. The Treasurer has talked about 9,287, which itself creates a concern that these three people who are providing information through to the budget cannot actually agree on a figure.

I know that there has been an increase in nurses, teachers, doctors and police officers. The Premier quite often quotes the additional 699 doctors who have been employed in the state. But if you deduct those people from the increase in public service numbers, even by the Treasurer's own figure of being in the lower estimates, there are still nearly 5, 800 people who were not originally budgeted for. So let's actually make sure that things are controlled a bit.

In my closing remarks I want to refer very briefly to country health. I will talk about this at later opportunities too. It was fantastic today to see 1,000 people out on the steps of Parliament House. Many of those people had very little warning about the effects of the country health care plan announced on 5 June. They did not have much of an opportunity to galvanise public support, but those people and a lot of key people from all the regions of South Australia made sure that a

core nucleus was aware of it. They organised to fill buses and cars to come down to the city, and for some people at tremendous cost and time impost, but they all wanted be here because they want to fight for a service that is important to them.

I had the opportunity to speak to many Yorke Peninsula people who were out the front and I commend them for the effort that they have made. They are people who have a passion for community life in general. I was not surprised when I saw so many people from Yorke Peninsula because I know that, if a serious issue comes up—and hospitals are the most important for them—they will fight with a passion for it, and they are an example to many of us in this place.

It is important that we in opposition ensure that the government is accountable on the Country Health Care Plan because it is causing enormous concern. I am trying to ensure that information is out there with people and, on that note, I thank the Minister for Health for ensuring that a senior officer within Country Health is available to address a public meeting in Yorketown within my electorate on Tuesday of next week. That meeting is going to be an interesting one. I am hopeful that at least several hundred people will attend. I have chosen Yorketown strategically because it is losing its obstetrics services as at the end of June, as I understand it.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Not both. Yes, the minister confirms that he believes that is what the local doctor wants to do. I know one 70-year old doctor who does not want to do any more, but there is a 62-year old who wants to continue.

Time expired.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:53): In my contribution to the debate on the Appropriation Bill, I will spend time talking about my electorate. Health and education are important issues, and a lot of teachers and health workers live in my electorate. I am sure that many of them were out on the steps of Parliament House yesterday and today protesting about the crisis in the education and health sectors, and I would like to let them know that I share their concerns. However, there are two other concerns in the seat of Unley, one of which is the encroachment of urban consolidation, and this budget is all about urban consolidation.

In the last couple of months in this house we have seen three members of the Labor government endorse the policies of urban consolidation, despite the fact that they challenged my claims at the last election that they were the party for urban consolidation. We heard the member for West Torrens saying that everyone has the right to subdivide their land. We heard the member for Mawson say that urban consolidation is a good thing, and the member for Norwood, of all people, said that urban consolidation is a good thing for her seat.

We know the views of the replacement candidate for the member for Norwood at the next election, Robert Bria, the mayor, who is going to demolish three historic homes at Linde park because he says that they are not in keeping with the area and that they are holding up progress. Urban consolidation is a big issue for those of us in the historic suburbs of Unley, Norwood, St Peters and North Adelaide. We feel that we have a proud heritage in South Australia and we need to ensure that the heritage and character of those areas remain a part of South Australia that we all enjoy.

The sell-off of open space as part of the Glenside Hospital redevelopment is causing enormous concern in the seats of Unley and Bragg, with 42 per cent of open space being sold off. The Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse told the other chamber that the sell-off of Glenside was part of the government's plan to control the urban growth boundary—again, more urban consolidation in the inner suburbs. There is very little planning involved in urban consolidation and that is one of the biggest concerns that people have about it, that there are no plans. They buy into a street for its streetscape; they buy into a street for its character; they buy into a street for the historic nature of the street and the nice setbacks that those homes have; the trees that the streets have; the trees that are growing in the gardens; and before they know it, a bluestone home has been demolished and a McMansion of three residences has been built from boundary to boundary next to them. That has a significant impact on the lifestyle of those living there.

That is a major concern for people living in my electorate of Unley, as is Unley Road. Unley Road is another interesting story. At a time when we are seeing enormous government revenues, above the budgeted revenues that the government was expecting, there still seems to be no money for the desperately needed upgrade of Unley Road. A feasibility study went on for a couple of years and a plan was approved under Diana Laidlaw, the former transport minister, for two lanes

in and one lane out in the morning and the reverse in the afternoon. There were also more crossing points for pedestrians. The good thing about this plan was that all the stakeholders—those who operated the strip shopping, the council, the residents—felt that the plan would work and it would be very cost effective.

The only thing it needed was for the new transport minister—and I believe it was Trish White at the time, the member for Taylor—to take that to cabinet for cabinet approval. Even though it was recommended for cabinet approval, the minister decided not to do that and there was no funding, so we are still waiting for funding on Unley Road. It affects all the people who live not only in Unley but also south through the electorates of Waite and Davenport as well.

[Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30]

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (19:31): Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I am not at all fazed by the fact that the chamber is not full of people listening to me.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am speaking to close the debate. I am trying to think back to when I was shadow treasurer and how many people from the then government were listening to me. There were not too many and, I have to be honest, there were not too many of my own colleagues, either.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All my colleagues were behind me. On behalf of the government, I thank members for their contributions. Over the course of this week they have been incredibly informative. Members have taken all volumes of the budget papers and forensically gone through the numbers and been prepared to both praise and criticise, but they have done so in a way that is incredibly non-partisan. It is a unique opportunity for us in this house to listen to a debate that is not based on party politics but, rather, what people actually think of the budget.

I have listened to all the contributions. Notwithstanding criticisms of the government's budget, the majority of voting members of this house believe that this budget is a good budget. I believe that if one is able to bring down a budget and the majority of voting members of parliament think it is a good budget, then, clearly, it is a good budget. The fact that a minority do not think it is a good budget, well, that is the beauty of our democracy. As long as we are in government and we are able to bring down a budget that is accepted by the majority of members of this house, then I think we will remain in government. This is a fairly logical approach to it.

This is budget No. 7 for the government. There is a surplus. I saw some nonsense about its being a deficit budget on a cash basis. Well, that shows how little the opposition knows about framing a modern budget. The modern budget has two principal measures on which to assess the budget. The first is the net operating surplus or balance or deficit; that is, the day-to-day expenses are in surplus and income well exceeds the expenditure.

We are, and always have been, extremely strong on that, but we have made a sensible decision to borrow in order to reinvest in capital in this state. The bizarre suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition that five years ago we should have put \$3.7 billion (I think that is the figure he mentioned) into a future fund beggars belief. What he is saying is that we should not have spent the \$3.7 billion on recurrent and/or capital on which it has been spent. He identifies none of the savings or none of the areas on which we should not have spent money. He says that somehow we should have put it into a fund to pay for the infrastructure of today.

What I can say is that when we came to government we were focused on the fact that we had to deliver a net lending surplus and a net operating surplus. The only way in which this state could ever regain a AAA credit rating was if it got its accounts into balance. Notwithstanding the rhetoric of the Leader of the Opposition, with the nonsense that was the record of the former treasurer Rob Lucas and the sale of many billions of dollars worth of assets in ETSA the former Liberal government was incapable of getting its operating expenses under control. It was incapable of spending less than it earned—but we did that.

An overwhelming theme that was coming through constantly from not only my own colleagues but also the business community, the trade union movement, the left of politics—and, if

I went through enough *Hansard* I would probably find from many Liberals—was that we should be prepared to borrow for infrastructure.

An absurd suggestion which has come out of this particular budget from the Leader of the Opposition is that somehow it is wrong for us to be borrowing for infrastructure. The truth is that there is a simple choice. If we do not borrow for infrastructure for the big projects, we do not get them. We cannot find \$2 billion out of a \$12 billion budget in one year. That is just nonsensical.

I know the member for Ashford would almost fall off her chair for my saying this, but it has taken some time for me to accept that, if we are building infrastructure to service a community for 30 or 40 years, why should the taxpayers of today pay for something that will be used by taxpayers for the next 30, 40 for 50 years. So, you spread that over the life cycle of the project; and, if it so wishes, any government into the future can pay down that debt. It is almost bizarre when the left of politics or the trade union movement and business almost sort of connect at the same point, but a business will always and should always properly gear itself. No business that wants to grow can do so without an appropriate level of gearing, and so should a state government be prepared to do it on its balance sheet. The \$5.2 billion figure the Leader of the Opposition sprouts around and says, 'This is of State Bank proportion' is nonsense.

There is roughly \$2 billion of budget debt. I do not have the exact numbers in front of me, but \$1.2 billion will be the desalination plant which will be recovered through pricing mechanisms. The bulk of that remaining non-budget debt will be stored in the Forestry Corporation and within SA Water itself. SA Water, under a former Liberal government, was set up as a public corporation required to act and behave as if it was in the private sector. For it to do that and for it to be properly pricing its product, it needed to have a level of gearing. The non-budget sector debt is underpinned by the income that, to a large extent, SA Water earns.

The budget debt is projected to rise to \$2 billion, and that is underpinned by a budget of some \$12 billion; but, more importantly, it is underpinned by operating surpluses in the out years of some \$400 million. There is a good, sizeable hunk of income to meet the interest payments on that debt, and that \$400 million surplus we have got scheduled in the budget in the out years is net of interest payments on debt. You are not meeting your interest payments from that surplus: it is net of interest payments. The state budget structurally is in a very sound position.

I think that all of us on our side of politics can be very proud—whenever our time comes when we move onto other careers, or whatever—when we look back, because, as a state Labor government, we will have rebuilt our hospital system; will have rebuilt, to a large extent, the major fabric of our school system; and we will have rebuilt, added significant capacity and 21st century conditions in terms of our prison systems. A desalination plant will have been in place and operating, and we will have a state-of-the-art world-class public infrastructure in terms of the light rail and electrification of our system.

I doubt there will ever be a government since Tom Playford's that could ever look back on its time in office—and all of us have been a part of this government in whatever capacity—and say, 'We have made a big difference.' Indeed, if one looks at the social services (and the member for Ashford was an outstanding minister and early champion of the fact) one can see that we had to give greater attention to kids in danger. One thing I find extraordinarily bizarre and quite distressing is that there has never been a time of greater wealth in our society. Regardless of one's politics or philosophical view, there has never been a greater time for personal, community and societal wealth than there is today.

But running with that is this abhorrent, obscene dark side—this insidious legacy that we as a human race are now leaving, and that is that kids are not safe in their homes. They are less safe today than they were decades ago, and that is not just in our state or our country, it is worldwide in the western world. I would hate to look at the underbelly of the Second and Third World countries or other places, perhaps in the Middle East. If a democracy at its wealthiest time in existence can still allow kids to be treated the way they are and need to be taken into state care is an incredible failing of us all who serve in government in western democracies. However, we have put as much into that as we can.

