

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 7 June 1995

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

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

RIVERLAND NUCLEAR FREE ZONE

A petition signed by 2 885 residents of South Australia requesting that the House declare the Riverland a nuclear free zone was presented by Mr Andrew.

Petition received.

EUTHANASIA

A petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia requesting that the House oppose any measure to legislate for voluntary euthanasia was presented by Mr Cummins.

Petition received.

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia requesting that the House maintain the present homicide law, which excludes euthanasia, while maintaining the common law right of patients to refuse medical treatment was presented by Mr Cummins.

Petition received.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier)**: I wish to make a ministerial statement. The South Australian Government has been closely monitoring recent developments in relation to the ban by the Federal Government on the construction of a bridge to link Hindmarsh Island with the mainland. As these developments have unfolded, we have become particularly concerned about the extent to which they are undermining the credibility of processes to identify and protect Aboriginal heritage, and causing division and tension within Aboriginal communities. Yesterday, I received a copy of a letter sent to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Tickner.

The letter is signed by Mr Doug Milera as secretary of the Lower Murray Heritage Committee. The letter raises further serious questions about the report prepared last year by Professor Cheryl Saunders upon which Mr Tickner's decision to ban the bridge was based. Mr Milera is mentioned in the Saunders' report as is his wife, Sarah Milera. Indeed, Sarah Milera was pivotal to the provision of information to Professor Saunders about 'women's business'. Mrs Milera has made public statements today alleging that the claims of 'women's business' which caused Mr Tickner to ban the bridge were concocted.

I am sure all members of the House will appreciate that this is now a most serious state of affairs. This morning, I spoke to the Prime Minister's office indicating the South Australian Government believed action must now be taken

in the light of recent events. I have written to the Prime Minister today in the following terms:

Dear Prime Minister,

I refer to the latest developments in relation to the decisions by your Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Tickner, to ban work on the construction of a bridge to link Hindmarsh Island to the South Australian mainland for 25 years. These developments raise serious questions about the conclusions of the report presented to the Minister by Professor Cheryl Saunders in July of 1994 on which his decision to ban the bridge was based.

However, of even greater concern is the extent to which this issue is now causing division within Aboriginal communities and has the potential to cause even more damage to the credibility of processes to identify and protect Aboriginal heritage. Yesterday, I received a letter from Mr Doug Milera, Secretary of the Lower Murray Heritage Committee. Mr Milera is mentioned in the report by Professor Saunders as having visited Hindmarsh Island with Professor Saunders while she was considering the 'women's business'. [Page 27 of the report.] I attach a copy of Mr Milera's letter to me. As you will see, Mr Milera, once a strong opponent of the bridge, now says it should proceed. Further, he calls into question the credibility of the process which resulted in the ban on the bridge. Mr Milera states: 'My wife and I were swept along with the current and we got in so deep it was hard to get out again.'

Mr Milera's wife is Sarah Milera. Professor Saunders reported that Mrs Milera, together with Doreen Kartinyeri, was pivotal to the provision of information to her about 'women's business'. Sarah and Doreen organised a meeting of 25 Ngarrindjeri women at Goolwa on 20 June 1994 which Professor Saunders said 'was central to my ability to report on the significance of the area for Aboriginal people'. [Quoted on page 15 of the Saunders report.] Professor Saunders also met Mrs Milera on 22 June and 24 June [as reported on page 12]. Mrs Milera has made public statements today alleging that the claims of 'women's business' were concocted. When I made representations to you and Mr Tickner last year about the implications of a Federal decision to stop the bridge, I referred to the concerns of South Australia about the manner in which information about the 'women's business' had come forward only at a very late stage, and about the damage this would do to the credibility of Aboriginal heritage processes. It gives me no comfort now to point out that my warnings have been justified by subsequent events.

It is quite clear that this issue is causing increasing tensions amongst Aboriginal communities, a fact confirmed today by Mr Garnet Wilson, OAM, Chair of the South Australian State Aboriginal Heritage Committee. In the national interest, the South Australian Government believes your Government should now immediately act to revoke the declaration made by your Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on 10 July 1994 to stop this bridge. Following that decision last year, my Government has been working with Aboriginal communities in South Australia to address the issues it raised about the process to identify and protect Aboriginal heritage. We have made significant headway but South Australia remains gravely concerned that the credibility of these processes, not only here in South Australia but nationally, will continue to suffer while the impasse over the Hindmarsh Island bridge remains. I am sure you will agree with me that such a state of affairs is jeopardising the process of reconciliation. Since coming to office the South Australian Government has worked in a sensitive manner with the Aboriginal communities affected by the Hindmarsh Island bridge. We will continue to do so following any revocation of the Federal ban on the bridge.

