

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 11 October 1994

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Financial Agreement,

The Flinders University of South Australia (Convocation) Amendment,

Real Property (Variation and Extinguishment of Easements) Amendment,

Statutes Amendment (Closure of Superannuation Schemes) (Extension of Time) Amendment.

SODOMY

Petitions signed by 522 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to criminalise sodomy were presented by Messrs Andrew, Ashenden, D.S. Baker, Bass, Brown, Leggett and Such.

Petitions received.

FILM AND VIDEO CENTRE

Petitions signed by 164 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the South Australian Film and Video Centre were presented by Messrs Atkinson, Brown and Meier and Mrs Penfold.

Petitions received.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 44 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

WILLUNGA BASIN

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide one full-time horticultural officer in the Willunga Basin was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Petitions signed by 92 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to cut the Education and Children's Services budget were presented by Messrs Buckby and Evans.

Petitions received.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

A petition signed by 132 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to order the decontamination of the ANR site at Islington, stop the development of the Collex waste plant at Kilburn and stop

obnoxious odours emitted from factories around Grand Junction Road was presented by Mr Clarke.

Petition received.

TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 1 234 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow general Sunday trading where restrictions currently apply was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

BLACKWOOD POLICE

A petition signed by 2 036 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide a shop front community police station within the Blackwood shopping centre and increase the number of police within the Blackwood area was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

NOARLUNGA COLLEGE THEATRE

A petition signed by 5 351 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain the Noarlunga Centre Theatre at its current level of operation was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 2, 12, 17 to 19, 23 to 27, 37, 39, 43, 45, 46, 52, 54, 55, 57 to 59, 61 to 66, 68, 72 to 77 and 88 to 113; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

EVENT TICKETING

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)** 6 September.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In South Australia the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust (AFCT) operates the BASS ticket agency as part of its commercial operations. As such its returns are constantly monitored to ensure sound commercial viability is assured. The Government has no plans to alter the AFCT's involvement with BASS. Since the financial collapse of the Austicket operation, BASS is in a most favourable position, although the AFCT is sensitive to the view that this presents a monopoly.

In South Australia the AFCT runs the most successful BASS ticketing operation in Australia and, while upgrading of technology is an ongoing issue, BASS in South Australia is financially sound. As stated earlier, the AFCT continually reviews its operations, including BASS, and strives to ensure that maximum return is made on its investment.

HOUSING TRUST ATTACHED DWELLINGS

In reply to **Mr De LAINE (Price)** 7 September.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: When the Housing Trust started selling these attached dwellings in 1981, the conditions of sale were as outlined by Mr De Laine. However the Housing Trust recognised that this was a potential problem and a barrier to tenants entering into home ownership. As a consequence, the Housing Trust changed the conditions of purchase in October 1984. Currently, when a tenant wishes to buy their attached dwelling the property is valued assuming it has separate services and separate titles and the trust bears the full cost of providing these.

There are currently 136 clients who purchased their properties prior to October 1984 and prior to the change in policy. These clients

will be entitled to a refund if and when the adjoining property is sold. The Housing Trust has been actively pursuing the sale of the adjoining properties in its sales campaign and has, over the past two years, achieved sales of nine properties, thereby enabling a refund to be made to the first purchaser.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman 1993-94.

Ordered that report be printed.

MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the statement of the Register of Members' Interests for 1994.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the statement be printed.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the assembly of members of the two Houses held today for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. C.J. Sumner and to which vacancy Mr Terry Cameron was elected.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1993-94.
Government Management Board—Report, 1993-94.
Office for the Commissioner for Public Employment—
Report, 1993-94.
Development Act 1993—Planning Strategy
Implementation, 15 January-30 June 1994.
Public Corporations Act—Regulations—State
Government Insurance Corporation.

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Evidence Act 1929—Report relating to Suppression
Orders, 1993-94.
Liquor Licensing Act—Regulations—Dry Areas—
Glenelg.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme—Report, 1993-94.
South Australian Housing Trust—Financial Statements,
1993-94.
State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1993-94.
Debits Tax Act—Regulations—Penalty Rate for Unpaid
Tax.

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Remuneration Tribunal—Report, relating to the Industrial
Relations Court and Industrial Relations Commission.
Daylight Saving Act—Regulations—Summer Time
1994-95.

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small
Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Adelaide Festival Centre—Report, 1993-94.
Department for the Arts and Cultural Development—
Report, 1993-94.
Marine & Harbors Agency, South Australian Department
of Transport—Report, 1993-94.
Department of Transport—Report, 1993-94.
Transport Policy and Planning, Office of—Report,
1993-94.

South Australian Museum Board—Report, 1993-94.
State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1993-94.
Road Traffic Act—Regulations—
Blood Analysis—Quorn Hospital.
Validation of Clearways.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and
Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Local Government Superannuation Scheme—Rules.
Racing Act 1976—Amendment to Rules.
Development Act—Regulations—Certificate of
Occupancy.
Development Act 1993—Crown Development Report—
Victor Harbor Primary School.
Corporation By-laws—
Prospect—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
No. 2—Street and Public Places.
No. 3—Garbage Containers.
No. 4—Parklands.
No. 5—Inflammable Undergrowth.
No. 6—Dogs.
No. 7—Animals and Birds.
No. 8—Bees.
No. 9—Caravans and Camping.
No. 10—Lodging Houses.
Stirling—No. 17—Caravans, Vehicles and Tents.

By the Minister for Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Greyhound Racing Board—Report, 1993-94.
Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1993-94.

By the Minister for Mines and Energy (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Mines and Energy South Australia—Report, 1993-94.
Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1993-94.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Agriculture and Resource Management Council of
Australia and New Zealand—Record and Resolutions
of 2nd Meeting, 29 April 1994.
Fisheries Act—Regulations—
Fish Processors—Catch and Disposal Record.
General—Catch and Disposal Record.
Rock Lobster Fisheries—Southern—Quotas.

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further
Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—

Non-Government Schools Registration Board—Report,
1993-94.
University of Adelaide—Report, 1993.

CHINESE DELEGATION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to
make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to let the House know
that next month South Australia will host a short visit by the
Chairman of the National People's Congress of China, Mr
Qiao Shi, and his wife. Mr Qiao is effectively the second
most important ranking official in China. His visit to South
Australia is one of the most significant visits by an overseas
dignitary for many years. His Excellency will arrive in
Adelaide with a large party of senior officials, staff and media
representatives on the afternoon of 8 November and leave the
following afternoon. His Excellency's Australian visit will
include the ACT, Victoria and New South Wales, as well as
South Australia, and will comprise seven days in all.

The Adelaide itinerary is now being organised. I hope,
however, that the Chairman will be able to include in his visit
the O-Bahn busway, the Grand Prix track and Technology

Park, all of which have significance for the development of commercial links between China and South Australia. The Grand Prix track will be almost ready for this year's Formula 1 race when Mr Qiao is here. One of South Australia's and, in fact, Australia's finest engineering companies, Kinhill Engineers Pty Ltd, has a major contract to develop a Grand Prix circuit in Zhu Hai in Southern China. In fact, I visited the site of the track during my visit to China earlier this year.

It would also be appropriate for Mr Qiao to inspect the O-Bahn busway. Again, following my visit to China, representatives of the Beijing Public Transport Corporation, at my invitation, recently visited Adelaide to inspect the busway. For those who do not know, Beijing is a very large city with approximately 8 million to 10 million people. It is almost entirely dependent on a public bus system, and its roads are becoming increasingly congested. They are looking at a system somewhat similar to the O-Bahn busway to see whether it might be applicable for Beijing. Therefore, it is most appropriate that His Excellency is here and has the opportunity to have a look at the O-Bahn busway.

Of course, Technology Park provides many opportunities for future technological and environmental links to be forged between South Australia and China. Anyone who visited the centre at Technology Park in recent months could not fail to be impressed by the vitality and vision of the work that is now being performed there. And any visitor to South Australia should not ignore the State's wine industry. Given the time, I would like Mr and Mrs Qiao to visit a nearby vineyard and winery, if only to give them a sample of what is presently the State's most successful and exciting export growth industry.

No-one should underestimate the importance of our trade potential with China. The fact that South Australia has been included in the Chairman's short itinerary is most significant. I look forward to welcoming Their Excellencies to South Australia and showing them in the short time available why this State provides bountiful opportunities for future relationships between China and South Australia.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I bring up the report of the committee on the police complex at Port Augusta and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Ordered that report be printed.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr BECKER (Peake): I bring up the eleventh report of the committee on the State Government Insurance Commission charter and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

AUDIT COMMISSION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier confirm the undertaking given by him to this House on 3 May that the Government will table before the

end of October this year a comprehensive response to each of the 336 recommendations of the Audit Commission?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government intends to respond to all the recommendations of the Audit Commission by the end of October. The honourable member can be assured that we will be giving a very detailed response on all matters by then.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): My question is directed to the Premier. What recent information has the South Australian Government received on the availability of Federal funds to upgrade Adelaide Airport and extend the runway?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Following the Labor Party convention in Hobart and certain resolutions that were passed, together with the announcement by the Labor Party that it would lease out a number of airports around Australia, including Adelaide Airport, I have, through the Premier's Department, been trying to seek information as to exactly what work would be carried out before the leasing of the airport. It is very important, because we need to make sure that we get both an extension of the runway and an upgrade of the airport terminal facilities, including air bridges.

I had a look at the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition in Hobart. It was written in very general terms, and in fact all it called upon was for the Federal Government to make sure that funds were available (not that they come from the Federal Government), including from the State Government and quite possibly from the new lessee—and I presume some from the Federal Government as well. I raised this matter with the Prime Minister on Saturday when we were at the Patawalonga jointly announcing the additional funds from the Federal Government for the upgrade of the Patawalonga. I welcome that contribution from the Federal Government which will boost the money already put in by the State Government and the development plans we have for the Patawalonga.

In reference to the airport, the Prime Minister indicated to me that no decision had yet been made by Cabinet in terms of the quantity of funds to be allocated for the upgrade of the airport or in fact what work specifically would be carried out before leasing took place. Equally, through the Premier's Department, we have been going to the Federal Department of Transport trying to secure information in terms of what money will be made available. It would appear that this matter has not yet gone to Federal Cabinet. No decision has been made about the quantum of funds or exactly what work will be carried out.

I assure the honourable member that we will be continuing to pursue that matter, because it is in the interests of this State that the Federal Government allocate funds not only to extend the runway but also, very importantly, to upgrade the airport facilities and provide air bridges. That is why back in April this year I wrote to the Federal Government highlighting both those matters, pointing out that a total of \$90 million would be required. On top of that, of course, we need to redirect Tapleys Hill Road, which will cost us another \$30 million, bringing the total to \$120 million. I have already detailed to the House the works we require to be carried out—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I must say I was delighted, because a week before the ALP convention I wrote to all our South Australian Labor members and urged them to get off their butts and do a bit of work, to put a strong case for South

Australia, because up until that point those members at their annual convention were actually coming out and opposing the leasing of the airport. Here were these troglodytes, their heads buried in the sand, not even willing to see the airport leased out. I had to spur them into activity by writing a letter and releasing it publicly, therefore embarrassing them about the stance they had already taken on the airport—and I was delighted to receive their support at the Labor Party convention.

I was delighted that they reversed their earlier decision. I just hope that the Federal Government comes up with the \$89.5 million we are looking for, because that is the money we need to extend the runway and to upgrade the terminal facilities.

TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier—whom I am very pleased to assist—announce the Government's new TransAdelaide fares before the 5 November Taylor by-election, and will he categorically rule out proposals for a fare structure that would massively increase fares for commuters in the outer suburbs, south as well as north? The Minister for Transport confirmed to the Estimates Committee on 15 September:

There will be an increase in public transport fares, probably some time in January.

The Minister also said that the Government was looking for a flatter fare structure, and I understand a decision has already been made and appropriate papers prepared within the Minister's own department. In August, Cabinet considered fare increases on TransAdelaide services, including long-distance multitrip tickets for pensioners travelling out of peak time increasing from \$3.60 to \$10.20 and four-zone multitrips increasing from \$14.60 to \$20.50. It has been suggested that the new fares will not be announced until after 5 November, and that a by-election where the ALP is prepared—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting. The honourable Premier.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was interesting, because there was the new Leader of the Opposition on ABC radio yesterday morning saying that he would not try using one-liners to grab a headline, and here on his second question for the day he just cannot help himself. We have had 24 hours of the man's trying to reinvent himself, which has failed miserably, because in the second question of the day he falls back into his old practices once again. I point out to our new Leader of the Opposition—I realise it is his first day on the block and he is bound to make mistakes—that once again he has made a mistake; once again he is wrong. No decision has been made by Cabinet. No paper whatsoever has been put to Cabinet in terms of those structures.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: But will it be by 5 November? That's the question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have not yet seen a paper that is ready to come before Cabinet, and I understand there is not one ready. I think it highly unlikely that the matter would have been resolved, particularly if no new fare structure were to apply until next year.

AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Following a series of presentations to international financial market representatives recently, will the Treasurer please inform the House of the feedback he received from these representatives on the management of the Australian economy? The Federal Government has consistently refused to alter its budget strategy in response to greater than forecast growth in the economy.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I visited a number of money markets overseas. We went to Singapore, London, Zurich, Tokyo and Hong Kong to present the new Government's credentials and to reinforce the strong message and the strength of affiliation that SAFA paper has for a number of investors in Europe and Asia. It was a highly successful trip on that and a number of other fronts. I emphasise that during these presentations a number of questions were asked and were followed up after the event. The question on everybody's lips was, 'What will happen to Australia in the medium term?' They all surmise that Australia has some marvellous growth prospects. They also believe that we are on the growth cycle, having been through a recession. However, time and again in different venues they asked, 'Will the growth be sustained?'

They said to me (I did not say to them) that they have grave concerns about the strategy being pursued by the Federal Government. They said that, despite the fact that Australia had one of the greatest prospects of any developed nation in the world, they believed that we would 'bugger it up again'. They said their reason for saying that was that the Federal Government simply seems to be unable to control its own affairs. They pointed to the massive budget deficit programmed for this year. They also pointed to the blow out in the current account (I notice that the estimate for the current account will not be \$18 billion, which was bad enough, but will now go up to \$22 billion in one year, and that all has to be paid for) and to the fact that the pressure on wages could start the inflationary spiral.

Australia has a good future, according to the scribes overseas, if the Federal Government gets its act together. Irrespective of how we feel about our prospects in South Australia, they are inextricably linked to the national performance. If we have a national Government which cannot control its deficit or current accounts and simply cannot control wages and starts the inflationary spiral again, not only the national Government but also we in South Australia are in strife. I remind members that our budget would be in a far healthier position—\$170 million healthier—if the interest rates that prevailed in January of this year prevailed today. There were some salutary lessons from the overseas visit, but they greeted South Australia very warmly.

TRANSPORT FARES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Premier say whether a family impact statement has been prepared for the new TransAdelaide fares? Will it detail the effect of the fare increases on families—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has the call. He does not need the assistance he is getting from my right.

Mr ATKINSON: Will it detail the effect of these fare increases on families in the outer suburbs, and will it be released with the new fare scale?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear that they prepare their questions before coming in here, and they stand up, wind the handle and out comes the question, regardless of what I have said previously. Perhaps I should repeat that Cabinet has not agreed to any fare structure for Trans-Adelaide. How can I bring in a family impact statement on something that has not been presented to Cabinet?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is aware of the Standing Orders. The member for Ridley.

FACTORIES ACT

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Has the Government planned any activities to recognise and celebrate the passing of the Factories Act in South Australia 100 years ago? The Factories Act was an extremely important piece of legislation. It was the first in this country of an occupational health and safety nature—a forerunner in the world, in fact. Also, I think that it is equally important this year to acknowledge the fact that the first inspector under that Act was a woman named Augusta Zadow.

This Government has put a significant effort into raising the level of occupational health and safety practices in the workplace so as to reduce the incidence of workplace injury. A number of employees and employers in my electorate, as well those from around the rest of the State, have suggested to me that South Australia's pioneering initiatives could well be recognised in this the centenary year.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Ridley for his question. Several major programs have been developed this year by the Government as a result of the 100 years celebration of the Factories Act. As mentioned by the member for Ridley, the first was a very special award—the Augusta Zadow award, which was announced some three months ago. That award, which will be given every year, will be for women who are involved in significant changes to occupational health and safety in the workplace.

Augusta Zadow was the first woman inspector in the factories area. She spent many years arguing and fighting for not only the rights of women in the workplace but for a general improvement in occupational health and safety. The second issue, as it flows on from this year, is the fact that the Government has already committed \$2 million to improve occupational health and safety within all workplaces in the State, and in particular within small business. It is a recognition of the 100 years of the Factories Act that we have made that money available. Thirdly, the role that Augusta Zadow played in the women's movement obviously ties in with 100 years of women's suffrage in this State, and her involvement has been part of the celebrations of the 100 years of women's suffrage in this State.

WATER RATES

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I will not respond to the interjection as to which team won the Grand Final—it is very evident from the tie I am wearing.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: You can have the reserves; we will take the big one any day. By how much will water rates for domestic users have to increase to meet the Government's target of doubling the rate of return on the asset base of the EWS?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As the House would well know, the Prime Minister put down and accepted Professor Hilmer's report recommending a 4 per cent rate of return on infrastructure, but COAG has not yet agreed to it. Some of the implications of the Hilmer report on the States will be significant. That is why the Premier, in discussions with the Prime Minister at COAG in Darwin, had matters related to Hilmer deferred until February so that further consideration could be given to the Federal Government's agenda. I suggest that the honourable member take up this matter with his Federal Labor colleagues.

Whilst the principle of Hilmer is not disputed, the rate of return on Hilmer that is being inflicted on the States is, as are the implications of that on the States. The clear message from the Federal Government is that the States have to put their Government trading enterprises on, first, a commercial footing—and there is no disagreement with that—and, secondly, operate on the principles of the private sector—and we have no problem with that. However, if we do not then take the other further step of obtaining at least a 4 per cent rate of return on assets employed, the Federal Government will put the States at a financial disadvantage. I suggest that the honourable member should take that up with his Labor Party colleagues in Canberra. The position with the Engineering and Water Supply Department in South Australia—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It will be interesting to see what happens if they take up the matter with the Prime Minister to start with, let alone whether there will be any success at the end of the day. However, I have a fair idea of what rate of success they would have with the Federal Government on that matter. What is important to note in relation to the EWS is that some two years ago it was a net drain and cost to Treasury and the taxpayers of South Australia. This year the EWS, because of the restructuring that has been undertaken over the past three years but, in particular, I would argue, in the past six months, will achieve a rate of return dividend to Treasury of about \$51.8 million, which will contribute to the provision of essential services to South Australians and it will operate on a commercial base.

I look forward to the support of the Opposition in the corporatisation of the EWS in South Australia so that it can continue that thrust of providing low-cost commodities to South Australians *vis-a-vis* other States of Australia and, in addition to that, contributing to the finances of South Australia and the provision of other essential services.

MANUFACTURER OF THE YEAR

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I direct my question to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. As the 10 finalists for the South Australian Manufacturer of the Year award have been finalised, can the Minister announce the finalists and tell the House what outstanding contributions they have made to South Australia's economy and what makes these companies winners?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The 10 finalists are Britax Rainsford Pty Ltd, BTR Engineering, Caroma Industries, Coca-Cola Amatil, Codan Pty Ltd, Faulding Pharmaceuticals, Philmac Pty Ltd, Scholle Industries, SEAS Sapfor and Seeley International. The Premier will announce the winner of the award tomorrow. There are some outstanding features in relation to the award this year. There have been 51 entries this year, and in the five-year history of the award this is the most significant number of companies in South Australia to enter. Some of the features of those companies are reflective of the ANZ job survey, which indicates that South Australian job advertisements have, on a month-on-month growth basis, enjoyed a greater percentage increase than other States, and the year-on-year growth has been greater here than in any other State in Australia. This clearly underscores that many manufacturing companies in South Australia, if not most of them, currently have full order books and are attempting to buy skilled labour for those plants in order to increase productivity to meet the orders available to them.

A comparison between the 1994 top 10 manufacturers and the 1993 top 10 manufacturers shows that return on investment is up two per cent, the net profit margin is up 7 per cent, productivity is up 6 per cent, exports are up 40 per cent, marketing expenses are up 32 per cent and training is up 41 per cent. Those last two points clearly underscore that the winning companies—the successful companies—are those that have a strategic plan for the future. They spend considerably more than other companies on training, export opportunities and on marketing their product. Clearly, the secret of success in manufacturing to access international markets is to undertake research, development, training and marketing of your product line. As a result of that, South Australia in elaborately transformed manufacturers is now leading Australia with respect to export market opportunities.

When we had tariff barriers and an aggressive migration program we had an expanding domestic market in which to sell our goods and products. Those circumstances no longer prevail. We therefore have to be able to access the international markets—the global markets—for the products in order to get economies of scale for our manufacturing industries. It is heartening to see that South Australian manufacturers are getting their act together and are focusing on the global and international markets. Of course, the end result of that is jobs in South Australia for South Australians.

WATER RATES

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure confirm that one of the options being considered by the Government's review of water pricing is for a full user-pays system for metropolitan households?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In reviewing any water pricing system one would look at all options, but many have been ruled out already. The Government will consider this issue in the fullness of time, as it does every year and as did the former Government, before water rates come on stream and are proclaimed prior to the operative date of 1 January.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr BASS (Florey): Can the Minister for Health inform the House of developments at Modbury Hospital with respect to industrial action by some sections of the staff, is this action having any impact on patient care and do the staff have any cause for concern?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The whole question of Modbury Hospital is, of course, well and truly up in the air at the moment because at no stage has the Government indicated its preference for anything other than the provision of increased services at a cheaper and more efficient cost to the taxpayer. As I have detailed in enormous depth to the House, we are indeed capitalising on initiatives taken by the previous Government. Consequently, the only particular statement that appears to have been ignored by a number of people in relation to Modbury Hospital, but about which we are quite definitive, is that in no way does the Government intend to sell the hospital.

It may well be that there is an opportunity to capitalise on private management of the hospital. However, as far as selling the State's assets is concerned, it will not happen; it is as simple as that. In relation to the industrial action at Modbury Hospital, a number of unionists attended a stop-work meeting on Friday, and the outcome of that meeting was that any industrial action 'would not have any impact on patient care'. I note that since then, presumably in an attempt to up her profile for preselection for the Federal seat of Adelaide, the ANF Labor left factional candidate, the Secretary of the Nurses' Federation, is now changing that to say, 'It is okay if it has minimal impact. We did not actually mean that it would have no impact.'

The fact is that the industrial action being taken at Modbury Hospital is really having no impact whatsoever at the moment. I applaud that, because the last thing that I would like to see is patients being sacrificed to factional dealing by a group that indicates quite categorically in communications to me that it is opposed to all privatisation of any service in South Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: On principle.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: On principle, as the member for Giles interjects. That means that the people running the protest meeting and protest theme at Modbury, such as that protest is, do not want the people of South Australia, the taxpayers, to pay less for better services. I really find that quite extraordinary.

Obviously I have a regular updating of the effects of the industrial action, and I have a couple of examples: the couriering of specimens was banned, but there has been nil reported impact and no action is planned; the phones were not to be answered when an office was unattended, and again there has been no impact and no action is planned; the servery was not to be attended, and there has been nil impact and no action is planned; special functions were not to be catered—in this day and age I am pleased about that—and again there has been no effect and no action is planned.

Further, regarding the cleaning of grounds or buildings, there was nil effect and no action is to be taken; in terms of furniture movement, there was nil effect and no action is to be taken; and in relation to the setting up of seminar rooms, there was nil effect and no action is to be taken. So, we have a number of elements in the debate wanting to whip up a quite unnecessary fervour. The reason why that fervour is unnecessary is that the Government has said on numerous occasions that the services will improve, it is not intending to sell the building, all jobs are secure, and indeed under its outsourcing arrangements it may well be that the people who go to the outsourcer, if that is the Government's final decision taken with the help of the board, may be in line for a large financial incentive to do just that.

It is my view that, when the nurses, cleaners, caterers and so on who have been working with dedication in the hospitals

are offered the same job with thousands of dollars in their pocket to continue with the private sector, if that is the decision the Government takes, they will queue up to join—and well they might. I add that, as long as these industrial actions continue to have no effect on the patients, I am happy to continue down that path and eventually come to a decision which will benefit the people of South Australia.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Do you agree with the remarks of the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide about the tone of parliamentary debate, and will you support the proposal by the Leader of the Opposition to form a high powered bipartisan group of members of Parliament to examine—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON:—in conjunction with the Standing Orders Committee ways to enable Parliament to function more effectively?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Following criticism by the Most Reverend Ian George of the standard of parliamentary debate, there have been suggestions of reforms that should be considered for this Parliament. These include the adoption of the system introduced by the Australian Senate which allows citizens who feel aggrieved by comments made under privilege to table a statement refuting allegations.

The SPEAKER: In response to the honourable member's question, I point out that any reform of the Standing Orders is a matter which members should bring before the Standing Orders Committee. I point out to the honourable member, particularly in relation to the letter which I received from the Leader of the Opposition, that it appeared in the newspaper before I had a chance to respond.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Further, one of the suggestions that the honourable Leader made to me about having a sin bin was rejected at the only meeting of the Standing Orders Committee that we had, and the honourable member who asked this question did not support the proposal that I put forward.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that the Chair welcomes constructive comment on any measure that can improve the operation of the House. I believe it is a matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!—which the two Leaders of the House and other members should address, and I am very happy to facilitate that action.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

Mr KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for Mines and Energy explain the cooperative role of the Department of Mines and Energy with Aboriginal traditional landowners in the provision of ground water supplies in the Maralinga and Pitjantjatjara lands?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: It is correct that the Mines and Energy Department over many years, because of its exploration activities, has helped Aboriginal communities in their search for reliable water supplies. In the 1970s, it drilled

wherever it thought it could find water on a geological basis. However, in recent years, with the cooperation of the Aboriginal communities, much more investigation has occurred to ensure that significant sacred sites do not exist in any areas in which the department drills and that environmental damage is minimised.

I pay tribute to the Mines and Energy Department for the very good work that it does in the outback areas of South Australia for Aboriginal communities. I must add that those Aboriginal communities have been very cooperative and helpful in terms of the recent announcements about exploration that is going on in the Officer Basin. Both the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands communities cooperated very well during that seismic survey. Recently it was announced that two major international companies will spend a considerable amount of money during the next few years on exploration in those Aboriginal lands. The continued cooperation by Aboriginal communities is much appreciated. The working relationship between the department and outback communities is very good, especially when it goes towards trying to help them to provide water to better their lifestyle.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Does the Minister for Health still claim that the quality of care provided by our public hospitals will not fall as a result of his Government's unprecedented cuts to the health budget, and will he say why 60 hospitals have refused to sign funding agreements? It was reported in Monday's *Advertiser* that 60 public hospitals have refused to sign funding agreements with the Government. The Executive Director of the Hospitals and Health Services Association, Mr Ken Goodall, was reported as saying:

Hospital boards and CEOs have looked very carefully at what is expected of them and, in all honesty, they feel they can't provide all the services they need to with the resources provided.

A spokesman for the Minister was then reported as saying:

... the number of hospitals with legitimate concerns was very small.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am very surprised that the member for Elizabeth, who I understand was a school-teacher before she became the shadow Minister for Health, would make such a big mistake. My recollection of the member for Elizabeth's question is that it referred to unprecedented health cuts in South Australia. I draw the attention of the member for Elizabeth to an article in the *Australian* of 20 August 1994 regarding health decisions of the Queensland Government. Amongst other things, the article states in relation to the Queensland Government, one of the honourable member's factional allies:

More than 320 cleaning jobs appear set to be axed,—and we are not axing any jobs—

staff shortages are causing the closure of operating theatres. . . the Queensland Nurses' Union said yesterday health officials had confirmed during an enterprise bargaining meeting that \$45 million in cuts would result in [these] cleaning positions being axed. . . those savings did not include further reductions in kitchen and laundry staff.

So, our carefully targeted management of the disaster left to us by the previous Government is 'Softly, softly, catchee monkey' in comparison with what the burners and slashers in Queensland are doing. So, first, let me say that our cuts are certainly not unprecedented. Regarding the service agreements, once again I am surprised that the member for

Elizabeth, who as a teacher would wish all the facts to be known, did not quote the part of the article which stated:

Both sides of the discussion expect there will be resolution of the problem by Friday.

In other words, whilst they are in a negotiating situation, there was concern on both sides, and both sides—in other words the hospitals and the Health Commission—expect resolution of these dilemmas by Friday. Friday is still three days away, and it was the day that we set for the signing of the service agreements. I do not think there is any problem whatsoever. There have been a number of instances of hospitals bursting into the press and saying that they do not wish to sign their service agreements. I wish to draw the attention of the House to one of those, that is, the Millicent Hospital.

The Hon. D.S. Baker: A very good hospital.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: A very good hospital, indeed. But I was surprised—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: An excellent local member. I was surprised when I heard that the Millicent Hospital intended not to sign its agreement until there had been further discussion, because under casemix funding it will get more money this year. I have to ask members of the House: what would you do if you were told by someone, 'I can either take away money or give you more, but we will give you more because you are an efficient hospital'? What would you expect that hospital to say? Nine times out of 10 you would expect the hospital to say, 'Thanks very much; we'll get on with the job of providing efficient health care.' But, no, it wanted to have further negotiations. I would like to point out that many hospitals around the country have been proved to be inefficient under the casemix funding formula and, if the Millicent Hospital wishes us to charge those hospitals using the same formula with which it wished to be charged, there will be outrage in the country, and that simply will not happen.