We have put as much as we can into hospitals. I must say that, and I do not want to be particularly provocative, in the last three or four years in this place, I feel like I am in some sort of twilight zone—like, where am I? We have got a Prime Minister, a federal Treasurer and every economic commentator extremely concerned about inflation in this nation, and one of the great drivers of inflation is wages explosions. Members will recall that the Hawke Labor government of the early 1980s put in place a system, and the great efforts of quite extraordinary people like Bill

Kelty and Cliff Dolan realised that the trade union movement had a responsibility as much as government and business did to understand that if we have a wages explosion and we let inflation run rampant the people it hurts the most are working people.

In those days they came up with the Accord and other mechanisms. I accept that the world has moved on, but I do think I am in some sort of a twilight zone when I am in here and getting shouted down by various members of the Liberal Party who say, 'We are not paying teachers enough. You are not offering them a wage that keeps up with inflation.' That may or may not be a legitimate point, but for it to come from conservatives I find extraordinary. In terms of the gay abandon the Liberal Party now has—oh, my God, talk about gay abandon! That is arguably the ugliest thing I have ever seen in this place.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is the Croatian National—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. Just in case posterity ever wants to look at what I was just referring to, the Attorney-General has walked in wearing a pair of running shorts, a soccer top, and gloves.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: From Croatia.

Mr VENNING: I have a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think that what the Attorney-General is wearing could almost be classified as a display, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, in fact, that is not the point of order. There is one, but if you do not know it, I cannot help you.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I have once been in a pair of footy shorts in the chamber. I hope I did not look like that. Anyway, I will wrap up, because I am wandering into a philosophical discussion about where the world is heading.

Whatever our faults as a Labor government, whatever our mistakes and weaknesses, this government is serving the people of this state to the best of our ability. Ultimately, it will be for others to decide whether that is worthy of a third term, but, if I may indulge myself by giving a lesson about politics to the opposition members, let me say that by all means they should be prepared to be critics and by all means they should be prepared to look for maximum mayhem. However, I think they do a disservice to the Liberal Party and the philosophical beliefs of their party when they choose to take populist positions that exploit tensions within the opposing political party. I say that because no-one every seriously believed, or would ever believe, that they would deliver a fairer outcome on the WorkCover scheme than a Labor Party, notwithstanding where we are at.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, members opposite laugh. Are you seriously suggesting that a conservative party of this state would suggest that we are not paying our teachers and doctors enough? At the end of the day, you can choose to walk away from your own inbuilt philosophical beliefs, your own party policies, and what you know you would never do in government in an attempt to get elected. Whatever we did in our opposition days, there was a philosophical underpinning of it. There was a philosophical underpinning of the negativity we had towards the sale of ETSA. There was a philosophical underpinning of much of what we did in opposition. What has struck me about members of this Liberal Party, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that they have been prepared to jettison their own philosophical beliefs to gain popular support. It really is quite silly when a Liberal Party attacks a Labor government because we are not doing right by the trade union movement, in its view, and we are not prepared to offer the wages that it thinks we should.

If all that is left for opposition members is to jettison their philosophical, moral and party policy positions to be popular, by God, what fabric holds them together? What makes them an alternative government? The great weakness of politics in this state in recent years has been the inability of the Liberal Party to behave as a coherent, organised, disciplined machine.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And the member for Schubert knows exactly what I am talking about, because I have got history in this place. At a time when this state needed decisive leadership, brave leadership, courageous leadership, a leadership based on making sure our state could regain itself—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, Mitch, you weren't around when I was around. What I saw was the rank division, the undermining, the white-anting and the ability to decide that a party in government would be prepared to sacrifice the state's future because it was more determined to deal with internal politics than the good of the state. I say that from a historical perspective because, as I look opposite now, I do not necessarily see quite the same division, but what I see is a political party prepared to mortgage its philosophical and moral reasons for existence to appeal to the voters to get into parliament.

From the level of cockiness that we now see opposite, there is no question that the Leader of the Opposition sees himself as the next Premier. I do not blame him for that. In all fairness to him, you would not want to do that job if you did not see yourself as the alternative premier of this state. The member for MacKillop, and others on the front bench, see themselves as future ministers. They may well be, and they may well be there at the next election. But the thing that is very clear in our state's politics, as I have learned through my long association in state politics, is that you actually have to get there and earn it before you can start behaving like you are the government of the day.

I can say to members opposite: you will have a mighty fight at the next state election, because, since the day we were elected to government in 2002 right through to today, we have remained a determined government—not a government without fault, not a government without weaknesses, and not a government that could have done better, but a united Labor Party, a united cabinet and a government which, through the successful leadership of the Premier, has ensured that we, for all of our faults as a government, deliver cohesive, controlled and disciplined government.

I am someone who has been a staff member in the Bannon-Arnold government and a member in opposition in this state for eight years. Both the Bannon-Arnold Labor government (as history no doubt says much better than I can here tonight) and, without a shadow of a doubt, the Brown-Olsen government years were pretty bad when it came to governance. And, as Labor politicians, we have had to wear it.

Mr Venning: Arnold wasn't that bad. He was straight.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, but I can tell you that, when we needed a political party to have its act together to take the state from the dark days of the State Bank collapse and restore our confidence and lead us into a great future, it was the Liberal Party in 1993, and it failed. It failed because John Olsen wanted the job that Dean Brown had and Dean Brown wanted the job that John Olsen ultimately took from him. Those lost eight years meant that, when we came into office, there had been a period of stagnation and division and painful, sloppy, undisciplined government. It required a disciplined unit to come in and run this state, and we have done that.

The penny will drop one day with the member for Morphett, who is the greatest exponent of this. Whatever comes into his mind he announces. He announced the other day that we should electrify our country rail system. I am not sure whether it was \$6 billion or \$8 billion, but the idea of electrified rail corridors to Kimba and Cleve and all those places defies belief. The member for MacKillop, who puts himself out as some sort of economic genius—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He may well be, and I may not be very good at my job and this whole front bench may not be very good at their job; however, what I do know is that Labor in this state has delivered strong, effective and disciplined government, which has our budget strongly in surplus. We are rebuilding and reinvesting in the state. We are delivering more doctors, nurses, and police than any government before us. We are not a government without fault and we are not a government without mistakes, but we are a government that has done this state proud in the last seven years, because we were the first government that I can think of in the last 20 years that has had its act together in terms of its ability to govern this state.

Ultimately, people will make a decision in 18 months' time about whether we deserve to be re-elected. But I say to members opposite that they do their party, their philosophical base and the people of this state no service by jettisoning everything they believe in for cheap populism. They should have the courage of their convictions and the courage to stand by what their party believes in, and ultimately people may well be prepared to elect them if they show the leadership that is required.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They say, 'Look at the *adelaidenow* website.' Strike action occurs and protests occur. Governments that reform and achieve things do so with a degree of political risk. They do so with the real likelihood that there will be a strong community reaction. We had to reform WorkCover: we had no choice. It divided our party internally but we held together and we stayed together, notwithstanding the internal divisions that may or may not have occurred. The sight of trade unionists protesting on the steps of this parliament does not give the Labor government any pleasure at all; however, we will not be pushed into a wages outcome based on a turnout at a strike or emotive action.

If the member for Morphett thinks that the Labor government has had a bad few days because we are getting protests and the *adelaidenow* website may not look good, he may well be right. But the difference is that we are fit for government and they are not. If you want to govern a state where you do not have people protesting or reacting negatively towards you, you are not a government. If you govern just to keep people happy you are a weak, insipid, irrelevancy as a government. If that is what members opposite offer this state—if they offer this state no courage, vision or ability to take a risk in how they govern—they are no government; they are a pale shade of what was once the proud Liberal Party of this state. I think their forefathers will be looking back now and thinking, 'Is this really the party that we built?'

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You will get a lecture, the member for Schubert. As long as a member who is 70 years of age (with all due respect to the member for Schubert) still wants to hold onto his seat, as long as Rob Lucas in another place, who could walk out tomorrow earning more than he earns as a member, selfishly holds onto his seat to stop new people coming in, if we see the Christian Democrats (or whatever they call themselves in this place) bringing Robert Brokenshire back, and Joe Scalzi—they cannot even give the state new people or new blood—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Trish Draper wants to re-enter politics. They are just a moribund bunch of politicians who are into recycling themselves, not about rejuvenating this state. Ivan, do your party a service and retire. Why are you standing at the next election at 68 years of age? Why is Rob Lucas doing so? Probably because he could not get a job anywhere else is why he remains in this place. Anyway, it is not for me to comment.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, female members, they said. Are you preselecting a female at the next election? There will barely be a female in the Liberal Party at the next election. Anyway, that is for their party to decide. I am proud to be a Labor member of parliament, I am proud to be part of a Labor government, I am proud to be a Labor treasurer, and I am proud of our budget. As I said, I am more than happy to sign any copy of *Hansard* that members opposite would like to raffle in their local Liberal Party sub-branch.

Mr Williams: Your last speech—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. I look forward to being Treasurer for another six budgets. But no more after that. You can get six more out of me and that is it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Five budgets, is it? I have never been good at maths. You do not look that enthusiastic, colleagues, about my hanging around.

Bill read a second time.

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

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the Minister for Police (Hon. Paul Holloway), the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. Carmel Zollo) and the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. Gail Gago), 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. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (20:00): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (20:01): I want to use the few minutes available to me to speak about something that needs to be done in my electorate of Morphett and also about a few other issues. While a lot of money was splashed around or proposed to be spent in this budget, there is very little that was spent in the electorate of Morphett. But before I talk about that, I want to talk about one of my shadow portfolios—industrial relations. I have had a little bit to say about the issues involved in industrial relations at the moment but I have been leaving it up to the quite capable shadow ministers for health and education.

However, yesterday I was made aware of another dispute that is going on—and I am pleased that the member for Colton is in the house because it will be of interest to him—with the firefighters. The EB is up for renewal and I have been reliably told that the government or its representatives are refusing to attend those meetings. I hope that is not the case and I hope the member for Colton is ensuring that is not the case. But I have a couple of things to say to the Minister for Industrial Relations, the Hon. Michael Wright. First of all, to your own self be true.

I am not a good negotiator, so a number of years ago I did a commercial negotiation course. I think it did me a little bit of good and I certainly remembered a lot of the things I should be getting other people to do when in negotiations. I have a little card from ScotWorks, the crowd I saw and spoke to, and they are very knowledgeable people. They have a list here of the eight steps in negotiating skills and I will put them on *Hansard* for the Minister for Industrial Relations to think about.

You have to prepare. You have to know what you want, where you want to go and what you want to do and what you are prepared to settle for; then you have to argue your case in a cogent and logical fashion. You have to be able to signal to the people you are negotiating with about what may be acceptable and what is completely unacceptable, and you have to be able to let them know that you are not just shutting things off. You have to put up proposals—of course, you have to be in the same room and you have to talk to the people concerned to be able to do that—and then you have to be able to package it all together in a package that is acceptable to everybody. You close off by making sure that all the bargaining issues are sorted out, then you close your deal, you agree and you can all go home. They are the eight steps of negotiating.

Some of the other things that they have listed here are that you have to be realistic and you should be rewarding the signs that are coming from the other side. Certainly, the fact that the doctors and teachers, and hopefully the firefighters, are willing to speak and negotiate and talk at any time is something that should be rewarded. You need to be making sure that all of your approaches are realistic so that nobody is being led up the garden path, and you yourself have to be realistic about the outcomes you are expecting.