There have been calls for a public inquiry into this matter. I make it clear that the South Australian Government's preferred option continues to be a revocation of the ban on construction of the bridge as the best means of upholding the credibility of Aboriginal heritage processes and preventing further division within the Aboriginal communities. However, in the event that you are not prepared to revoke the ban within the next 48 hours, I must advise that the South Australian Government will consider other options to prevent further damage being done to Aboriginal interests and communities.

I signed that letter to the Prime Minister and sent it off a few moments ago. This issue is now one of grave concern to my Government in terms of Aboriginal heritage issues and the relations within the Aboriginal communities here in South Australia. We believe that it is time to resolve those issues to the satisfaction of the parties involved as quickly as possible and to make sure that those divisions are not allowed to

proceed any further. Therefore, unless there is a response from the Prime Minister within 48 hours, the South Australian Government will consider what further options and actions it should therefore take.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Conveyancers—General.
 Land Agents—General.
 Land Valuers—Qualifications.
 Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—
 Various.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Petroleum Products Regulation Act—General.
 Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of
 South Australia Act—Election of the Board.

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

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—Regulation—
 Various.

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

History Trust of South Australia Act—Regulations—
 General.
 Statutory Authorities Review Committee—Response to
 Report on ETSA and board membership.

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Local Government Act—Cemetery.
 West Terrace Cemetery Act—General.

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

Rules of Racing—Racing Act—Greyhound Racing
 Board—Sires and Brood Bitches.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, for the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Fisheries Act—Regulations—Fish Processors.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, for the Minister for Mines and Energy (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
 Mining Act—Application Fee.
 Pipelines Authority Act—Form of Pipeline.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the twenty-sixth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Order! I notice in the Gallery members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Pacific Island Parliament study tour. I welcome them to the South Australian Parliament and wish them well during the rest of their visit to South Australia.

QUESTION TIME

EDS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier confirm that the EDS contract will include the provision of information technology to the South Australian Water Corporation and to ETSA and, if not, why not? Last October the Premier told the House that the EWS and ETSA data would be formally put into the system owned and operated by EDS.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer is 'Yes,' it will include the data processing for that area, but I do not think that any further detail should be given at this stage.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Has the Premier been made aware of the further public statements this morning by Mr Doug Milera, Secretary of the Lower Murray Aboriginal Heritage Committee, now known as the Ngarrindjeri Heritage Committee? The print and electronic media have recently been reporting that Mrs Sarah Milera and Mr Doug Milera have admitted their respective parts in generating interest in the women's business and described how they reluctantly became caught up in the momentum of action which followed. Members will also remember the contents of a letter from Mr John McHughes to Aboriginal Affairs Minister Tickner, which I read to the House last week and which explained how he has got it wrong.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, I am aware of what Doug Milera said on Keith Conlon's program this morning and, of course, I received a copy of a letter from Doug Milera yesterday. Yesterday, Mr Milera, as Secretary of the Lower Murray Aboriginal Heritage Committee, sent a letter to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Robert Tickner, and I should like to bring to the attention of the House the last paragraph of that letter, as follows:

Now is the time to speak out and I feel the bridge would be a good thing for the whole community, both blacks and whites, and the bridge would do more for reconciliation than what the Government is doing.

That letter is signed by Doug Milera. This morning, Doug Milera said some things on air that disturbed me considerably, and I know they disturbed many others, including the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in South Australia. Our concern in all of this is, first, we do not want to see the Aboriginal community torn apart by claim and counterclaim. Secondly, enormous damage is being done to Aboriginal heritage issues as a result of the question marks raised about this particular issue in relation to Hindmarsh Island bridge. Doug Milera said on air this morning that he was once a very strong opponent to the bridge. He said also:

Let everybody in South Australia know that I was one of the instigators who created the story to stop the bridge.

He went on to say:

The women's business is all fabricated.

He further said:

This debacle has gone on for far too long. My wife and I have been under tremendous stress.

Here is someone in Doug Milera, whom I can recall from my own visits to Goolwa and statements in the Goolwa area and who effectively led the protest against the construction of the bridge. Through his wife, he was also very closely involved in the preparation of the Professor Saunders report which

went to the Federal Minister and which became the basis for placing a 25 year ban on the bridge.