The hospital in the rural areas with the largest of all the expectations for the budgetary position is in the member for Giles' electorate—the Whyalla Hospital. It has the bigger ask of any of the hospitals, and it has indicated that it is quite happy to sign the agreement. Indeed, the people from the electorate of Giles have a history of being cooperative, so I thank them in this matter. I also thank a number of the metropolitan hospitals which have already indicated that they are quite happy and that they will sign. I have to say that, from the point of view of the article in the paper which the shadow Minister quoted when asking her first question, the part she really ought to look at when she goes back to see why she left it out is the part which says, 'Both sides expect a resolution of the matter by Friday.'

TRAINING CONTRACTS

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Has the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education been informed of the contract of training figures for September and, if so, can he indicate to the House the significance of those figures?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: This is another good news story for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Have you finished? Contracts of training refer to apprenticeships and traineeships. The figure for this time last year for the month of September was 172; for September this year, it is 437. That relates to legally

binding contracts signed—not people talking about becoming apprentices—between employers and apprentices and trainees. That is an increase of 154 per cent. It is a very encouraging sign. It is a vote of confidence by employers that they can see the economy picking up under the change of Government and, importantly, they are prepared to train young people, because we will need those skilled people as the recovery picks up. They are very welcome figures. We still have a long way to go, and I am sending a clear message to employers to make sure that, when the recovery is under full swing, they have people who can maintain and provide the skills that their industries need.

Those figures are in addition to the recently announced 700 new trainees that we are taking on in the State Public Service as an indication of our support for training young people. That is in addition to the 801 trainees that we have taken on since December last year. Shortly, I will be giving positive news about an increase in the number of apprenticeships in the public sector. We are practising what we preach and setting an example which is being followed by the private sector.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Are the agreements that the Minister for Health has introduced to establish the funding of public hospitals and the services they must provide legally binding on hospital board members, and what legal advice has he sought in the preparation of these agreements?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The advice has been through the legal services part of the Health Commission, and I have faith in it, as I am sure would all members of the Opposition. There has not been any change in that area since the last election. It is a matter of an agreement, and I sincerely believe that there will not be any question of legally binding or anything like that: it is a matter of an agreement among people in the position of being a board member who wish to provide services for their community, and the Health Commission and the Government is keen that we agree on what services will be provided at what cost.

PRISONER INTERVIEW

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Minister for Emergency Services outline to the House the circumstances surrounding the reported interview between an *Advertiser* journalist and a convicted murderer who is currently being detained in one of the State's prisons, as reported in the *Advertiser* yesterday? I had barely read the article yesterday when an elector rang expressing some concern about this apparent new direction of interviewing people in gaol and expressing ongoing concern about the trauma that this might cause victims and people who had previously been involved with the crime.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Unley for his question and for his genuine concern about the family of the victim of this terrible crime. I want to make perfectly clear to the House that as Minister I did not authorise the interview that occurred between the convicted person and the *Advertiser*. I was particularly disappointed to find that not only had the article been run but it ran on the front page of the *Advertiser*. As Minister, on a weekly basis I receive numerous requests from various media outlets throughout our State and country. Since becoming Minister, in all but one case I have refused such requests for interview, the reason being that most requests are to interview violent

prisoners, and to agree to those requests would bring unnecessary trauma to either the victims and/or their families. The only request I have approved to date has been a request by the *Advertiser* to interview a person convicted of fraud.

The reasons for this are quite simple. It is important that victims are not caused trauma beyond that which they have already experienced. However, I was particularly pleased to hear on 5AD this morning an example of what I consider to be responsible journalism in debating and highlighting this aspect of reporting. I would like to share with the House some sentences from the 5AD/5DN broadcast, through their journalist Mr Shane Sody, who said, in part:

Murderers are not celebrities, and reporters and editors have a responsibility to make sure that murderers are not treated like celebrities. But we are all failing in our duty. Yesterday, the *Advertiser* ran a front page story about a murderer. Scott Hart is in gaol for two murders he committed 10 years ago. Hart spoke to the *Advertiser* in an unauthorised interview by phone from Port Augusta Gaol. Of course, to explain the story, the newspaper had to remind us of the crime and publish photos of Hart's victims. The victim's families were not warned that this was coming up in yesterday's paper. I wonder how the families would have felt to see their loved ones once again in the paper just because the killer wanted to get something of his chest.

I applaud those sentiments by that journalist. It is an example of what I consider to be responsible journalism—an indication of the complexity that is behind any decision that is made or not made to allow a person to be interviewed if they have committed a crime. The statement by that journalist highlights another problem within our prison system, that is, access to telephones. At my direction, the Department of Correctional Services has, as members of the House would be aware, for some time been examining a range of options that will restrict telephone use by prisoners.

Extensive inquiries have been made both interstate and overseas by my department to determine the most cost-effective method to adopt and the extent of restrictions which the system should place on prisoners. Ideally, the preferred system should restrict telephone calls to relatives, friends and legal representatives of a prisoner to ensure that the prisoner cannot make nuisance telephone calls or telephone calls such as this one of an illegal nature. The department has experienced difficulty in comparing the benefits of differing systems because of the complexity of some of those systems and the complex funding structures. However, despite that, the department has now almost completed its work, and the cost of installing and administering the systems has been carefully investigated by the department.

I have been advised by my department that within the next fortnight it will be in a position to make recommendations to me regarding the most appropriate system and the cost of such a system, so that we can ensure that, through the telephone system as well, victims' rights and feelings are kept paramount in determining the sort of access that prisoners ought to have and the public statements that they can or cannot make.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Will the Government proceed with the appointment of Mr Brian Noakes of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry as President of the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thought the new Deputy Leader must have been demoted, not having a previous

question. However, as he would know, it is out of order for me to answer the same question again. If he would like to look it up in *Hansard* he will find the answer.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. With the continuing attention being given to trade with our Asian neighbours, can the Minister provide the House with information about the forthcoming world economic forum in Singapore which he is to attend and the significance of South Australian companies and the EWS Department in participating in a major infrastructure trade fair in Jakarta next week?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In relation to the infrastructure forum and trade exhibition in Jakarta on Monday and Tuesday next week, South Australia will be represented with Austrade. In fact, South Australia is the only State in Australia, together with Austrade, to be participating in that infrastructure forum. When one recognises that Indonesia is looking at spending billions of dollars on water and power infrastructure in the course of the next five to eight years, coupled with China looking at tens of billions of dollars worth of infrastructure over the next decade or two, the opportunities for South Australia to access those markets are significant.

The South Australian firms that will be participating in that exhibition include SAGRIC, Built Environs, Fisher Jeffries, Greenway International (an architectural firm), Flinders Medical Centre, and the Economic Development Authority. Firms being represented with promotional material and participating in the stand include: Rexco, MFP, Static Engineering, Codan (communications), Production Machinery (manufacturing), and Ashel Products.

In addition, the CEO of the EWS Department (Mr Phipps) will participate in the full four days of the infrastructure forum next week, and appointments are being made for him with the Director of Public Works in Indonesia. Further, Badung Province has requested meetings to look at further involvement with South Australia in the provision of infrastructure. Its purpose simply is to create an opportunity for South Australia to promote the capabilities of its firms and Government agencies with infrastructure expertise to the world and those Asian markets. There will be some 300 exhibitors at the trade show from 20 countries, with about 10 000 visitors expected to attend.

In relation to the economic forum in Singapore, there will be some 16 regional leaders and representatives of Governments: nine European and seven Asian covering Australia, China, India, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Russia, Spain, Switzerland and the Philippines. That forum was established in 1971. The sessions will include new business growth, new prospects in Europe, consumer preferences, transport and communication barriers, trade barriers and technology cross flow. Its aim is to advance the economic partnerships between Europe and East Asia, and to look at the opportunities in this instance that might present themselves for South Australia and Australia in accessing some of those markets.

There is no doubt that South Australia's economic future and its expansion rely upon accessing those international markets. With the successful completion of the IT&T centre of excellence being established through EDS using South Australia as its base and headquarters to access the Asia-

Pacific markets, this State's profile needs to be raised in the Asia-Pacific region. It can and will be raised as a result of EDS, Motorola and other companies locating and establishing their headquarters in South Australia. It will give us the opportunity to expand the economic base of South Australia from traditionally primary production and manufacturing industries in the 50s, 60s and 70s that accessed those international markets, into the new generation: the new growth area of economic development. The EDS contract and the benefits that it can and will bring to South Australia will help us access those Asia-Pacific markets.

I recall being concerned on a previous trip to the Asia region, as was the Premier when he returned from his visit to Singapore, Malaysia and China earlier in the year, with the profile of South Australia in that region. We are simply way behind the eight ball. We have to do a lot of work to market South Australia and to identify the technical expertise that is available out of the State to create those opportunities. By doing so and marketing this State appropriately and well, accessing those markets by giving the support that is needed and facilitating South Australian companies to get into those markets, we will broaden South Australia's base and give it a surer footing. That is good news for all South Australians.

ENERGY

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Mines and Energy consider introducing incentives to encourage people to install solar powered appliances? It has been put to me that the widespread installation of appliances, such as solar water heaters, will ease the load on the State's electricity and gas resources and also positively contribute to an improvement in the quality of the environment.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I will refer the matter to the Office of Energy Planning and bring back a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Following the Treasurer's recent visit overseas, can he provide the House with a summary of the financial market's view of the need for South Australia to regain its triple A credit rating? The Treasurer has consistently maintained that the State must regain its triple A credit rating which was lost in 1991 by the former Government during the State Bank disaster.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The message that must be clearly understood by everybody in this House, and particularly by members of the Opposition who want to hijack the Government's strategy, is that the recovery of and the need to get back to triple A status as far as the financial markets are concerned is absolutely vital. That is the message I bring back from overseas. They were particularly pleased with this Government's new economic direction. The former Treasurer went on a similar road show the previous year, and he noticed how appreciative those markets and the people dealing with our paper overseas are to see the Treasurer of the State over there. Importantly, these people can remember what state the State was in; they can remember the messages that were coming from South Australia. We are not an island: the markets actually understand our financing, and if they do not understand it they go and find out about it.

So, if they are recommending that their clients buy our paper they want to know how good our credit ratings are, how good our financial strategies are and how secure their clients

will be if they invest in our paper. It was great news to be back and to receive a big tick from the various banks that actually surveyed the client groups that attended these demonstrations and explanations of South Australian finances and the directions of the Government. It was good news that we had actually gone out there, sold a message and the message was accepted. However, it is important that the recapturing of that AAA status must be the goal and must be achieved. It is very important to understand that, whilst we did receive a tick for our economic strategy, the facts of life are that we still take a hit; we still pay a premium for borrowing money if we do not have the top rating.

It is useful to observe from the past financial year, for example, that the Commonwealth will always have precedence in the financial markets should it require money. If we look at Commonwealth financing over the previous financial year, in relation to longer-term borrowings of five years or more, we will find that the spread there compared to that in South Australia was about 55 basis points on average. That emphasises the extent to which you pay for the credit rating. If we look at Queensland and New South Wales, on average they were about 30 basis points better off than South Australia. If anyone wants that translated into cost of funds, it is quite simple: 10 basis points is about .1 per cent. So, on an \$8 billion debt we save \$8 million, simply because we can get our money more cheaply.

Therefore, whilst we were pleased with the result and pleased with the improvement in our capacity to market our State and market our money in the international markets, there is still a huge job to be done for this State. We simply cannot allow wastage of the order of \$24 million, in this case, because we do not have an AAA status. We must reach that AAA status in order to get our money more cheaply than we are getting it at the moment, thus providing relief and allowing some of our service areas to be under less pressure because not so much money is required to service the debt. It was an important lesson to be learnt.

I have been provided with feedback on the acceptance of the information that was provided by South Australia. For us it has been excellent, so we are very pleased with the result. But that is only an interim result: the final result must be having our State finances back in order, back to a greater state of health, and I would ask the Opposition to support that effort.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I refer this afternoon to the Family and Community Services Estimates Committee and the deplorable attitude of the Opposition, comprising Labor Party members who claim to be all about families and social justice yet who, when it comes to an important area such as Family and Community Services, pulled the pin on the Estimates Committee at only 6 o'clock in the evening. It is clear from that experience that the Opposition members speak with a forked tongue, because the Minister for Family and Community Services (Hon. David Wotton) had 19 staff

available to be questioned until 10 o'clock that evening, to ensure that the Opposition members had a fair go in examining what our Government was doing with Family and Community Services. However, because they had a conference to attend in Tasmania, members opposite determined that that was more important than getting on with the job of examining this important portfolio area.

Of course, when we talk about families we talk about grass roots, the foundation and the basics we need to see for this State to develop. We hear Labor Party members going on with a lot of rhetoric about being a Party that now listens to the people; a Party that, at the grass roots level, will allow people to make decisions on the sorts of candidates who should come up through the ranks and be chosen to take on the job of representing the people of the State.

It has been interesting in the past few weeks to note the various press reports and to listen to the Leader of the Opposition and other people within the Party talking about how they want to get closer to the people of South Australia, to listen to what they have to say and to represent them in a true, clear and honest fashion. Of course, all we have seen is a heck of a lot of deals being done, more trade union people being brought into the Parliament and factions controlling their activities, with grass roots people having no chance whatsoever of being able to make any decisions about who should represent them.

So, what have we learnt from all this? We have learnt that, after nearly a year in Opposition, Labor members are not really out there working hard for the people of South Australia; that they are still far more interested in continuing to help those to whom they owe a favour jump onto the gravy train; and that, when it comes to areas such as Family and Community Services, they would rather go on a trip to Tasmania than question the Government on what it is doing.

However, on the positive side, it is great to see that, even though we had to take some pretty big cuts in the budget across the board, our Liberal Government, understanding how important the Family and Community Services portfolio is to many families in the community, has been very careful to ensure that those cuts are kept to a minimum. I was delighted to see our Government make that decision, because down in the south, where we have been neglected for such a long time, we recognise the need for facilities and services involving not only Family and Community Services but also law and order, health, road infrastructure and job creation programs, etc.

Of course, we note that Noarlunga Hospital did very well out of casemix, receiving additional funding for the mental health services it now proposes, but it disappointed me that the Opposition spokesperson, the member for Elizabeth, when referring in Question Time today to cuts that we were purported to have made in the health arena, failed to let the people of South Australia know that, when members of the Opposition were in Government, 60 per cent of the McLaren Vale Hospital health budget was slashed. It was the slash and burn Government, as we all know only too well. We have only to look at the financial position of this State to realise that.

Our good friend the member for Playford was the only member who asked sound questions when it came to Family and Community Services, and I personally have come to admire the honourable member in the relatively short time in which I have been in this Chamber. Whilst it appears that he was knifed at this time, I know that the calibre of the honourable member, as well as his dedication to bipartisan development in getting this State going, will see him come

much closer to being Leader or Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the foreseeable future. So, I look forward to working with the member for Playford as we keep developing this State, but for the people of South Australia it is very disappointing to see that Labor has not learnt anything.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I think that all members would be aware of the Archbishop's concerns about the decline in parliamentary standards, offering the view that childish attacks, smear tactics and the politics of personality are doing a great deal to undermine public confidence in politicians and in Parliament. All of us should recall the words of former Prime Minister Ben Chifley, who said:

Honourable members should not forget that in the life of a democracy it is important that the public should respect not necessarily a Party but the Parliament. Everything we do to destroy that respect deals a blow to democracy itself.

There is no doubt in my mind that respect for Parliament and for politicians is at an all time low, both in this State and around this nation. When I have been doorknocking, I have been told constantly by citizens that they are sick and tired of politicians bickering and using the Parliament as a vehicle for vicious and often unsubstantiated personal attacks playing the person and not the issue. I am also sure that the aggressive, abusive and confrontational behaviour often highlighted in television coverage has helped deter many talented people—particularly talented women—from pursuing a parliamentary career.

Certainly it is my view that the public expect all of us as politicians, all of us as parliamentarians, to put the long-term needs of our State and nation ahead of short-term partisan concerns. It is true, however, that the public are often presented with a distorted picture of what really occurs in Parliament. Many citizens do not realise that around 90 per cent of Bills considered by Parliament achieve unanimous bipartisan support. Television news teams generally attend only Question Time (they certainly packed up and went at the end of Question Time today) and then tend to focus on the more vitriolic exchanges or the most colourful grab or sound bite. Realising this, many politicians choose to play the media game in the hope of being featured on the nightly news. It has reached a point in South Australia where several senior parliamentarians turn their back on the Speaker in order to posture before the cameras.

All Parties, and many politicians, are guilty of using the Parliament to make attacks on political opponents. All of us—the Premier, the former Leaders of the Opposition and now Ministers and me—have been guilty of going over the top at times. That does not mean that none of us can improve. We should all improve and collectively endeavour to lift the public's esteem for the institution of Parliament and their representatives. There is no doubt that on a number of occasions in South Australia totally unfounded personal attacks made under parliamentary privilege have caused considerable damage to an MP's reputation, health and family life, which no denial or hard won apology can later rectify. Personal attacks and deliberate smearing of political opponents or members of the public must be dealt with most severely.

Today we heard people being called 'thick heads'. I highlight a past example where a woman member of this Parliament some years ago was described as a slut, and that

was an absolute disgrace. We have seen people in this Parliament referred to as murderers. We have had questions raised about Mafia connections—all of which turned out to be untrue. Recently, we had an example where a member of this House was mentioned in relation to ‘when she slips into the sheets with him tonight’ and so on. There is a general view around the community that that type of comment about peoples’ looks, separations, family circumstances and personal life and so on should not be permitted in this Parliament. People raise those issues when basically they cannot cut the mustard in terms of debating issues.

I wrote to the Speaker of the House some days before the letter to the Archbishop was made public. Indeed, I sent that letter to you, Sir, last Wednesday and was disappointed by your comments because my question was phrased in a most constructive way. Certainly I will address that matter outside this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will not reflect on the Chair. The response he gets will be most constructive, too.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will continue to be constructive, Sir, and continue to seek with you ways of improving and reforming this Parliament. I hope that you, the Premier and I can sit down as three mature members of Parliament and work out how we can lift the game of this Parliament to be more effective and accountable, without personal abuse.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member’s time has expired. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I am only sorry that there were not more members in the Chamber to hear that contribution. There are few moments in history that deserve particular note, and to see the Leader of the Opposition’s conversion on the road to the front bench, as illustrated in his speech, is truly remarkable. It is to be commented on that so few members were present to witness such a sincere and total conversion, such a reversal. In fact, it was almost a polar reversal.

Mr Becker: Do you believe he was really sincere?

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Peake is most cruel.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. My understanding of the Grievance Debate is that it allows members to raise an issue of significance relating to their area or an area of interest. I draw your attention to relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not have a point of order. The member for Unley is entitled to raise any matter that he thinks appropriate.

Mr BRINDAL: Thus, not one minute after the Leader of the Opposition finished speaking about relevance in Parliament and contributions to debate we see the true tactics of members opposite with frivolous interjections and points of order. I was most interested in the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition, so much so that the subject of my grievance changed in the course of that contribution. The member for Hart might like to take note of this because, along with the members for Peake and Newland, during my time in here I have asked for exactly what the Leader of the Opposition comes in here and asks for today, namely, a bit of common decency and a bit of lifting of the standard of debate in the Parliament and, more specifically, a little bit of treating the Parliament with the respect that an institution like this deserves.

In the years that I and my colleagues served on the Opposition benches, we had no such concessions from those who then occupied the Government benches. I am a particularly interested observer today because I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition canvassed many instances, and all

of them involved situations where a Liberal member of Parliament in this place or in another place may have criticised a member of the former Government. One example that he did not mention occurred, very curiously, just before the last election, wherein the then member for Gilles directed a comment at me, quite deliberately. In so doing he put a slur on my character that I will have to live with for the rest of my life.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to looks, families, personalities, marital break-ups and a lot of other things, but he did not talk about the one thing the member for Gilles got stuck into me about, namely, sexual preference. He did not talk about his own Party’s deliberate performance in maligning people on this side of the House. He comes in here as Leader of the Opposition and the prime focus of a very small Party and lectures us on fair play and parliamentary standards. I do not think that any member of the Party of which I am proud to be a member needs that lecture. The lecture should be delivered in his Caucus and to his Party room. Members opposite certainly have runs on the board with respect to this issue.

I can point to a number of books written in this State about the sort of tactics members opposite have pursued both in this Chamber and in lifts and other places all around this State to deliberately malign and denigrate people in a way they did not deserve. I find it offensive. I do not find the Leader’s remarks offensive: I totally concur with them. However, I find his motives questionable and I find it personally offensive that a person who was a senior member of the former Government and who resorted quite deliberately to the tactics to which they resorted prior to the last election, and with some of the things that some of their supporters pulled in the election campaign, can come into this House and have the temerity to lecture a Government, which has so far behaved with propriety and decency towards members opposite, on morality and other such virtues. Let the person with perfect morality come in here and lecture us. I do not think it is the Leader of the Opposition.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): Order! The honourable member’s time has expired.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I appreciate the opportunity to rise in this Chamber today to talk about an occurrence in the past few weeks that was of real significance to the well being of this State. I am not referring to the magnificent victory of the Port Adelaide Football Club in the SANFL grand final. It was a momentous occasion, Sir.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I believe that this Chamber does not allow displays. The member for Hart is wearing a tie that appears to display the football club—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr FOLEY: That makes a mockery of the appalling contribution made by that member, who just tried to talk about ethics. I was not referring to the great grand final victory of the Port Adelaide Football Club, which is soon to join the AFL. I was talking about the recent ALP national conference in Hobart where the delegation from South Australia, led by the Leader of this State Labor Party, achieved for this State something that this present Liberal Government has been unable to achieve in the past 10 months.

What we achieved, as a South Australian delegation led by the Leader of the Opposition (the member for Ramsay),

was an extension of the Adelaide Airport runway. The past Labor Government was unable to achieve that; and the present Liberal Government was unable to achieve it. The new Leader of the Opposition and the South Australian delegation went down to Hobart with one objective. We met for many hours behind closed doors. We worked hard and diligently towards brokering a deal for this State that would add real value to our economy.

We did that not with any political point scoring in mind—none whatsoever. We went down there with the economic development of this State as our number one priority. We did not get what the Premier may have liked us to get, that is, some utopia of an airport, some mega revamp of our airport. What we were able to achieve was a beginning of the rebirth of Adelaide Airport—that is, the extension of the Adelaide Airport runway. What we were also able to achieve was a resolution that allows our airport to be leased to and run by the private sector, if the private sector is the most appropriate body to run our airport. That will give the Premier of this State the flexibility to find the ownership and management structure that will move our airport forward.

We achieved the extended runway for the airport, which will give the Premier a far better product with which he can attract an appropriate airport developer and manager. The other very important fact, which unfortunately has not received the same degree of prominence as the great victory of the State Labor Party in getting the runway extended, was that we were able to get the existing debt of the Adelaide Airport removed so that any operator coming in to operate Adelaide Airport will do so debt free. With that airport debt free, it will return a reasonable rate of return. It is a profitable airport and will be a very attractive investment and proposition for the private sector, if that is the appropriate body to manage and operate our airport.

When I was in Hobart I was very disappointed to see the churlish reaction of our State Premier who could not accept the fact that other people were capable of delivering results for this State. As I said, we went down there to play a constructive role for this State. It would have been decent, whilst the Leader of the Opposition was down there brokering deals with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Transport, to at least have the Premier of this State supportive of that move. But, no. We had this churlish reaction, which we have come to expect every time the Premier does not get his own way. Unfortunately, at times our Premier behaves like a school boy: when he does not get his own way he becomes very churlish.

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

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I would like to raise my concerns for the TransAdelaide bus drivers at the Lonsdale depot, and the vandalism and attacks that have been occurring in the southern area, particularly with rock throwing. This is a very serious problem in the southern area. Some time ago the three southern members met with Mr Ray Marsh and other union members and management for the Lonsdale depot. There has been an escalation of vandalism in our area over the past five years. It has been worse than ever during the past six to eight months.

Since January this year vandalism attacks alone have numbered 78. Drivers constantly receive verbal abuse and often feel seriously threatened for their physical safety. We need these experienced drivers doing the job they are so well trained to do. I congratulate the members of the union and the

management at Lonsdale for the way in which they have dealt with these problems. They have been prepared to sit down with the local members and discuss the issues, and find some genuine way of attempting to work with the Government to solve this problem. The Government and the southern members do not accept the behaviour of this small group of thugs in our community and do not accept the situation our drivers are placed in while simply trying to offer a service to the community in doing their job. They are under attack by these thugs from within and outside the buses.

I also place on record the positive actions that our Minister for Transport and Minister for Emergency Services are putting in place to address this issue. Of most importance is the Transit Squad improvements, which have been very significant. Currently there are 67 fully trained police in the Transit Squad. There were only seven officers in this squad when this Government was elected, and they had very limited powers. The number of officers in the Transit Squad and their powers have been addressed by this Government. The increase to 67 officers has been achieved by training 39 new police through the Police Academy, the seven that were already in the squad, and a further 21 police who have been assigned to the Transit Squad while others are being trained. At the end of this process, the Transit Squad will number 80.

When a category one situation occurs, the nearest police patrol car responds to the incident. Since this Government has taken control of the situation, the number of arrests and reports has increased from 165 to 1 391 for the same time period in the years 1993 and 1994. In particular, arrests increased from 77 to 669 for the same time frame as previously described. This Government will be introducing 60 passenger service attendants to replace the former guards that the Labor Party removed from the buses.

I refer to correspondence received from the Minister for Transport in response to inquiries particularly in the southern area. All 70 TransAdelaide buses that are used on night shift will be fitted with security screen doors, which will particularly benefit the drivers. All buses and trams in the TransAdelaide fleet will have a protective film applied to the side windows of the driver's seat. Also, protective film will be applied to the windscreens of all buses that do not have laminated and strengthened windscreens. All TransAdelaide vehicles have now been fitted with a new radio system which has an emergency facility so that when an emergency switch is activated the TransAdelaide radio controller can monitor an incident as it occurs on the bus. TransAdelaide radio controllers can therefore quickly assess the situation because they are aware, through the conversations taking place, how the situation is progressing.

Another initiative is the Young Customer Focus Group, which is particularly important and which is the continuation of an initiative that was instigated by the Lonsdale bus depot—that is, the anti-graffiti program. I will not continue outlining the situation in terms of graffiti in this grievance debate because it would take 10 minutes to put into words some of the things that I feel need to be taken into account. However, after the Premier's visit to Kaurna and the issues that were raised at a public meeting at Port Noarlunga, I am very pleased that several Ministers have got together and will continue to work with back bench members to find some solutions to these problems. I think the extra transit police resources that have been put into the southern area to combat our problems will help, and the addition of plain-clothes patrols will target the key areas.

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I would like to address a reply dated 5 July this year to a letter I sent on 24 May to the Women's Suffrage Committee which organised the women in power and politics conference. That reply is a rejection of the suggestions that I offered in my letter of 24 May. At that time I had been reading the brochure which had been presented by the organisers of the women in power and politics conference, which was to mark the anniversary of the centenary of the vote for women in South Australia. That conference is being held at the Adelaide Convention Centre at the moment, through to 11 October. It is a most important conference that celebrates the centenary of an event in which South Australia led the world in giving women both the right to vote and the right to stand for Parliament.

As this was an international conference and one which would draw a great deal of attention from local media, and probably the world's media, I felt that it should therefore reflect a balance of women's current thinking, not only that of those who appeared on the brochure to be Marxist-oriented feminists but also of those who would want to uphold the status of women from a different perspective. I was not convinced that the backgrounds of the speakers listed on the brochure adequately reflected such a balance. It was to that point that I wrote the letter to the committee.

Also missing from the program seemed to be an acknowledgment of just how South Australia and New Zealand came to win the distinction of being the first places in the world to achieve women's suffrage. Those supporting women's suffrage in Britain, for example, had to wait decades to achieve the same success. Of course, part of the reason for that is the work of the first international women's organisation here—the Women's Christian Temperance Union. One of its founding mothers was Frances Willard of the United States, who had strong convictions about the status of women and their potential to influence society for good, especially if they had the right to vote and, indeed, to stand for Parliament. Her vision and enthusiasm spread to the WCTU groups in Australia and New Zealand in the 1880s. In South Australia it was the hard work of Elizabeth Webb Nicholls and her many supporters that convinced their male relatives of the solid advantages of women's suffrage. They used the power of reasoned argument.

The South Australian WCTU gained more than 8 000 of the 11 000 signatures on the famous petition that helped South Australian MPs to grant women's suffrage in 1894. I believe that this historic victory would not have happened in that year without the key influence of what was predominantly conservative women, indeed conservative Christian women.

One hundred years later, conservative Christian women seem to be entirely missing from the Women, Power and Politics conference list of invited speakers. To that end, I wrote to the committee and suggested three speakers who I felt at least should be invited to speak. One was Mrs Gwendolyn May, who is now in her eighty-third year and who is the only active member of the SAWCTU to have strong memories of Elizabeth Nicholls. There are many other areas to which I could refer in relation to Mrs May, but time does not allow me to do so. She was also apparently the only person who ever spanked our former Prime Minister, Robert Hawke. Gwen was a close friend of Bob Hawke's mother, Ellie, who was an active member of the SAWCTU.

The other name I offered was Mrs Carole Caroll, who wants Government policy to endorse a woman's right to choose and not to favour institutional care over home child-care. She has become an accomplished public speaker at rallies in several capital cities and has struck a clear chord with thousands of home maker women who feel that feminist bureaucrats have ignored them. I believe that a conference reflecting the concerns of all women should include speakers such as the two I have mentioned. The other was Mrs Ros Phillips, who sees organised drug, prostitution and pornography trades as being very damaging to the status and well-being of women.