I commend a negotiating course to the Minister for Industrial Relations because I think that, by the way things are going, it is not good, and I certainly hope the firefighters, along with the teachers and doctors, are able to speak to the Labor government. We were being lectured on the attitude of the Liberal government by the Treasurer just a moment ago. I think the current situation in South Australia—whether it is to do with WorkCover or industrial relations—speaks for itself. This Labor government is not new Labor nor is it progressive Labor but it is still supposed to be Labor, and I think they have forgotten their roots.

The estimates committees we are about to go into are going to be an interesting experience. I am really looking forward to the area of transport because there are so many issues that I need to have sorted out in my own mind. I am a tram fan—I love my trams—but I do not see any real plan here. This proposition, because it is not a plan, has been cobbled together in the past few weeks. I hope I am wrong but I can see no evidence whatsoever that this is any more than a mishmash of wish lists and feelgood statements that are stuck so far out the distance that people will have forgotten what they were talking about or they will not be there to do it anyway. Let's find out in the estimates committees.

In my electorate of Morphett, one of the issues that keeps coming up is the King Street Bridge over the Pat. This morning at a stakeholders meeting, we talked about the need to close the licensed venues there at two or three o'clock in the morning because of some alleged social issues. I was sitting next to the former Labor candidate for Morphett, Tim Looker. Tim is now Councillor Looker on the local council and I said to him, 'What about the King Street Bridge?' He said that it is a state government issue, that it is state infrastructure and that it should be funded by

the state. Even your own candidate down there thinks that should happen. Seventy per cent of the people who use that bridge are not from the City of Holdfast Bay. Why should the cost of this be shifted onto the City of Holdfast Bay? I just hope at some stage there is a rethink about that bridge. I hope it is not going to take a collapse or a terrible accident to make the government do something about it.

This morning I had leave from parliament for a little while to attend a meeting in Holdfast Bay with the council, the police, the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner and DRUG ARM, who do a fantastic job. We were talking about whether there is a need to curb the opening hours in the Bay and whether there is a problem with binge drinking. Chief Inspector Graeme Adcock was there who gave us some real insight into what is going on. The statistics have actually been going down through good policing in the past couple of years. He had some very interesting video footage of Moseley Square very early in the morning between one and three o'clock in the morning.

Very little was going on. The perception of antisocial behaviour is there and the noise is there and, certainly, we need to cope with some issues. A lot of younger people come down there and the Bay has been a fantastic place for years and years, so people want to come there. The younger people go there and they are getting a bit out of control, but it is not over the top. It is not a bad place to be, and the police are doing a fantastic job.

What I would like to see, though, to give the police some assistance is not just CCTV in Moseley Square but also on Jetty Road and perhaps the main side streets so that, when people are leaving venues or people cannot get into venues because they are under age (and quite rightly are not allowed to get into those venues), when they are a bit disgruntled, if there is some antisocial behaviour, they will be deterred from acting in that way because they will be on CCTV.

That does not necessarily need to be live-monitored. I would prefer that, but I would really like to have it recorded at least so that, if there is an incident, police can follow it up. Chief Superintendent Graeme Adcock and Chief Inspector Les Buckley are doing a fantastic job down there, and I would like to commend all the police in the Sturt LSA for the job they do. They are doing a great job.

Let us look at state funding for things down there, not just King Street Bridge but also New Year's Eve. New Year's Eve activities cost the ratepayers of Holdfast Bay about \$125,000 a year. If the police, the council and the government, I think, were honest, they would admit to themselves that if they do not organise something down there, people will still go there and then there will be issues, so we need to have an organised event down there. To expect the ratepayers of Holdfast Bay to pay for that, I think, is very unfair.

With the extension of the tramline, more people are coming down to Glenelg. Last New Year's Eve, 35,000 people came down to the Bay on the tram and on buses. Great, fantastic, they are welcome down there, and they were all well-behaved because we had 85 police down there. It was a fantastic effort by the police and they do a terrific job for a great night, but why should the City of Holdfast Bay, the ratepayers—including me, so I will declare that—have to pay for what is really a state celebration and a terrific celebration? I ask the government to reconsider its attitude to funding that. The council could then put some money into other issues.

There are three issues in particular that the council should put money into. I think it is an indictment of the mentality of some council members that there are three issues that need to be funded out of ratepayers funds. One is putting money towards the upgrade of the toilets at the Glenelg Oval, which would be used by the kids in the Glenelg Primary School. The state government and the footy club are putting money in but the local government is not. It is a disgrace. So the kids have to use almost condemnable toilets at Glenelg Primary School.

The other issue is stormwater management. Sure, there is a plan with local government and the state government, but a lot of work remains to be done because we get a lot of stuff coming down through Sturt Creek and Brownhill Creek through to the Pat. So there are more issues down there than local government can cope with and the state government needs to put its hand in its pocket. I do not think that the local government is doing enough by way of consultation with residents about stormwater management.

The last issue is the lights at Glenelg Football Oval. The ratepayers do not have to put in any money for this. Telstra was going to put the money in for it, but the council is blocking lights at the football oval. Why would you not have lights at Glenelg Football Oval for footy and for Twenty20 cricket?

Time expired.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (20:11): I must say it is very difficult trying to speak to the state budget, particularly after the brilliant speech that the Treasurer made defending, and also talking about the philosophy behind, the state budget. There are a couple of areas that I would like to speak about with regard to the state budget that I am particularly excited about.

One of them is the new project to tune up South Australian buildings. As someone who has a fascination with building as well as architecture and development in this state and also on an international level, I think that the \$2 million Building Tune Ups Project to make commercial buildings in the Adelaide CBD more energy efficient is a wonderful initiative on the part of the government. The Premier has already announced the four-year project supporting the third sector agreement entered into under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 between the state government and the Property Council of Australia, also working with the Local Government Association. I believe this all happened at the Local Government Association's Climate Change Summit.

Who would have thought, just looking back five years ago, that we would be talking about climate change, not to mention that we would have a minister for sustainability and climate change. While I am a long-term greenie—I think I have quite good credentials in this area—I am particularly proud that the Labor government, particularly the Premier, has taken on the responsibility for sustainability and climate change. I think this sends a very important message out there about how important it is.

The other reason I support the Building Tune Ups Project is that it seems that this is an opportunity for us to reduce emissions from existing commercial buildings and their contribution to climate change. It is thought that, by following through with this project until 2012, there is the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 70,000 tonnes per year. It is a bit like weight loss; we all need to lose weight—I certainly do—and every kilo is important, so certainly in reducing greenhouse gas emissions every tonne counts, and if we can reduce something like 70,000 tonnes a year that is a good start. So I really do support the fact that we are trying to make a start in this area.

The other thing about this project is that, by supporting it, South Australia will continue to be home to the highest number of green buildings in the nation by upgrading existing buildings, rather than just solely focusing on new developments. As people in this chamber probably know, almost one quarter of Australia's carbon emissions can be attributed to the energy consumed in buildings. There is a lot of support for the project, and I am hoping that eventually our electorate offices will be on that agenda and that, like the fantastic program that has been happening and rolled out in our schools, we too as members of parliament can contribute to climate change by making those differences.

The other initiative that I was particularly pleased to hear about in the electorate of Ashford is the Adelaide Showgrounds upgrade. I am a member of the Royal Adelaide Show. It is probably the only thing other than the Royal JP's Association that I am a member of that has 'royal' in it, because I am a very proud republican. Putting that to one side, I think having the largest solar rooftop installation is something to be proud of.

I did listen to what the member for Flinders said with regard to this project, but I disagree with her. This is a great initiative. I understand that her responsibility is to defend her patch, and I respect that, but, as I said, not only as a member of the show but also as the member for Ashford, I am really proud that 1,000 kilowatts of solar panels will be installed on the roof of the soon-to-be opened—I am sure the member for Goyder will appreciate this—Goyder Pavilion at the centrepiece of the Adelaide Showgrounds upgrade.

For me, the fact that the government, through our Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change, has committed \$8 million to this project, which will have the largest rooftop photovoltaic installation in Australia, which I am told is five times the size of the next largest installation, the Melbourne Victoria Markets, is something to be very proud of.

I also think that it provides a showcase for other organisations to look at what is happening at the show. The show is a very respected organisation as well as an event that a lot of us really enjoy attending. This is on top of, as I said before, a number of other solar panels on major buildings, such as the South Australian Museum, the State Library, the Art Gallery, Parliament House, Adelaide Airport, and 250 public schools across the state as part of our Solar Schools Program. As the member for Ashford, I am very pleased that this is located in my electorate.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (20:17): My constituents and I are feeling devastated by Labor's new Country Health Care Plan which downgrades 43 hospitals across regional South Australia, with eight on Eyre Peninsula. The country health plan states:

The population of Eyre Peninsula...and the West Coast will be served by the Port Lincoln Country General Hospital and by the Whyalla Country General Hospital.

Cummins, Elliston, Streaky Bay, Tumby Bay [and] Wudinna GP Plus emergency hospitals—

I add Cleve, Kimba and Cowell.

—will provide emergency response and other services in line with community needs, which may include expanded primary health care services, aged care support, observation beds and respite/palliative care beds. The GP Plus emergency hospitals will over time develop closer links with the Port Lincoln General Hospital, Whyalla General Hospital and the Ceduna Community Hospital for inpatient care and specialised community and allied health services.

Birthing and surgical services currently provided in Cummins will be transferred to the Port Lincoln General Hospital over time. The current close relationship between Streaky Bay and Ceduna will continue for the provision of birthing services for Streaky Bay.

Surgical services currently provided at Streaky Bay will over time move to Ceduna to meet expected workforce shortages.

My feelings of disbelief followed by anger and those of the people of Eyre Peninsula are summed up in the many visits, phone calls, letters, emails and faxes to my office far more adequately than I can say with yet another speech about the concerns I feel for regional South Australia's people under this Labor government. In a letter to the Minister for Health from my constituents, Julie and Scott Crettenden, they state that it is the first time they have ever written to a politician but they are so distressed and angered at the news that the local hospital at Cummins is to have its services downgraded that they feel compelled to voice their concerns. They state:

You may not understand the strength of feeling about this issue, but in rural Australia the hospital is the heart of an area. My first job was as a cleaner at the Cummins Hospital. Both of our children were born there. My husband, a farmer, has had numerous occasions to visit and stay at the hospital; as have I for surgical procedures, or with an asthmatic toddler, or when our children were involved in a school bus crash. And last year my nanna passed away there.

Our hospital is staffed with people we know well, and who are key members of our community—any cuts to services will see many of them lose their jobs, and possibly they will leave the town. Our whole community is involved in fund-raising for our hospital because it's 'our' hospital.

Another constituent, Mrs Charlton, wrote the following:

If services are cut here we will probably lose Dr Quigley who is a fantastic doctor and his two part-time doctors Claire Rowe and Lexie Yuill. If this happens then we'll lose our chemist and probably our services of physios, podiatrists and dietician, then we won't be able to attract teachers with young families or expecting to have babies because of no proper medical or hospital services. Our town will die—there's nothing surer.