It is quite clear that both Doug Milera and Sarah Milera are saying that the story concerning women's business was concocted. It therefore raises further doubts, and this is on top of a series of very similar claims made by other women who were involved with the meeting at which the women's issues were outlined to Professor Saunders. Quite clearly there is now enormous doubt about the claims that have been made and the whole basis of the Saunders report. Of course, that report, and particularly the issue of women's business, was the entire foundation of the ban imposed by Mr Tickner.

My concern relates to the enormous damage that has been done to Aboriginal heritage issues, along with the standing of Aboriginal heritage issues within the broader South Australian community, and the ill feeling that is obviously developing within that Aboriginal community itself, the Ngarindjeri community. Quite clearly the Federal Government cannot afford to stand back any longer and allow those divisions to continue to fester. In fact, it is more than a fester—it is now an open division within the community—and, very importantly, it is now causing enormous damage publicly right across Australia to the issue of reconciliation and Aboriginal heritage items.

Therefore, I reiterate the action I have outlined this afternoon in my ministerial statement: I call on the Prime Minister to immediately remove the ban on the building of the bridge and, if he fails to do that within the next 48 hours, the South Australian Government will consider other options open to it.

EDS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is again directed to the Premier. Will the delayed EDS contract be signed this month as announced by the Premier on 20 April, and are the economic benefits negotiated by the Premier last year with EDS still in place? Last October the Premier told Parliament:

We will benefit from the \$500 million of additional economic activity brought to South Australia by the way of this contract.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will not talk publicly about the negotiations that are going on. It would be inappropriate to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: When you are involved in commercial negotiations, to talk about them publicly would undermine your own position. We certainly do not intend to do that. The honourable member will just have to wait and see.

STATE TAXES

Mr ROSSI (Lee): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What action is the Government taking to ensure that it collects all the taxes and revenue due to it?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: This is an issue for those people who obey the law and comply with the taxation laws and regulations. It is aggravating and frustrating to find on occasion that some people working in the industry are not doing the same thing and, of course, are obtaining advantage because of lack of compliance with the laws of the land. From a Treasury point of view I am not amused, either, if revenue required and due to the Government by this sector is not being paid. A significant restructuring of the State Taxation

Office is taking place at this time to focus on key areas where we believe we can do much better in terms of revenue gathering processes and to make at least the compliance laws much more easily understood and met by the taxpayers, particularly those in the business sector.

There are four major items in terms of compliance: first, those who do not understand the law, and we are putting effort into voluntary compliance through educating taxpayers and publishing circulars and rulings for as many people as possible; secondly, monitoring compliance levels and enforcing payments of correct amounts of tax where breaches of the law are detected; thirdly, identifying loopholes, ambiguity and uncertainty in legislation and policies; and, fourthly, uncovering avoidance and evasion methods through investigations. To undertake this there has been an increase of 23 in the staff in this area. That will change as the need changes, but it is believed that there is a need for an enormous amount of effort sooner rather than later. In relation to the net benefit, at this stage we are being very conservative and looking at an extra \$3.6 million above the salaries and wages associated with that effort, and we believe that it will be much higher.

We will be conducting a number of programs, targeting financial institutions duty and looking at compliance in relation to motor vehicle stamp duty, at licensed premises and at areas where we believe there has been consistent underpayment of tax. Of course, penalties will be levied on those who have transgressed. It is important for the taxpayers of South Australia to be assured that we are collecting what is due to them and to the Government. We intend to pursue that with considerable vigour so that everyone believes that the system is fair.

PRISON SITE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): In order to ensure adequate public consultation, will the Minister for Correctional Services release the short list of sites for the new 500 cell prison to be built in the metropolitan area and managed by a private operator? Yesterday the Government confirmed that it was close to choosing a site for a new 500 cell prison in the metropolitan area and the Minister revealed that the Government had a short list of sites—which I understand may include one in the electorate of Bright.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: They are really short on questions today. In the 1994-95 budget, money was allocated to find land for a new prison, that being a continuation of a process started by the previous Labor Government. When a final site has been determined by Cabinet, it will be revealed; it is inappropriate to release information on sites in advance. One thing that I can say, and I am pleased to report to the House, is that the Government has been surprised by the large number of councils, in particular regional councils, that have approached Government seeking an opportunity to have the new facility built in their area. Indeed, some of those councils have already put their desire on the public record, and the Government has been appreciative of those local government bodies coming forward and expressing their interest in having that development occur within their area.

One thing we have been insistent upon is that the site for the new prison be in or near the Adelaide metropolitan area. I can assure the Deputy Leader that the site will be revealed well before the next State election if he wants it on the board before then.