If women are not prepared to be intellectually big enough to accept, but not necessarily embrace, the vast diversity of opinion across the spectrum of their peers—and their peers are all the women in our communities—they do the women's cause a disservice because they will be, in essence, no better than the men who hold the attitudes about which women so bitterly complain and which they seriously want to address. Although I recognise that the conference will include seminars and discussion groups that may cover some of the concerns mentioned above, they do not cover family-oriented women.

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

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. C.A. Pickles to fill the vacancy on the committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. C.J. Sumner.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. T.G. Roberts to fill the vacancy on the committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. C.A. Pickles.

APPROPRIATION BILL

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr BECKER: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I addressed most of the issues of concern previously, but I will use some of this time briefly to raise a couple of matters which are important to me personally and which came out during the Estimates Committees. First, I refer to the abolition of free transport for school card holders. This is something about which, even during these school holidays, I have received a great many calls at my electorate office. It is obvious already that this will cause a great deal of hardship to people all around Adelaide. However, I am particularly concerned about the people in my electorate, where there is a high number of unemployed people and a high percentage of single parents. In addition, it must not be forgotten that there is a high number of people on relatively low incomes who have their money already tied up in living expenses.

On many occasions people from each of those three groups have contacted my office to explain how difficult they would find it under the new system whereby their children do not have free transport when they would have been eligible for it previously. For example, I was contacted by the mother of four children who each travel a short but significant distance to a Catholic school in the area and who now may not be able to attend the school of their choice because of the extra cost of transport.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: It will cost them \$5.10 a week for a multi-trip ticket. When that is multiplied by four, it is a significant cost. Members on the other side who are perhaps a little more wealthy will not understand the difficulties that this involves for people on low incomes.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: That is with the concession. It means that these parents face the possibility of having to pull their children out of the school to which the mother, father and all her family went and sending them to a local public school. She acknowledges that the local public school is a good one and she does not have a problem with it, but her children are happy at their school and it is a family tradition to go there. However, the simple fact of the matter is that she probably cannot afford to continue to send them there.

Another single parent in my area telephoned me. As a result of the scaling down of classes at the Smithfield Plains High School, he needed to direct his children to another high school. His two children now attend Elizabeth City High School and make use of the school card concession. My constituent is unemployed, and he is now in a position where, from his unemployment benefit, he needs to find an extra \$10.20 a week for those two children. This is a dire form of hardship for parents who see education as a big priority in the lives of their children and as a major requirement to enable them to secure a better position in life. They cannot rely on anything other than their own efforts to improve their position.

The single parent to whom I refer has been unemployed for some time. He wants to see his children educated to a level where they can obtain a job, but the very fact that he has to pay for transport for those children jeopardises their chances of doing that. They will have to consider seriously how long they can stay at school if it begins to be a hardship. The alternative to these extra payments is that something else must give. These people have no discretionary spending

power. When the Government talks about cuts, in some areas this means cuts in food and clothing. None of these people spends a great deal of money in those areas.

The point I am trying to make is that this will mean a very small amount of saving for a very short-term gain. In the overall context of the budget, free transport under the school card is insignificant. Problems have already started to emerge. I put this issue to the Parliament in a constructive way, because it is possible that the Government may have to concede that it has made an error in doing this and that it may have to reverse its decision.

In a quite different but related example, the previous Labor Government reversed a decision to provide free transport for all school children when it became obvious that problems were arising in that area. It acknowledged its mistake and changed the system. The problems that will emerge from the Government's decision about the school card will become evident. I ask the Government to maintain an open mind about this matter, to realise that it is imposing an unnecessary hardship on people and perhaps to make some adjustments to its decision. In view of the fact that transport is being restructured enormously, there is a chance further down the track that this decision could be reversed.

The second area to which I refer, one which is of personal interest to me because of my background in science, concerns what is happening to SARDI, the Government's research institution. SARDI has been subjected to long periods of uncertainty over a number of years, first concerning its location—whether it will remain at Northfield or be moved to Waite. It has undergone restructuring over a number of years, and a 25 per cent reduction in staffing levels has now been announced. Also, over a period of time there appears to have been a question as to whether the separating of SARDI from the Department of Primary Industries was a good thing. However, during the Estimates Committees the Minister said that he believes that this separating of SARDI will 'in the long term be good for South Australia'.

I was pleased to hear that, because it is important that SARDI not be subjected to further periods of uncertainty, that it be given the opportunity to settle down in its new premises at Waite with the new staffing levels, acknowledging the reduction, and that it be able to continue its excellent work. During the Estimates Committees, its research work in the areas of viticulture, barley breeding, the quality of navel oranges, pasture cultivars and livestock programs was acknowledged. It was also acknowledged that about 50 per cent of its funding is already obtained from private sources. Obviously, these private sources are from within the industry. The point I make is that industry funding generally has a specific focus, which is often short to medium term.

It is important that the Government guarantee the valuable resource that exists in SARDI in terms of its staffing and the knowledge that has been built up within that organisation. It is also important that we give the graduates from our academic institutions somewhere to go and something valuable to do. For SARDI to spend all its time getting private research moneys, reorganising and restructuring, being in the Department of Primary Industries and then out of it and looking at position papers is very destructive to its activities.

I go back to the point that it is important that the Government adopt a long-term strategy. In the long term, in view of the importance to this State of agriculture and aquaculture, we must maintain within South Australia and controlled by the South Australian Government a research facility that we

can use for, of course, short and medium term research for the benefit of our agriculture industries but also for long-term research so that we maintain our expertise in agricultural research within this State and do not allow it to disappear or dissipate. We cannot rely on Federal and private funding. This State must have some input in ensuring that SARDI remains a viable organisation, and we must give it the adequate support that it requires in order to do that.

Following on from that, I believe it is important that we maintain Government intervention in a number of areas. Obviously, the economic situation at the time and budgetary considerations play an important part in our weighing up the role that the Government can play in the provision of public service and the pumping of money into various areas. I do not believe that, necessarily, the Government must have a finger in every pie in the State, but in calling for a long-term view of SARDI's activities I also call for a long-term view of the activities of other Government enterprises and organisations. As a State, we need to consider seriously which areas should require Government intervention and which need Government help, and plan in an medium to long-term way because, basically, this Government relies too much on what the market might do. It is prepared to privatise or corporatise a number of areas that should not be left solely to market forces. As in the case of SARDI, it is often for very good reason that the short-term focus of many industries—I believe it is a criticism of many Australian industries that they have a short-term focus—does not make for a State that will grow in an orderly and organised way.

Going back to perhaps a more human point of view, I emphasise that the Government has said that it is not the business of service providers to provide social benefits. In a number of areas, it is saying that the service providers should concentrate on providing their service, and any concessions that need to be made on social justice grounds should be left to the Government to provide. My problem with this is that it creates a mendicant group within society who have to go cap in hand to various Government agencies to prove that they are poor enough to qualify for the benefits. This creates an undesirable us-and-them type of society, with people having to expose themselves to the degrading process of having to apply for concessions and having to say that they are poor. For example, they may have to apply for concessions for their health services or their water service. The problem with this is that it creates a very divided society.

I believe in issues such as law and order, employment and the general smooth running of society, but this is not a good way to go. The Government has a requirement to provide basic services in our society. That is what the Government is for: it is here to serve all people and treat them in an equal fashion, not to create a group that is suppressed by the need to constantly prove their poverty. Anyone who has had to fill in forms or stand in queues at counters in Government agencies knows just how degrading this process is. Governments have moved towards that process through the necessity to ensure that assistance is targeted to groups who really need it. Of course, that makes a lot of sense, and it has happened at both a Federal and State level, but we need to be careful as to exactly how far we go in this process, and we must not go too far down this track.

With regard to people who need concessions, I am talking not only about people in poverty but about people living in rural areas who are given subsidies which at the moment are hidden in the form of services provided at the same cost—whether it is more expensive to provide them in the country

than in the metropolitan area. So, we are talking not only about people who live in dire poverty but about people who are disadvantaged on geographical grounds as well.

The prospect of people having to prove that they are disadvantaged in some way when they have every right to rely on the Government to provide these services is the wrong way to go. In its budget and in the provision of its services, the Government is starting to go too far down this track when those who are able to make their way in a market driven economy are left to make whatever profits are possible and to benefit wherever they can use the system, whereas those who, for whatever reason, are not able to use the system as efficiently or effectively as others are left behind to become the welfare group that Governments are then required to support. We all pay minimum taxes, the Government has minimum intervention, and people in lower socio-economic groups have little chance of improving their lot in life. Those people are constantly suppressed, constantly in a position of having to fight for benefits and to justify the benefits they receive.

This Government will feel the effects of this sort of policy in terms of increasing difficulty with law and order and increasing unrest within our community. It needs to think perhaps about more creative ways of dealing with a number of its Public Service instrumentalities. I recognise and am wary of a number of the Hilmer report provisions. This Government must deal in a very intelligent and creative way with the Federal Government and other States in the way that the Hilmer report is implemented. However, it must also rethink the way that it believes the economy runs. Perhaps it needs to rethink whether market forces are necessarily the best driver for our economy.

It is interesting to note that this Government has provided so many subsidies to the private sector and yet seems very unwilling to subsidise the people it represents. It wants to restrict those subsidies and have people apply constantly for any benefits they get, whereas industry is offered benefits on a plate to it here without adequate public consultation on the trade-offs required in terms of the services the Government is then able to provide for the community. A number of those community services are already reduced: women's community health services, for example, and I understand there have been savage cuts to a number of smaller community groups.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): When I rose to speak in the budget debate, I commended the Treasurer at that time for putting an extensive and responsible budget to the people of this State. Having sat through the fortnight of Estimates Committees, looking at the budget in all aspects, I must now reiterate my congratulations to the Treasurer on having a greater feeling for what has occurred and will occur throughout the State because of the budget presented by the Treasurer. Of course, in the areas of budget estimates, involving all the programs that will be initiated throughout South Australia during the coming year, there are areas where positives are blatantly seen, and there are areas where negatives reveal themselves also.

With regard to the area of negatives, the Auditor-General's Report outlined the financial mess that was left by the Labor Government and its financial mismanagement of the State. Of course, the Auditor-General's Report is an indictment of that very situation. The report covers a number of issues that are now being tackled by this Government in relation to the proper management of the State's finances. We

can all agree with the Auditor-General's finding that the provision of whole of Government financial information is in his opinion fundamental to understanding the position of public finances. However, the mess that we inherited in terms of accounting in asset management records has not allowed us to achieve that goal.

The State Government, as obviously indicated through the Estimates Committees, has been in the process of developing an asset register, and a comprehensive policy paper is now being distributed to Government agencies for their comment. The Auditor-General raised a number of concerns that had been highlighted in previous reports which the former Government failed to address properly; in particular, the lack of comprehensive information on State-owned assets.

In recent months the Government has devoted significant resources to correcting this deficiency. The Government now has in place a basic asset register identifying each major asset by type and location. The next step is to finetune this register and include all the information necessary to provide the Government with a complete valuation. Although significant advances will be made over the ensuing year it will not be possible to account for all Government assets until 1996-97. This will coincide with the implementation of accrual accounting into all sectors of Government which is another Government priority. This Government is now working through the various accounting issues to ensure that it will be able to produce a whole of Government financial report in the same time frame.

One of the other negatives was the claim by the Opposition that the Government had conned small business over new land tax measures. That matter was addressed during the Estimates Committees. For the Opposition to claim that this Government has conned small business in any way, shape or form is outrageous, particularly in the area of new land tax measures, because the former Government increased land tax rates in three consecutive years to offset falling property values. The Leader of the Opposition's new found concern for small business was grossly hypocritical considering the high taxes imposed on not only small business but industry in general as well as individuals during the Labor Party's reign of financial mismanagement and high unemployment. The fact is that the Labor Government refused to adopt the former Government's practice and, over the past three years, increased land tax rates to overcome revenue loss from reduced property values.

It was this Government's decision to lower the land tax threshold from \$80 000 to \$50 000 a site value, which will result in land tax revenue falling short of last year's receipts by \$2.7 million in real terms. The impact of the lower land tax threshold will be a charge of \$17.50 for properties with a site value of \$55 000, \$52.50 for a site value of \$65 000 and a maximum increase of any one ownership of \$105. Most land ownerships within the value range of \$50 000 to \$80 000 will be eligible for the principal place of residence exemption.

The Liberal Government reviewed the impact of land tax on small business operators and found that it was not a significant burden on small business owners. Many property owners have received lower cost benefits due to falling property values in recent years, and with the serious financial problems facing South Australia the State had to protect its revenue base. During the Estimates Committees it became obvious that the Liberal Government has kept its commitment not to introduce new taxes or increase tax rates in the 1994-95 budget while trying to address the State's financial predicament caused by the previous Government.

Although I appear to be competing with the Minister's telephone and several members conversing in the Chamber close by (if the Minister continues I may not be able to hear the conversation going on) I will refer to the other area of positive comment, namely, the Premier's welcome announcement at the end of September concerning job creation, which is what this budget is all about. The State Government and South Australia's car manufacturing industry have reached agreement on a new multi-million dollar training initiative that will benefit more than 5 000 workers in five years. I refer to the vehicle industry certificate, involving the largest cooperative State industry training scheme in Australia, which will be run by General Motors-Holden's Automotive Ltd and Mitsubishi Motors Australia Ltd with financial support from the Government through the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education.

The vehicle industry certificate (VIC) is of critical importance to our State's automotive manufacturing industry as it will provide employees with the skills and knowledge to be involved in the changes required to make the car industry in South Australia world competitive, and it will also help sustain employment levels in this State. It is particularly important at this time, as car manufacturers in South Australia look to increasing production especially for overseas markets. The car manufacturing industry represents about 18 per cent of South Australia's total manufacturing turnover and 16 per cent of manufacturing employment. That is why it is very pleasing to be able to see such an important cooperative venture being put together. The State Government will inject \$1.3 million into this enterprise while the other enterprises which include GMH, Mitsubishi and the Automotive Industry Training Board will contribute up to \$10 million by the end of 1995.

Members interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: I cannot not only hear the Minister but the other end of the conversation as well, which is quite interesting. I am sure the Minister will be interested in the remarks I have made on behalf of his department with regard to assisting the State by increasing our work force over the next four years.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: I appreciate that very much. That is exactly what I have just stated and I am very pleased to do so. Apparently, the VIC proposal was put to the Government by the Automotive Industry Training Board, and that will result in about 75 per cent of the company's non-trade work force obtaining a nationally recognised portable training certificate. That agreement can only strengthen the already close relationship between the automotive manufacturing industry and the Government. It also will help to develop a more diverse range of training for the people working in this industry. In fact, GMHA's executive-in-charge of vehicle assembly operations (Mr Rod Keane) says that the company saw the VIC as an important component in achieving world class performance. He goes on to say:

As we introduce new technology and extend our continuous improvement activities, we will require all our employees to be fully conversant with the knowledge and skills to continue the vital change process necessary to sustain our current position and improve long term export opportunities.

Mr Keane said that the VIC would give employees the opportunity to contribute more in day-to-day operating and open up a career path into other areas such as trades and supervision. It also is interesting to note that the Chairman of the Automotive Industry Board (Paul Noack) said that the

investment in training would ensure the company's competitive edge would come from better skills capable of delivering quality and productivity. Mr Noack, who is also Secretary of the Vehicle Division of the Automotive Food, Metals and Engineering Union, said that career development for employees was essential. I am quite sure we all agree with that. He also said:

Boosting training with this injection of funds will further enhance the trend towards a healthy and sustainable car industry in our State.

It was also interesting to hear the range of initiatives that had been taken by Government to help support bringing business and industry into this State and the means by which the tenures of some of these areas of business and industry had been secured, which means of course that job creation for our young people is a definite reality for the future. But in listening to some of the negotiations that had taken place it was quite obvious that, although the media had picked up on many of these areas and highlighted to the public of South Australia that these negotiations had taken place, a great number of negotiations had not been reported and no media attention had been given to these achievements of Government. I believe that highlighting the good news and publicising the jobs that these companies will create is absolutely necessary. From the number of companies that have been convinced to remain in South Australia it is fair to say at this stage that, summarising some of the Ministers' comments through the Estimates, the Government is still negotiating with a further 60 companies for projects worth at least \$80 million and creating a further 350 jobs directly and a possible 1 000 jobs indirectly.

In the short time left to me I would like to put on record some of the company names, the estimated capital expenditure and, where possible, the number of new jobs estimated in each of these areas. It is also important to say that direct business investment in South Australia went up more than \$600 million during the first nine months of the year, and further capital expenditure of \$350 million has been committed for the next 12 months. This is an unprecedented success for the Government in economic development strategy, which means that we have already exceeded what was our annual target of \$500 million of new investment. Investment activity has been strongest in industries with a large growth potential such as automotive, defence, IT and wine. As a result, these investment decisions secured more than 2 600 new long-term jobs directly and about 8 000 jobs in a flow-on effect from this.

The manufacturing modernisation program delivered through the Centre for Manufacturing helped to attract almost \$20 million of investment and new technology for our manufacturing industry, which puts companies in a strong position to stay internationally competitive and to respond to export market opportunities. My Government is supporting a strategy of attracting new business by looking closely at international economic developments and, on the basis of two reports into the electronics and IT industries, and jointly with business representatives, it will prepare a plan to advance these key sectors to take advantage of South Australia's standing as the State of innovation. State activities during the past nine months have also given us a reputation for being smart in advancing trade relations with overseas countries.

Germany and Japan are cooperating with South Australia on a space capsule recovery program based at Woomera, which will add \$25 million to the State's economy. The successful delivery of this project in January 1995 will boost

the redevelopment of Woomera as a major international facility for space projects and, to ensure that the State benefits from a growing commercial market for space products, the Government has signed a memorandum of understanding with Telstra and the Lockheed missiles and space company that aims at making South Australia Lockheed's base for the Asia-Pacific region. I should like to commend the Minister who is now at the front bench, because it was through his hard work that many of the instances I am relating at the moment have been possible. I was very pleased to hear once again in the Estimates the different Ministers address the areas of their portfolios, which have brought added investment to South Australia. I certainly commend the Minister at the bench.

The other area of great importance to South Australia is the Australian Aviation College at Parafield, which has grown to be the largest commercial pilot training facility in the world. After signing contracts with Cathay Pacific and Vietnam Airlines, it is now developing plans to offer training for air traffic controllers. That particular success story appears to get better and better as the years progress. Apart from the obvious economic benefits that result from our expanding trade links, we have the effect that South Australia is continuously gaining in international recognition. As a result, we will be better placed to attract further investment to this State. I believe that we are already negotiating with more than 60 companies that focus on growth industries such as ship building, avionics, light manufacturing, automotive parts, training, and value added agriculture and fish processing.

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

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I would like to draw attention to the appropriations that were examined in the course of the Estimates Committee. A consideration of funds needed for the Legislature. This afternoon I want particularly to focus my remarks in the first instance on the very dramatic changes we have seen to the offices of the Legislature—and I am not talking about the surroundings in which we have to work. I commend the Government for what it is doing in that respect: it has bitten the bullet that no Government for two decades has been prepared to do anything about. I am talking in particular about the Opposition's offices in which its officers serve. In the last few days of the Estimates Committees dramatic changes occurred in the Opposition, and one wonders why that happened. In this Chamber we saw the Hon. Lynn Arnold ignominiously kicked out and replaced by the member for Ramsay.

We all know of the record of that honourable member. He said in his maiden speech in 1986, I think, 'I firmly believe that our best is yet to come.' That was eight and a half years ago, in February 1986. I do not know how long we will have to wait for the best to come, because what we have seen in the interim, both from his Party and from him in terms of the way he has dealt with issues, has been anything but good. If he thinks that it is at all acceptable in the minds of the general public of South Australia, I believe he has another think coming, as do members of his Party. Let us look at his record. Just yesterday, that very man—the Leader of the Opposition—said that name calling needed to stop. I should have thought that, of all people, he is the one who needs to desist and apologise.

I personally remember the kind of abuse that he gratuitously hurled at me across the Chamber, in particular on occa-

sions where, for reasons unknown to me, he alleged that I was in some way dependent upon mood modifying drugs. He used to call out, as I recall or as it was pointed out to me, 'Have you taken your Valium today?' I thought at the time that maybe he was getting a bit of a lift from the same kind of approach to life, but apparently not because of the things that happened subsequently.

Quite simply, he has lost us the Grand Prix, he led the Labor Party campaign against Roxby Downs, he referred to Marcus Clark as 'brilliant' after the State Bank had already lost millions upon hundreds of millions of dollars, he presided over an increase of almost 35 000 in our unemployed in less than three years during his time as Minister for Employment (quite a different story to the success that this Government has had in less than a year), he more than doubled the youth unemployment rate to over 40 per cent while Minister of Youth Affairs, and he wasted more than \$400 000 of taxpayers money on a business conference that he arranged to boost Labor's 1993 election campaign. There is no question about that in anybody's mind. When he was first appointed as a Minister in 1989, he said that he had learned prudence in management from none other than John Bannon. We have seen what that means.

For every day that he was Minister of Employment, 34 more South Australians joined the dole queue. Some record! It goes on. The number of people employed during that period fell by 7 900. Unemployment increased from 6.8 per cent to 11.4 per cent. As Minister of Youth Affairs from December 1989 to September 1992, the teenage unemployment rate in South Australia rose from 17.6 per cent to 40.3 per cent. As Minister for Tourism from January 1993, he was responsible for the Grand Prix, and it was in September last year that we lost the Grand Prix. We can think back to January last year when the now Leader of the Labor Party in this Chamber called a press conference to announce that he had been given ministerial responsibility for the Grand Prix. In June of that year he announced that he had initiated negotiations for a clash between a Formula One car and an Indy car at the 1993 Grand Prix. He said that it would reach a massive world wide television audience. That clash never eventuated. So much for promises!

On 23 September he issued a press statement challenging the then Opposition—the Party to which I belong—to declare its support for securing the Australian Formula 1 Grand Prix beyond 1996. He said:

We have to know once and for all where the Liberal Party stands on the future of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix for South Australia.

There was only one problem: a week before this stunt, on 16 September, FOCA had signed over the event to Victoria. Earlier in 1993 he said that he had been told that FOCA had given Adelaide 60 days to negotiate the continuation of the event after 1996, but he failed to ensure that those negotiations were pursued.

Let us look at the State Bank and the involvement of the now Leader of the Opposition in that fiasco. We all know that by early 1989 the State Bank was in serious trouble. The bank faced massive losses following the collapse of Equiticorp, the National Safety Council and the Remm project, to which the bank was massively exposed if not, in my judgment, over exposed, and was falling way behind schedule. During February and March 1989 we asked a series of questions in the State Parliament about the obviously emerging problems in the bank. We asked them here and in the other place. It

prompted the now Leader of the Opposition to move the following motion:

That this House condemns the Opposition for its sustained and continuing campaign to undermine the vitally important role of the State Bank of South Australia in our community.

In moving that motion he made the following statement:

The State Bank is one of South Australia's greatest success stories.

I am quoting the Leader of the Opposition, the man to whom we have appropriated money. At the time the budget came in it was a different man, and we have now seen that man, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, resign from Parliament under pressure from his colleagues. The Leader continued:

No-one of significance in the Australian financial community would not acknowledge the success of the new bank is in large part due to the brilliance of its Managing Director, Tim Marcus Clark.

Some judgment that was! The Leader continued:

His appointment in February 1984 was a major coup that stunned the Australian banking world. It was a major coup for this State. There is hardly any aspect of South Australia's social, cultural and economic life which is not touched by and is not better off because of the activities of the State Bank. Our bank is entrepreneurial and aggressive as well as careful, prudent and independent.

This is the Leader of the Opposition speaking. His speech drew the following observation from the State Bank Royal Commissioner:

The member of Parliament who proposed the motion condemning the Opposition for attacking the bank spoke in glowing terms of the bank's role and performance, so praiseworthy indeed as perhaps to cause the State Bank Centre to blush a deeper shade of pink.

That is at page 234. The Royal Commissioner also commented:

In the second half of the year, for those who wish to hear or ask questions so that they could hear, the noises of impending disaster were reaching a crescendo.

That is at page 259. Some judgment! Some judgment the Labor Party has exercised in electing its Leader, too! Let us look at what happened in connection with Roxby Downs. In 1977 the South Australian Branch of the ALP led—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I acknowledge that as a new member I am not fully conversant with all Standing Orders, but my understanding of the Appropriation Bill is that we should be debating it as it comes out of the Estimates Committees. I draw your attention to the relevance of the contribution of the present speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hart is correct in his understanding that the debate currently is relatively narrow and should deal with the matters emerging from the Estimates Committees. If the member for Ridley can demonstrate that this issue was in fact openly canvassed during the Estimates Committee debates, he is on secure ground, otherwise I ask him to keep his debate focused upon the issues as they emerged during that debate.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, I can Mr Deputy Speaker, because at the time we scrutinised the line for the provision of funds, in particular for the office and staff of the Leader of the Opposition, the incumbent was a different person. That tends, to my mind, to indicate the level of contempt with which the Labor Party treated that process, treats this House and this Parliament and the whole process of democratic Government. It illustrates, through the kind of person it has elected as its Leader, how willing it is to pursue convenience—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I again draw your attention to relevance. Whilst the present speaker may

wish to draw some lines, I do not know why or how the berating of the present Leader of the Opposition is in any way consistent with debating the Appropriation Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Ridley was in the Chair during that debate but, nevertheless, the issues he is canvassing at the moment are not relevant to the lines of the budget debate.

Mr LEWIS: Let me now then draw attention to the \$60 million in royalties we get from Roxby Downs, which was referred to during the course of consideration of the debate of the Estimates for the Department of Mines and Energy. It was that very mine which was attacked in prospect by the current Leader of the Opposition. We would not now have the benefit of those royalties were it not for the determination of members on this side, because in 1977 the South Australian branch of the ALP led national debate within the Labor Party to establish a policy prohibiting uranium mining in Australia. The Leader of the Opposition, as he now is, was a leading activist within the Party pushing a strong anti uranium, anti Roxby Downs line. Left to him, we would not have had that \$60 million plus revenue or the benefits that have otherwise come from that development. During the period 1979 to 1982, when we successfully negotiated as a Party in office an indenture agreement to secure the future of that project, the current Leader was Chairperson of the Labor Party's Nuclear Hazards Committee.

Another member of that committee was the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, who has just become the Leader in the other place. I think that is fairly significant. That committee produced a booklet called *Uranium: Play it Safe* in March 1982. At the same time, the Liberal Government's indenture legislation was before the Parliament. The booklet made the following assertions in support of a continuing complete prohibition of uranium mining, including at Roxby Downs:

Uranium industry boom goes bust. South Australia's non-boom. In South Australia the Liberal Government has got itself in a tangle over the proposed Roxby Downs copper and uranium mine.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the publication of a booklet is extraneous to the issues in the budget lines and I ask him to return to the subject of the debate.

Mr LEWIS: Can I therefore, Sir, refer to the efforts that have been made since this Government has come to office by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, none other than the member for Kavel, and compare and contrast them to the efforts that were made by the previous Minister, now Leader of the Opposition. The Export Asia event to which I refer cost the State dearly. From the Auditor-General's Report of 1994, we note that the organisation of the event involved input from the office of the former Minister for Small Business and Regional Development and that the approved funding allocation for the event was \$350 000 but the actual cost was \$765 000, which was more than double the amount allocated—\$415 000 was the over-run. The Auditor-General further reported this year:

There was inadequate monitoring of actual expenditure against budget.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr LEWIS: This is the Auditor-General's Report, which was the subject of those Committees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Ridley will resume his seat.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Again I draw your attention to relevance. The member for Ridley is

now referring to the Auditor-General's Report which, as we know, is about the previous financial year's expenditure. This debate is about the Appropriation Bill, which involves the forward estimates. I ask you, Sir, to rule this contribution out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Auditor-General's Report is one of the key documents for debate during the budget Estimates Committees. It is one of the documents frequently referred to. I will listen to the member for Ridley. The honourable member for Ridley.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I know this is a sore point for the member for Hart.

Mr Foley: It is a stunt.

Mr LEWIS: Absolutely not. What they do not like is the truth. They can't cop it. The Auditor-General's Report went on:

Insufficient regard was given to prudent principles of budgetary control and project accounting and reporting arrangements.

I think that well and truly deserves to be placed on the record, because we can now see that we have appropriated revenue to a Leader who was not there at the time the matters came before the Estimates Committees and who had left before the Estimates Committees process was concluded.

That is exactly the same kind of contempt with which the Opposition, when in government, 12 months ago treated this Parliament. I could go on, but I will not. Were it not for the incompetence to which I have just alluded, we would have been doing much better with the further assistance that we have had from the member for Kavel since he has been Minister in our penetration of the Asian markets. We know that we have to find bigger and better markets and have better access to those markets from South Australia if this State's economy is to turn around and continue heading in the direction in which it is now heading, and if we are to get unemployment down and expand employment opportunities, thereby consolidating our position as a State in the federation without going down the gurgler in the direction in which the previous Government was taking us. In particular, I am referring to exports to countries to our near north.

It strikes me as odd and quaint that, for all the years the Labor Party was in office and the platitudes which I could quote about the Leader of the Opposition (as he now is) and the botch he made of his job while he was there, we could have been so much better off had he done what he claimed to be doing rather than what he in fact was doing to this State and its economy.

Let us look at an example of the economies I am talking about, into which we can market our goods and services. One in particular, which is often overlooked, and overlooked in great measure because it is supplied as an onward destination of the hubbing activities of Hong Kong and Singapore, is the economy of Korea. That country has a population of more than 47 million. Its biggest city is the second largest city on earth with a population of well over 11 million. Those 47 million people live in an area very much less than the size of the greater metropolitan area of Sydney and the extended environs north and south along the coast. In fact, South Korea has a total area of about 100 000 square kilometres, and five-sevenths of that area is so mountainous that it cannot be inhabited. It is simply parks and forest under bare rock mountain.