The tone of people living in isolated rural areas is one of extreme worry, and many have expressed their deep concern that lives will be lost. I quote again:

This has the potential to issue a death warrant for many members of our community.

There is a concern about the availability of doctors who know their patients and community well. Again, I quote:

Farmers are going through tough times with the drought, cost of fuel and follow-on costs of fertiliser, transport, etc., and also more cases of mental depression than ever before. It is literally like a kick in the teeth when a plan comes out to take away even more services, such as the one you are proposing. It takes a lot of courage to operate a farm, and even more courage for a local farmer to go to the doctor to see about his depression.

The tone of the people who contact me certainly continues to echo that they are concerned about losing their well-loved, appreciated and admired doctors. I quote:

If these closures are implemented you will have lives lost. And not forgetting the large losses of doctors and staff, because they will not hang around to look after 'old folks homes' and/or staging centres for the transfer of patients to your large central hospitals—they will, I know, just simply retire. Words fail me...

Constituents Brian and Wendy Treloar question the mentality of these decisions. They ask what consideration has been given to the flow-on effect that taking away health services will have. They state:

Consider the role of a country GP, the role of relief doctors, visiting health specialists, visiting medical staff. What about the school without a doctor and a hospital? The policeman who won't come because he and his family have no medical service, chemists forced to close. Because according to you, Mr Hill, and your henchmen we can

go to Port Lincoln for our treatment and our scripts. That is 66 km from Cummins and what about those who live out from the township—would you, Mr Hill, travel so far to get a prescription?

And how about the price of petrol today? My husband has had two heart attacks—he would not have survived the road trip to Port Lincoln. He had a blood clot on his lungs following surgery. He would not have survived the road trip to Port Lincoln. The local doctor on call saved his life.

There are numerous stories of people who would have died had full professional help not been available at our country hospitals. I call on the member for Chaffey and minister in this Labor government to stand up with her National Party President, Wilbur Klein, and publicly renounce the decision made by the Rann Labor government. As he said in an open letter to the Minister for Health:

If this policy proceeds, it will impact negatively on the ability of these communities to attract and retain quality health professionals, allied health workers, other professional services as well as new industry. The health and wellbeing of many country people will be put at risk and the very sustainability of these communities will also be put at risk.

I quote from another letter received today:

I wonder if you have any idea of the travel time involved for people within the area. There are no buses to catch you know, so we are unlikely to get there for \$2 to \$3, the cost of a city fare. Nor is there a ten minute wait for an ambulance that speeds out from a centre with a specialist crew on board. Our ambulance is manned by volunteers who get a call, travel from their homes to the town, then travel out to any required area. They respond as quickly and as well as they possibly can, but we need to know there is the best attention medically available at the hospital plus treatment. What a strain will you be placing upon these people, or do you intend to supply the paid ambulance staff? Your plan: off to the regional centre we go, cut off from family and friends. Have you checked the price of fuel for travel?

What about nursing staff? Most are locally sourced and there goes their employment. Their skills to manage significant illnesses are lost to the community, and what a loss to the rural community in general as they are lost to the health system. A care centre you indicate, but when I need care there will be so many patients from outside of our area sent to our hospital that the care I may need will be unavailable to me.

Your government seems to be biased against the rural communities. They are most productive, self-reliant people who are battling many adversities at the present time, drought, etc. You appear to favour those who do not help themselves. Our hospital needs to be available in its present capacity, or to be upgraded to encourage rural communities to again feel a part of this state you say is so great. We pay enough tax from this area to warrant that.

Finally, Wendy Treloar sums up the sentiments of country people throughout South Australia:

You are playing with people's lives, Mr Hill. People will die, Mr Hill, no question, people will die.

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta) (20:26): I rise today in support of the Appropriation Bill. The key action of this budget for transport development has been long in the planning, but we will see developments in the infrastructure of this state that will provide a framework for the future development of our city long overdue. It will attract more and more South Australians to use the public transport system over the next decade and that has to be good for this state. The more cars we can get off the road the better for us all.

An extra 80 buses providing up to nine million extra passenger journeys over four years is in response to calls from the public for a more efficient bus system. The new proposed ticketing system will also cut processing time and speed journeys for all passengers. However, the investment of \$2 billion to electrify northern and southern rail lines, the purchase of 50 new electric trains and the extension of the tramline, together with the provision of extra trams to boost the fleet will, in my opinion, revitalise our city and take it to a new visionary level.

It shows that this government is able to think and plan beyond the term of each government, that it has the good of the state, the future of the state at its heart. We are taking action now for the future of the state. These are not short-term, populist plans, but long-term visionary plans that will develop this state, so that we can continue to punch well above our weight in comparison to the eastern states and attract and maintain our workforce. This budget also makes provision for \$700 million to be spent on the state's roads during the next four years. These projects will include road widening and shoulder sealing, including \$40,000 for Gorge Road, in my own electorate of Morialta.

I have a very special interest in our health system and I am delighted that this budget builds on last year's budget with another record amount of money for health in 2008-09 of \$3.246 billion. In particular, there will be an extra \$26.6 million to the SA Ambulance Service over the next four years. We as a government really value the work of our paramedics and recognise that the growing demand for their services means that we need to employ more paramedics to

cope with this increase. In conjunction with this money will be an additional \$7.3 million to replace and upgrade ambulance stations across the state.

I am also pleased that we are providing \$2.6 million to replace two country mobile vans for BreastScreen SA, a topic that I have talked about in this place at length on a previous occasion. These will be installed with state of the art digital mammography technology. This is a very important initiative to women living in country SA if we are to be able to keep up our proactive testing program and encourage women over 50, plus others at risk, to undertake routine mammograms. While we continue with our \$1.7 billion plan for the new Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital, we have committed \$7.2 million to refurbish parts of the RAH to increase capacity, while the new hospital is under construction.

Having spent much of my adult life working in the disability and ageing sectors, I am proud of this government's commitment to increase disability funding in order to improve the quality of life of people with disabilities. In this budget there is an additional \$5 million to clear the waiting lists for equipment for children and adults. This will provide more than 1,230 pieces of equipment, such as wheelchairs, walking frames and hoists, which enable people to remain independent in their own home.

One piece of equipment for which Novita has lobbied for some time is the redevelopment of the hydrotherapy pool at the Regency Park centre, and I am pleased that a further \$2 million will be provided to redevelop that pool, which is used by almost by 200 special students from 16 different schools across the city.

Despite the message delivered by the opposition, spending on disability services has increased considerably under this government, from \$118 million in 2001-02 to \$201.2 million. On top of this increased recurrent funding, we have provided extra one-off spending totalling \$51.6 million. On top of this, there is extra investment to help people with disabilities in transport, recreation and sport. Since 2002 the Rann government has also invested an extra \$75.7 million in education to increase support for students with extra needs, including students with a disability.

As my electorate covers both the Adelaide Plains and Hills areas, I am pleased that the CFS firefighting effort has been further supported, particularly in the area of aerial firefighting. An Erickson air-crane will now be based primarily in South Australia over the fire danger season. This high volume helicopter will complement the existing fleet and support the CFS volunteers tackling fires on the ground. I am also thrilled that the first sod has now been turned on the new Paradise Metropolitan Fire Station in Morialta, which will be completed during this budget cycle.

The Education Works program continues to help many schools through the process of restructuring in order to deliver more efficient and effective school buildings and education outcomes. Campbelltown will see the development of a new one-stop shop children's centre, which will be based in the education hub and which will include Il Nido Child Care Centre, Campbelltown Junior Primary School and Charles Campbell Secondary School. This new centre will help families cope much better by providing a service for children of all ages from birth onwards.

Many families in South Australia now have both parents in the workforce and they often find it extremely difficult and time consuming delivering and picking up children across the age groups from different venues. This government has made early childhood programs a real focus of our education policy and families really appreciate this change in emphasis.

I believe that South Australians deserve to live in a safe and secure environment. This government continues its record funding for police, with an 11 per cent increase in operational funding to nearly \$630 million this year—62 per cent more than in 2002-03. I am very pleased that the new police shopfront is now open in Newton. This increase in budget will enable an additional 100 police officers to be employed this year. This is over and above the annual attrition rate.

Youth offending has been a focus for this government, with the Commissioner for Social Inclusion, Monsignor David Cappo, producing a report, 'To Break the Cycle'. This budget sees \$11.5 million being devoted to a package of coordinated programs focusing on young offenders and children at risk who have fallen through the gaps of the youth justice system. This money will go a long way towards helping to deter a small group of young repeat offenders from antisocial and criminal behaviour; and I applaud this initiative.

I have highlighted issues that are of particular interest and importance to me, and time does not allow me to go into the whole budget. I believe we are building a better future at all levels of the community. The increase of the payroll tax threshold to \$600,000 by mid-2009, together with a cut in payroll tax of 5.25 per cent, will assist small to medium businesses to stay competitive with

other states. Some 6,500 businesses employing 380,000 South Australians will benefit. The \$4,000 bonus grant for first home buyers will be of great assistance, particularly to young South Australians who are trying to get onto the property ladder and purchase their own home. The government estimates that over 9,000 first home buyers will receive the full grant in 2008-09—that is 9,000 young people who will be assisted to take this very important step to independence. As a mother of two children in their 20s, I know firsthand the struggle in today's world of spiralling costs to make this first step.

This is the third budget since I have been in this place. I am proud to be part of a government that is continually building on long-term visionary plans for this state, with priorities for health, education, law and order, and infrastructure, without forgetting our increasing number of children in care and those with a disability. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (20:35): There are a significant number of issues I want to canvass tonight. First, I will talk about things specific to my electorate. My country electorate is quite distant from metropolitan Adelaide and it is one of those parts of the state which is totally ignored in this budget.

I do not know how many times the issue of the pulp mill at Penola has been raised in this house. In fact, in the past 12 months we passed a bill to facilitate a pulp mill being built in my electorate near Penola. I do not think any member in this house could say they were not aware of the extensive blue gum forests that have been planted in my electorate. Some 30,000 to 40,000 hectares of blue gums have been planted over the past 10 to 12 years. All those blue gums are reaching maturity and they will be harvested.

The land will be replanted, but the trees will be harvested and chipped and the chips put into trucks to be transported. They may be transported as far as the pulp mill at Penola, but in the first instance they will be transported right across my electorate and through the adjacent electorate of Mount Gambier to Portland for export. Well over one million tonnes, probably 1.5 million or two million tonnes, a year will be transported. Not one cent in this budget is directed towards building the infrastructure which will be necessary to move those chips—not one cent.

We have been debating about what we should do for at least five or six years now. Everyone knows that the task is in front of us; everyone knows that we have to get on with it and upgrade the road infrastructure to facilitate that industry—not one cent. Every member here knows about the Penola bypass because it has been talked about for so long. In fact, last year the Minister for Transport tried to tell the people in the South-East that he had provisioned for the state's share of the funding to build a bypass around Penola. We are not talking a couple of hundred thousand dollars here, we are talking millions of dollars. There was not one provision in last year's budget and, of course, it is not even on the government's radar now.