CHINESE HOUSING

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations provide details of a project involving the Housing Trust that he has been working on with the Chinese housing sector?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: This is another little bit of good news for South Australia. I am pleased to inform the House that the Housing Trust, together with principal consultants Price Waterhouse Urwick, has just completed a four month implementation phase of an Australian International Development Assistance Bureau funded \$.5 million consultancy project for the World Bank in China. This Adelaide based consortium has provided computer based, Chinese language financial management systems for housing management companies in Beijing, Yantai, Ningbo and Chengdu as part of China's Housing and Social Security Systems Reform project. The reform project, using loan funds from the World Bank of approximately US\$350 million, is intended to assist manufacturing and other enterprises in China to become competitive in the world market by enabling them to transfer responsibility for providing and managing housing (as well as social security and health care) for their workers to newly formed housing management companies. This allows the businesses in China to concentrate on core activities.

The technical assistance provided includes the development of financial management systems to suit local needs as well as systems implementation and training of staff in each city. Participation in this project illustrates that the public and private sectors have expertise in a number of complementary areas with scope for cooperative arrangements to promote that expertise internationally. Following on from this project there may be other opportunities for further participation in World Bank initiatives in the Asia region.

PRISON PRIVATISATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Correctional Services concerned by the record of Group 4, the private UK company he has contracted to run Mount Gambier Prison, and is the Minister aware that in the first 15 days of the company's contract to provide prisoner escorts in the north of England seven prisoners either escaped or were mistakenly released by Group 4? On the first day of its contract, one man under Group 4 supervision ran from the courts. On the second day a prisoner kicked his way out of a prison van. On day four a prisoner was accidentally released. On day five another prisoner fled from a van. On day six another prisoner was mistakenly released. On day 11 a 17-year old under Group 4 supervision escaped from the dock. And on day 12 another prisoner fled from a court in Sheffield. Group 4 had a strike rate of one escape every three days, and the Minister wants it to come to South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the House wants Question Time to continue, I expect members to comply with Standing Order 142, or Standing Order 137 will be applied.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition stands in this House to muddy the representation of a company and would not have the courage to make the statements that the Labor Party has been trying to circulate outside this Parliament. In this Parliament we deal in facts. I share with the Leader of the Opposition and the

Parliament comments from the House of Commons' *Hansard* of 21 April 1995. These comments were put on the record in the House of Commons by the British Government and are as follows:

In 1994-95, the total number of escapes from prison and escorts outside prison, as a proportion of the average prison population, was 32 per cent lower than 1993-94 and 49 per cent lower than 1992-93, the last year before the Prison Service became an agency. The total of 202 escapes from prison and escorts in 1994-95 includes 15 from the privately managed court escort and custody service—compared to 26 in 1993-94 and one from the four contracted-out establishments.

The rate of escapes continued to decline during 1994-95, and in the second half of the year—October 1994 to March 1995—the rate of escapes was 67 per cent lower than the same period in 1992-93. . . there were only three escapes from the privately managed court escort and custody service—less than 10 per cent of the number under the previous arrangements provided by the police and the Prison Service.

I repeat that the United Kingdom private sector prisoner transport service escape rate is less than 10 per cent of what it was when it was run by the British Government service. Let us now look at the reason that many of those escapes occurred in the early days of private sector involvement in the United Kingdom.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the Opposition will listen: the British Government required the private sector to utilise faulty prison vans—vans from which the windows could easily be kicked out—and those vans have now been changed. The contract no longer requires the company to use those vans; it uses its own.

Let us look at what Group 4 has been contracted to do here in South Australia—not to run a prisoner transport service but to run a prison. Let us look at the escape record from its prisons. It has two prisons in the United Kingdom, from one of which it has had no escapes at all. The other prison has been operating for three years. It has had two escapes—two escapes from a 320-bed prison, or an escape ratio over three years of one escape per 160 prisoners. Over that same three-year period here in South Australia, the Mount Gambier prison has an escape rate of one to eight prisoners compared with one to 160 and, compared with the whole prison system, a rate of one to 19.

Group 4's record far exceeds that of the current prison service here in South Australia. It is far superior. As for its contract, if escapes from the Mount Gambier prison exceed those of the present prison system, and far below that, of two in any one year, it pays for the rest. No other prison in the country presently has to pay for its escapes. Group 4 would have to.

In terms of operating costs, we have already advised the House that we have cut the cost of keeping a person in gaol by 24 per cent in 18 months. Group 4's contract price is for a cut of much more than 25 per cent below that new cost. That is a good deal all round for South Australian taxpayers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for continuing to interject. The honourable member for Hartley.