The people of South Korea live in very densely populated coastal areas and highly utilised flatlands on the streams near their estuaries. It is a credit to them that they have continued

to maintain their independent culture and production capacity. They have demonstrated that ability by the speed with which they got their economy to recover during the past 20 years whilst our economy, predominantly under a Labor Government, was going in the wrong direction. They now have on average a standard of living higher than South Australia, and they have much lower dependence on welfare and much better economic performance prospects than we have had at any time in the past 20 years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): It is with great honour that I stand here today to participate in my first debate on the Appropriation Bill as a member of Parliament. What a load of tripe we have heard from the member for Ridley. As a new parliamentarian, I can learn many things from members opposite and my own colleagues. I acknowledge strengths in members and at times I will even passively offer some mild criticisms. But I have to say that, when it comes to the member for Ridley, there is not one lesson that I can learn or one lesson that I would want to learn from him. I must say that the consistent—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, in what way does the remark made by the member for Hart—and I do not mind his bigotry—relate to the budget and the Estimates Committees?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hart is really hoist on his own petard. He has criticised the member for Ridley for not sticking to budgetary matters and now, in his own reply, he seeks to comment about the member for Ridley's speech, which the member for Hart, by way of points of order, claimed was largely irrelevant to the budget. So, I ask the honourable member for Hart, in good humour, to stick to the issues relating to the budget as they emerge from the Committee.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. I will ask a question through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, if I can, as a point of order. Did I hear the member for Ridley use the word 'bigot' when referring to me?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair did not hear the honourable member for Ridley use the word 'bigot'. The Chair does not propose to allow a Question Time—

Mr FOLEY: I heard the member refer to me as a bigot, Sir, and I would ask the member, if he did say that, to withdraw it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The term 'bigot' is not unparliamentary and the Chair does not propose to support the withdrawal.

Mr FOLEY: I do not accept that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair will support the member's request, but the Chair is unable to enforce the withdrawal of a term. Does the honourable member for Ridley wish to draw whatever term it was which he may have used and which the Chair did not hear?

Mr LEWIS: No, Mr Speaker, I have said nothing from which I resile.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hart is faced with a dilemma.

Mr FOLEY: I am not faced with a dilemma. I just point out the consistent double standards in the treatment of members of this House by the Presiding Officer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has only two choices: he will withdraw that comment unequivocally, since it is a direct reflection upon the Chair and the

manner in which the House is being conducted, or the honourable member will be named.

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw unreservedly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept your withdrawal.

Mr FOLEY: My comments in relation to the member for Ridley were very much to do with the Estimates Committees process, because I sat in an Estimates Committee where the person in question was the Chair. I have sat through some six or seven Estimates Committees in this Parliament. During the previous six such Committees prior to this one, I was a minder for the former Government and I have never in my days seen a Chair conduct himself in the manner in which this Chair did. The questioning and conduct of that person in the Chair was nothing short of surprising.

The point that I am trying to make in referring to the member for Ridley so directly is that what we have just seen is a deliberate stunt. The speech delivered by the member for Ridley was not written by the honourable member: it was written by officers of the Premier's office. They thought they would use this as an opportunity to put on the public record historical points that they thought may in some way reflect on the new Leader of the Opposition. If they have to find a sucker to deliver the Premier's blessing or contribution on the new Opposition Leader, they find no better member than the member for Ridley.

The new Leader of the Opposition must have the Government worried if it wants the Estimates Committees process to include performances such as that of the member for Ridley. It must really be feeling the pressure beginning to build when it sends in the honourable member with the utter tripe that we have just had to suffer.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I have just listened to 20 minutes of the member for Ridley playing the man. If you want to set the standards, I will play to them.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Just take it on notice: if you want to set the standards, I will play by your standards. Let us talk about the budget and the Estimates Committees process. As I have said so many times in this House, this is a budget of broken promises. Members in this Chamber who say that this is a tax neutral budget have to be joking. This indeed is a high taxing budget. This is a budget that has taxed the very community which the Government prided itself on saying it would not tax and, indeed, which it would support in Government. I am referring to the business community.

Mr Lewis: Where is your evidence?

Mr FOLEY: I will give members the evidence. We have an increase in land tax. Unlike some members who have not been watching the world of politics for past three or four years, I have been. There was no greater issue that inspired contributions from the then Opposition than land tax. When we were in Government, we had an Opposition berating us for the impost of land tax and calling on the Government to eliminate or reduce it. What does this Government do in its very first budget? It increases land tax.

Dropping the threshold is not an excuse and it is not something that can be defended as not being a tax increase. It is, because more people are paying tax than would have been paying it prior to the implementation of this measure. How can the Government state that the land tax change is not an increase in taxation? There are more people paying land tax today than yesterday.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Those people understand finances.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Unley, I expect—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: When you drop a threshold, more people pay land tax. That is a pretty basic thing to understand. I acknowledge that some members opposite may have trouble with that. However, if the threshold is dropped from \$80 000 to \$50 000, more people will pay. The tax pool might be the same but more people are paying. There are new people paying tax and that is an increase in taxation.

The Government has explained away the payroll tax change as nothing more than a very small adjustment: it is not an increase in taxation but a small adjustment. I will have more to say on these issues when we debate the relevant Bills. However, I want to make some points about the payroll tax issue. By including superannuation in the payroll tax net, the Government is taking a greater slice of revenue from employers than it was before this measure was introduced. In any reading, this is a new tax—an increase in taxation.

The Minister for Industry knows what I am talking about. He has had correspondence and he knows that there are manufacturing companies in this State that are paying more in payroll tax than they paid before this budget. There is one very large employer within my electorate whose payroll tax bill has increased by some \$65 000. That is equivalent to three jobs, and those jobs have gone because of this taxation increase.

How can this Government claim to be one of low tax, pro-business and pro-investment? This is a Government that in Opposition criticised the former Government in relation to payroll tax. It was very loud in its criticisms. Members opposite felt that they had all the answers. Indeed, they misled the public with their promises before the election.

Of course, drivers licence fees have gone up 5.6 per cent, Housing Trust rents have gone up 2.6 per cent, fisheries licences have gone up 10.5 per cent, sewerage rates are up 10 per cent and the list goes on. What about the impact this is having on some of, from my point of view, the Labor electorates? After this budget there will be fewer teachers working in my electorate, because this Government does not treat education as a priority. My young son will have more children in his class than prior to this budget. What about public transport charges in this State? They will increase under this Government. In an electorate such as mine, which is dependent upon public transport, that is very disappointing.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will ignore the consistent interjections opposite as I make my contribution.

Mr Brindal: You don't know how many of your people use public transport. You come in here and tell us all about your problems.

Mr FOLEY: Are you finished?

Mr Brindal: No.

Mr FOLEY: If you want to get up and contribute, do so.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Go ahead. I'll stand back and listen. The point I make today is that this is a dishonest and disappointing budget, one which unfortunately has greatest impact and impost on electorates such as mine. There is one saving grace in this budget, and that is that there will be more of my colleagues to join me after the next election. That fact has been recognised by the member for Peake who, in announcing his retirement, made very clear that a margin of 4.5 per cent would not be sufficient to ensure his re-election at the next State election. All I say is: don't listen to me; don't

believe us—listen to your own member. He says that with a margin of 4.5 per cent Peake cannot be won. Even the member for Unley might be a little nervous. The one positive thing about this budget from the Labor viewpoint is that the electorate will see it for what it is: a budget of failed hopes and aspirations. It delivered—

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: It was trying to correct the failures of the past.

Mr FOLEY: I say to the Minister: why didn't he come clean before the election? He knew what the financial position of this State was.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: And we were honest about it. We brought down a statement that was honest about the financial position of this State, but you were dishonest and misleading: you chose not to be honest with the electorate before the election. Let judgment day come at the next election; let us then see how the electorate judges the dishonesty of this Government.

We have heard speakers this afternoon talk about programs such as the manufacturing modernisation program and the Parafield Airport Flight Training Centre, significant achievements that were started as part of the economic programs put in place by the former Labor Government. This Government is keen to promote a number of issues as its own, but let us remember that many of those programs were started by the former Government.

We also saw in the House today a very immature and somewhat less than dignified performance by the Treasurer when he decided to educate the Federal Government education on how to run an economy. When I compare the stature, ability and quality of Ralph Willis with that of our State Treasurer, I am not sure who should be giving the lecture. The point I make is that this State budget would have been much more difficult to frame had it not been for the \$647 million State Bank rescue package negotiated by the former Leader of the Opposition, Lynn Arnold.

Mr Brindal: At gunpoint.

Mr FOLEY: Not at gunpoint. That package was put in place, and I, with the former Treasurer, the member for Giles, had a significant role to play in putting that package together. So, \$647 million was injected into this State budget by the efforts of the former Labor Government and, of course, by a Federal Government that was prepared to assist this State.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, I will put it in that context, because we were all about repairing the damage. The point I make is that the \$647 million which the former Leader, Lynn Arnold, the member for Giles and a number of other key advisers to the Government at the time were able to secure made the framing of this Treasurer's budget easier, for want of a better word. For him to get up in this Chamber and berate the Federal Government, accusing it of a whole host of issues in which he believes he has not been supported or for not managing the economy, I think is pretty cheap. I say that because the Treasurer would have had to fish for a further \$200 million in this financial year had it not been for the Federal Government. In the context of this and the next two budgets, that point needs to be remembered: \$647 million of new money is available to this Government because of the work of Lynn Arnold and the Federal Government—and that should be acknowledged.

In conclusion, I again apologise to the Chair for what I thought was an important issue in putting on the record what I believed to have been a stunt by the member for Ridley. I again apologise as it had nothing to do with the management

of the Chair, but it incensed me to think that this Chamber and its processes could be abused in the manner in which they were. It was an attempt at political assassination, and I felt that was inappropriate.

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): I never cease to be amazed at what is happening with the Opposition. Someone asked me what I thought of the first week of the Estimates Committees, having chaired Estimates Committee B. I conveyed then my impression that the Opposition did not understand the budgetary process, the financial responsibility that faced it and what was expected of it in scrutinising the budget. I tried as hard as I could to assist the Opposition. Whilst it was not my role as Chairman to help anyone, I felt it necessary in the process of democracy that the Chairman make it possible for the best scrutiny of the budget to take place. On the Tuesday, the first day of the Estimates Committee hearing, we dealt with the portfolios of the Minister for Tourism and Industrial Affairs. It was all very well to sit in the Chair and listen to the debate about what is being done in the name of tourism in South Australia—the member for Hart touched on this briefly in his speech—but it is a great tragedy that we are fighting, in such a very difficult situation, to restore the economy of South Australia.

The budget brought down by the Treasurer was responsible in the circumstances. He has been criticised for not making a long, drawn-out speech, as have most Treasurers. If you can sum up the budget in precis form and explain exactly what you are doing and your philosophy behind it, it is not necessary to go into a lot of drawn-out rhetoric. The only good feature about the current budgetary process is that it is the last time that it will take place at this time of the year. In future, the budget will be brought down before the commencement of the financial year, and I hope that it will go through the House of Assembly, certainly the Estimates Committee process, before the commencement of the next financial year.

Ever since I have been a member of this place (and that is almost 25 years), I have said that it is wrong to bring down the budget well into a current financial year and have to wait until almost half the financial year is completed (we are in October and it will be November before it will be through the Legislative Council) before Government departments can officially spend the money allocated in their budget.

About 80 per cent of the budget outgoings involves wages and related payments. Not much money is in there for infrastructure or for assistance to growth areas within the community. It is a tight budget, and it is even tighter than it has been in the past. We all know that the State Bank lost \$3 150 million and that that sum had to be made up somehow over a given period or the money had to be borrowed to provide financial backup. That disturbs me. I am disappointed that the former Leader of the Opposition is not here. As some said, his departure was a little earlier than anticipated but, once that magic figure of 15 years is achieved in this place, there is an incentive to go. The *Australian* of Friday 2 July 1993, at page 5, under the heading 'Arnold rejects call for poll on bank collapse', stated the following about the former Leader of the Opposition:

But he conceded the Labor Government had been caught up in the corporate culture of the 1980s and that it had failed at the time to investigate persistent Opposition parliamentary questioning over the bank because the Opposition had a history of 'crying wolf'.

We tried in every way possible, through the Public Accounts Committee (of which you, Mr Deputy Speaker, were a member at the time), to get the then Government to do something about this matter. I consistently advised Terry Groom, Kevin Hamilton and Don Ferguson, who were Government members on that committee, 'Go back to Caucus and ask questions; find out what's going on with the State Bank', because I gave it five years to survive. I gave Marcus Clark no longer than five years at that time, and I gave him less than three years as we kept asking the Labor members of Parliament to find out what was going on. I was only about a couple of months out, but that does not matter. The whole point is that the Labor Government at the time was well warned that we knew about the matter, and the information that was coming to me was from within the organisations, namely, Beneficial Finance and the State Bank, that there were difficulties. Yet these Labor committee members said that they put propositions and questions to the Labor Party and to the then Premier and that everybody believed that they were just rumours.

Former Premier Lynn Arnold's saying that the persistent questioning by then Opposition members should be ignored because they had a history of crying wolf indicates the irresponsibility of the then Labor Government and the management team, because it should never be thought that the Opposition is crying wolf or causing mischief: everything should be investigated and followed through. I made private telephone calls to John Bannon advising him of what should be done. Certainly he reacted and put somebody from Treasury on the State Bank board, and that is when they started to find out things. However, it should never have happened, and we should never have reached the financial situation we are in at present. It makes it extremely difficult for a Government, Parliament, State or nation to remedy the economic hardships that we have in South Australia. In the long term, the Federal Government is also involved.

As the member for Hart said, the Federal Government is involved to the tune of some \$647 million to bail out the State Bank. That State Bank should have been guaranteed by the Federal Government under the Reserve Bank Act years ago. The State should have flick passed that over to the Federal Government as then Treasurer Keating wanted many years ago. He wanted to get rid of the State Banks, because he could see that they would repeat the history of almost a century ago: they could bring down the States and impact on the Federal Government. Had the Reserve Bank had the ultimate control, as it would have under the Banking Act, many warning signals would have been heeded and action taken earlier to save this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is fascinating to read the remarks of a former Labor Government board appointment, Hugh Stretton. Professor Emeritus Hugh Stretton (who, if I remember correctly, was Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust) was asked for his view on the economic principles underpinning the Audit Commission's report, because it impacts on every portfolio that came under my scrutiny as Chairman of Estimates Committee B. Hugh Stretton commented in the *South Australian Institute of Teachers' Journal* of 3 August 1994, at page 5, as follows:

I think the report is partly incompetent and wholly mean-spirited. It exaggerates the State debt, which is much as it was under the last Liberal Government. It treats an unfunded superannuation obligation as a debt or a disaster. That's like treating the old age pension as a debt. All retired folk have to be given a living by those still in work.

Whether the pension comes from the working population through the prices they pay, with profits supporting pensioners, or through the taxes they pay to provide the pensions, makes no real economic difference. No amount of funding now can get those folks supported any other way than from the output of the work force at the time when the are pensions paid.

And mean-spirited—the State Bank losses were all lost by rich or would-be rich private enterprisers. So this rich quartet recommends that the losses be made up almost entirely by poor people: Housing Trust tenants, and sacked teachers and nurses and public servants, many of them middle-aged men and women, competent at jobs we still need to be done, but unlikely to be employed again.

You can recognise the nastiest economists by their use of the double standard. Where private service is cheaper than public, that proves the private sector's efficiency. Where public service is cheaper than private, it should raise its prices to save the private sector's reputation.

Of course, Stretton is a well known Labor supporter and socialist who would be supporting the Institute of Teachers attitude, and that criticism of the Audit Commission report, which was so necessary, could have been avoided, as I said, had the previous Governments taken that responsible action. It makes it hard for any Government to come in and boost employment and confidence, and to get the State going. What happened is history; we must put it behind us as a lesson—a lesson that has now been learnt, a lesson that will be hard to swallow for many years to come. It is a great tragedy for South Australia, but if the Parliament is good enough it will learn from those errors and those mistakes and get on with the job of improving the opportunities for employment and for opening up development. That has been happening; there has been a considerable amount of activity in the first nine months of the new Government. A considerable amount of expenditure has been allocated in the budget to boost employment opportunities, to attract industries to South Australia and to encourage South Australian industries already operating here by providing opportunities to expand further and develop export opportunity and, through that, create more employment.

The present Minister for Infrastructure can take some credit for what has been happening in the Economic Development Authority area. It involves a lot of hard work, and many hours have been spent by the Minister's department and his officers in encouraging industries and technology companies to establish in South Australia. Some mistakes will be made there, too, and there will be some losses, but we expect those losses.

In the meantime we are in there trying to do something more proactive for South Australia than has been done in the past 11 years. In relation to the tourism portfolio, I was concerned to learn about the difficulties of KickStart and tourism in South Australia. I remember a popular American television program, *Good Morning America*, coming to Australia in May 1993. It was no doubt enticed here by the Australian Tourist Commission to highlight Australia, focus Australia to the American people and create the opportunity to sell Australia. I wrote to the Federal Minister for Communications and the Arts, and Minister for Tourism (Michael Lee) and am grateful for the reply he supplied on 2 September 1994. He advised me that in 1993 the total short-term arrivals to Australia from America were 2 996 300 compared with 2 603 000 in 1992: a rise of 15 per cent in American tourists to Australia. There was an increase in the number of tourists from the United States of America to Australia, but there was a decrease to South Australia. The full year visit arrivals from America to Australia were up by 7 per cent in 1993 (280 800) compared with 1992 (262 900).

Tragically, there was a decrease for South Australia in that period. That is the difficulty and it is something that the Government finds hard to accept. Over the past 11 years we were told by the Labor Government how much work was being done, how much money was being spent, and how much effort was going in to bringing tourists into South Australia. There was a boom in the tourist industry, yet the hard core data we are getting from the bureau of statistics and the Federal Minister for Tourism shows that there was a tragic decline in the number of people coming into South Australia from overseas. At the same time, we were not getting the tourists we should have. A considerable amount of money was spent.

South Australia's percentage share of Australia's visitor nights remained at a steady 5 per cent in 1992-93, although visitor nights spent by visitors from America and Canada as a proportion of South Australia's total visitor nights rose from 5 per cent in 1992 to 6 per cent in 1993. Given that poor return of 5 per cent when we have just on 9 per cent of the country's population, is it any wonder that in this budget some \$20 million of the \$29.1 million available for development will go towards doing something positive for the tourist industry? There will be tourism development of \$8.9 million; international marketing expenditure of \$7.1 million; State marketing of \$6.8 million; and national marketing of \$6.3 million. Members can see that the new Minister for Tourism (Graham Ingerson) is out there doing something in relation to capitalising on the tourism strengths of South Australia in the wine, food and ecotourism areas.

We also hope that South Australia will benefit from the Olympics. South Australia is well placed with sporting facilities to capitalise on the upcoming Olympic Games in the year 2000. That was proved when we bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games. It was a disappointment a few days ago to hear that the Government has decided not to proceed with its bid because it could not obtain support from the Federal Government. The Federal Government could not come up front and conclusively say, 'Yes, go ahead. We will support you and back you all the way.' The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing decided that we could not punt on something like this unless we had the full blessing of the Federal Government. In 1993 we found that it was very difficult for the State to bid on behalf of Australia against the might, wealth and determination of the Malaysian Government for the 1998 Commonwealth Games. It is a shame that we have had to forgo this opportunity, but in doing that I sincerely hope we have not lost the opportunity to bid for a Commonwealth Games in South Australia in the future.

Every city that has staged a Commonwealth or Olympic Games has done well. In 1962 Perth hosted the Commonwealth Games (in fact, Adelaide was awarded the 1962 games but reneged at the last minute so Perth took them on) and as a city, and Western Australia as a State, never looked back. Brisbane held the Games in 1982. Brisbane did it well in the usual style and fashion and has never looked back. Queensland absolutely boomed as a result of the 1982 Commonwealth games. It was a shame that South Australia did not win the 1998 Commonwealth Games, and it is a shame that we now will have to wait probably until the year 2010 before we put in a bid again.

The bidding process and the cost of running the games has escalated dramatically. I blame the Canadians for that. The Canadians went out and did all they could in a very selfish way to make sure they got the games. They did it their way at the expense of other nations who will have great difficulty

in ever trying to emulate what Canada did. In the near future I hope to find out what the final debt in Canada was because somehow we have to find out exactly what the Canadians were up to and the influence they had on other nations as far as the Commonwealth Games are concerned. It all leads to one thing: the opportunity to promote South Australia as a major tourist destination.

Mr WADE (Elder): I had the pleasure of being a member of the Estimates Committees that examined Family and Community Services, the Ageing, Health, Aboriginal Affairs, and Industrial Relations which included workers compensation. I will spend a few minutes talking about the Family and Community Services Estimate Committee. The 1994-95 budget for the Department of Family and Community Services amounted to around \$146 million. I counted about 15 questions from the Opposition, which equates to about \$10 million per question.

Reading back through *Hansard* and going through all the details of the Estimates Committee, I have no doubt that some members of the Opposition would be a little bit disturbed and perhaps confused by the note on page 260 which states that Mrs Rosenberg substituted for Mr Wade, even though Mr Wade then began asking questions. It should be noted in *Hansard* that Mr Wade substituted for Mrs Rosenberg and not the other way around.

The Family and Community Services Estimates hearing began with a statement from the Minister that set the scene. The Minister said that the department has made available some \$230 million, which is more than was available last year and significantly more than the department spent last year. He then went on to say that there were no plans to close district centres and there were no cuts in existing levels of service as a result of this budget. This probably did not help the Opposition too much.

However, those are the facts of life, and that is how it is as far as FACS is concerned. The first question was put to the Minister by the member for Playford—and this, remember, is a \$10 million question. The question related to the Health Commission and had nothing whatsoever to do with Family and Community Services. I can understand the member for Playford's being a bit confused, a bit distracted that evening, as he had just had his throat slit in one of the normal Labor Party factional fights and had missed out on achieving his exalted aim of being Deputy Leader. So, he was distracted and as a result wasted a \$10 million question. However, as is the usual method of the member for Playford, he came back again and asked questions regarding welfare outsourcing.

The Minister replied that in 1993-94 22.54 per cent of the budget was outsourced to non-government organisations to deliver a wide range of services, and that for 1994-95 there would be an increase and 35.6 per cent would be outsourced to non-government bodies; that the sum of \$178 000 had been allocated over the next two years to the Caring for Families project through the Port Adelaide Mission; and that a further \$356 000 had been directed to family preservation services in partnership with the non-government sector. That is a demonstration of our Government's complete commitment to finding the best services for our dollar.

The next question asked was in regard to juvenile justice. The Minister responded to that question by saying:

I would hope that we might be able to look at other programs, also, that would provide alternatives to locking away some of these youngsters up to the age of 18 years.

I am glad he said that. One scheme that had been wound down by the previous Labor Government was the INC (Intensive Neighbourhood Care) scheme, which had nothing to do with graffiti; this is to do with caring for young offenders who have the option of being locked away in an institution, going on the streets or being cared for in a family environment. The INC scheme was highly successful, but it had been wound down totally by the previous Labor Government for financial reasons, we were told, and for social justice reasons. What it really meant was that in 1992, from the department's own budgets, the Government spent \$6 million keeping kids in institutions when those same children, if they had been kept with INC families, would have cost the then Government and the department \$600 000: one tenth the cost.

In answer to a question by the member for Playford, the Minister stated that at the moment it costs between \$72 000 and \$75 000 a year per person to keep young offenders in institutions. If you compare that with the INC scheme, it would be perhaps \$7 300 rather than \$73 000. I know that the Minister is genuine in his desire to look at other programs that will provide alternatives to locking away young offenders, and I suggest most strongly that his new CEO look at reinstating the INC scheme, a scheme that we borrowed from Wales, a scheme which is highly successful and which should never have been wound down by the previous Labor Government, putting pressure on all other institutions, including foster families.

I asked a question on domestic violence and, in response, the Minister explained what this Government will be doing in 1994-95 to address that most horrific social problem. We introduced specific legislation regarding domestic violence, and I spent some time in this House detailing various aspects of it for the record. It was our election promise: we have fulfilled that election promise. The Crime Prevention Unit now has a domestic violence portfolio. The Minister for the Status of Women has established the South Australian Women's Advisory Council, and one of its briefs is to research the subject of women and violence. The Health Commission provides prevention education programs through its community health services, and it centres on domestic violence. In fact, my community health centre at Clovelly Park offers domestic violence courses.

Mr Quirke: Anti domestic violence courses.

Mr WADE: I am corrected by the member for Playford: anti domestic violence courses, which emphasise support, information and strategies to escape violence and abuse for men and women. The women's course includes such things as understanding violence and its impact on children; the options available to women; how to access community resources, mainly of accommodation, money and legal advice; and developing strategies to maintain themselves and their children. The women's course also offers a method of developing a network to reduce isolation. On the prevention side the Clovelly Park Community Health Centre offers a program for men called MASA, Men Against Sexual Assault. However, I am concerned that the Clovelly Park Community Health Centre offers these courses as being totally confidential for women and for men, yet it says in the pamphlet, 'Please make inquiries and book your place at reception.'

This is a matter I will be raising with the Clovelly Park Community Health Centre and its management. I find it very hard to believe how confidentiality can be maintained when one must go to a public reception desk and seek the receptionist's advice as to a particular course. In my electoral

office we have most prominently displayed a Crows football poster (actually of Greg Anderson) which states, 'Domestic violence is not a game: everyone loses.' Just for the record, a domestic violence help line has been set up, and that number is 1 800 800 098. The Minister also indicated to the Committee that there were 24 domestic violence action groups in South Australia at this time. The sum of \$4 million has been put aside in funding for women's shelters, and there has been a 39 per cent increase in emergency financial assistance to victims of domestic violence.

The Government's thrust in its programs is in early intervention and education, and this is aimed at people recognising the difficulties, the problems and the consequences of domestic violence. This Government has stuck to its pre-election promise. It will gain a zero rate of domestic violence because it has put into action those programs and the necessary funding to ensure that the community can control and eradicate a social evil that has lifetime consequences for its victims.

Returning to the \$10 million question, the member for Price had his turn to ask a question, which he did. However, it had nothing to do with family and community services at all and should have been directed to the Attorney-General. Another \$10 million question down the drain. So much for the member for Price! The next topic of interest was raised by the member for Playford and concerned the gamblers' rehabilitation fund. A good question. The Minister advised the member for Playford and the Committee that \$1.5 million was to be raised in 1994-95 from the IGC and the casino for dealing with gambling addiction.

The Minister also advised the Committee that Treasury will set up a special deposit account to deal with this issue and funds will be paid in quarterly instalments. He also indicated that the Family and Community Services Department will administer the day to day activities of a committee which will be established to organise research into the extent of the need relating to gambling addiction, including the families affected by it. The committee will recommend to the Minister the directions that the Government should be taking, the priorities and the services that should be funded.

Again, without any shadow of a doubt, in terms of domestic violence, the Gamblers Anonymous rehabilitation fund and youth accommodation programs, this Government made pre-election promises and it has fulfilled them. It is worth stating again that there will be no cuts to existing levels of service as a result of this budget in relation to the Department for Family and Community Services. It is also worth stating again, for the information of this House, that 17 questions were asked, 15 relating to family and community services and two being totally unrelated.

I was appalled that, in looking at a budget of about \$146 million, and at \$10 million a question, the Opposition did not seem to be on the ball. Its questions were not incisive and showed a lack of knowledge of the portfolio. I had a great urge to walk across the room and hand them my questions, thinking that perhaps they needed some assistance—or perhaps they had been working too hard doing the things Opposition members normally do. For the week or so before the Estimates Committees, they were busy sharpening their knives and preparing themselves for future executive positions within their Party, and the budget estimates were way down the list. It did not really concern them.

I felt rather sad that the member for Playford did all the right things but did not gain his rightful place as Deputy Leader. However, the knives are still out: they are still sharp.

His opportunity may come soon enough if he stays in there and keeps trying. I give him credit because, of the questions asked on family and community services, 14 were asked by the member for Playford, two by the member for Price and I think one and a bit by the member for Torrens. I apologise for the delay in recalling the district of the member for Torrens: she speaks so rarely that I forgot she was here. On the night of the Estimates Committee, I was certain that she was not there.

In summary, I enjoyed attending my first Estimates Committee: I thought it was fun and it was a joy to be there. There was no pressure at all on the Government, because the Opposition was totally unprepared for any kind of intelligent discourse. I do not believe too many members opposite had read the budget and those who had I am sure did not understand it. It came out in Estimates Committee questions. It was obvious to all concerned, including Government members, that, when it came to being an effective Opposition, the questions we asked the department prior to the Estimates Committee were far more incisive and decisive and showed far more knowledge of the portfolios than the Opposition had then, has now and, based on its performance, will ever have.

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The member for Elder made an interesting address. With regard to the business of knives being sharpened and the Opposition not concentrating on the Estimates procedure, I assure the House that the Opposition well and truly concentrated on the Estimates procedure. The honourable member has been through only one Estimates Committee so far.

Mr Wade: I enjoyed it.

Mr QUIRKE: He says that he enjoyed it. I am wondering whether in two or three years he will be saying that. I do not think he will be saying it in four years, but I wonder whether in two or three years he will be as interested in the whole process. I thank him for his support for my candidacy. I am not sure whether that puts a few six inch nails in the coffin, or what. I am glad he did not say that beforehand, but I thank him very much.