Those chips to which I referred a few minutes ago will have to go through the township of Penola. Already something like 600 heavy vehicle movements a day travel through the middle of Penola, down the main street. It is a dangerous place for the locals to go shopping. It will be an even more dangerous place in Penola shortly because its hospital is one of those which will be a GP Plus—a bandaid clinic. The Penola hospital does not provide a huge range of services now, but, when it becomes a GP Plus clinic under minister Hill's plan, it will mean that if you are admitted to the Penola hospital you can stay there for only 24 hours. Once your 24 hours are up, and if you need to be hospitalised for longer, you will be moved. And where will you be moved to?

You might go to Mount Gambier, which is going to be one of these super-duper hospitals. So will that be clogged up with people from surrounding communities who can no longer stay in their own community hospital, or will you have to go to Naracoorte or Millicent, even further away? That is bad enough for the people of Penola, but they will have choices: Naracoorte to the north; Millicent to the south-west; and Mount Gambier to the south-east. What happens to the people in similar circumstances in a place like Meningie? I suggest that members of the government consult minister Hill's map, because he obviously does not know the geography of South Australia. He does not know where these hospitals are that he is intent on closing down.

He does not know where the hospitals are that he will downgrade. He does not understand the implications on families. When you live in a community like Meningie and you need to be hospitalised for more than 24 hours you will be shipped out of your community. He does not understand that you either end up at Millicent two hours south or Murray Bridge an hour to the north. What about all the people in a community like Meningie who are currently hospitalised for more than 24 hours? All their families who are trying to support them through their illness, or whatever it might be, will have to visit them in Murray Bridge.

The irony of this is that, over recent years, the government has funded a public transport service out of Meningie. It has subsidised a local bus company to run a bus which runs from Meningie to Murray Bridge and some other surrounding townships. At the end of this month that funding dries up. At the end of this month those people in Meningie in my electorate have no way of getting to Murray Bridge. Take, for example, a retired couple, because there are a lot of retired people in Meningie. I wish that some of the members of the government would get out of the city and visit some of these communities—go to the Mid North or down into my electorate. Go and visit Meningie and just see how many farming families, particularly out of the Mallee, have taken their retirement and settled in Meningie to enjoy their retirement, because it is a lovely town on the edge of Lake Albert.

Meningie had good services and, particularly, a terrific little country hospital. You could not have open heart surgery there; I doubt whether you would have a hip replacement there, but it is a great little country hospital, and it does cater for the local community. A fantastic couple of very dedicated doctors work in that community, and now members of that community will be shipped out an hour up the road to Murray Bridge, at the very best. Of course, Murray Bridge will be catering for people from all over that region—out of the Mallee in the member for Hammond's electorate. Pinnaroo, Karoonda, and Lameroo will all have GP Plus clinics, and the only place for all the people from those areas to go will be Murray Bridge. The Murray Bridge hospital will be chock-a-block full. Where will the overflow go?

I can only assume that the nearest place for them to come to is here in Adelaide. Is it the health minister's plan to ship people who need two or three days hospitalisation into the Royal Adelaide? What on earth is this plan about? These are the sorts of questions the minister refuses to answer. The minister himself is so embarrassed with this plan that he slipped it out under the darkness of the budget late on Thursday afternoon when the budget had just been brought down. He stood in the house today during question time and spent 10 minutes reading out the names of people and groups that he claims he has consulted with, yet, as soon as we asked him a question, he said, 'But now we are consulting.'

Has he consulted before the plan? Will he consult after the plan? Does he have any damn idea what this plan is about? I suggest that he has not. I suggest that he has no idea; and, as I said earlier in my 20-minute contribution, either he is being snowed by his bureaucrats or, if he knows what they are talking about, he is snowing the community of South Australia. The Deputy Premier half an hour ago told the house, 'This government is serving the people of South Australia to the best of our ability.' If that is accurate, God help South Australia, God help country South Australia and God help metropolitan South Australia. The people I have had the pleasure to represent for 10 years will be devastated by this Country Health Care Plan.

The people of every rural electorate will be devastated, because suddenly not only will you be taking services out of local communities but you will be tearing the fabric of those communities apart. It is not just about health. How on earth do we have businesses survive in a place like Meningie when we are trying to attract a young person to Meningie as a diesel mechanic to service the tractors the farmers are using?

If we are trying to attract an accountant to the town to service the business houses, if we are trying to attract any professional, semi-professional or tradesperson to support the local industry, their wife is likely to say, 'I am going to have a family, I am not going to live in a place where there is no doctor, no hospital and no health service.' That is fact. That is the daily life of country people. You are not just ripping the guts out of country health: you are also ripping the guts out of the country. I think every member of this government needs to sit down and think seriously about this. They need to go and knock on minister Hill's door and say, 'I think you have this wrong, minister. You have to stop talking the rhetoric about consultation and go back to the drawing board.'

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

Mr WILLIAMS: That is most unfortunate, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (20:45): I rise in support of this bill. This, the seventh Rann government surplus budget, builds on those great budgets that went before it. It is a budget that obviously has a high degree of spending in the transport area, and builds on previous budgets that have been all about rebuilding this state's health services and education services—building new schools, putting in more teachers and making class sizes smaller.

Year after year we have seen a different focus from the Rann government. First, it was law and order, after the bad days of conservative Liberal government when it turned a blind eye to law and order and allowed crime to get out of control. We put more police on the beat, we have more people in our courts and we have more people in our prisons, because we are not going to take the nonsense that we put up with when the conservatives over there were in power.

I think this is a great budget, but it is not necessarily for me to judge. I think history will be a better judge than me, and, when historians look back on this period from 2002 until now, and into the future, the Rann government will be judged very well against the Kerin months, the Olsen years, the Brown years, the Arnold months, the Bannon years, the Tonkin years, the Corcoran years, and even the Dunstan years. I think you would probably have to go back to Sir Thomas Playford's day to see a government that has brought about such widespread reform in so many areas.

After coming in after the conservatives sold off ETSA and privatised hospitals and the TAB and left a train wreck of an economy here in this state and continually talked down our state, we had to rebuild it and gain the confidence of the people of South Australia, because we had Liberal premier after Liberal premier going out and saying, 'Kick a Vic,' 'South Australia has lost the Grand Prix,' we have done this and done that. They kept talking down South Australia so much that we lost many of our young people interstate. We lost an entire generation.

Since that first day in 2002 the Rann government has been about rebuilding this state and getting South Australians to believe in ourselves as a great state. Now that we have done that, we have business believing in South Australia—not just the local business community but also business people from interstate and overseas who are looking to South Australia as one of the most attractive places in the world to invest. They can see that this government means business and is putting in the social infrastructure and also the infrastructure needed to do business here in South Australia. We see that as a priority, and that is being backed up by the business community.

As well as doing the physical builds, we are also doing a lot to build communities and strengthen our social network, which is all very important. It is no good just the big end of town making billions of dollars in profit. We need to look after the little people, and over the past seven years we have been putting record money into social services and things such as Aboriginal lands and, while there is still plenty of work to be done, as a state we can be proud of the work we are doing in those areas. It is not necessarily about the biggest business. When the smallest individual is doing well and living in better conditions than six years ago when we came to power, that is the true judge of a good society. So I think at all levels we are doing the work—in the top end of town, and also for the poorest people in our community.

It is not just the commentators who are picking up on this and it is not just the accolades that we get from the business community, but it is also the people whom the Liberals might have hoped to convince to come and stand for election to this place in the future. Instead, we have had people coming in here saying, 'You should see the line-up we will have running in Mawson in 2010. We have some great and talented people who are champing at the bit to get in and run for the Liberal Party.' But the Liberal Party brand is so on the nose that they cannot get anyone to put up their hand. In the seat of Mawson Kym Richardson was elected unopposed to the Liberal Party candidacy because no-one else wanted the job. He is a failed federal member who did nothing in the three years that he was in Canberra purportedly representing the people of Kingston. So he is a failed federal candidate and he is the only person the Liberal Party could get to put their hand up.

Joe Scalzi is running again. Talk about attention deficit disorder! What is it with these people? Can't they realise that they were part of a dreadful Brown-Olsen-Kerin reign of sell-offs and privatisation and just be done with it and go off and sit on their retirement packages and pensions and not pop their head up again? They achieved absolutely nothing in this place. We see Trish Draper, another failed federal member of parliament. All she seemed to do was grizzle about being in parliament the whole time she was there. She has got the government pension and is now putting up her hand for another slice of the pie.

The Liberal Party brand is so on the nose in this state, if that is the best this party can do to attract candidates, we may soon see the death of the Liberal Party. That would be a pity, because it is good to have healthy opposition, and I wonder what that great socialist premier Sir Thomas Playford would have thought if, after doing so much to build this state and put infrastructure in place, he had seen the sell-off by his descendants in the Liberal Party during those terribly dark days in the 1990s, when these economic bandits got in and sold our state up the creek. We have come in and, as I said, basically rebuilt this state from the bootstraps up, in terms of social wellbeing right through to putting in the infrastructure.

I would particularly like to pay tribute to our Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure. He has held the line over several years as the money was put into police to get law and order back in check and to fix our health problems—the hospitals which had been sold off and the health system which had been run down. We had to put money into the education system because the Liberals went around the state closing down school after school. And all the time Patrick sat there.

We had a plan in 2004, when I was working with the minister. We sat down and burnt the midnight oil with every single department to come up with an infrastructure plan. We also sat down with the private sector and mapped out a plan to build infrastructure for this state. If one looks at that document, one will see that the framework for the measures that we have been able to announce this year was set in the Infrastructure Plan that we released in 2005.

We put long hours into that. We knew that the money could not all be spent in a single budget because, just like running a household budget, you cannot do everything that you want to do in one year. We had a long-term vision for this state. We knew that it was in a deplorable condition after 8½ years of Liberal mismanagement. This is now all coming to fruition, and I want to congratulate the Minister for Transport for holding the line and for his vision. It is a wonderful vision and, as I said before, history will be the greatest judge. I believe that, when we look back on this era, it will be held up as one of great eras in this great state's history.

I attended a Property Council breakfast function a few weeks ago and someone from the private sector said, 'What this government has done by getting out there and really encouraging people to go and look for mineral resources will not bring about a mining boom; it will take this state to another level.' It is not a boom that will bust in a few years. It will take us to a level where this state will stay year after year, decade after decade, and from that position we will have the money—the royalties—to invest in our police force and to grow our transport department and infrastructure even further.

This all paints a very bright picture for South Australia and, again, I want to commend the Premier, the Minister for Health, the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Education and Children's Services and, of course, the Treasurer, who has to go through documents with a fine toothcomb each year and decide which money will be in and which money will be out. I think we have shown great discipline over the past seven years to deliver seven successive surplus budgets and, as I said, I think history will show that this has, indeed, been a great era in South Australia's history.