The Estimates Committees represent a process, I suspect a not very good process, of examining the budget. I say that because, if you look at the whole budget process, you find that you need a bit of time to deal with a number of the issues. The member for Elder and others said that Opposition questioning perhaps was not as strong as it should have been, and he offered to give us some questions. He said that he almost came over and gave us a bundle of questions. We would have welcomed him or anyone else bringing over a bundle of questions.

Let me tell members how it works on the Opposition side. I am sure, Mr Speaker, that I do not have to tell you; you were there for many years. The Opposition has limited staff resources, which is a nice way of saying that we have sod all. At the end of the day, we have a number of people who read through the budget. This Government has exactly the same attitude to the Opposition at the staffer level—not at the ministerial level or back bench level—as the Labor Government had to the Opposition over many years.

We find that, if there is a choice between getting the documents on the first of the month or the thirty-first of the month, we always get them on the later date. If there is a choice between getting them at 1 o'clock in the afternoon or 2 o'clock in the afternoon, it is always 2 o'clock in the afternoon. On the day of the budget, as I understand it, there

was a lock-up for the media. We made a perfectly reasonable request for multiple copies of the budget earlier in the day. And I have to say that the common law book came out. A certain staffer from the other side who shall remain anonymous said, 'You so and so's gave us one copy at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and that's all you're getting.'

We then waited for the Program Estimates, and we got those documents at the last sitting moment of this House before we went to Estimates Committees in the next week. Did we have a non-sitting week when we could sit down, debate all this stuff, pour over all the figures and prepare all these questions that the member for Elder had in his folder? No, we did not. Indeed, with very limited resources, we did a great job. In the Estimates Committees procedure, all the shadow Ministers excelled in examining the budget and its various aspects.

Having outlined the resources available to the Opposition, I now want to talk about the procedure. The problem is that this is a small Parliament. There are only 47 members in this Chamber, with a ministry of 10, three Ministers being in the other place. There are 69 members in the two Houses. In the Estimates Committees, we exclude immediately the members of the other House, so we are down to the 47 members in this Chamber.

I think that we also have the attitude of defending our team. Government members in general did not abuse the Estimates Committees procedure. I think in large part they played the game, and the game is that the Opposition, in the interests of good government, should pull out various bits, see what is in the budget and examine the witnesses who come before the bar.

A couple of Ministers rang me and asked what the Opposition's attitude was on this and that sort of thing: how would we proceed? In fact, a number of senior departmental officials asked what the Opposition wanted in respect of certain matters. The first thing I asked for was any juicy scandal. I must say, though, we did not get any of that. But I made that request of anyone who asked, from the Ministers all the way down: if there was any juicy scandal, we would have loved it and we would have used it for everything it was worth. That did not come.

I asked for a briefing on a number of issues in my portfolio areas; that was forthcoming and I was quite happy with that. But, in general, I believe we bring limited resources to the whole process. There are three Opposition members and three Government members on the Committees, and the job of the Government members, whether we like it or not—and some are more maverick than others—is to protect, which means to bury, dig a bigger hole and push any scandals further into the ground. The job of the three Opposition members, with limited resources, is to dig furiously, faster than the Government members, to try to find scandals.

The process could be conducted a little better if we are serious about redressing some of the problems in the 1980s. I have referred in this Chamber to the State Bank of South Australia—a favourite institution of mine, as most members would know. I have also referred to the meeting that took place down here regarding the chief's superannuation and how his mates tried to protect it up in the second floor conference room. I have said there are too many cars in one or two other financial institutions, and I have said various other things. I could go on at great length about some of these things but, at the end of the day, it was only when the door was belted open and the light shone in on those institutions that we started to see what was going on.

I suggest that we need to look at the Estimates Committees procedure. It is not a bad one. I have sat in on the process in Canberra, and I can tell you about Senator Vigor. At about 4 a.m. a hanging party wanted to get hold of him because you could not go to bed until Senator Vigor shut up, and that meant you were not going to get to bed for a long time. Our procedure involves resources that are far too limited in our trying to examine closely the documents in front of us. I suggest to the Government—and I hope it takes this on board—that, even though it is primarily responsible for the departments, departmental heads, officers and the budget, it needs to use the budgetary procedure to look very closely at what is happening in the departments. It follows then that we need to provide the Opposition with more time, more resources and greater access to the various resources particularly in the departments so that it can examine the budget in close detail.

I will continue talking about the budget after the dinner adjournment. However, I want to put on the record now that the Estimates Committees procedure could be a lot better than currently is the case. I hope the Government will pick that up, run with it and have a look at it.

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

Mr QUIRKE: Through the Estimates Committees, despite the lack of time, resources and all the rest of it, Opposition members had an opportunity to quiz the Government in a number of key areas, and I will mention a couple of those in a moment. We had an opportunity to examine various parts of the budget and to see where we are going in 1994-95.

I was involved in the Estimates Committee dealing with Treasury matters. It was useful to have before us our old friends the State Bank and SGIC, representatives of the Treasury itself and various other groups that come under that portfolio area. We found that the name change to the Bank of South Australia incurred a cost of \$10 million, which I hope bears some fruit. However, our questioning in that area revealed that the Bank of South Australia is not as profitable an organisation as many of the pundits in the market tended to think it would be.

I think the profit budgeted for the bank this year is \$56 million. If one considers an organisation such as that and the kind of income stream involved, one would have to say that, in terms of the sale price that the Government had hoped to get for that institution, it will be undersubscribed in any share float. Indeed, unless the Government speeds up the process my guess is that a trade sale for the bank is unlikely.

Of course, the Opposition set in train the sale of the Bank of South Australia. I have no problem with that. As I commented last year: buy one get one free—I would have thrown in the insurance company as well. At the end of the day, my guess is that the amount of money that will come out of the bank—as the Deputy Premier indicated at the time—will be in the region of \$500 million to \$750 million. I believe that it will be at the very bottom end of that scale. I do not want to talk it down; I am quite happy for the Government to make as many dollars out of the Bank of South Australia as it possibly can. However, I think that, because of the way that the Government has gone about it—and this was quite clearly shown in the Estimates Committees—the sale of the bank is looking more and more remote. Unless the Government is careful, by going down the road of a float some years from now, it will be lucky to sell it at all.

Other organisations appeared before the Committee that day and we had an opportunity to ask a series of questions about a number of matters. The SGIC fronted and we went through a series of issues, including a follow-up of various reports from the Economic and Finance Committee during 1992-93 and, in particular, the question of executive salaries. We had an opportunity to establish that the Bank of South Australia had made few or no changes in relation to the executive structure. I had a concern about the number of people earning over \$100 000 a year. In fact, the whole group seemed to be much larger than should have been the case, given the very necessary downsizing that was going on in the bank.

Through the questioning procedure we found that we still had some 67 or so persons under the Bank of South Australia umbrella, which included the asset management company—SAMCO as it is known; the bad bank—earning over \$100 000; the executive structure had, in my view and I think probably in the view of many members in this House, far too many people at the top end. With other South Australian corporate institutions such as the Commonwealth Bank, despite its massive pay hikes—and it can be argued that the head office is not here, but there is sufficient responsibility here for the Commonwealth Bank to be some sort of comparison—the reality is that, even after its share down sale, the Bank of South Australia is a much more generous payer in its executive structure than just about any similar institution in Australia.

I raised this issue in the Estimates Committees, indicating that the Economic and Finance Committee had made a number of recommendations last year and that it was sad to see that the Government was not implementing some of them, given the then Opposition front bench's support for those recommendations.

Under Marcus Clark and the rest of them, the State Bank determined salaries using a consultancy firm. It was a fairly loose arrangement, and I do not know whether it is much tighter today. They positioned within a percentile range where they believed the bank should be. Under Marcus Clark the bank moved through the fiftieth percentile to the seventy-fifth percentile. That means that the bank's executives were being paid in the top bracket of all the banks in the world that referred to that particular structure. In short, looking at the position across the whole of Australia, one found that the bank was paying executive salaries at the very top end and that 75 per cent of bank executives in all other banks were getting less than those in the State Bank executive structure. As a result of the previous Government's actions, that was wound back to the fiftieth percentile; in other words, right in the middle of the range for all banks in Australia.

However, we found the Deputy Premier getting a little confused on this issue. He was saying that now that the bank is a regional institution it is paying as a regional bank. It is a regional bank and it was all along, but it is still not paying like a regional bank: it is still paying in the middle range of all the banking structures in Australia.

If we exclude the Commonwealth Bank, which is what gives many of these executives a good name—because the Commonwealth Bank, certainly in terms of the Bank of South Australia, is a very miserable payer—we see that the Bank of South Australia is paying its executives at a rate very much higher than the fiftieth percentile which is meant to be for regional banks. The reality is that the Commonwealth Bank and certain other banking institutions make it look as though the executives of the Bank of South Australia are earning

around the average across Australia, whereas if we looked at median rates we would see that they are doing very much better.

It is a disappointment to me that this Government has not grasped one of the key findings of the Economic and Finance Committee on this issue, which was that the Bank of South Australia structure ought to be made to go from the fiftieth percentile to the seventy-fifth percentile, in keeping with the size of the institution and, indeed, its staffing.

As I understand it, we now have a bank with less than half the staff that it had three years ago, a bank which had, I think, 177 retail outlets across South Australia but which is downsizing into the 150s. The bank had offices in other countries—disastrous as that was—which are being closed. Some have already closed; their operations have finished. What we are dealing with now is, principally, a small banking facility that primarily lends money for housing in South Australia.

The Bank of South Australia is a bit sensitive about the world knowing what its market share is. As I said in this House previously, the Bank of South Australia even sends out Christmas cards with the words 'in confidence' stamped on them. Everyone knows that about the 40 per cent mark is the share of mortgages in South Australia. When we probed this area and we asked the Deputy Premier questions, the impression I got from his answers was that the Government was happy with the present executive pay structure, that it was downsizing slowly and that, at some stage in the future, it would be rid of the bank. I think a much more rigorous application of the Economic and Finance Committee's report of last year would probably make the bank even more saleable.

We were generally satisfied with the answers to our questions on the State Government Insurance Commission. It appears that SGIC is being prepared for some sort of a sale, possibly a float as well. It is a bit early to say too much about that, but at the Estimates Committee I was happy with the information provided on that point. I was much happier with the information provided about SGIC than I was about the Bank of South Australia, the Group Asset Management Division or any of the other organisations that come under the State Bank's umbrella. During the Estimates Committees, when we examined such lines as that involving Family and Community Services—which was not an enormous budget line; in fact, there was a rather small provision of funds compared with some of the other departments—the Minister and his staff were quite accessible, and the Opposition was happy with that line of questioning.

The same could be said about some of the other more non-contentious areas of the budget. The Mines and Energy Department gave a full account of its activities for 1994-95. Suffice for me to say as shadow Minister that I am satisfied with the progress that has been made in that area over recent years. Aeromagnetic surveys featured as a large part of the questioning procedure. Obviously, over the years in South Australia we have increased the amount of exploration that we are doing. I think that is a significant aspect of South Australian life: at every juncture in this State's history mining has been absolutely crucial.

The aeromagnetic surveys which we questioned in the Estimates Committees clearly reveal a number of possible findings. We looked at some of the potential for diamond mines in the north, further gas exploration, copper mines and other uranium sites, etc. Overall, the Opposition is satisfied with the way in which that department is operating and with

its program for this year, and we wish it well, because in many respects it holds the key to much of South Australia's future economic development. Suffice for me to say that I would have been happier the other week if we had managed to secure some more uranium mining prospects in South Australia. I must accept the fact that not everyone has the same attitude to uranium as I and other members of this House have, but I believe that over the next three to 10 years in South Australia we will need to bring a number of mines on stream if we are to maintain our standard of living.

One of the very interesting things that came out of the Estimates Committees was the life of Port Pirie and, in particular, its smelters. If, as the latest estimate indicates, within a minimum time frame of 15 years sufficient ore stock is not found to replace what has been basically the lifeline of that town—the Broken Hill deposits—the township will suffer dramatically. Members on both sides are happy that that exploration should take place. They recognise the need for further exploration and for the Mines and Energy Department to carry on the good work it has been doing in South Australia over the past decade or so. I suggest that much of South Australia's future wealth will depend on a stepped up exploration regime over the next few years.

I took a particularly close interest, as either a participant or in the usual sense of listening in or attending the Committee, in areas such as transport, education, health and a number of others. The Opposition managed to extract a lot of information from the Government, but we found a rather coy approach in a number of areas in which we want the Government to come clean—and come clean relatively quickly. During the year, the Opposition has been trying to find out what is happening in a number of key areas. Let us take one or two of those areas now. I refer, first, to education, the education budget for which is about \$5.3 billion. Although this Government has broken up the super education ministry that existed under the previous Government, in general, education expenses total about 27 per cent, or \$1 400 million.

What we would have liked to ascertain during the Estimates Committees and from the whole budgetary allocation is the true story about cuts in education. Everyone knows that in Australia today, despite an inflation rate of about 1.7 per cent, there is an underlying inflation rate of probably closer to 3 per cent in some service areas. Much of that stems from the fact that, for the past few years, wages in general have been held down, but there is a realistic expectation that this year wage breakouts will take place.

It is quite clear from these budgetary papers that the Government has brought in a \$20 million cut in the education allocation for 1994-95, and that it has made no forward provision for the probability of any wage breakout. My guess is that the real rate of inflation in some areas, which are heavily dependent on wages and wage control, next year could be as high as 3 per cent, which means that the Government would need to have budgeted a further \$50 million for education just to keep going with what is already there. In fact, it did not do that; it budgeted for a cut of \$22 million.

We would like to know some of the finer details in this area. We understand that some schools have been earmarked for closure, and that there will be an increase in certain class sizes and a reduction in some ancillary positions. We believe that the community should be told as soon as possible—it should have known by now—where these cuts will take place and when this hit list will be put into operation. I give the Government a bit of advice on this point: it would be better for it to come clean on this issue and deal with it up front than

allow the present situation to continue in which there is such uncertainty as we approach the end of the year, together with the 10-year placement problems and a number of other such matters. It will cause a great deal of chaos in schools.

Through the procedures of the Estimates Committees, we tried to find out as much as we could about what is going on in the area of health. Again, it is an area that is heavily dependent upon the control of the wage structure, yet it contains absolutely no provision for pay rises. Of course, the problem is this: it has been some time since the last pay rises took place. These things are cyclical. We have already seen small break-outs in the current enterprise bargaining regime, with the probability of more substantial pay rises. If we again take the 3 per cent benchmark, the health area would need about \$40 million. That figure may well be wrong but, if a substantial catch up of wages takes place in that area, we may see a situation where 3 per cent is a wholly inadequate figure. Of course, we see cuts being made in that area.

Quite frankly, despite the questioning in the Parliament and in the Estimates Committees, the large amounts of money that have been taken away from the teaching hospitals will mean either that dramatic downturns in service will occur or that these cuts will just not be realised. One of my fears is that, while these cuts are being put in place, a further wages blow out will occur. The Government has made no provision for it, and dramatic cuts will occur in a large number of areas. The \$20.8 million which is to be cut from the principal teaching hospitals is of concern. Indeed, these hospitals provide a large number of services to my constituents and those of many members of this House who are heavily dependent on the public hospitals for the provision of those medical services. We hold the view that slicing that amount of money out of the principal teaching hospitals will lead to many problems.

We hope that the casemix agenda and so on will result in a greater provision of service. However, we are also realistic about the fact that the provision of service will require resources. A large number of resources are being cut out of the health system. In general, we went through the process—and I will come to a couple of other specifics in a minute—and we took the view that the budget has unrealistic parameters and expectations and will not be able to deliver the same level of medical service to the community of South Australia in 1994-95 that was delivered in 1993-94.

A couple of other things have been proposed in this budget; for example, the move to make Modbury Hospital a public hospital run by private management with a rather dramatic budget cut. We would like to know more about this. We did not get all the answers we wanted. We have been probing and asking questions. That facility is important to my electorate, as it is important to all those members in the north-eastern suburbs. Last year in 1993-94 that hospital operated on a budget of \$44.8 million. This year, it is expected, in line with other cuts in health, to operate on a budget of some \$42 million.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I understand that the Minister, who wants to join in on the debate, has made arrangements with Health Scope and possibly one or two other companies (but I understand they are the favoured sons or daughters in this exercise) and that they will do it—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Do you want to join in?

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: I'd love to.

Mr QUIRKE: They will do it for about \$33 million next year. That sounds great from the point of view of the taxpayer, but the problem is that, when you wipe out effectively half the nursing staff in any institution, you will be able to reduce costs drastically but you will also cut many services. We are happy the Minister is present in the Chamber. We would have liked him to come a bit cleaner on some of these issues, and we look forward to that as the matter goes on. Just for the Minister's edification, I understand that the 146 full-time equivalents in the nursing area will be downsized to about 80 as part of the provision. The Minister would be right to say that it is not half, but it is a large part thereof. In any case, we will have that debate if and when the Government decides to go down that road. Certainly, there has been a mixed response in New South Wales, but in general many of the public hospitals have not seen the hoped for reduction in waiting lists, and certainly in general the provision of service has gone down, because they have gone down the same road as this Government intends to go down.

The Appropriation Bill pays for a whole range of other services. We find the police budget and a number of other budgets have either stayed much the same or have seen smaller reductions. There is no doubt the areas of health and education have borne the brunt of this budget. There are a few unknowns. Of course, one of the unknowns is the return from gaming machines this year. The Government's estimate is based on a \$40 million return. I understand it is already well on its way to that return, and indeed it could be substantially greater than that amount. Generally, the Opposition feels that the budget picks on certain groups of people in our community—and I will deal with that in just a moment—much more than should be the case. We think the rest of the budget lacks imagination; and it makes few provisions, if any, for any general break out that may take place, particularly in wages in South Australia either within the health service or more particularly within education.

Quite clearly, one of the groups that we believe has been singled out in this budget (and we were not satisfied with the answers that were forthcoming during the Estimates) is school card holders. Those people's income is very close to if not well and truly below the poverty line. We estimate that 20 000 families—indeed the poorest families in our community—have been singled out in this budget for quite unnecessary and rather draconian cuts. A family struggling to send two or three children to school, a family that receives welfare or is a low income earner will now have to find a substantial amount of money to pay for bus travel. Indeed, if some of the schools are closed, some children who used to walk down the street to school will now have to pay bus fare to attend another school a considerable distance away.

As I said before, the number of families affected by this budget, which is about 20 000 or so, is far too dramatic. Also, we think that what these measures achieve in relation to the budget (and I remind the House that the budget involves some \$5 300 million in total), namely, the miserable few million dollars difference they will make, will be out of all proportion to the number of people who will be hurt by it.

A group of people have been singled out by this Government. They have been singled out because they are poor and they will be hit. Unless I am wrong, because there is no suggestion that any of those people in that group can afford private insurance, many of those people also will be affected by changes in the medical area and in many of the other services to South Australians.

I conclude my remarks by repeating what I said at the beginning of my speech. If the Government is serious about having an active Opposition with proper examination of its budget through the Estimates procedure, it is my hope that it will look at the way the Estimates Committees were conducted this year. In that regard I refer to some of the old animosities. The budget could be handed over to the Opposition a bit earlier than 2 p.m., and instead of supplying only one copy it might be appropriate to give the Opposition the same number of copies supplied to Channel 7, Channel 9 and Channel 10.

The Opposition should have the proper time and staff allocation to look at these sorts of issues. The Opposition and the Government backbench in these areas should have positive input into the whole budget process. The Estimates Committees are less efficient than should be the case, and in many respects the Opposition and Government members who quiz the Ministers and the officials play the role of auditors. I do not know that we can play that role as effectively as what might be the case. I hope that the Government will pick up some of the issues I have spoken about tonight.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): As a new member I express my appreciation in respect of the Estimates Committees. I believe it was the Tonkin Liberal Government that established the Estimates Committees. I think they are a great opportunity for all members to participate in and contribute to the parliamentary process. In a way they represent a continuation of standing committees and other committees of the Parliament, and they allow us to get away from the adversary perceptions which too often are portrayed by the media about Government and what happens in Parliament. The Estimates offer a great opportunity to contribute. I cannot agree with the member for Elder who enjoyed being there from 11 a.m. until 10 p.m., but I found it rewarding.

My involvement in the Estimates Committees dealing with Education, Health, Aboriginal Affairs, Sports and Recreation, Multiculturalism, and Employment, Training and Further Education gave me a perspective which, as a new member, I had not had the opportunity to fully appreciate. I think that ought to be pointed out as an important aspect of our democratic process. The Estimates Committees also give the Opposition the opportunity to question the Government. In the Committees in which I was involved there was no lack of opportunity. I am sure that members of the Opposition would have to agree that they were given plenty of opportunity to ask all the questions that they wanted, and that should be the case.

The Estimates also give members the opportunity to relate to their own electorate. For example, I was fortunate enough to put questions to the Minister for Education and Children's Services about the multicultural unit in my area, and school closures. This enabled me to allay fears about the process that will take place. It has been well documented that 40 schools might close. There is no hit list, as the Opposition would have us believe, whereby certain schools are earmarked for closure. That peddling of fear is not constructive at all. In a way, the Opposition complained that the Government was putting pressure on students at the end of the year when they have to make choices. It was made quite clear that no schools have been targeted: there is no hit list. The process that took place in the past, in consultation with the community, will take place in the future. If it is really concerned about allaying fears in the community, the Opposition would do well to say, 'Well, times are difficult but the process has taken place. We

will have a bipartisan approach with these things. We are not out there to scare the community.'

There has been a lot of talk about the budget and the effect it has had on the community and the less fortunate. I will not go into too much detail again. I spoke about this when the budget was brought down. It was really a budget that we had to have, and it is a responsible budget given the circumstances that the Government found itself in. If the Opposition is objective about it, in the long run it will see that it was the best thing that could be done given the resources we had and the mess we were in. This Government has taken responsible action with sensitivity and care.

For example, I refer to the establishment of traineeships to deal with the youth unemployment problem. One cannot say that the Government is not sensitive in providing jobs for young people. That is an area we should all be concerned about, along with the balance of trying to restructure and rationalise the problem of scarcity that we face with the resources we have whilst at the same time creating a base and giving confidence for the future. I believe that has been the case and will continue to be the case with the Brown Government.

I refer to the idea of shifting towards capital works. Anybody will tell you that there are great benefits in moving into capital works. It has a multiplier effect; and it is a way of stimulating the economy. There is no doubt that there is some hurt. There is an extra student in some classrooms, and unfortunately some schools have to reduce language classes. I am aware of those problems, but also I am well aware that this has not taken place overnight. I was involved in school amalgamations, closures, clustering, etc. well before the Liberal Government came to power. For example, the sacrificing of some subjects has been an ongoing process. One has to be rational and try to separate what normally takes place with school numbers, which have nothing to do with the budget, and what has resulted from the budget process that we had to have to get the State in order. The problem is separating fact from fiction. If we were honest with ourselves, we would do well to pursue that. Fortunately, the budget has provided some benefits in my electorate. For example, the Magill Child Care Centre will receive \$300 000 for expansion. That substantial grant will fund the expansion of the centre to cater for 20 more children.

This is great news for local families, and I have had positive feedback in my electorate. There has been a significant need for more child-care places in the area, and this boost for Magill is terrific; it is really what we needed. So, good things have taken place as a result of the budget and in difficult circumstances, and we would do well to acknowledge that. Work will commence on the site next month and the development should be finished by March next year. I acknowledge that that is a joint effort with the Commonwealth Government. This project is part of a combined State-Commonwealth agreement to provide 1 900 additional child-care places in South Australia by 1996. Personally, as the member for Hartley, I am delighted that Magill was chosen.

Similarly, one must acknowledge the capital development, and I refer back to my electorate with the redevelopment at Norwood-Morialta High School. It is true that these are difficult times, but we have made a commitment to education and these programs, as part of the capital development programs that are taking place, really illustrate this. In the case of Hartley, the Government has allocated \$830 000 to the development of drama facilities at Norwood-Morialta as part of the \$90.2 million commitment of capital works in the

1994-95 State Government budget. One must acknowledge that that is a fair commitment to education and, specifically, to those areas. Norwood-Morialta High School is acknowledged for the provision of an excellent standard of education, and these facilities will enhance the provision of drama at that school. I welcome the announcement: it is great news.

So, it is not all doom and gloom. When one thinks what we had to deal with, the resources that we had and the way we have been able to balance the little that we had, one must acknowledge that we are laying the foundation for the future. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. I have been out there at shopping centres and to the school councils, and I know there are some concerns about school cards and so on. But overall the message I receive is that difficult decisions have to be made but people are pleased that there is a vision; the decisions have been made for a purpose. In other words, with the pain there is some gain. It is like purchasing a home: when you purchase the home, you have to put all your savings together but, by making that decision, you are establishing something that will be of value for the future. That is what it is all about. You just cannot go on kidding yourself that you can spend what you do not have.

We must have a direction where we create wealth and where we create the export mentality, and that is taking place. We must all work cooperatively with the Federal Government, because we are a Federation. If we have that cooperation mentality, we will have a future that this country deserves. Basically, that is what I wanted to say about the Estimates Committees and the budget. I was pleased to be part of it. I think it is an important process and the Government that initiated the Committees should be commended. It is a great opportunity for members such as I who are new to participate and contribute. I found it exhausting but rewarding, and I observed that the Opposition, as should be the case in the democratic process, had ample opportunity to question the Government, the Ministers and the various Government departments on behalf of the community to make us accountable. After all, that is what it should be all about.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset I want to say that it is a great honour and privilege to be asked to lead the Opposition in this Parliament. I have already indicated publicly and I wish to reinforce in Parliament tonight that I will endeavour at every opportunity to ensure that the Opposition is a patriotic Opposition and one that is constructive. Earlier this year I spoke to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and assured him of my support in project bids such as the Orion project, in terms of dealings with the Federal Labor Government, with whom we obviously have a special relationship, because some things should be above Party politics in terms of achieving the best possible outcome for South Australia. So, I have made a commitment to be a positive Opposition Leader leading a positive Opposition and making positive contributions to debates about ideas instead of petty bickering.

I have no intention of being a one man chorus of gloom or of being stuck in the groove of constant negativity. Obviously, there are times when the Government will deserve tough scrutiny and will be held to account for promises made before the last election. We also will want to take every opportunity to assist the progress of South Australia and its economic and social development, and we will be looking forward, not backward. I want to congratulate some Ministers for their conduct of the Estimates Committees. Obviously,

there is a variety in terms of the standard and quality of the contribution made by Ministers to that process. During the Estimates Committee relating to industry and economic development matters it was pleasing to see a Minister who did not need to have a script put in front of him for every question, and I want to congratulate the member for Kavel on that.

In a number of forums during the Estimates Committees the issue of the upgrading of Adelaide Airport was fairly central. I hope that on this issue we have been able to indicate that the Opposition is fair dinkum about promoting economic development in this State. Of course, during that Estimates period the Premier said that the Opposition was irrelevant. It would be very bad for Government if the Opposition were irrelevant. It would be very bad for this Chamber, as I am sure the Speaker would be the first to agree, if Oppositions were irrelevant. Rather than being irrelevant, on the airport issue the Opposition has proved its willingness to work for the State and to use the strong links with the Federal Labor Government to South Australia's advantage.

I want to say, as I said to the conference, that Adelaide International Airport is substandard, is second rate and is in danger of becoming third rate. All of us want it to be a first rate airport; as a State we need it to be so. Our airport as it exists today is a major impediment to export growth; it is a major obstacle to our manufacturing industry and to our primary industries. Indeed, our airport is also a major deterrent to international tourists coming to South Australia. Every Minister who has had any involvement with the Federal Airports Corporation would have felt let down by that body, driven by its perceived imperative to develop airport facilities in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. Right from the start, my bottom line on this issue has not been ideological: my motivation is based solely on getting Adelaide International Airport up to scratch and upgraded, no longer Mickey Mouse and no longer a substantial deterrent to and brake on our regional economy in South Australia.

Most importantly, Adelaide Airport lacks the most basic infrastructure. Indeed, it was the only major city international airport that was officially listed as being below standard in 1988 when it was transferred to the FAC. It lacks basic facilities. There is only one aerobridge: it needs two more. But, most of all, its runway is too short to do the job, and 747s cannot take off fully loaded. It is too short to support freight flights to any offshore destination without unacceptable payload penalties, or even passenger flights to north Asia.

About 50 per cent of our exports have to be transhipped through other Australian gateways, particularly Melbourne international airport, while jets in Adelaide have to take off part loaded, leaving freight behind. This is obviously of substantial negative impact on time sensitive or perishable products exported from South Australia. Indeed, 75 per cent of our air freighted goods are time sensitive. This poses a major cost burden on exporters, it reduces the competitiveness of local products overseas and obviously it limits export sales.

The prime problem is the length of the runway. That is the main game. Adelaide's runway is 2 528 metres and that compares with runways in Brisbane of 3 500 metres, Cairns 3 200 metres, Darwin 3 300 metres, Perth 3 400 metres, Melbourne 3 657 metres and Sydney 3 692 metres. Adelaide's 2 528 metre runway is 572 metres too short. It needs to be extended to 3 100 metres to do its job properly and that is what the decision in Hobart was about: it was

about getting through the log jam, about breaking through and finally getting recognition from the Federal Government that Adelaide's airport was substandard, and about finally getting recognition from Laurie Brereton—who said publicly that the runway would be extended—that the airport would be upgraded, which was confirmed on Friday in a statement made by the Prime Minister. Apart from some of the things he had to say about the process, he said that, in the course of these arrangements, the runway will be extended, and that will be part of the scoping study. That is the point: we will get a runway.