However, having said that, now is no time to give up. We need to be out there and continue to listen to the community and deliver what this community wants without any sense of arrogance or losing touch with the people. I think we have done that very well over the past six years. We want to keep our ear to the ground, our finger on the pulse and deliver on the community's needs.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (20:55): Mr Speaker, you might have imagined the budget as being a document about which one would expect accolades from members of the party that forms government and areas of criticism from members of the opposition, and that has largely been the case in the preceding speeches. There is a little light on the hill that I wish to acknowledge as the member for Bragg and for which I want to express my appreciation to the government, and that is the announcement this year of a \$2 million plus extension of facilities at the Kensington Centre. The Kensington Centre is an educational facility in my electorate that provides for special children with high needs, and I recently had the privilege of welcoming a number of them to Parliament House.

However, I note that the centre is in a part of my electorate which, at the time the project will come to fruition, in December 2010, will form part of the electorate of Norwood, and the political cynic in me would question why, after all these years, I get a project for Kensington Centre and it is about to go into a neighbouring electorate. However, I will look forward to attending the opening of this new extension and facility for secure play areas with the new member for Norwood, Mr Steven Marshall, in December 2010.

On the other hand, the people of Bragg are used to receiving very little provision for our electorate. It is usual for me as the member to peruse the budget and find nothing for the people of Bragg. I am quite used to that. But is it not interesting that, when we have a new Prime Minister who describes climate change and water and the like as the biggest moral issue facing the state, the country and the universe, there is very little provision for the capturing of stormwater from the eastern suburbs? I understand from the reports I have read that every year there is enough water run-off in my electorate to water the whole of Adelaide. Project after project of stormwater initiatives

to capture and harvest some of this run-off has been presented to the government to ensure that we can water our parklands and to make sure that the people in the electorates of the member for Torrens and the member for Unley are not flooded every year.

However, what is completely missing is any infrastructure project to rebuild the road in Waterfall Gully, where a cyclist from Unley was killed. The government has refused to fix that road and resolve that infrastructure issue. However, there is nothing—not even the \$10 million plan that was proposed for Glenside as an extension of the detention dam, which would harvest an enormous amount of water and would enable it to be released slowly to reduce the flooding problems and also to pump it into an aquifer in the south-east Parklands.

These are projects worth \$10 million, or probably \$15 million, which would be a massive contribution to the water security issue which we need to face and address, not only to protect the River Murray but also to ensure that we have sufficient water for critical human needs and for environmental, commercial and farming purposes.

Is it not incredible that, instead of these important projects, I note that in the Premier's investment program, with respect to his portfolio in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$8.3 million will be spent this year as the preliminary to a \$44.77 million project at the Glenside Hospital? We heard from the Hon. Gail Gago, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, that we had to sell off 42 per cent of the Glenside Hospital, even though there was no documentation and no basis to support why it was necessary to place more private housing, a supermarket or other commercial purposes above the urgent need for extended services for mental health patients, not just in-house acute care but also supported accommodation.

The priority of the government, which I read in the Premier's new works project, is to have an Adelaide film and screen hub to which he has allocated \$44.77 million. After the Hon. Gail Gago, through her representatives at public meetings, said that the sale of 42 per cent of this site is not negotiable and that it was necessary to enable the redevelopment to go ahead, we find that \$44.77 million is going to be spent on a film hub.

I have looked at the Hendon property which the South Australian Film Corporation currently occupies. It is an expansive property for the purposes of film production and the like; I think it is an excellent facility. For whatever reason the government wants to dump that property—sell it off, flog it off, or make it into housing or whatever—it is no justification whatsoever for the Premier and his department to spend this sort of money on relocating a perfectly good facility (the Film Corporation) from its Hendon site. I want to highlight the small print. The small print is absolutely extraordinary because in tiny print at the bottom of this is a footnote:

Total project cost includes construction costs of \$42.3 million and \$2.5 million for the purchase of land from the Department of Health. In addition, \$680,000 budgeted expenditure for shared car parking facilities is included in the Health Portfolio (Glenside Campus Redevelopment).

So, we find that the government, through the health department, is selling the whole of the cultural precinct, which forms part of the site, to the Premier at a cost of \$2.5 million. It forms part of the Glenside Hospital site, so it is not only the 42 per cent that has been flogged off to a supermarket and private housing, but in addition to that the whole of the cultural precinct is going to be purchased by the Premier.

Where is the valuation, I say, that justifies the Premier buying a large slice of the Glenside Hospital site for \$2.5 million to put in his identified preferred tenant for this building? I think the government and the Premier need to explain what the basis of this is when the mental health minister has been out there telling the public that she needs to sell off half this property to finance a facility for mental health patients—a statewide service for people across South Australia—yet more of it is going to be flogged off to the Premier to facilitate this transfer of his preferred tenant. We need some explanation of this.

I discovered today that they have said they are going to proceed anyway before the select committee has finished on the inquiry into this, before we have had the Auditor-General's response on his inquiry into the Chapley deal, before we have had the determination by the National Trust on whether the property is at risk, and before we have had the Ombudsman's response in relation to the nondisclosure of documents on this site in relation to the redevelopment of Glenside Hospital, to which so far the government has snubbed its nose in relation to the select committee.

Today, I found that they are pulling down the laundry property at the Glenside Hospital. They have started to demolish this property which has been listed on two heritage lists. They have the audacity to start bulldozing the site before the select committee has even finished this inquiry. It

shows utter contempt for this parliament and its process, for its responsibility to the people of South Australia. It is time the Premier came in here to answer a few of these questions and place on the table his explanation for what is a gross waste of public money in favour of his preferred mates to the exclusion and detriment of the thousands of people in this state who suffer from mental health problems. It is an utter disgrace and we want an explanation.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (21:05): We live in an ever-changing world. Very little now is as it was and change seems to be upon us everywhere and in everything we do. It is a time when communities need to be resilient and work together to take advantage of every opportunity. South Australia is well-placed to be part of the success of the future. This government has worked hard to foster mining, defence technology, tourism, and training and employment among many things while working hard to provide the best education and health services possible.

The State Strategic Plan is the blueprint for an exciting future. In supporting the Appropriation Bill, I acknowledge the efforts of ministers and their staff to maintain the balance between strong fiscal discipline and new directions in service provision. This budget delivers improved services to South Australia in many areas. In Florey, residents will benefit from improved coverage by the Metropolitan Fire Service via its increased staffing and the building of the new Beulah Park station—an important link for call-out times in the north-eastern suburbs. Modbury Public Hospital's role in the public health system will grow as additional funding comes on line to provide extra services, especially in elective surgery.

In the important area of family and community services, the Modbury Regional Office will take on a new enlarged role in the north-eastern suburbs and maintain and enhance its wide range of services. In education, a highlight for our area will be Modbury High School's continuing to work on the plans for the commencement of their new arts centre. They also play an important role in music in our area and it is my privilege every year to accompany their stage band to Mount Gambier for the Generations in Jazz competition where this year we were placed third in their division.

As we all have seen, public transport is the focus of infrastructure in this budget and in the north-east we will see new buses come into service on our O-Bahn line to the city which also services the Adelaide Airport—itself a recent winner of an award for its dynamic design. There are also a great many groups in the Florey electorate that will benefit from funding opportunities provided in this year's budget.

Groups like the University of the Third Age now will establish on the site of Modbury Primary School, the old building being transferred with the help of the education department, the Land Management Corporation and the Tea Tree Gully Council.

University of the Third Age provides dozens of courses to the now record number of seniors who are part of this vibrant example of lifelong learning. As part of this development, the Tea Tree Gully toy library has now moved into its new premises within the City of Tea Tree Gully library providing an expanded service to the young families in our area. Young people are also well served by the excellent community child-care centres in the Florey area, and I would like to thank the staff and management committees of the Lurra Community Child Care Centre and the Modbury Community Child Care Centre, located near the TAFE site at Tea Tree Gully.

The TAFE site at Tea Tree Gully is another great resource for our area providing excellent further education opportunities that complement the courses running in our local high schools, helping to prepare our children for fulfilling paid employment. I would like to mention here in passing how impressed I was to see the wide range of projects from the students at the Valley View Secondary School at their recent C2C open night. Students and staff are to be congratulated on the standard and quality of the projects that were on display.

The Premier's Reading Challenge and Active Challenges, of course, continue to provide another opportunity for primary students to excel at literacy and to encourage healthy lifestyles. I would also like to mention the excellent work in science being undertaken by students at Para Vista School. They have attracted a great deal of warranted kudos for their work.

The largest employment sector in Florey is the retail sector and, in these tough times, I would like to make particular mention of the work done by small business owners and acknowledge their contribution to the economy. In saying this, I would also like to thank shop assistants for their work. They certainly make our lives a lot easier (particularly the 9 to 5 people) because they work out of hours to provide us with more opportunities to shop over the weekend and at late-night shopping times.

Another important role in the community is that of the sporting groups and the thousands of volunteers who put so many hours into providing recreation for all, either playing or watching—something in which I excel. One of my greatest pleasures is seeing our young people and veterans (when they come out, of course) improving in their chosen areas, and calisthenics is particularly strong in Florey along with all the other well-known sports such as netball, basketball, cricket, AFL, soccer and all the other football codes, including gridiron, as well as hockey and table tennis, just to name a few.

We are all also very grateful for the work of churches in our community and, as this is Refugee Week, I would like to finish off by acknowledging the work of the Modbury Uniting Church and their running of the African Women's Group. Many people work tirelessly to provide assistance in many areas to help large family groups learn about the different culture that is Australia. It is a joy to see the families with lots of small children and babies as they begin to understand their new life here in South Australia.

When you hear their stories, and know how many struggles they have had to come to Australia, you know how lucky we are not only to live in this country but especially to be in South Australia where so much is available to those who want to be part of such a wonderful community.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (21:10): I rise tonight to make my contribution to the AAA budget—not the AAA credit rating that the Treasurer thinks he has got but the budget that is all about Adelaide. There is absolutely nothing—I stress, nothing—in this budget for regional South Australia. As I said in my earlier contribution, the Labor Party only have a map of South Australia which ends at Gepps Cross and Glen Osmond. There is nothing outside those areas if you go through the budget papers to see essential allocations of money to country and regional areas.

As I have said before, the people in the Riverland, the people in the Lower Murray around Murray Bridge and the people in the Lower Lakes are really suffering from the inattention of Labor governments, both state and federal—it is just atrocious that this goes on. There are people who cannot afford to buy water to sustain their irrigation and people who cannot access their water. I had a meeting only today with agriculture minister McEwen about the Jervois footy club, which needs to put in infrastructure to access water for their oval.

All they need is a \$28,000 grant, coupled with the \$28,000 that the community are putting in and the 13 gegalitres of pledged water from local irrigators, to keep their oval going. Jervois is a little town that supports sporting clubs, bowling clubs, netball clubs, football clubs—about 450 different people use these club facilities in a little place like Jervois.

Do you know what the minister said to me today? He said, 'If the government put any funding toward it, why would we fund something that might become a stranded asset?'—a pipeline that would go 1.1 kilometres into the river to support the Jervois Football Club's oval.