I saw the criticisms by the Premier. Two weeks previously he said that we were irrelevant, and then we got a letter from him saying that he wanted these things done. That is what we went into bat for and that is what we achieved. I am prepared to make this offer today in this House to the Premier: let us put aside the bickering, let us put aside the jealousies and churlishness, and let us work together to achieve the best possible outcome in terms of the upgrading of the airport. We will not get JFK Airport landed in Adelaide; that is a pipe dream. But I am prepared to offer my assistance to join with the Premier in negotiations with the Prime Minister or Laurie Brereton. Let us put aside the politics of division and say that this is an issue that both the Labor and Liberal Parties believe needs to be progressed in a bipartisan way.

I have made that offer in good faith and I am looking forward to a positive response from the Premier. Let us show that we are big people; let us show that we are bigger than staffers who say, 'Let's say it is not good enough. Let's cobble together a press release or an urgent letter saying that it needs to be twice as much.' We all know what that was and the commentators described what it was, namely, basically the politics of envy and division rather than the politics of getting the best possible deal for Adelaide Airport.

A number of other issues are connected with the airport. There was the suggestion some weeks before in the debate leading up to the privatisation issue at the Federal conference of the Labor Party that airports be sold in clusters. The suggestion was that Adelaide Airport be privatised or leased in association with Melbourne Airport. Quite simply, that would have been a disaster. It would have been the worst case situation: it would have been worse than being linked with the FAC. If Adelaide Airport had been privatised or leased in association with Tullamarine, it would simply have become a regional feeder airport to a major international airport. We would have been in a worse situation than we are now in. First, we wanted to secure the support of the Federal Government in achieving the extension of the runway as part of the leasing process. Secondly, we wanted to ensure that the airport was leased on a debt free basis so that a future operator would not be impeded by that debt. I am delighted that Laurie Brereton said publicly in Hobart at a news conference that the debts of the Adelaide Airport, but not others, would be wiped out. Thirdly, we wanted to ensure that the airport was leased as a separate entity and not as a part of a package deal with other airports around Australia.

We had a good outcome in Hobart—a better outcome than had any other State. I did not see clauses about airports in Brisbane, Cairns, Coolangatta, Darwin or Perth. We were able to get a special recognition or breakthrough on Adelaide, because we negotiated and got down to the hard yakka, locked away in closed rooms. That is how you get a deal. You do not simply put out a press release and say how good you are: you have to get down there and hard knuckle negotiate. We used our votes unashamedly—we used South Australia's

votes—in conjunction with a couple of other States, such as Tasmania and some votes from Western Australia, to get the best possible deal for South Australia. That is what all of us should be about, Liberal or Labor—getting the best deal for this State rather than playing games or resorting to childish innuendo and the politics of jealousy.

The Estimates Committees dealt with other issues under the Premier's budget lines, one being the running of this Parliament. It is quite clear to me that we can improve the way we run this place. Anyone who comes into the gallery and watches how Parliament runs itself could only conclude that we are not about the efficiencies and accountability for the next century. We have to upgrade our skills. All of us have been guilty of going over the top, all of us have used the politics of personality, but all of us can and must improve if we are to get better public support, not in terms of us politically or in terms of our Parties but in terms of the institution of our Parliament. In a bipartisan gesture tonight we have the member for Florey giving me some assistance because of the parlous state of my throat.

I have asked Labor's shadow Attorney-General, the member for Spence, to examine ways in which Parliament can be improved to restore public confidence and to establish higher standards of debate and conduct. I wrote to the Speaker of the House of Assembly last week suggesting that a bipartisan group sit down at the highest level to see how we can make this place run better. Serious consideration should be given to introducing a right for citizens named, criticised, vilified or attacked in Parliament to submit a reply for tabling in the House, subject to guidelines. There is no doubt that people who believe they have been falsely accused in Parliament find themselves powerless to do anything about it other than to protest their innocence publicly or challenge the member involved to 'say it outside the House' without the protection of parliamentary privilege.

Let us all remember that parliamentary privilege was introduced so that members could be free to speak without fear or favour. But there is concern that this necessary protection is often abused by members of Parliament making wild accusations that cannot be substantiated. We have seen it in this Parliament; we have seen millions of dollars being spent by investigating authorities who have eventually cleared members of Parliament from attacks that were wildly based and done for political reasons. Concern exists that this necessary protection is often abused. The Australian Senate has introduced a procedure whereby a citizen can request that a statement revoking the allegation be tabled in the House, subject to vetting by the Privileges Committee. A similar process should be considered for the South Australian Parliament. I could not care less whether previous committees have rejected this suggestion. Let us go back to the drawing board and see how we can do our job better.

The conduct of Question Time should also be reformed. There is no doubt that televised reports of the highlights or low points of Question Time can give members of the public a terrible impression of Parliament and the standard of debate. Whilst strict standards are applied to the content and length of questions asked in Parliament, no similar standards apply to Ministers when answering those questions. The Premier or a Minister who has been asked a question can answer in any fashion they choose, including deliberately avoiding answering the substance of the question.

So, consideration should be given to reviewing the rules relating to both the asking and answering of questions during Question Time. At present, a member asking a question must

not offer argument or a personal opinion about the matter being questioned. Consideration should be given to the rules governing the content of answers to ensure that they are directly relevant and responsive to the question, must be reasonably succinct, and must not introduce matters extraneous to the question or debate a matter to which the question relates, with the Speaker strictly applying the same rules that apply to the asking of questions.

Consideration should also be given to providing the Speaker with the power to temporarily remove a member who is disrupting the House. That provision applies in New Zealand, where the Speaker can simply say that the member for Unley or the member for Ramsay should leave the House for half an hour, an hour, or until the end of debate on a particular Bill, if in the unlikely event they are disruptive. It is a way of defusing tension, of resolving conflict and of stopping personal abuse.

We all know that the present system of naming a member is a political process. Sometimes it is a political act on behalf of the person being named, who wants to be thrown out for a day so that that person can have a grand news conference on the front steps of Parliament House. We have seen it happening for years; it happens a couple of times a year. It is all a big fandango. The media trot along and film it; anything that moves is filmed. We see the members concerned packing their bags and going down the steps of Parliament House. It is a charade, and we know it.

The sitting hours of Parliament should also be reviewed. The personal lives of members, especially those with young families, and the parliamentary staff are severely disrupted by continuous late nights and even all-night sittings. In the last session we had a series of all-night sittings going through Thursday, Friday, Saturday and finishing at 9 o'clock on Sunday morning. We need to do things better. That is not to say that it is the fault of Liberal or Labor. It has happened over the years. We have to get beyond the past: we have to look towards the future. All of us, every member of this Parliament from the Speaker down, can improve. I can improve; the Speaker can improve; the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs can improve. We could all do our job better if we could learn new skills.

For any of these things to improve there must be a measure of bipartisan goodwill, and a commitment to restoring, upholding and enhancing the respect for and authority of the Speaker of this Parliament. The Speaker not only must be independent but must be seen to be independent. The standard of debate can only deteriorate if the status of the Speaker is weakened or if a Presiding Officer in a different jurisdiction, for instance, is considered to be following directions from the Government of the day or the Premier's Office.

Parliamentary democracy, I believe, can be the most successful form of Government yet devised if it has safeguards built into it to protect it from abuse and undermining by those who do not understand its fragile qualities. I was delighted that the Archbishop, through his Secretary of the Synod, wrote to me about the need to improve parliamentary standards. Those criticisms were both apt and timely. We all have made mistakes and, whilst flare-ups will no doubt continue in tense circumstances, we all must endeavour to lift our game if we are to restore public confidence in the institution of this Parliament and in our roles as representatives of the people of this State.

Politics is a tough game, and Government decisions require strong scrutiny to protect the interests of the public

and ensure accountability. At times MPs get passionate about issues and get angry about injustices—and rightly so. There is nothing wrong with that. No-one is suggesting that we should not get angry about injustices, but vigorous debate need not and should not descend into personal denigration and abuse of individuals, their families and personal circumstances. That has happened in this Chamber in previous years and it has happened in the Upper House. We should work together to make sure that all of us can say that we have played a role to improve the function of this Parliament as we go towards the next century.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Never in my perhaps short political career but somewhat longer life have I seen a more remarkable conversion than that which I have witnessed today. Never in my life, Sir!

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: St Michael was an archangel, I believe, and a defender of God, and the new Leader of the Opposition seems determined to emulate that role. Indeed, he wants to be either St Michael or perhaps Joseph in his technicolour dreamcoat: the archangel, the prophet and the visionary rolled into one! I think I speak for many members on this side of the House who had the privilege of being in the last Parliament when I say that I concur with many of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. If the Leader refers to my speeches and the speeches of many other members on this side of the Chamber in the last Parliament, he will see that we said much the same sort of thing—in fact, almost identical things. I could be uncharitable and say that he might have read speeches by you, Sir, by the member for Peake or by the Hon. Ted Chapman when he was the member for Alexandra—

Mr Becker: Your speeches.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, my own; a number of members said exactly that. The interesting thing is that things are never the same when they are different. Then we had the Leader of the Opposition sitting as a Minister on the front bench. I do not remember his answers being succinct. I do not remember him answering the questions or taking relevance too seriously. I do not remember him, or any of his then colleagues, the Ministers of the day, treating this House with the same dignity and seriousness with which I see the current members and Premier treating this House.

I, for one, believed that South Australia was being governed by press release. We would not know what was happening until a morning or two before Parliament sat, and then when we read the paper we would be told what was going on, and we would have Question Time to explore what the Government was doing. Never government by Parliament, always government by press release. When the new statesman that we have as Leader of the Opposition wants to preach to us about churlishness, political jealousy and childishness, I say let him first examine his own conscience and prove to every member of this House that he himself is reformed.

Perhaps the best way he can do that is by learning the first lesson I learned when I started work, and that is never blame those who work for you. If you are in a position of power you accept the responsibility and you take the responsibility for those who work under you. I believe that I heard the Leader of the Opposition say, in an attempt perhaps to give Ministers an out, that it was the staffers who were jealous and petty and who would suggest that the letter go out and the base political attack be made. I find that an abhorrent statement. I am sure that every Minister on this side of the Chamber accepts

responsibility for their actions and portfolios. Whatever the advice given to them by their staffers, they make the decisions and they take the advice.

I find that statement more abhorrent because it comes from somebody who himself was a staffer, who himself was nurtured, promoted and fostered by a succession of political bosses to the point where he not only entered this Chamber but quickly rose to become a Minister and has now risen to the ranks where one day—God forbid—the electorate might have to choose between him and our side for a future Premier. I hope that the electorate is wise enough to look at past actions and present platitudes, and judge people accordingly.

We have heard a lot from members of the Opposition about the budget process. I think what is true of the Leader of the Opposition is equally true of many of his colleagues. I heard the member for Playford waxing eloquently about how we were doing in the little people and how for a miserable few million dollars we were depriving people. I put to you, Sir, that the comment 'a miserable few million dollars', more than any statement I have heard in this House today, exemplifies the Opposition's attitude to bucking the budget process. I do not know what the honourable member's electors think, but I can tell members what the electors of Unley think: they do not consider a few million dollars miserable. No matter how big the budget, a few million dollars is a few million dollars. There was an old saying many years ago that 'if you watched the pennies the pounds would look after themselves'.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I suppose the member for Giles is amusing himself by talking to himself, but there is a difference between \$25 000 and a 'miserable few million'. I might think that a few thousand dollars is not worth a Minister's money when he has several hundred million dollars in his budget, but a few million dollars is a horse of a different colour.

The member for Playford accused the Government in this budget of singling out the poor and the needy in society for particular targeting. I had the privilege of being present on several Estimates Committees and of chairing others. So, I heard more than my fair share of Ministers answering questions put by Government and Opposition members. I can say that without exception I did not hear one Minister chortling or being happy in any form about any cut that he or she has had to make. They were unapologetic that this Government has to provide efficient and effective Government. However, neither the Minister for Health, who is here tonight, nor the Minister for Education was at all pleased that their departments, no matter how efficient they are going to be, would have to be more efficient with less.

The member for Playford said that it was the Government which had singled out the poor and which was victimising people. He picked the school card scheme as an example. I am glad that the honourable member has returned to the Chamber, because I would ask him whether he truly believes that half the number of school children in this State are in such necessitous circumstances that they deserve school card. No-one has challenged the fact that just over 50 per cent of all school children in public schools in this State currently get school card.

I support the school card scheme. I know that when the Labor Government introduced this scheme—and I believe it did—it was a good measure. It was a measure designed to assist in providing an education for those in necessitous circumstances whose parents could not afford to provide them

with basic educational necessities. It was an excellent scheme, but when 50 per cent of the school population is getting school card one has to question whether it is still an excellent scheme or whether it has turned into some cargo cult mentality, whereby the boat comes in and dumps the welfare money on the shore and gives it to people who do not really deserve it but who will say, 'Thank you very much,' anyhow, and the boat then goes out again on the next tide. There is a point at which social welfare goes mad.

I put to this House that we have seen a procession of Governments both in this State and federally that have beefed up the social welfare component of our society to create a section of society which is dependent or which sees itself as being dependent on a particular political Party in this country. You give people the welfare and then tell them that the ALP is the only Party in Australia that supports social welfare. Then, by definition, when the Liberals get in they will cut it out, they will increase Housing Trust rents, they will cut out school card and free travel and do all sorts of abysmal things. You have a captive audience, ever increasing in size, that is too scared other than to vote Labor. We get a dependent mentality.

I put to this House that if there is one disservice that the Australian Labor Party has done to the people of this nation it is to build up a social welfare mentality at a State and Federal level. If this country is in a parlous state, if this country is in any way less productive, less well economically placed than it was when the member for Wright, the member for Florey or I were lads, it is because this social welfare mentality has been built up and deliberately maintained and this country has suffered as a consequence.

I am not saying, because I do not believe, that members opposite would have deliberately done that or would deliberately seek to do anything that would harm this country. I just do not believe that they would do it. However, I would put to them that, whether or not they like it, that has been a logical consequence of the policies pursued by a succession of their Governments.

This budget—the first Liberal budget for a long time—seeks to get away from that mentality. It seeks to help people to stand independently on their own feet, to have dignity, an opinion of their own worth and a belief in themselves. It seeks to protect the integrity of the individual and the individual's family. It seeks to give people some feeling of self worth. If that is wrong, and I do not believe it is, I will go to the next election and quite happily lose, because I would have lost knowing that I had lost for something in which I believed.

I am quite sure that on this side of the House there are many, if not all, members who feel exactly as I do. Members can criticise what we are doing—and that is the legitimate role of the Opposition—but I think Opposition members will find that on this side of the House we are doing it not because we think it will get votes but because it is what we truly believe needs to be done.

Of all the criticisms that may be made of politicians, of people in different political Parties, one is not valid; that is, to say that this Liberal Government is not committed to a cause and that it does not believe in what it is doing. No matter how we proceed down the track, I believe that you, Sir, know as I know, and as all other members on this side of the House know, that we are committed to trying to do the right thing for South Australia.

I would hope that in his rhetoric and his vacuous comments the Leader of the Opposition will pause long enough

to listen to himself and think that perhaps he might take on board a little of his advice and be supportive of a Government that is trying to go in a direction that the people of South Australia have clearly indicated they want this State to take. If it is wrong, they will vote us out, not at the next election but at the election after that or the election after that, or later. We will eventually be voted out if we are doing the wrong thing.

However, in the meantime, we have been given a mandate to try; and, for a change, the Opposition should heed the will of the South Australian electorate and help us to get on with the job. All I am doing is calling on the Leader of the Opposition to fulfil his own rhetoric and discipline his own Party enough to see that we can get on with the job of governing instead of having to put up with the slur, the innuendo, the smart comments and the other smarmy tricks that they have perfected, in not only the past five but 20 years.

I would like to touch briefly on what the member for Playford said about the budget. Again, he highlights the deficiencies of Labor Governments. He said that the budget lacked vision. All he could see was that the budget had to come up with all the solutions. That is the Labor way of looking at things: Government is big brother, some sort of overarching patriarchal entity which, like a benevolent God, reigns over everybody and sorts out all the problems of society—if you have a problem, Government will fix it.

Again, he stated that the budget lacked vision because it did not have this, that or something else. I am pleased that it did not, because this Government, unlike the previous Government, does not believe that it is the sole repository of all wisdom or all the answers. It believes that it should solve certain problems that it was elected to solve on behalf of the people and that it should stimulate the private sector to solve other problems.

If you have a Liberal Government, as we have, that believes in this philosophy, of course you will not see every solution in the budget, because it is not a universal panacea for the State's woes, needs, or, indeed, its problems for the next 12 months; it is one part of the jigsaw. The member for Playford, when he comes in here and says that this budget is not very good, exposes himself and his Party for exactly what they are. They see Government not as only one part of the jigsaw but as interventionists and as the whole part of the jigsaw.

In the time available to me, I want briefly to illustrate that point in respect of tourism. The Government believes—as, I believe, does the Opposition—that tourism is one of the ways ahead, one of the ways in which to earn greater prosperity for our State in the future. A couple of weeks ago, I attended a conference at Cairns using my parliamentary travel allowance, which was quite legitimate and on which a report will be duly forwarded to the parliamentary Library. I hope the *Advertiser* got that quite clear. I discovered that in August, one month alone, Cairns had 250 000 visitors. Taxicab licences in Cairns sell for \$330 000. That contrasts with \$130 000 for a cab licence in Adelaide and \$160 000 for a cab licence in Melbourne. Generally speaking, people do not pay more for something than it is worth, so I can only suspect that if they are prepared to pay \$330 000 for a cab licence in Cairns there is good money to be made by driving tourists around Cairns—250 000 visitors in one month I think speaks for itself.

I am not suggesting that South Australia will ever quite be a Cairns. We do not have a reef or a tropical wilderness on

our doorstep. They are things we can never quite match, but we can—and I have heard the Minister for Tourism and the Premier say this—get a greater share of the tourism dollar. Another and more important thing that we can do is to get in on the tourism industry. I point out that there is only one place in Australia that has a chair of tourism at a university. That is something which we as a Government could sponsor through private sector tourism operators. As a Government we could get together with the tourism industry and say to one of our universities, ‘Why don’t you sponsor a chair of tourism?’

It is something for which the Government could act as facilitator, and which the tourism industry would see as being in its very good interest to pay for. It would then bring to South Australia a new industry, a strong and developing industry, which would understand the market and train people. Like our hotel course at Regency Park, it could provide people of world-class standard to service the world. In other words, rather than looking only at bringing tourists here let us look at industries in which we can train people to serve the tourism industry, and let us look at establishing a chair of tourism in one of our universities, not with Government money but with private sector money. Let us then train people so that South Australia has the best trained people, first, to use here but certainly for export around the world.

Lest members opposite think that we cannot do it, I remind them of our friend Dr Hemmerling. Dr Hemmerling took over the Grand Prix as a public servant at the behest of the Government. We paid him a considerable amount of money, and when some members of the Economic and Finance Committee asked why, the answer we were given was that he was the best in the world. If we can train the best Grand Prix organiser in the world, we can set up a faculty in one of our universities and start to train tourism people, and undoubtedly we can train the best in the world. We can do exactly what the Premier said and make South Australia a world leader. The Premier and the Government are well ahead, and are doing it very well, in information technology and a whole lot of areas. Tourism is another area on which we must focus. Perhaps we will never be quite the attraction of Cairns, but we do have some unique resources. Kangaroo Island is one great instance. I conclude by saying that in Denmark the stretch of water between an island and the mainland is treated as a highway and therefore a subsidy is applied to all vehicles. That might be worth considering for Kangaroo Island.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order! The honourable member’s time has expired. The member for Mitchell.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): It is a pleasure to follow the member for Unley, having listened especially to his ideas on tourism. At about 8.30 this evening I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and I thought to myself that at long last we were about to hear a constructive positive approach to the budget from the Opposition, at long last we were about to see a different approach than we have seen from members opposite to the Estimates Committees and the budget with regard to their nitpicking on little issues and trying to be negative. I refer also to their approach during the Estimates Committees where there was no real fiscal examination of the budget. They did not get into the nitty gritty of the budget and give it a close examination. There appeared to be a total lack of interest in the budget in both their budget speeches and questions during the Estimates Committees. No greater

picture could be seen of their lack of interest than the fact that at a number of the Estimates Committees only one member of the Opposition would be present while three Government members would be present at the questioning of a Minister.

In a number of areas, one of which I will highlight later, members opposite made up a number of issues just for that particular occasion. They had looked for a juicy issue to run with without worrying about whether they had any facts. Where was the Opposition’s fiscal plan during this period from 25 August to 8.30 this evening? There was no fiscal plan for the next 12 months or long-term plan for the next four years. The Leader of the Opposition came in here and I thought that at long last we were about to hear the Opposition’s fiscal plan for the next four years and, in particular, the next 12 months—its alternative budget. However, what we heard from the Leader of the Opposition was political mumbo jumbo. He said that we should have a bipartisan approach, but straight away he ran off to the media with a press release. At no stage did he come forward with a fiscal plan. As he said, it is easy to criticise—and that he did—but at no stage did he come up with an alternative budget.

During the budget process and the Estimates Committees, we came up with the parameters. We said that the growth rate for South Australia would be 3 per cent to 3.5 per cent, that the unemployment non-public sector growth rate would be 1.6 per cent, that the inflation rate would be 3 per cent, that interest rates would vary from what they are now to the end of the period by 1.5 per cent. At no stage during the budget period or the Estimates Committees did one member of the Opposition question those parameters, and nor did they put up any parameters of their own. Therefore, it can be assumed that they agree with the parameters that the Treasurer has set for the budget and our plans.

We then had a look at the basics of the budget, which showed that the interest net costs for the next financial year would be \$920 million. The Treasurer also said that the debt level for South Australia, including unfunded liabilities of \$4.3 billion, is basically, at the present stage, 40.6 per cent of gross State product. But the Opposition did not oppose those figures. At no stage did it put in its basics. All the way through, since 25 August until now, it was well aware of and in agreement with the parameters and also the basics of the budget, the starting figures for the budget.

At the start of our first budget we said that the underlying deficit would be \$300 million. That was not refuted by the Opposition. At no stage did it come up with an alternative. Given our parameters and basics (excluding asset sales, because they are an unknown quantity) we then set our objectives. From that, our objectives were: in the 1997-98 financial year our underlying deficit would change from a \$300 million deficit to a \$36 million surplus; and, as a percentage of gross State product, our debt would be 34.1 per cent, which includes unfunded liabilities. They are the objectives that we set down in the budget. At no stage did the Opposition, or the Opposition Leader at 8.30 tonight, when he said, ‘We will try a new approach, an approach of a bipartisan, positive, constructive Opposition,’ say that those objectives were wrong or incompatible with the future of South Australia and the growth of South Australian business. Therefore, we have to assume that he feels they are the right parameters, basics and objectives.

The third part of the budget involves the means to obtain those objectives. Included in the budget and associated with health was our casemix policy, and in that area we are looking for an expenditure reduction of \$35 million. Basi-

cally, this was the only time that Opposition members criticised our budget, and they criticised the means. They said that those costs would affect the quality of life for certain people in the electorate. They also said that we did not worry about budgeting for pay increases. But, if they had read the budget document, they would know very well that we said that we did not allow for pay increases *per se* but, if any pay increases were to occur, they must come out of productivity gains within the department or they must look at further reductions in the rate of staffing levels. They failed to realise that Labor Governments, both Federally and also in Queensland, have embraced the idea of casemix funding, which is the trend for the future in respect of health funding.

Opposition members then looked at education, which is another means of obtaining our objective. They criticised some areas of our policy; for example, we proposed a \$22 million cut in the area of education. They criticised the need for school closures. At no stage has any member of the Opposition asked people who live at Mitchell Park and whose children go to the Tonsley Park Primary School, 'What do you have to say for the future of children at that school who, because of population reductions, are faced with the fact that there will be only four classes and four teachers?' The quality of education will suffer at that school not because of budget cuts or policy decisions of this Government but because of changes in that community as a result of the upgrading of Housing Trust units. As a result of that, few children in that area will be able to go to that school. At no stage did Opposition members address the problems—they simply criticised. At no stage did Opposition members come up with a means to obtain the objectives. That is a pure failing on the part of the Opposition, which has been quite evident in every facet of the budget since 25 August until now. Basically, no alternatives have been forthcoming from the Opposition.

This evening, we heard from the member for Playford that his excuse was lack of time. How often do we hear in business and in the public sector, 'I didn't have time to do it?' The member for Playford received his copy of the budget on 25 August. He gave a speech on 6 September; he gave a speech on 11 October; and he still uses the excuse of lack of time for being unable to put forward the means to meet the objectives. The member for Playford was well aware of the basics, because he was a member of the previous Government; he was a member of the Economic and Finance Committee; and he knew the basics of this State with respect to debt and interest costs. As well, he knew the parameters that we would face in the oncoming financial year. Yet during this period from 25 August to 11 October the only excuse he could put forward was, 'I didn't have time.' As far as I am concerned, he has run out of time. The electorate should no longer give him time. Decisions have to be made to reach the objective of getting the State back onto a proper financial base.

We heard from the new Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Ross Smith. His only approach to obtaining the objectives and dealing with the means was to talk about back-door taxation. He went on with the rhetoric of saying that there was a two year wage freeze. The member for Ross Smith, the current Deputy Leader of the Opposition (and I say 'current' because it all depends on how much the knives are sharpened by the member for Playford), talked about the two year wage freeze. He knows very well, and it has been spelt out, that it is not a wage freeze. The fact is that we have not appropriated for any wage increases in the budget papers, so any wage increases must be obtained through productivity

gains, otherwise other forms of cost cutting must occur because the budget must stand; we must have fiscal and managerial responsibility.

On 6 September, the new Leader of the Opposition talked about the impact on small businesses and the fact that land tax has gone up. He seems to forget that, not long ago, he was responsible for a Government that increased land tax in this State by 37 per cent. He also discussed the fact that asset sales were not included. Our budget basically says, 'We will reach our objectives by these means associated with proper fiscal management. The asset sales, if they occur in the meantime between now and the 1997-98 financial year, will give us a much better outcome.'

The member for Hart, who I thought was one of the few members of the Opposition who had anything close to business experience and who I thought would at least give some form of contribution to fiscal management with regard to an alternative budget, was also left wanting. He said that it was wrong for us to rely on contributions from authorities. For the past 10 years the previous Government relied upon contributions from authorities. He said that we would lose \$17 million from the Pipelines Authority once we sold it. He failed to realise, or he did realise but he failed to mention in his speech, that with the sale of the Pipelines Authority we would reduce debt which would, in turn, reduce the interest cost, and that would save us more than the \$17 million contribution from the Pipelines Authority.

Earlier today, the member for Hart also said that this was a dishonest budget, and he made a comparison between our Treasurer and the Federal Treasurer. I put it to the member for Hart that unfortunately the Federal Treasurer did not address the debt levels of this country. As a result of not addressing the debt levels of this country, we are facing an increasing balance of payments on an ever-increasing spiral which will create ever-increasing interest rates. As a result of those increasing interest rates, the effect on South Australia will be horrendous, because the \$920 million net interest that we are paying will be double what it is now.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The effects on interest rates will be horrendous. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the level of debate, an improvement in the way people carry themselves in this House and the level of unsubstantiated attacks of a personal nature. He referred to an *Advertiser* article which quoted Archbishop Ian George. I will address Archbishop Ian George later when he comes to my electorate. There are a couple of things I will gladly take up with him, because we have a common interest in a particular area which we will discuss. I wish that sometimes he would stick to those particular religious issues.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Exactly, he is my Archbishop: I will gladly have a discussion with my Archbishop. Given the Leader's comments tonight, I wonder whether he will take the member for Spence aside and give him a little bit of advice on parliamentary etiquette. During the Estimates Committees the member for Spence was guilty of unsubstantiated attacks—one could say fabrication. In the Estimates Committee of 20 September the member for Spence asked the Chief Justice:

The Opposition understands that a magistrate in the Magistrates Court has been off work since August 1993 and has 92 outstanding judgments that have been waiting more than 12 months since the final hearing of the case. What does the Attorney propose to do . . . ?

Mr Brindal: Did the member for Spence do that under privilege?

Mr CAUDELL: He did this under privilege, and then the member for Spence went on to say:

I will provide the Chief Justice with the name of the magistrate concerned but, if the magistrate has been off for more than 12 months and if there are 92 outstanding judgments, I would have thought that someone would know something about it.

At the end of that evening when the truth had finally surfaced, the member for Spence said:

Earlier today I told the Committee:

The Opposition understands that a magistrate in the Magistrates Court has been off work since August 1993 and has 92 outstanding judgments that have been waiting more than 12 months since the final hearing of the case.

By 'off work' I meant not being on sick leave but not hearing the cases, that is. . .

Previous to that the member for Spence said that he could name the magistrate and that the person had been off work for more than 12 months. Further, the member for Spence said:

. . . 'off work' . . . the magistrate was writing judgments and not hearing cases—

He was hearing cases, but he had not been off work—but he had been sick and the honourable member could name him. He continued:

However, I have now checked the matter further and the member for Norwood was right to criticise me: I believe the claim of 92 outstanding judgments that have been waiting for more than 12 months is exaggerated. . .

The member for Spence has carried on in the same manner that was criticised by the Leader of the Opposition in saying that he has been told constantly by citizens that they are sick and tired of politicians bickering and using Parliament as a vehicle for vicious and often unsubstantiated personal attacks.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: In the Estimates Committee of 15 September, the member for Spence referred to the member for Adelaide and asked the Minister for Transport, regarding a road closure in North Adelaide:

Does the Minister consider that, as a North Adelaide resident and as a sister-in-law of one of the originators of the closure, namely, Dr Armitage, she has a conflict of interest in handling this matter?

The member for Spence used the Estimates Committee to make an unsubstantiated attack.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Giles.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. May I say welcome to the ranks of those who have announced their retirement. I know that you, Mr Acting Speaker, will find the next three years particularly interesting as you gaze upon those who are striving to build a career in this place. It is a wonderful feeling to have that career behind you. Whilst we wish all these fresh faced new people well, we know that they have a daunting task to emulate our feats in this place, and I can only say good luck to all of them but even better luck to the likes of us.

Before commencing my few remarks, I refer to something that the member for Mitchell said. The member for Mitchell seems to think that the previous Government kept schools in the metropolitan area open where there were only sufficient children to warrant four teachers. I inform the member for Mitchell that that was not the case. The then Labor Government had no difficulty in speaking with the entire school community. With the agreement of the entire school

community, eventually those schools were closed—not necessarily on the basis of financial efficiency. There is no way you have to make the kinds of compromises in educating students in a school of so few in the metropolitan area. You have to do it in the country areas, but there is no way in the metropolitan area you have to make those compromises. It is better for all concerned—students, parents and the entire school community—if those schools are closed, amalgamated or whatever the euphemism is at the time. I think the Labor Government was constantly berated for doing that. The number was about 70 schools over 11 years. The Labor Party has no problem with that policy.

Mr Caudell: I was talking about now.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am talking about now. The difficulty is that, when you reduce the number of teachers not just because there is a drop in the number of students, but when you overlay on that the budget cuts that this Government is making, you have a difficulty: that is where you will have conflict within the school community. The Labor Party will be supporting those school communities in attempting to maintain schools where the number of teachers have been reduced because of budget cuts and not purely because of a reduction in the number of students. The Opposition has no difficulty with the problem as far as it goes.

I refer now to a couple of issues that have caught my eye over the past few weeks while we have been discussing the budget. First, I congratulate our new Leader and Deputy Leader. I have known both these people for many years and I know that they will make a great contribution to the Labor Party in opposition and in government. Both people are young enough to retire young having been in government for a considerable number of years. They are both people of great skill in quite different ways. I do not think there is a more skilled political member of Parliament than the Leader of the Opposition, and the organisation skills and the people skills of the Deputy Leader have been well known to the Labor Party for 20 years.

Contrary to the actions of members opposite, it is not my wont, every time I stand up here, to congratulate people on my own side. Never in my period in this Parliament have I heard so much crawling from members opposite to their Ministers. It was quite disgusting, and it will get them nowhere—and properly so. When I congratulate people on this side, it is something that is well meant.

I also want to say a few words about the Hon. Chris Sumner, who was replaced in the Legislative Council today. I do not believe that the joint sitting was the appropriate place to make long speeches about the Hon. Chris Sumner: I thought the day belonged to the Hon. Terry Cameron, who has replaced him. I just want to say a few words about Chris whilst I am on my feet in this debate.

It is traditional to say nice things about people who have left the Parliament and, largely, I believe that most people who leave the Parliament quite properly have nice things said about them, because people who spend some time in the Parliament by and large work for their constituents very well indeed. But the few things I want to say about the Hon. Chris Sumner I believe go beyond the traditional things we say about people who have left Parliament. I came into the Legislative Council of this Parliament in July 1975 with the Hon. Chris Sumner and a number of others. Only the Hon. Anne Levy is left of that team, known as the Class of '75, in the Upper House. I left there in 1985 and came to this place. Coming in with Chris Sumner was quite an experience. Chris

was number six on the ticket, a position that was not certain to be elected in those days (I think number four on the ticket these days is no certainty, but number six then was no certainty), but I understand that he was pre-selected on the basis that he had done a lot of work for the Labor Party, stood in a number of unwinnable seats, and also had the advantage of being a lawyer. At the time, there was no lawyer in the Government in the Legislative Council.

He was successful. We had a very successful election: six were elected and Chris Sumner was one of them. I am a couple of years older than Chris but, nevertheless, he taught me a tremendous amount. He was one of the most generous people I had ever met. He was extremely generous with his time for people who required advice on various matters, usually legal advice and technical advice on Bills. He never stinted in responding to anything that we asked. From a very early parliamentary age he developed a style that was very forthright. He had a way of putting a point of view very strongly, but he was enormously good humoured and tolerant and did not ever stoop to being personal or to attacking individuals as individuals: he attacked vigorously the policies they espoused if he did not agree with them. In my view, his retirement is probably one of the biggest losses that the Labor Party has suffered in a long time.

Many notable people have left the ranks of the parliamentary Labor Party over the past few years, none of whom will be missed by the parliamentary Labor Party as much as the Hon. Chris Sumner. I always thought it was a great pity that the Hon. Chris Sumner did not attempt to be elected to the House of Assembly. At that time in our Party office there was a policy or a very strong point of view that, if he was elected to the Legislative Council, he should stay there and not attempt to move to the House of Assembly. I always thought that was a foolish policy, and in 1985, when we had some difficulties in the seat of Whyalla, the policy changed very quickly, apparently, in the Party office, and they could not get me to stand quickly enough. But had Chris Sumner come to this place I have no doubt that at some stage he would have been Premier of this State, and a very good one too.

Over the past 20 years I have met many members of Parliament, both State and Federal, and I have met most of the prominent ones from top to bottom. In my opinion, Chris Sumner is the best all round member of Parliament that I have met. It has been a great privilege to work with him and, as I have said, I have worked with some very prominent people. None was better than Chris Sumner. I wish Chris, Suzi and their family well. Chris retired of his own cause and, as I say, I think everyone in the Parliament thought it an enormous loss that he went. But he did go with some reluctance. I think he knew that it was time for him to start another career—that this stage of his career was to all intents and purposes over. I wish him well in his new career, whatever that may be. I have no idea what might happen in the future: who knows? But whatever it is, Chris will be an asset to whatever organisation he joins or works for, and I know that Suzi and the children will appreciate having him home at a more civilised hour.

Those comments took a little longer than I intended, although it was well worth it, so in the time remaining to me I will necessarily be brief on a couple of issues of the day. First, I refer to casemix funding, which is very fashionable at the moment. We have all seen these fads in public expenditure over the years, and you have to ask yourself at some stage, when you are reminded of them, whatever happened to a particular program, because they come and go. But the

flavour of the month in health is casemix funding. I agree that, if you want to reduce patients to merely economic units, casemix funding is the vehicle to do that. But I have some grave reservations about how it will work in practice, because sick people are not economic units and they ought not to be reduced to economic units. But I am afraid that they are; that is exactly what is being done today.

It is not as if we do not have some examples from other States of the problems that can be created by casemix funding. The apparently simple solution of casemix funding to all the supposed ills in our public hospitals has been tried quite extensively in Victoria, and the hospitals there have, quite properly in my view, been described as a basket case. The Federal Minister for Health, Dr Lawrence, has kind things to say about the hospital system in some of the other States, including, obviously, in these days, the Liberal States, but the hospitals in Victoria are described by Dr Lawrence as a basket case.

Casemix funding will create problems of its own in hospitals but, coupled with budget cuts occurring at the same time, in some hospitals there will be absolute devastation. We have seen this week about 60 hospitals in South Australia refusing to sign the agreement with the Health Commission. Those hospitals are not signing the agreement because they are happy with casemix. They are saying that casemix is a useful tool; do not go over the top with it and certainly do not impose budget cuts at the same time. Over the next 12 months we will witness, when the Health Commission budget starts to bite in the individual hospitals, story after story of where the hospital and health systems in general will not work to the standard that people in South Australia expect. It will simply not work. Articles in the press have demonstrated that, in Victoria in particular where casemix is going full bore, the effects on hospitals, particularly country hospitals (which concerns my electorate), are quite devastating. I quote from a recent letter in the *Australian* as follows:

In rural Victoria, particularly in the western part of the State, little communities are grimly fighting to maintain their hospitals. They know that once those hospitals are closed the continued existence of their farming towns becomes precarious. Unfortunately, the Kennett Government has failed to understand that, while its target may be the efficient provision of hospital services, hospitals in themselves provide many more benefits than just medical services, particularly in small communities.

That explains quite clearly some of the dilemmas that will face this Government, particularly in the country. In Question Time today, in answer to a question from the member for Elizabeth, the Minister of Health mentioned a hospital in my electorate, the Whyalla Hospital, and said that it had had the biggest ask of any hospital in South Australia and was happy to comply. That simply is untrue. The Parliament was misled by the Minister: it is simply untrue. I can assure the Parliament that the Whyalla Hospital is not happy with those budget cuts—the largest in the State.

We understand that there are special problems in the Whyalla Hospital and I support the Government in dealing with those problems. We cannot operate and fund a 200 bed hospital and staff it as a 200 bed hospital when it averages only about 70 patients. Whatever configuration or alteration is required to the hospital to bring down the cost relative to the number of patients, I support—and support the Government doing that. I have no problem with that, but at the Whyalla Hospital the Government is imposing huge budget cuts which, for the first time in the history of that hospital, has created waiting lists. In response to a question from the

member for Elizabeth in the Estimates Committee, the Minister said that there were no waiting lists in Whyalla. I assure the Minister that the surgeons are sending their patients into my office, complaining that they now have to wait many months for space in the hospital and theatres, where previously they could have that space in a matter of days or weeks at the outside. That has meant that the surgeons now have waiting lists because of the reduction in funding to the hospital. To suggest that casemix is the answer to everything is wrong: it is not.

There are still severe reservations about the casemix system, and to overlay on top of casemix the severe budget cuts that are happening will ensure that dozens of hospitals in this State will not be able to cope with their budgets. Either there will have to be a severe reduction in services or the Government will simply have to make supplementary funds available during the year, which means budget blow-outs. I believe that the present fad of casemix being the answer to everything will be seen for what it is—a gross overstatement.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Mawson.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is a pleasure tonight to follow on from the member for Giles. In the short time I have been in Parliament I have always been keen to listen to the honourable member, because undoubtedly he would be one of the very best speakers in the Opposition. He makes a fair bit of sense most of the time, and it was particularly interesting to hear what he had to say tonight because it really confirmed the observation that I had made during the Estimates Committee, which was simply that the Opposition could not put a glove on the Government. When you see someone with the ability and experience of the member for Giles battling tonight to bring up an issue, it reinforces how good the budget is for South Australia.

The budget, as we all know now, was thoroughly worked through for many months before it was finally presented, having involved careful planning and a lot of community consultation. This was supported by all the documents that came out showing forward estimates, budget expenditure, and so on, during the two weeks of Estimates Committee hearings. Whilst unfortunately we have, as the member for Mitchell pointed out, quite a large underlying recurrent budget deficit, at least we can see from the budget documents and the Estimate Committee debates that the Brown Government's plans are on track to effecting an economic recovery for this State.

We all know that the terrible drought we are currently experiencing in South Australia, as is virtually the whole of Australia, will have a large impact and will put us back one to one and a half years in our recovery program, given that we are looking at about \$500 million less income for this State from agriculture for the 1994-95 budget period. It is unfortunate that that sort of natural disaster can put a State's economy so far behind, but the positive side is that we have a Government here with many strategies in place to offset these problems, whilst realising the importance of agriculture, in particular, to the South Australian community.

It is interesting to listen to the Federal Treasurer's claim that growth nationally will reduce by only .25 per cent—from an estimated 4.5 per cent to 4.25 per cent—because of the drought. We all know that the Labor Party in both the Federal and State spheres, particularly in this State over the past few years, has not shown a lot of passion, consideration or

support for or an understanding of the importance (particularly to the South Australian economy) of our agricultural base, but I am sure that the Federal Treasurer was trying to make a little light of it when he indicated that the massive lack of income we will have nationally because of the drought will affect growth by only .25 per cent.

In the areas of health and education, the budget outlays projected for 1994-95 reveal that, whilst the Government has had to make cuts (and everybody knows the reason for that), these important areas have not had the hit that many people thought they may well have had. In fact, the budget outlay, as borne out in the Estimates Committee, indicates that, out of the whole of the budget of about \$6 billion of the State's revenue that can be allocated, about 19.14 per cent will be spent in the area of health.

That is quite a significant amount of money. It was interesting today to hear the new Opposition spokesperson—and I congratulate the member for Elizabeth on being given that position—asking Minister Armitage about cuts to health expenditure. She forgot to remind members in this Chamber that when the Labor Party was in Government it cut funds to the country hospital at McLaren Vale, which is in my electorate, by something like 60 per cent—something that neither I nor the people of the south will forget.

Next, we examined Education, which still got 27.75 per cent of the budget, and that is quite a large slice. I was fortunate enough to be a member of several Estimates Committees, being on some because I was on the portfolio committees for those Ministers and on others because I had been invited. The portfolios involved included Tourism; Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations; Environment and Natural Resources; Family and Community Services; and Employment, Training and Further Education and Youth Affairs. In the Education area it was good to see that the balance sheet did not show cuts across the board. In fact, in some areas additional expenditure was allocated, particularly to the early years of education, behaviour management programs and the maintenance and minor works areas.

I would like to spend a couple of minutes addressing the maintenance and minor works areas. As a South Australian citizen, it is deplorable to see what has—or has not—happened regarding this State's public assets over the past five, six or seven years. Year after year, less and less money has been spent on minor and capital works maintenance. One only has to travel around any electorate—and my electorate is no exception—to see that many of the Government's buildings are very shabby and need millions of dollars spent on them to restore them to an acceptable standard.

It is good to see that, in the area of Education, Minister Lucas has recognised this and allocated additional money for maintenance and minor works during 1994-95. One of the areas that I have a particular passion for and in which we are blessed with having a very good Minister is Environment and Natural Resources. Before each election, we see in the press the Labor Party really getting out there and trying to woo the vote of the environmentalists, and one would have thought that that was an area in which the Labor Party had a particular interest and would have spent some time in questioning the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources.

I thought it was amazing that the Opposition did not really put any effort into assessing that portfolio area. The only conclusion to be drawn from that is that we are three years from an election and that the Opposition must think that the lobby groups are not paying attention at the moment, so it

will not spend too much time on that portfolio area, but that, when we get a little closer to the next election, it will put in some 'warm and fuzzies' and try once again to woo those voters. Mr Acting Speaker, this Government is not about that: this Government is about short, mid and long-term planning in all portfolio areas and in making sure that we have sustainable plans for Environment and Natural Resources. We know that a lot of work is needed in that area: because of degradation, work is needed in parks and other areas. It was good to see considerable sums of money being applied to and new initiatives being shown for environment policy areas during the Estimates Committee.

I want to talk now about youth initiatives, something that is very important in my electorate. We seem to have two large groups—one comprising senior citizens and the other youth—who need a lot of support, infrastructure and facilities. In the south during the past couple of years we have had high youth unemployment. I am not very proud of that situation; it is something that I hope, as a member of this Government, we will be able to remedy over the next four to six years—and it will certainly take four to six years to achieve, because these deep-seated problems cannot be solved in a short time.

It was gratifying to hear Minister Bob Such announcing very good job creation programs, some of which have already been successful and others which are budgeted for with the strategies now in place to create jobs for our youth, not the least of those programs being the one involving the allocation of 700 places for traineeships within the public sector. During the Estimates Committees I was pleased to see other areas where we are recognising our youth, with policies and initiatives put forward to further enhance and develop the youth—the future of this State.

Most members of this House have heard me speak many times about the importance of the wine industry and benefits of the wine industry, viticulture, horticulture and floriculture for the electorate of Mawson. When asking the Minister a question from page 546 of the Financial Information Paper No. 1 about the status of rural and horticultural programs at the Woodcroft campus of the Onkaparinga institute, I was very pleased to hear of Woodcroft TAFE's success in rural and horticultural programs. The programs running from this campus have indeed been very successful. In fact, this year's viticultural programs have attracted much attention from wine growers and have resulted in 25 wine growers committing themselves to on-the-job training for long-term unemployed people.

Of the 15 participants in the first program, I was pleased to hear that 11 completed the course and that all were employed by the time of their graduation. That is an outstanding result and one of which I as the member for Mawson am very proud. I look forward to seeing more development in these areas. The current program, which involves a further 15 students, is shaping up to be as successful as the first. Prior to the completion of the second program, 50 per cent of the participants have been guaranteed employment. That shows how important TAFE is, providing practical education and practical training and getting on with the real job of looking after and putting young people into full-time, satisfying and rewarding jobs. I would like to thank Rosemount Estate, Seaview Wines and Southern Vineyard Contractors for their involvement in this area. I look forward in future to the urban horticultural industries for the southern metropolitan and Fleurieu region providing those certificate offerings, includ-

ing the Advanced Certificate in Urban Horticulture and the Land Management Certificate.

Returning to the matter of capital works and maintenance, I was disappointed to see what happened in 1993-94 and 1992-93 before we came into Government. I am not throwing a brickbat at the Opposition here: I would throw the same one at the Liberal Party if it had been neglectful in this area. It was disappointing to see, when it is one of the few ways a Government can directly create jobs through capital works, that in many portfolio areas budget moneys allocated for capital and maintenance works had not been spent. That should leave a sour taste in everyone's mouth, particularly when we know how difficult it has been over the past year or two to create jobs. For the life of me I cannot understand what the Opposition, when it was in Government, was doing with respect to that issue.

One of the reasons why the Opposition could not throw a glove at us during the Estimates Committees was that the budget was well thought out and planned. The Opposition seemed to be more involved in deals within the factions during the two weeks of the Estimates Committees than in actually doing some work on sourcing and having a close look at the forward estimates. In fact, that seemed to take nearly all its energies at times: members opposite were having more meetings in the corridors and back rooms over this faction deal than they were having about the Estimates Committees.

Of course, not very long ago I heard about a retired Federal Labor member who had come over here to reset the agenda for the Labor Party and who spent quite a lot of time on reviews and so on. There was a lot of hype in the press: the Labor Party had learnt its lessons and it would come back and listen to the people of South Australia. That sounded very good. Of course, as Liberals we have been doing that for some time. One thing that we have certainly learnt is that we will ensure that we continue to work very closely with the broad cross section of the so-called grassroots people of this State—the people we are here to represent. I am very pleased to see that the Liberal Party has a policy that allows the community to be involved in its endorsements and does not allow backroom deals to go on. We now have Rex Phillips from the PTU talking about running as an independent against Trish White, who with a bit more factional strength was able to be endorsed for the seat of Taylor. We have seen Terry Cameron sworn in today as a reward for his efforts and so on.

The sad part is that, when one talks about rewards for efforts, in the short time that I have been in this place I would have thought that if anyone should be rewarded for their efforts it is the member for Playford. After the member for Giles, the next best person whom I can see, who is obviously a lot younger and who will end up with at least as much experience and ability, is the member for Playford. Yet, what happened? I understand that the honourable member worked to try to bring in some of these new members and at the first opportunity they threw the big knife at him and he did not get up as Deputy Leader. The honourable member has got on with his work and members can see that he is happy enough to do that, because he seems to be one of the members on that side who really does get into his electorate work. I guess it is a great gain for us having the current Deputy Leader of the Opposition. However, I am sure that the member for Playford would have been a much stronger opponent for us than the member who has been endorsed.

Then, of course, we saw the Leader of the Opposition racing from one Estimates Committee to another grabbing

about five minutes of the spotlight while the press were there and then we did not see him for the rest of the day; he was gone again. He is talking about making all these changes and lifting the image, accountability and codes of practice and so on. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition does that, because it would be a pleasant change. We have been appealing for that to happen over the past 10 or 11 months—a lot more bipartisan work to get on with the job of getting this State going. I hope that it is not just rhetoric and that the Leader of the Opposition gets behind us.

In conclusion, I would like two points recorded tonight. It is a pity that I could not have said goodbye to the previous Leader of the Opposition—the member for Taylor. My understanding is that he had to leave early. As I said earlier, it is pretty clear that the Opposition could not put a glove on us because of the job that had been done in terms of careful planning. I understand that was one of the reasons why the push came so early. Of course, the same thing happened in the Legislative Council, where the best operator on the Opposition benches was also pushed. As he said, he still was not sure in his heart whether or not he should be going.

The greatest point on which to finish this Estimates debate is to refer to an article on the front page of today's newspaper. It is headed 'South Australia sets pace in export drive', and it states:

South Australia's economy has been buoyed by figures showing it leading the national export drive and job vacancies surging to a four-year high.

That does not mean that we have hit the racing position yet. I do not think there is a member on this side who believes that we have. However, it does clearly mean that this Government is on track. Yes, there will be hiccups and things will go up and down, but the important thing is that it will be on an inclining curve and not a declining one. That is backed up by all the budget and Estimates documents that have been put forward. The accountability is there not only in a financial sense but also in a public sense, and I am very pleased to have been involved in the Estimates Committees.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I would like to start by thanking the member for Mawson for his congratulations. However, I feel that I should make a slight correction to the point he made in relation to the Labor Government's making cuts to the hospital system. If he had read the Audit Commission report he would have noticed that it stated that we funded the hospitals too much; we were above average again. That is probably what drove this Government to make the biggest cuts across all Government areas in the health sector.

I have been the shadow Minister for Health for only two weeks and it is an enormous area. I will describe some of the things that I have done in those two weeks and some of the information that I have received from all around the State that disturbs me greatly about what is happening within our health sector and some of the things which I think are of great concern and as a result of which I believe we will suffer consequences far into the future.

The health budget was cut by \$32 million—the largest single blow to any Government department. A further \$33 million will be cut from the health budget, again over the next two years. It was interesting that a week or so ago on ABC radio during an evening program I heard the Minister answering questions from callers. One of those callers talked about the cuts in the health system and asked the Minister about possible cuts in services. The Minister answered that question and said that what people needed to understand was that the Government was elected with a huge majority to fix the economy. However, he omitted to mention that the Government also made a number of other commitments, and that when electors voted for the Government last December it was not just the first half that they were looking at but the whole package. The Liberal Party's health policy of December 1993 states:

We will allocate an additional \$6 million annually to public hospitals [and we will] retain within the health system all savings generated so that increased funds can be provided for direct patient services.

Of course, he did not say that to the caller who rang in that night.

In the Estimates Committee the Minister's opening statement was that, in fact, \$34.3 million would be returned not to the health sector as the policy document states but to Treasury. So, we enter this financial year with unprecedented—and I use that word deliberately—cuts in relation to our State health budget at the same time that that sector is undergoing unprecedented changes, both in the nature and the speed with which they are being implemented.

In the two weeks that I have held the shadow portfolio I have been inundated by people who run hospitals, by health groups and by community health groups across the board. There are enormous concerns. What concerns me is the glib replies of the Minister that everything is okay, that those people who can meet the budget are efficient, that those who cannot are inefficient—end of story—and that everything is honky-dory. I believe that is not the case and that the Minister needs to take heed of that and make some changes.

Certainly, the introduction of casemix together with the restructuring of the Health Commission, the introduction of the contestability policy, and the issue of privatisation—in particular as it relates to Modbury Hospital but, of course, as it may relate to other hospitals and other services—are happening. What I am hearing from hospital administrators around the State is that not only are they reeling in relation to budget cuts but they are also trying to come to terms with casemix, and things are just not coming together.

I will go further into the matter of casemix shortly, but I want to mention also that during the Estimates Committee the Minister mentioned that \$34.3 million had been carried forward from the Health Commission budget for 1993-94 and that \$10.8 million of this money had been set aside to meet further cost pressures. He made the point that this was good financial management, and I guess it was. Just last week, nurses across Australia had an award increase of \$8 a week. I heard the Minister mention that it would cost up to \$10 million to implement that award increase. My point is: if we have \$10.8 million to meet further cost pressures, surely this is what it should be used for. The Minister needs to be honest about that rather than attacking nurses who I believe are among the most dedicated and professional workers in our society. He needs to come clean on this matter—the money is there, they deserve their rise and they should get it without

being castigated as people who are destroying the health system, which is what the Minister has been doing.

I would like to talk about casemix. As I said, I have been in the job for only two weeks and there is a lot more for me to learn about this, but these are some of the things I have picked up. People have said to me that they agree with the principle of paying health units according to the services they provide. I have no problem with that. I believe we need to be accountable and efficient, and that we need to be funded on the outcomes that we deliver. That is a move that has been happening across all parts of the public sector in recent years. It is not a new thing. It may be new in respect of the health sector, but in other areas of the public sector that is the way in which it has been moving. However, having said that, there are many concerns about this formula. It would be fair to say that when you are bringing in such a massive change issues are bound to arise. That is why it is important to pace that sort of change so that you can work out some of these things and do the best you can to sort things out before you launch into it holus-bolus.

I refer to a document printed by the Hospitals and Health Services Association of South Australia, which states:

It is apparent that the time frame in which casemix was prepared and introduced was totally unrealistic. The problems being experienced are due not to the shock of sudden change but result directly from the opportunities to provide training and the inadequate infrastructure required to implement the system.

The document goes on to detail some of the inadequate infrastructure, which these bodies are trying to grapple with while casemix is being brought in. It mentions lack of information technology, the expertise to use it and the lack of coders. It talks about the benchmark price that has been used to make the calculations on the groups of operations and procedures. It says that the price that has been set by the Government is neither fair nor efficient, and that it has been set to enable the Government to make the cuts that it needed to make. A number of these bodies have said to me that, instead of actually determining a fair and equitable price and working it out for each hospital, the Government has worked backwards from the cuts it wanted to achieve to get the benchmark price, which is why so many hospitals are in so much trouble.

There are a number of other issues in relation to casemix, especially in relation to older people and casemix. A number of people have contacted me, and I will cite some practical examples of those in a minute. The problem with bald formulae is that they need to be handled carefully, because they do not take into account special needs. Figures and formulae do not account for special needs that are a reality for many people. For older people there are things such as the fact that they come to hospital with multiple problems. They are not easily categorised into one group for funding purposes. Sometimes they have many problems. They take longer to recover from an operation. As we know, the casemix model encourages a higher throughput of patients. Older people take longer to recover, and there is more of a chance that they will be pushed out at the other end of the production line before they are sufficiently recovered.

Another matter that has been raised with me is that the throughput model of pushing people through the system is based on the expectation that people can be cared for in their home. This again is especially an issue for older people because lifestyles in our community have changed, and for many older people there is not the support that there used to be once upon a time when members of families were at home

and able to care for an elderly relative. Our lifestyle has changed, and we find that many elderly people have to go home from hospital and look after themselves. This might have been okay if the infrastructure support in the community had been set up and merged with the hospitals to ensure continuity, but that has not happened, and that will cause problems.

I have received a letter concerning this issue. A woman wrote to me about her father who is 74 years old. He has mild dementia and diabetes. He had to go to hospital because he had a fall at home and broke his leg. She describes the fact that he went to hospital with a swollen leg and he got ulcers, which of course tends to happen when you are older and not as healthy, and you do not recover as well. She goes on to say:

Casemix and economic rationale in general are responsible for George going home too soon each time from hospital and this has led to further injuries and discomfort for George and his family that is trying to support him. If George had had full day nursing support at home until he had recovered and learnt how to manage alone with his new disabilities he would have avoided the repeated trips to hospital.

There is more in that letter, but it makes the point that there are issues that a bald formula does not address. These are the issues that a lot of people across our State in the cities and the country are worried about. It concerns me when I talk to hospital administrators who are not usually particularly militant. They throw up their hands and say things like, 'We'll just have to wing it and hope for the best.' The Millicent Hospital said that they would not sign their agreement because they just could not do it. It concerns me when the Minister pours scorn on such hospitals and says that they cannot possibly be right. Perhaps what the Minister needs to do is to talk to the hospitals, work out their issues and help to solve them.

Another big issue that concerns people is the restructuring of the health system. I refer to a letter I received today from a woman from Booleroo Centre. She states:

Last Tuesday I attended a meeting called by the board of the Booleroo Centre Hospital. They very rightly felt it was important to inform the community of proposed changes to the health system. Over 200 people attended that meeting. The general feeling was extreme concern at the inadequacy of information being given to health services about exactly what is entailed in these changes. What seemed even more serious and disturbing was the pressure being brought to bear on hospital boards to sign a legally binding service agreement which is designed to limit the type and amount of services our hospital will be allowed to provide.

The letter continues:

Apart from the gross inequities it seems this system will create, I have two very specific concerns:

(1) As a member of a small community I feel extremely disadvantaged and endangered by having my health care choices limited in this way.

(2) Attracting doctors to small country hospitals is difficult enough as it is. This restriction will make it even less likely a doctor will be willing to come to a place where he/she will be told that he/she cannot practice or carry out certain procedures or in specific areas/fields.

I will not go on any further, but that person goes into more detail about the fact that there needs to be a lot more discussion. People say that things are happening too fast, that they are not being consulted, that the consultation periods for far-reaching changes are one, two or three weeks when boards meet only on a monthly basis, and that they are worried that the rug is being pulled from under their feet and they will be left with diminished services. Again, the Minister has said:

Now that casemix is bedded down, we will be able to get on to restructuring the department.

The Minister must be in fantasy land if he thinks casemix is bedded down: many issues need to be addressed. Of course, the issue of privatisation also comes in on top of this. There are huge concerns in the Modbury community about what is happening. I say again that the process followed by the Minister and the Government in relation to Modbury Hospital has been extremely poor.

At the Flinders Medical Centre and the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler privatisation in the form of a private hospital provision and shared services is under way. Those hospitals followed a process that involved consultation and open discussion over a long period of time, and that enabled the ironing out of concerns. That has not been so in the case of the Modbury Hospital. We have to ask, 'Why is this so? Why are people afraid to discuss it openly and get a result in which everyone can have a say and understand what is happening?' There are many concerns about that.

Mr Bass interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: It is not surprising that rumours are arising. When you are undergoing enormous changes, you have to give information and consult, then that will not happen.