Because, strange as it may seem, what has happened at Jervois is what has happened with the present health minister who, once he has stuffed up natural resources, has managed to give country health a belting. Through his management, or rather, mismanagement of natural resources with the so-called rehabilitation of the Lower Murray swamps, now they cannot access a waste water channel at the back of those swamps so they have to go this 1.1 kilometres for water. The minister said to me that the government will not put in funding for what may be a stranded asset if there is no water allocation or no water available. I said, 'Well, minister, if that happens no one would access water for themselves and do any work for it.'

It is interesting to note that I had a conversation with people at DWLBC who admitted that the trenchers were turning up to dig the privately-funded pipeline to Langhorne Creek and that was going to start today. I found that very interesting. These are just people who are trying to get on with their lives and trying to keep their communities viable.

I get back to health, and we saw hundreds of people protesting out the front today. There was no difference really to the protest that was here yesterday—thousands of teachers protesting against the Labor government, members of the Australian Education Union.

Today we had country communities out in force. I had quite a few phone calls from people who said, 'We can't make the trip. We are too busy out here surviving, but give everyone our best. We support the program.' They know only too well that they have been cut off in this budget, and they know that it is an absolute fabrication if minister Hill thinks fewer people will access services in Adelaide. The simple fact is that there is a great part of this state between Berri and Whyalla—hundreds and thousands of square kilometres of this state where people live and try to run their lives.

I talked about mining in my contribution earlier today. We talk about the big mines—Roxby, Prominent Hill—and I notice that the member for Stuart talked about what could happen in this area with the Leigh Creek mine (run by NRG) and other associated interests. Where will people go when they need health services? They have the Australian Zircon mine at Mindarie. It takes them three quarters of an hour to get to Loxton, and they have more than that—an hour and 10 minutes—to get to Berri. There is no point ducking back to Karoonda, a half an hour away, for health services if this plan goes through, because there will not be anyone there. There will not be a doctor. The doctor from Karoonda was in the chamber today during question time, and he is just appalled at what is going on.

Right throughout the outer regions of Mallee we have had trouble attracting doctors. If they do not have any services to supply, there will be no reason for them to go there. I reflect again on what has happened in Strathalbyn. Where will people from Clayton, Milang, Langhorne Creek and those areas go for health services? They will end up going to Mount Barker, which will be fully loaded, because there will not be any room for people, and then they will have to go to Adelaide anyway.

I want to make a comment about the Mobilong Prison upgrade near Murray Bridge. The government gave in-principle support for adequate public transport, to help supply infrastructure for stormwater, maintain roads and other infrastructure programs, and to make a decent contribution to the Rural City of Murray Bridge. The government has to come through with its word. If it wants to run state facilities—the women's prison, the men's prison, high security prisons, and the forensic mental health facility—the government needs to come good, and do not think the Rural City of Murray Bridge will just stand by and get along without any assistance.

I want to again reflect on transport in the Mallee and the Coorong at the moment. In a letter that a constituent wrote to minister Hill it states:

I would like to bring to your attention here at Meningie, situated at the Lower Lakes, that we have just found out that the Transport Advisory Board has recommended not to renew the contract for the public transport from Meningie to Murray Bridge. This service will cease on 30 June 2008.

I need not tell you how important public transport is to our community. You may think how does this concern you. As our community is under enough stress, and to lose this essential service, it seems that the rural communities have to accept a lesser standard. There are people living east of the tollgate. So I would like to challenge you and your public servants to back up your proposals published in the new South Australian Country Health care Plan, section 4, page 18, under the heading, 'Better Transport and Improved Coordinated Care (the Patient Journey)'.

'Transport and accommodation support will be developed to help country people access the health care services they need.'

The Patient Journey Initiative has already improved coordination of care and appropriate discharge planning for patients who need to access health services in other locations to ensure a smooth transition of care between services and locations. This initiative uses patient liaison network members, rural liaison nurses, patient transport coordinators and local practice nurses to support rural people to access health services.

We will:

- Explore ways to increase transport options which can incorporate the existing Patient Assistance Transport Scheme.
- Improve access to transport and accommodation subsidies and support when using both metropolitan and country services.

That is all very interesting, isn't it, when we have a government that is threatening to cut the funding to the Coorong services that run out to the Mallee down the coast road to Meningie and down the Dukes Highway to Culburra.

I indicated in my contribution last night that last week I sought a meeting with minister Conlon on this issue, and minister Caica on the other side laughed, thinking, 'Oh, yeah, that'll happen.' I must say that minister Conlon and I have a working business relationship. He did say last time that perhaps we need to have a monthly appointment, and I said, 'Yes. I'll book that in right now, minister.' It seems that I should have, but at least he is giving me the time at 11 o'clock tomorrow to discuss this issue with the operator of the service at Coonalpyn and some concerned parents of students who ride on one of the buses—and I commend my contribution.

Time expired.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (21:21): Again it is a pleasure being in this house making a brief contribution in regards to the budget for the 2008-09 and the period beyond that. When *The Plains*

Producer, which is a newspaper published around the Balaclava Adelaide plains area, asked me for a comment about what I thought about the budget I simplified it down to one word: 'abandoned', as it relates to regional South Australia. I do not use the word abandoned lightly, but, from my perspective that is what it really is.

I have tried to identify as many aspects of the budget as I can that actually relate to South Australia and the regions, and I just cannot find very many. There is some money for shoulder widening; there is a little bit of money for road improvements, but that is just a pittance of what it needs to be. I think in total it is something like \$40 million over the four-year period. But we know even from a couple of years ago from budget figures produced by the RAA that there was a \$200 million backlog for road maintenance required then. The regions need so much money. About 30 per cent of the people who live in South Australia live in regional South Australia, but they do not necessarily get the return.

I have a quote from a lady whom I know quite well. She is from my electorate. She was out the front earlier today. She was one of about 70 people from Yorke Peninsula who jumped on two buses and came over here and wanted to have a strong voice about regional health.

Mrs Geraghty: You have already said this.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I know. This is a very different comment, though. She said to me—and this lady has a very strong way of expressing herself:

Steven, I want you to tell those people in there that we're going to refuse to pay our taxes unless our hospitals actually get cared for.

They have a large property. They would put an enormous amount of taxpayer dollars into the economy. They have been farming for a long time. They have been very successful at it. They would spend money on a variety of things and they are just sick of it. They want to ensure that regional hospitals get the support they need. She was saying to me that, 'I'm not paying taxes to the state anymore. That's it. I'm prepared to pay the equivalent of what I would pay in taxes I'll pay to the hospital at Maitland to make sure that it stays open to the level that they want to.' We all know that that is very difficult to do, but that is the sort of passion that exists within many sections of the community.

Since the budget has come down there is one letter that I will read into *Hansard*. It is from a chap by the name of Newton Lines, who is the president of the Hamley Bridge Football Club. Hamley Bridge is on the extreme eastern end of the Goyder electorate, but they are wonderful people there. He states:

As president of the Hamley Bridge Football Club it is with great interest that I hear in the news that there is \$100 million to be spent on AAMI Stadium and \$5 million to be spent on Port Power and the Adelaide Crows.

I think Hamley Bridge Football Club celebrated its centenary last year, so they have been playing footy there for 100 years. He further states:

To a football club like Hamley Bridge these sorts of figures are like telephone numbers.

I think that is a pretty good description, actually:

The Adelaide Plains Football League complains that our change rooms are too small. The ladies would like to have decent toilets and change rooms with showers.

By that I think they mean netball players:

We desperately need a new mower to mow the oval as the old one is dangerous as the blades sometimes go flying off, it keeps breaking down and at best does a very poor job in mowing the oval.

We don't need anything like \$100 million, but we do need some money. This is grass roots football where we cultivate and develop juniors who may one day play league football or AFL. We are volunteers who work tirelessly to keep the club going. For example, my wife and I on home match days start at about 8am and work through the day until about 8pm. The satisfaction of seeing 100 footballers playing our great game is enormous. We have A grade, B grade, senior colts, junior colts, modifieds and mini modifieds. There are five A grade netball teams and four junior teams. That is close on 70 girls playing netball.

Our kids deserve to have nice facilities, safe facilities, and to be quite frank the Power and the Crows do almost nothing for us. Why should the rich fat cats have the facilities at AAMI Stadium upgraded at the taxpayers' expense while our volunteers at the Hamley Bridge Football Club have to bust—

I will not use the next word—

...dip into their pockets to keep our club going? Rumour is around that we will have to pay a \$1,000 affiliation fee to the SANFL next year.

His closing comment is:

Come on, for the sake of our kids playing football what about doing something for us as well.

I think that is fairly apt and it demonstrates the way that people in regional South Australian feel about a lot of things. Those in the regions volunteer their time in so many different ways; people work on the ambulances and people work in community groups. We have all had the chance in our time in parliament to attend hand-over dinners for Rotary, Apex and Lions and these are all wonderful people who do tremendous work in the community.

Every sporting group and every volunteer group that exists in the regions need to feel wanted and need to feel supported. Their feeling is now that the budget that has come down for 2008-09 and across the forward estimate period does not do that for them and they are frustrated and they want to start to see a reasonable level of return on the investment that they make to the state to come back to them and certainly they do not feel that. That is why I come back to that word abandoned again. It is a pretty good description I think.

I have also had a letter from the Combined Progress Associations of Yorke Peninsula. This group has representation from something like the 26 progress associations which are within one of the council areas that I represent. These people also work hard. I know one chap who has been a member of a progress association for 50 years. They want to ensure that their hospitals remain open. They have given me a very detailed letter, which is a copy of a letter which has gone to the Premier and I know many people who are intending to try to telephone the Premier's office, they want to write to the Premier, they want to email to the Premier because they want the Premier to understand and be accountable for the decisions that are made by government.

These people get very upset. They are working hard. This chap who is president of this group lives in Port Victoria. As a community Port Victoria alone has raised \$42,000 to try to provide a building for doctors to come to and consult, but they are fearful that if the process of GP Plus centres goes ahead, that the GPs that might be in that area would move, therefore making their investment worthless because there will not be the GPs to provide a service to them. We need in this house to ensure that we respond to all South Australians. It is important when we prepare a budget that uses thirteen and a half billion dollars of the community's money that we share that wealth around.

The people who have spoken to me since the budget has come down understand that with the overwhelming majority of the state based around metropolitan Adelaide, that an enormous component of those dollars needs to be expended in the metropolitan area. They understand that. They understand that public transport needs to be provided too, but they are fearful and very upset by the fact that there never seems to be that return. We all know and presumably everyone in this house has got country cousins at least and they have had the chance to visit small towns and they have had the chance to visit farms and they can see good people.

Mr Pederick: But you'd better not get crook.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, the member for Hammond says, 'You'd better not get crook,' though, and that's true. But all these people deserve the support and, as a reasonably new member of parliament, only having been here for two years, but one who believes in his community, I am always going to try to stand up for the needs of the regions because that is what I love. I never want to have to live in Adelaide permanently. I always want to ensure that I can relate to the electorate in which I serve by living in the electorate that I serve.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

Mr GRIFFITHS: We all say 'Hear, hear,' because that is what our intention is. Not all members of this place can say the same thing.

Finally, I will talk about some of the very pressing needs of the electorate. I know that water is in crisis in this state; there is no doubt about that. The member for Hammond and every member of this place who has an electorate that has anything to do with the River Murray and those affected by the Murray, puts to us all the time the devastation—

Mr Venning: And the member for Schubert.

Mr GRIFFITHS: And the member for Schubert—the devastation that is being felt in the Riverland. We were there in late December I think. As a parliamentary party quite a few of us went up and met with people who were affected by it. While I know the indications for them are immense, I want to ensure that the government sees that it is necessary to invest in infrastructure

that will give a better reticulated water supply to the other regions of the state too. Technology is available through desalination to provide potable water. In the Goyder electorate an immense future awaits us and a bright and prosperous one, if you have access to a better water supply.

Mr Venning: There's a lot of seawater.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Exactly; the member for Schubert says, 'There's a lot of seawater.' It surrounds us, there is about 1,200 kilometres of coastline in my electorate alone. The opportunities are there to do something.

I ask the government to investigate any possibility for desalination technology which will remove our reliance on the River Murray and allow water we currently take from the River Murray to be used for environmental flows and, importantly, by the irrigators in the Riverland who need support, the people in the Lower Lakes who have been devastated by everything and everyone who derives an income from anything in the River Murray.

We need to ensure that we support all communities. If we can get a better water supply into the Goyder electorate, it will allow business to expand, industries to come there that have not had a prior opportunity and quality residential developments to be built. I do not want to focus solely on Port Hughes because exciting developments are happening right across the Goyder electorate, but we need a better water supply to make them a reality. It is part of the infrastructure challenge of this state. Let us make sure that we start to develop the visions that will supply not only water but also improved roads, power and public transport options in regional areas. A lot of things need to be done.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (21:31): As whip I am proud to finish off the debate for our excellent team. I am proud to be their whip. They all are doing a fantastic job. I have been here for a fair while so I am a fair judge of that. Before I conclude today—a day when country health became the issue of the week—I want to clear up a few misrepresentations.

As whip I refute absolutely the insinuation that I called 'state of the house' to get a quorum for my leader for his reply on the budget. The contrary is true. I called 'state of the house' (or a quorum) to get the bells ringing to get government members in here. I gave instructions to my good deputy behind me to keep our members out until enough government members were in here. All members of the opposition came in here when all government members were in here—and all the opposition members stayed in here. It was sad that only seven out of 32 government members remained in here.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for Hammond will tell you that his instructions were to go outside that door and to keep opposition members out until government members were in here. That was the instruction given by me.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I have a point of order. This appears to have nothing to do with the budget—and I might just say that it is really appalling when you have to call a quorum to get people to come to listen to your leader.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no a point of order.

Ms Simmons interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I have a point of order: the member for Morialta is interjecting while she is not in her place.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a point of order. Member for Morialta, either go to your place or cease interjecting, but if you go to your place and interject it is still against standing orders.

Mr VENNING: I thought it was good manners that, when the Treasurer delivered the budget in this house on budget day, we were all in here and we sat in silence.

Mrs Geraghty: You were not all here.

Mr VENNING: I believe they were all here; they were not supposed to be absent. I thought it would good manners if it was reciprocated—no such luck. It was poor form, arrogance in the extreme. I did note who did stay today. Some seven members of the government have principles—they stayed and listened. I want to put that issue to rest. It is true. I have been here a while. That tactic is well known and commonly used. Any blame or criticism belongs with me.

I congratulate my leader on a great performance and a great speech in his reply to the budget. He gives me great confidence. The philosophical comments of the Treasurer tonight were quite extraordinary, especially when he reflected badly on both the Bannon and Arnold

governments. Members should read this in *Hansard*. He used to work for premier Arnold. I will not hear criticism of him. He was a straight person. He was handed the poisoned chalice. He was handed leadership of the Labor Party and led the Labor government to oblivion. It was not his fault. He took it like a man and I will forever admire him for that—more than I can say for those who have followed him.

I used to advise minister Arnold when he was minister for agriculture, so I have always had a lot of time for him. I thought it was poor form to tackle him like that. He took the wrap for the State Bank debt, but it was not just his fault.

The Treasurer gave me some gratuitous advice about whether or not I should be here. I remind him—and all members—that I am not here at my own behest but, rather, for the people—wise or unwise—who support me. Do members think I have not asked that question? Of course, I have asked that question. I am 62 and I have been here 18 years. I am the whip and I hope my experience will assist this wonderful group of people over here to form in government 2010. I have much admiration for my leader Martin Hamilton-Smith. He has what is needed to lead us for the next 18 months and then the state after that. When the father of the house (Hon. Graham Gunn) leaves us in 2010, we will miss him but I could be a link because of my experience in past campaigns for this place. I hope my services be will be valuable.

I am encouraged by our newer members and I look forward to seeing them build long and meritorious political careers; and members heard one of them speak tonight just before me. I hope they are given the privilege in 2010 to govern for all South Australians. Let us hope they can take over the Treasury bench without inheriting huge government debt which will blunt their ability to perform at their full potential.

I thought the speech tonight from the member for Mawson was quite extraordinary. What a lot of rubbish! The guy is totally in denial. State debt is climbing every day and he says that it is great to see the government back and the state in good economic hands. Well, the government is going the same way as it did with the State Bank. It will hand over the Treasury bench to a new government with a much higher debt than when it took over—and nothing to show for it. What a lot of rubbish. State debt is going up—and that is an unrefuted fact.

I was heartened today to see country people come to town to rally in support of their country hospitals. It is great to see people here who do not usually involve themselves in the political process. I saw a lot of people I know personally who have never voted Liberal in their life. Three or four of them are strong card-carrying members of the Labor Party. I admire them for that—good friends, always have been, born into it. I said to them, 'It's good to see you here today. Can I ask you to do one thing? You write a letter privately to your Labor MPs and your Labor friends and tell them that this is hurting you. Do not put up with it.' It is not a political issue for them. It is an issue that confronts them and their community, and that is us. This is a downgrade of services that we currently enjoy. 'GP Plus' are becoming very dirty words; 43 hospitals are so inflicted with that horrible term and we have only 11 community hospitals.

These GP Plus clinics will kill many of the 43 hospitals. I was born in Crystal Brook hospital, as was my father, as was his father, and they all died there, and I hope that I will die there. These places are sacred to each one of us and our communities for all sorts of reasons. They are pivotal in country communities. If you do not think this will happen, if you think this is a political game, do not take my word for it or the word of the members for Hammond and Goyder, go and ask the ordinary people. Go and ask your own supporters who live in these communities. Go and ask them. Please, ask them. This is not political. Just ask them. They feel really threatened by this.

I have still got time for minister Hill even though we had a bit of a stoush. I believe that his bureaucrats have totally overtaken his judgment and are ruling the day for him. All I can say is that the rural people today have spoken. I just plead that the government will listen to them and act because you just cannot put the economic scrutiny over little country communities. I note that the Treasurer has walked in. You just cannot say, 'Well, this hospital is not efficient, this hospital is not viable, purely because it is hundreds of kilometres from anywhere.' They are there for the strategic reason to provide that community with the security, safety and the realisation that people can stay in that community knowing that, if they get sick, they can get help, otherwise older people will have to move out of some of these communities.

I cannot believe that astute politicians can come up with stuff like this that allow their bureaucrats to say, 'Well, we'll save the government money. We'll put the knife through all these country communities, because there are no votes there for us.' I note that the member for Giles is not in this house today. As I said yesterday, I am quite upset and concerned that both the member

for Mount Gambier and the member for Chaffey sat over there and did not mention one word of support for the country people who came here today, not one.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. My point of order is that constantly throughout his contribution, the honourable member referred to members who are not in the chamber or who are leaving the chamber. He has been using those kinds of phrases. My understanding is that it is against standing orders to do so; and, because it has been something that has been quite common practice, particularly today, I think we do need a ruling on it so that it is not a practice that continues.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Torrens raises a valid point of order. It is not in order to refer to the presence or absence of members from the chamber. The member for Schubert's time has expired.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (21:41): I guess that, if I speak, I close the debate. Ivan, comrade. What I have learned from the Liberal Party now is that you are more of a comrade than I am. The member for Ashford is shocked by that admission; but, in the last couple of years, I am not quite sure where the left sits and where the right sits.

The Hon. S.W. Key: I know where I sit.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And no-one is ever in doubt. The good thing about the member for Ashford is that no-one is ever left wondering where her philosophical views sit. There is one thing about the member for Schubert: he has been arguing from the backbench for as long as I have been in here. You are eloquent and you are lively. You should have taken up that offer I gave you back in 2002. Let us be honest, you were tempted.

Mr Venning: I might have if the Attorney-General hadn't dobbed me in.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He was tempted.

Mr Venning: He dobbed me into Brindal!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It may not have been one of my finest moments—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Agriculture. Perhaps we can have, as the Premier often says, breaking news.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Okay, we will not have breaking news.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Treasurer, I have bad news for you. You are not entitled to be speaking. Unfortunately, because he moved the motion, the Treasurer is considered to have already spoken. Unfortunately, as the Treasurer did not take his whole time possible, no other minister can speak. However, another honourable member may take the opportunity.

Mr VENNING: Madam Deputy Speaker, on a point of clarification, does that go on the record?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It does.

Mr VENNING: What I said does go on the record?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It does.

Mr VENNING: Okay, I am pleased with that.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (21:44): I move:

That the proposed payments for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Thursday 3 July 2008, in accordance with the following timetables:

APPROPRIATION BILL

TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

25-30 June & 1-2 July 2008

WEDNESDAY 25 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Premier

Minister for Economic Development

Minister for Social Inclusion

Minister for the 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)

Auditor-General's Department

Arts SA

Treasurer

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 26 JUNE AT 11.30 AM

Minister for Industry and Trade

Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)

Defence SA

Office of the Venture Capital Board

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

FRIDAY 27 JUNE AT 11.00 AM

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 (part)

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)

MONDAY 30 JUNE 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 1 JULY AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Water Security
Minister for the River Murray
Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade
Minister for Small Business
Minister for Regional Development
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)

WEDNESDAY 2 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

25-30 June & 1-2 July 2008

WEDNESDAY 25 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
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
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)

THURSDAY 26 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Police
Minister for Urban Development and Planning
Minister for Mineral Resources Development

South Australia Police (part)
Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Minister for Tourism
South Australian Tourism Commission
Minister for Tourism

FRIDAY 27 JUNE AT 11.00 AM

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

MONDAY 30 JUNE 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
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Independent Gambling Authority

TUESDAY 1 JULY AT 9.00 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)
Minister for Emergency Services
Minister for Correctional Services
Minister for Road Safety
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
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)

WEDNESDAY 2 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
Environment Protection Authority
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)

Department of Health (part)

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Ms Ciccarello, Messrs Griffiths, Hamilton-Smith, Kenyon, Pederick and Piccolo, and Ms Thompson.

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Bignell and Goldsworthy, Ms Key, Mr Koutsantonis, Dr McFetridge, and Messrs Rau and Venning.

Motion carried.

At 21:48 the house adjourned until Thursday 19 June 2008 at 10:30.