I want to mention briefly community health services. The health system is so vast that it is impossible to talk in much detail about many aspects. I want to mention one counselling service in my own electorate, the Para Districts Counselling Service. This service has been operating for 30 years in the Elizabeth area and serves people in Salisbury, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Gawler. It has a very large volunteer component and a relatively small number of staff. This year its budget was cut.

It asked for a budget of \$211 000, which it received the previous year. This was reduced to \$200 000 before it went up for consideration as a budget line, and then it was cut by a further \$50 000. The reason it was given was that it was not a health service. So far, it has not been able to get any clearer clarification on that, but it is a health service in that it does counselling in grief, relationships, anxiety, depression, sexual assault, substance abuse, domestic violence, personal growth, personal empowerment and financial counselling, and it does a whole lot of other things. The Government's policy last December talked about supporting community health services. Here we have one that has been very successful, but funds have been cut.

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I wish to talk about education, because there is no doubt that in my electorate education is a key issue: there are 22 schools within the electorate of Wright. I wish to commend the teaching profession as a whole and the individual teachers within those schools in the electorate of Wright for the work they are doing. I started out—I will not say how many years ago—as a high school teacher. In those days, I really enjoyed teaching. I was fortunate to be sent to the Murray Bridge High School, and it was an absolute delight to work with the students at the top end of the secondary school system. However, in those days I found that the students wanted to learn, and the worst disciplinary problem I had to put up with was occasional chatting or someone not doing their homework. When I look back on the life I had in those days, it was very much easier than the life teachers have today, even though the class sizes were huge. I had one class of 45, and I was trying to teach senior school mathematics.

At a recent school council meeting at the Salisbury East High School, I was being quite honest when I told the school council that there was no way I could be a teacher today: I would be frustrated at trying to impart knowledge in some instances where students were not only not interested in gaining that knowledge but seemed to be actively doing all they could to make life as difficult as possible for their teachers and co-students. I am continually amazed, not in a positive way but in a negative manner, both by stories from my wife who is still in the teaching profession and from my own experience as I move around schools, at what the teaching profession has to put up with today. There is no doubt that teachers who work with students today are extremely dedicated. They would have to be extremely dedicated to go about their tasks.

Teachers today do not work from 8.30 in the morning to 3.30 in the afternoon. I know only too well the amount of work they do before and after school and into the evening in their own time to make sure that they are in a position to assist the students as much as they can. People not only in my own electorate but throughout South Australia are fortunate to have an extremely dedicated teaching profession. A vast majority of that profession are exactly that—professional—and are doing a wonderful job of doing all they can to assist our young people to gain a good and proper education.

SAIT is the union which allegedly represents the teaching profession. It is interesting to note that this year its membership is down by about 50 per cent because of the changes this Government has brought in, first, by removing compulsory unionism and, secondly, by making it necessary for the institute to get out and do some work for a change to keep its membership. The institute is finding that, because it has been a political union (and we have only to look at the fact that its Secretary ran in the last election, spending \$100 000 of teachers' money because she had the grandiose plan of becoming a member of another place), its political activities are now catching up with it. It is finding that teachers no longer want to be a member of the union or a part of the political activities it is undertaking.

This leads to another point: there is no doubt that teachers are genuinely and rightly concerned that the necessary cuts the Government has had to make in the budget have impacted on education. However, in percentage terms, they have impacted on education far less than on any other area. Unfortunately, one impact is that in some schools class sizes will be increased.

In relation to primary education, only 25 per cent of schools will be affected: 75 per cent are not affected. In the secondary area, the impact is greater. As I have gone around schools since the budget was brought down, teachers have expressed to me their concerns that the budget cuts will affect the way in which they will be able to work with the students and provide the education that they so desperately want to provide. I give the teachers in my electorate absolutely 10 out of 10. They appreciate that the Government has a major problem on its hands, a problem not of its making and a problem which, unless this Government addresses it, would have made us go down the gurgler. If this Government had continued the trend up until the last election, it would not have been able to provide any education at all, because there would not have been any money left.

Teachers—and I give them full marks for this—are aware of the reasons for the changes to the formula that determines the number of teachers in any given school. When I have talked to teachers about the impact, they have listened and

accepted that actions were necessary. However, SAIT came out just after the present Government was elected and made all sorts of scare claims. It alleged that the Liberal Government would sack 3 000 teachers and close a couple of hundred schools. I might say that in the electorate of Wright at the last election I bore the brunt of typical Labor Party tactics: in the week or two before the election, letters went out to residents in the area around the Keller Road Primary School saying that, if a Liberal Government were elected, Keller Road Primary School would be closed. SAIT and the Labor Party ran that campaign. Immediately after the election, SAIT and the Labor Party ran a scare campaign about the number of teachers that would go, the number of schools that would be closed, and so on.

All that did was to create tremendous concern within my electorate, concern which I have now been able to completely allay. I have been able to go back to Keller Road Primary School and give assurances that the school will not be closed. As was pointed out to me by the principal of that school, the damage has been done. Because of the scare campaign undertaken by SAIT and the Labor Party in putting around the furphy that the school was to be closed, a lot of parents have put their children into other schools. Keller Road Primary School is now suffering because people had that absolutely unwarranted fear that their school would be closed: because parents did not want their children in a school that was to be closed, they moved them elsewhere and exacerbated the problem at Keller Road. However, I have been able to give that school the assurance that it will not be closed. Salisbury East Primary School was in a similar situation. It was very fearful that it would be closed, but the Government has been able to give assurances that it will not be closed.

SAIT has acted most irresponsibly in the way that it put out this scare campaign. I give the teachers full marks because, once reassurances were given that schools would not be closed and once we were able to talk about the rationale behind what the Government was doing, the reaction I had from the vast majority of teachers—and I think I can safely say from all teachers except those who are active union representatives within the schools—was, ‘Okay, what we have now is a situation where in some schools we will have one less teacher than we would have had under the old formula.’ The teachers have asked, ‘What is best way we can go about overcoming this problem and still providing the best possible education for the students in our school?’

Golden Grove High School is an excellent example. I give the principal of that school full marks for the approach he has adopted. He rightly has advised the parents of students attending Golden Grove High School that the change in the formula will impact on the subjects available to students in that school. What he has said in his newsletter to parents is, ‘Do not worry about these changes. We at the school are confident that we will be able to come up with a positive resolution to our problems.’ He assured the parents and the students that the school was working to provide the best possible education with the resources available to it.

In my electorate I have found that the teaching profession has said, ‘We do not like what has been done. It will impact negatively on the education we are able to provide our students. But at the same time we accept that there was a problem. The Government has taken a decision and we will now work within the new parameters.’ Despite the fact that it will make their already hard job harder, they have said they will work within the new parameters and they are determined to provide students with the best possible education.

I commend those teachers for the approach they have adopted. As I have said, they have an unenviable, thankless task, a task which I personally would no longer be able to undertake. Unfortunately, the work they are doing in providing an education and a grounding for the future life of the young people in South Australia today is something that tends not to be recognised. It certainly tends not to be recognised too often by parents, because I find as I move around that parents are blaming schools for problems that are the parent’s responsibility. They are blaming schools for the problems of vandalism and graffiti. In my own electorate there is presently a problem at the Golden Grove Village Shopping Centre. The blame is being put on the Golden Grove High School, and that is most unjust, because the vandalism and graffiti attacks occur well outside school hours. But because the people undertaking these activities are young, people are saying that they are from Golden Grove High School and that Golden Grove High School is not doing what it should be doing.

That is most unfair, because I know how hard the teachers and professional staff at Golden Grove High School are working with their students to do all they can to overcome the problems. It is so easy for some parents to turn around and say it is the school’s fault instead of looking at themselves, their own home life and what they are doing or not doing for their children. Until we overcome the teacher bashing by some parents and other areas of the community, we are doing those conscientious, hard working teachers an injustice. It has been pointed out to me that at present the morale in the teaching profession is low, and part of the reason for that is that, in some instances, teachers will have larger classes and more difficult jobs.

I believe that one of the most significant reasons for the low morale of the teaching profession at present is that teachers feel they are under attack from every quarter. You only have to listen to the radio, the news services, and so on to hear spokespersons from different areas saying that schools should provide training to overcome this or that problem. For goodness sake, schools are there to provide an education for our students. Teachers cannot be expected to provide the answers to all life’s problems for young people.

I will conclude my remarks on the important issue of education by saying once again how much I admire tremendously the work that the teaching profession is doing within the community. I admire the way in which teachers have said, ‘Yes, life will be more difficult for us.’ But they have not just thrown their hands up in horror and said they will not do anything: they have said, ‘Okay, they are the parameters we now have to work under. We are determined to get out there and provide the best possible education for our children.’ I place on record tonight my admiration for the teachers within my electorate and the work they are doing.

Mr VENNING (Custance): Before beginning my remarks on the Appropriation Bill I want to note the retirement today of the Hon. Chris Sumner. He has been a very good, longstanding member of this Parliament and, irrespective of politics, men of such calibre should be recognised. He will surely be missed. Also, I do not want to be political but I want to comment tonight on the retirement of the Hon. Lynn Arnold. I found him to be a particularly honest, straightforward man and very frank with me. I felt very sad indeed that he decided to retire. I think he retired a little early, and I hope he was not pushed, because I thought that the Hon. Lynn Arnold was a very credible, very honest man. We knew

things about each other, having done much in common together, and I appreciated the trips he made to the country, where he got on very well with my constituents.

It is very sad to lose a man of such calibre, even though he was a member of the Bannon Government that put this State in a very bad position. I do not hold him particularly to blame for that, even though he was a part of that team. I did not think that he had to resign, and I am very sad that he has gone. Parliament will be the lesser for his not being here. The incumbent, the now Leader of the Opposition, will have to be a long time here and change his game considerably to be able to fill the shoes of Lynn Arnold. In fact, we already have indications that the Hon. Mike Rann has been born again, with the hint of the new image. But when you have the baggage the honourable member has, it will take a lot to change. A worm never does a full turn and a leopard never changes its spots.

I congratulate the member for Ramsay on becoming the Leader of the Opposition. No doubt he is an ambitious politician, and he has that position now. I wish him well but, no doubt, we will be very critical of him. If he cooperates with the Government in what is best for South Australia and he does not play the political game he has been playing in the four years I have been here, I will give him credit for that.

Also, I want to congratulate the member for Ross Smith (who I notice is in the Chamber tonight) on his rapid rise to fame. He trod on poor old John and squashed him a bit, but this game is like that. We do not have the factions in our Party that the honourable member has in his. We do not seem to need factions. I am very upset, because I have got on very well with the member for Playford over the years. He has been on my property shooting, and he told me about young Ralph Clarke; about how he was coming into the place and would be of great value to the House. And look what happened: the promoter became the demoted. Is this not a strange place? Here am I, the member for Custance at the moment, while we all know that in the draft the seat of Custance has disappeared. But I will serve the people of Custance right to the next election, whatever happens—and it may be 'Custance's last stand'. I am sad to be told that I will be losing the right to represent the greater part of my people. However, I live in hope of being spared the ultimate sacrifice, first by the commission or secondly by the electorate.

I note that during the Mines and Energy Estimates Committee, which I had the privilege to attend, the member for Playford made a very good opening speech and referred to the change in the Australian Labor Party's nuclear policy, saying that he was going to Hobart to win the day. We know what happened: it was a good speech but he did not win the day. It is a disgrace, and all in this House agree that we just cannot wear this three mine policy of the Federal Labor Party. Sadly, our Labor colleagues here did not have the strength and did not win the day in Hobart. I wish that the honourable member could have convinced his Federal colleagues, but he did not.

The exploration initiative in this State continues and we continue to get results. Aeromagnetic surveys are being carried out, and I give the Opposition credit for beginning these surveys. I am being very charitable tonight, because we must give credit where credit is due. It is just a pity that the Opposition could not deliver an open mine uranium policy. There is so much potential: we have so much production and so much value there, but this whole matter is now becoming bogged down in bureaucracy and politics. We have native

title, world heritage and all those things standing in the way of the tremendous potential our State has in the minerals and energy field. I wish we could cut this resistance away. Our Government is trying to do that, but the Federal Government is in our way. If only a Hewson Government had been elected at the last Federal election we would find tremendous progress in this area. But the Federal Government is holding us back. However, I am very grateful for the progress made, irrespective of these handicaps, and I give the Minister every credit for that.

The sale of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA) is scheduled to be completed by the end of this year and the dividends will rise from \$11 million to \$17 million, a \$6 million increase to the State coffers, but the best thing about it is that it is a move in the right direction; it is a positive result. We are forging back. Rather than seeing loss upon loss and devastation upon devastation, we are actually seeing some positive moves, and I applaud the many departments now that are turning their budgeting around and showing positive results such as that. It is a positive although not huge result at last; it is a move in the right direction. Only \$4 million is attributable to an increase in the transportation charge, so the rest of that has been an increase in business. We have sold 160 petajoules of gas to ICI, which did concern me, but I welcomed it because it has not affected the possibility of our getting a petrochemical plant in the future. I am still hanging out for that one, though, hoping that, when we get our act together and we have that bipartisan support, we can eventually add so much value to our raw product, particularly our gas.

The tioxide plant in Whyalla is something the member for Giles would know all about. I am very concerned that that proposal still hangs around without a result. I have noted that the company is concerned about a continuing depressed market, as the world market prices are not very good. Also, the company has a choice between Whyalla and Malaysia and is evaluating the best and most economic area in which to produce. The Malaysian Government offers incentives, which our Federal Government does not offer. How often have we seen this? Once again, we trade with our hands behind our back. Our farmers have been doing this for 30 years and now our miners are doing it because we are unable to give incentives to these companies to set up here in South Australia. If any region in Australia needs jobs and needs this plant, it is Whyalla.

I know that the bigger the plant the more workers who will live there and the fewer votes we will get, but is that not the story of Tom Playford and how he built South Australia? He created jobs; he created Elizabeth. He brought General Motors-Holden's here and got this State rolling. It did, in effect, cost him Government, but that did not worry him. He was an honourable man and he built this State up. It is a pity that we do not have more of that style of politics here today. We really need this type of industry, and it is a disgrace that we cannot get out there and say to the Malaysians, 'We want this industry and this is what we will do for it.' We are doing nothing, and if that tioxide plant goes to Malaysia I will be very disappointed. Any industry for our regional centres in South Australia must be sought after—and sought after with great zeal, energy, effort and resources. We need that plant. I offer this company every encouragement that I can to come to South Australia.

I said in the Estimates Committees how critical a position we were in because of the weather. We were within a week of total devastation in this State. Six days passed, and we

were blessed with approximately 10 millimetres, or 40 points, of rain across the State. It gave us a few more days to hope for a reasonable result. Much of the State, but not all of it, received rains amounting to about 20 millimetres. Parts of the peninsula, areas near Port Pirie and the Mallee missed out. There was an inch virtually across the State, and now 10 days later you would not believe the difference it has made. The crops are far from average, but at least the farmers can get out there and have options: they can cut hay, for instance. The general feeling among the rural people is so much more positive and they have so much more faith that they can continue on.

In this game you seem to just get over one problem and you have another one. Who would have thought that we would have the horrendous frosts that we have had in the past week? So many areas of the State have been frosted out. I speak of a belt of land extending from Port Pirie through Wanderah and Port Broughton to Bute. They lost almost all their legumes with the frost, experiencing a 100 per cent wipe out in some places. They are trying to recoup their losses by baling their pea straw and making hay out of it. However, it is amazing what rain in this State can do to people's attitudes in such a short time. Unfortunately, when you think you are out of the woods the weather gets you again and you are back where you started.

As the Minister said today, the prices offered for our rural product are very good, but this brings me to the next concern I have: they are so good that this country could be short of food. Who would have thought that of Australia? The farmers and bulk handling authorities throughout Australia do not hold the supplies they used to hold. In biblical stories they used to hold enough grain in the gallery for the dry times—for three years. We have not been able to afford to do that and have not had the carry-over stocks. Now this country is perilously low in food. We say we can go and buy it, but as soon as we go on the world market what will be the prices, from whom will we buy and what will we buy? It is just as well that South Australia grows as much wheat per capita as any State in Australia by pure luck of the weather but also by good farming practices, thanks again to the department.

It worries me that we have to put away reserves not only for the animals (much of the animal livestock is fed in feed lots) but also for people who have got used to eating only prime hard wheat, bread with the maximum crust and the maximum rising in it. Our people are very spoilt, always being able to eat the premium product. The way we are going we will only have feed wheat left. Try to make bread out of feed wheat: it is more like damper than bread. It may come down to that, but not likely.

In future we have to provide the finance to encourage our boards, the handling authorities or our farmers to store grain for the years when we do not get a crop. With drought like this right across Australia, New South Wales and Queensland are facing horrific situations, half of Victoria is just as bad and three quarters of South Australia is reasonable. It is not average, but not far away from it in many areas. We have to make sure that we do not go through this process again. We have to put away the acorn, as the squirrel would say, for the day when we do not have any food. It could be a serious problem.

In the Estimates Committee, the Department of Primary Industries and its low morale was referred to at length. This matter concerns me greatly and it was discussed at length. The problem is that, under the previous Government (I am not being political) we had an extensive review (an ODR)

within the department, causing massive upheavals. Many departmental officers did not know what was their role or where they were going. We then had a change of Government. We have dual management in the department under PISA and SARDI, and that has been confusing. The previous Minister, Lynn Arnold, set this up. I do not know why he did that, but he has left us a dilemma and, until we can solve this management problem, it will always be with us. The Minister is getting close to solving it. When you have people in the regions like Clare with 14 employees, some employed under PISA line and some under SARDI, in the rural research unit it is very confusing.

The decision was made under the Clare operation not to restructure and move field crops into Clare. Personally I was not happy with that decision, but the Minister stated clearly that we could not afford it. I accepted that but am very disappointed that the work done by the previous Minister with all the effort that went in was not proceeded with. I hold hope for the future that, when we get the system up and going and have spare funds, we will again look towards continuing that project.

Many other projects at the moment are giving rural people much confidence. The farm hand operation is a direct hand-out to battling farming families. It is a fantastic gesture by people, charities and the Federal Government to hand money to battling farmers without a means test, by simply making a telephone call to a councillor. They know who are the battling farmers. Up to \$12 000 can be granted, and many people are giving so much time, effort and money as volunteers for the project. The Adelaide Central Mission, now Mission SA, is helping as well, because we have a lot of hardship in the rural areas.

Referring to the agricultural bureaux mentioned in the Estimates, I am glad that the Minister has recognised them as being vital to the extension of our research work in South Australia. As long as I am in Parliament I will ensure that that activity is at the forefront of the department's operations. I welcome the programs the agriculture bureaux are able to use to assist researchers through crop rotations and the right rotations group.

When we have had an average of 7.5 to eight inches of rain this year and have crops that could yield up to a tonne an acre, that is unbelievable. It is unheard of anywhere else in the world to grow such crops with so little rain, and it is possible because our farmers are so smart. They are smart because they have been trained by our departmental people, including people I have named previously, such as Reg French and Albert Rovira. They are clever people, and this information has got down to the farmers through agricultural bureaux, which have played a large part in the extension of work and helped with the trialing. The proof is out there now. Anybody going up those roads will see pretty good crops. When you consider that we have had 7.5 to eight inches of rain, when the average is 16 inches, it is fantastic. I pay the highest tribute to our extension workers and departmental people. Although they may have low morale, I want them to know that we as Parliamentarians appreciate what they have done, because the proof is out in the paddock. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will try to keep my comments brief because my colleagues on this side have done their bit in exposing a number of points of the Government's hypocrisy with respect to its budget for the forthcoming 12 months, as was further exposed with respect

to the Estimates Committees. I was fairly impressed with the Estimates Committees (it is the first year that I have been on the Committees) by the level of work done by the various departments and by some of the Ministers. I cannot speak about all Ministers, as I was only on several committees that were held.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The worst performance, unfortunately, was by the Treasurer, but he had to defend the indefensible with respect to his department.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: His interjections strain my good feelings towards him at this late hour. I also place on the record—and it does come under the Estimates in so far as salaries for parliamentarians and the like are concerned—my appreciation for the work of Lynn Arnold, our former Leader and a former Premier, and a member of this House for some 15 years. I had the pleasure of working with Mr Arnold only from 11 December. In so far as the Parliament is concerned, I found him extremely honest, forthright and a pleasure to work with. I found that to be the case when I was President of the Labor Party for 12 months, ending in August this year, and when he was the parliamentary Leader of the Party. During this time I had a great deal to do with him. Within the forums of our Party many difficult issues had to be confronted and unpalatable decisions made amongst the heartland of our constituencies, in particular the trade union movement. Nonetheless, he put the interests of this State first and foremost in his deliberations, notwithstanding the flak that he copped from some of our supporters, in particular in our heartland.

It is very easy to play up to your constituencies, your natural supporters, but the real test of statesmanship—or statespersonship I guess these days, and particularly this week—is being able to stand up to those you most like, admire and respect and say, 'I believe that in the interests of this State and our community we should take a decision which is at variance to the point of view of those who have been our strongest supporters.' I believe that that is the mark of a true statesman. Lynn Arnold displayed that, particularly in his time as Leader of the Opposition and Premier.

I now turn to the former leader of the Legislative Council for the Labor Party, Chris Sumner. I do not want to go through his history, which my Leader went through in great detail, and properly so, at the time of the joint sitting of the Parliament early this afternoon, when we elected his successor. Suffice to say that I have known Chris Sumner since 1968 when I was an 18 year old activist within the Young Labor Association. He appeared at my parent's house where I was living at that time. I think I was actually 17; I have aged myself by one year. He was the campaign director for Terry McRae, a former Speaker of this House. I had the pleasure to be Chris Sumner's campaign director for the then seat of Torrens in 1973 and have had a fair bit to do with him over the years in his parliamentary career.

In one sense I would put Chris Sumner in the same category as Lynn Arnold with respect to his dedication to the State. He was never a member of any faction in the Labor Party, and he was proud of that, as was Lynn Arnold. He was able to achieve very senior positions within our Party not by being a member of any faction but by sheer ability, and by being prepared to say unpalatable but honest things that people would prefer not to hear but which he believed were in the best interests of the Party and the State. Rather than earning the enmity of other members of the Labor Party who

might have supported a different point of view to himself, he incurred their respect. They knew that when he told them something he meant it and that he would stick by it, and he argued from a position of principle.

As the current Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council put it, or it may have been the Hon. Anne Levy in another place this afternoon, he will be a person sorely missed in this Parliament. I will not speak any further on Chris Sumner. I could go on for ages, but I would merely be repeating—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is really under a misapprehension. The Chair has been very tolerant for the past six minutes. The subject is really the budget as it emerged from the Estimates. I ask the honourable member to return to that.

Mr CLARKE: I appreciate that, Sir. I address this issue in the sense of the budget line for the Parliament, Sir. Consequently, if one draws a very small bow one can see the connection. I welcome my colleague, the former State Secretary of the Labor Party, Mr Terry Cameron, who today was appointed in Mr Sumner's place. I will speak more of him at another time. He has been a great supporter of mine, as I have been of him. He is a person we will hear a lot more of within this Parliament over the years. Members opposite will regret his entrance into the Parliament on the basis of the abilities and skills he will bring to work on behalf of the Labor Party and which will assist in driving the usurpers from office.

I turn now to WorkCover. During the Estimates, the Minister half hinted that there would be a review of those injured workers who have been on WorkCover benefits for more than two years, as part of the drive to reduce costs. The difficulty I have with that is that the Government's approach is a knee-jerk reaction. There are a number of other steps to control the cost of WorkCover, and the most fundamental and seemingly the most obvious would be to reduce the number of claims in the workplace. I do not believe that we should tear away at our social fabric and in particular WorkCover by telling those individuals who are in most need of support that they can be thrown on the scrap heap and reduced to living on social security payments rather than on income maintenance as part of WorkCover. This is particularly important given that in 1986 the trade union movement, on behalf of employees in this State, agreed to forgo common law claims for negligence on the part of employers in return for income maintenance.

A simple example is workers from non-English speaking backgrounds. They make up a significant proportion of blue-collar workers in industries which are most susceptible to injury. I believe that WorkCover should establish an advisory committee of persons from non-English speaking backgrounds. Last Thursday I attended a conference in the WorkCover building. It was conducted by the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and looked at injuries in the workplace amongst employers from non-English speaking backgrounds. As a person from an Anglo-Saxon background, culture and language, I did not appreciate that in Australia we have 50 or more different phrases for the term 'Keep Out'. For example, 'Entry Prohibited', 'Danger'; and a red circle with a slash through it with a figure of a person indicating danger and no entry beyond a particular point.

Those of us from an Anglo-Saxon background and culture readily understand the different phraseology and readily understand the signage and language used. However, if you are from Cambodia or Vietnam, or from a range of other

communities, what is depicted on a sign may not mean what it appears to us to mean. One of the examples used by a speaker at the conference was a Vietnamese worker who had his arm amputated after it was crushed by a machine in a textile factory in Victoria. The supervisor said to the worker, 'Stay clear of the machine, okay.' After the tragic accident, the amputation of the arm and an interview with the injured worker, it was found that he interpreted those words as meaning, 'Stay put, okay.' Now, that may seem to be a simple thing, but it can create an enormous cost to the community generally and more particularly to the injured worker.

I believe that WorkCover, by establishing an advisory committee for workers from non-English speaking backgrounds, could act proactively and not wait for people to knock on its door. The 'Stop the Pain' campaign currently being run in the media is in the English language. To my knowledge it is not being run in the ethnic press and it is not being run in languages other than English. Yet, workers from non-English speaking backgrounds account for 40 per cent or more of the WorkCover claims in the blue-collar area.

It is those types of initiatives that I think WorkCover and the Government could grab and thereby make significant inroads into accident prevention in South Australia and significantly reduce the cost of WorkCover without having to cut the benefits to those long-term injured persons.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I will certainly be following that through. I was at that meeting, and I will be taking it up with the Minister. I am not in any way criticising the Minister. He and I were at the same meeting but, because I am not a Minister at this time, I was able to stay a little longer. He had to leave because of pressing commitments, and I make no criticism of him in that respect. However, I will certainly take up the issue with him.

Another point that I would like to raise relates to Adelaide Airport. What surprises me in relation to the extension of the runway is the churlishness of the Premier on this matter. The Premier recently said that the Opposition was irrelevant and all the rest of it; nonetheless he wrote to us asking for assistance because we had a national conference of the Labor Party in terms of the privatisation, as it was termed, of our major airports. Of course, we in the Labor Party in South Australia, despite the churlishness of the Premier, delivered for the people of South Australia. We will see a significant upgrade of Adelaide Airport, not because of any assistance, advice, comfort or bipartisan support from the Premier, but purely because the Labor Opposition in South Australia, acting on behalf of and in the interests of South Australians, put the interests of our State first rather than embarking on a political point-scoring exercise.

Of course, the Premier has forgotten that he won the election in December and his comments are more attuned to those of the Leader of an Opposition rather than a Premier of this State. Rather than welcoming the bipartisan approach of the Leader of the Opposition in securing this extension in the interests of South Australia in respect of Adelaide Airport, I remember only too vividly watching the Premier on the television news services commenting on what was happening in Hobart and about the efforts of the Leader of the Opposition in that area. He said that the Leader of the Opposition was looking extremely piqued and upset. With respect to a vital part of our economy, as the Premier himself has admitted, far from the Leader of the Opposition's being irrelevant, the Premier looked totally irrelevant. The Premier

was a bystander in that exercise. He would have won far more votes had he acted as a statesperson and welcomed the Leader of the Opposition's initiative and congratulated him for achieving what he could not achieve because he was not a member of the Labor Party in that exercise. Of course, that requires an element of statespersonship that unfortunately the Premier is incapable of displaying.

In conclusion, I want to raise the issue of the status of women. Of course, we have had the conference held in Adelaide over the past few days, and the Labor Party's national conference decision to bring in a 35 per cent quota with respect to women members. We in the South Australian Labor Party are very proud because we introduced that rule well before it became part of our national rules. We are not ashamed of bringing in that quota system.

Of course, with the election of Trish White as the new member for Taylor within the next few weeks we will achieve and in fact surpass that quota—we will be the first State in Australia, so far as the Labor Party is concerned, to exceed the quota. I might add that the Labor Party in this State has preselected women for safe seats. I note that, other than the member for Flinders and the member for Coles, if one looks at the rest of the rural rump within the Liberal Party one sees that it has achieved nowhere near the preselection levels that we have achieved for women in the—

Mr BASS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Of what relevance is this to the matter being debated?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is quite correct: it has very little relevance to the debate.

Mr CLARKE: It has a lot of relevance. The Minister for the Status of Women and the Government's decision to abolish the budget line with respect to women's positions in each of the departments make it very relevant. That was a Government decision; and it was the subject of questioning at the Estimates Committees. So, my speech is on all fours in that respect—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Of course, the Deputy Premier would be embarrassed. What we have demonstrated in the Labor Party, and in particular at the conference, is how progressive we have been in this area, and what a bunch of troglodytes and neanderthals the Liberal Party has been, not only in this State but elsewhere, with respect to recognising the role of women in our society. We have been prepared—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: If the member for Unley wants to find out what a neanderthal is I suggest that he looks in the mirror and he will see the perfect description. I am saying that we in the Labor Party are immensely proud of the role that we have taken in this area. I am sure that the member for Coles would congratulate us as well if it were not for the thuggery by the male-dominated Liberal Party, which would intimidate her from being able to express those sentiments openly in this House about the progressive role that the Labor Party has taken in advancing women's interests and rights within this Parliament. What I also find very churlish is that the Minister for the Status of Women in this Parliament does not even have the courtesy, when she appears at these conferences, to recognise who brought the conferences to South Australia in the first instance: it was a Labor Government.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I move:

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 12 October at 2 p.m.