WORKCOVER

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Spence, if I heard him correctly, that if he continues to object or make snide comments in relation to rulings by the Chair he will be named. The honourable member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. What progress has been made by WorkCover in the contracting out of WorkCover claims management?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As this House would know, early in August there will be the total outsourcing of the management claims by WorkCover. One of the initial exercises was to ask all employers in the State whether they would nominate insurance agents that they would take up. I am pleased to announce that in the first round 57 per cent of employers, which in essence represents 50 per cent of the market share, have already nominated the companies with which they wish to go.

It is a very satisfying position at this stage. The new reminder notices go out early this week to encourage the rest of the employers to nominate their insurance company. The reason is that early in August WorkCover Corporation will allocate the balance to private insurers. I encourage all employers to nominate, because at the end of the day they may not wish to go to the companies allocated. We believe that this change involving outsourcing has been thoroughly endorsed by the private sector. We have had an amazing response in such a short period, and it will enable us to ensure that the WorkCover cost to employers is reduced quickly.

PRISON PRIVATISATION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Correctional Services concerned about the \$17.6 million blow-out in the cost of running Britain's privatised gaol, a facility run by Group 4, the company which the Minister has contracted to run Mount Gambier Prison? Is he confident a blow-out will not occur at Mount Gambier? In February 1995 the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee found the cost of running The Wolds remand gaol was £8 million more than the original bid made by Group 4. The bid was £21.5 million over five years but the actual cost is estimated to be £29.87 million, a blow-out of 39 per cent.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Again, we have a case of the Labor Party grabbing the first lot of the news and not grabbing the reply.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If members listen, I will tell them what happened in the House of Commons after that occurred. The information to which the honourable member refers involves a question asked by a Labor Party member on the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, a Labor Party member who did not understand that the contract that the British Government had with Group 4 did not include the complete cost of all operations. What that Labor Party member who asked the question did not understand was that the contract in the United Kingdom with Group 4 did not include the complete cost of all operations. What that Labor Party member asking the question also did not understand was that the United Kingdom contract with Group 4 did not include the cost of electricity, gas, water and maintenance of the prison building. Those items were not included in the cost.

What he further did not understand was that the British Government had extended the contract with Group 4, had extended the contract to cover more prisons and, further,

extended the contract to take the institution from being a remand institution to an institution housing both sentenced and remand prisoners. He did not understand the contract or the figures behind it. After those articles were run in the British press following the Public Accounts Committee issue, retracting letters were then run in the British media detailing the true situation. The contract here is for a five-year period and it is subject to an increase against CPI and wage movements. It is a firm contract. If the company does not meet the contract, it loses it: it is that simple. The company has an obligation to meet the contract that is being set for it here in South Australia.

WATER RATES

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Can the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House whether there is any truth in the current comparisons being made between South Australian water prices and those in the United Kingdom? The ALP has begun an expensive advertising program as part of a campaign against the future restructuring of South Australia's water industry. This advertising appears to draw upon comparisons of the privatisation of the entire British water industry with the contracting out of only the Adelaide metropolitan area water supply and treatment where the State Government retains ownership of the asset and controls prices.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let us look at the truth of the matter in relation to prices, which is something the Opposition has not pursued. Truth number 1: we are not privatising or selling our water, as even one ALP advertisement admits when it says, 'Oh, we are lucky; we still own our water'—and so will South Australians after this outsourcing contract. Truth number 2: water and sewerage services in Adelaide are cheaper than in any other capital city in Australia. According to the Agricultural and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand, in 1993-94 the average annual cost of water and sewerage services per household in Adelaide was \$469; in Sydney it was \$490; and in Melbourne it was \$562.

Truth number 3: last financial year UK citizens served by North West Water (one of the three bidders in the contract to operate the metropolitan water and sewerage system) paid less for their service than even people in Adelaide: they paid an average of \$398 per household. An ALP advertisement says that we should send some money to Betty's mother to pay the water bill, but the simple fact is that Betty's mother has to send money out here to pay the water bill.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Truth number 4: why do they pay less for water in the UK? Because all over the world the cost of operating water and sewerage services reduces if a private company is contracted to deliver the service to save taxpayers' money while still, in this instance in South Australia, owning the assets. That is good and responsible management of taxpayers' money, and that is what we will do in South Australia to keep the price of essential services where they are at the moment: the lowest in Australia. The campaign being run by the Leader of the Opposition is one of total fear and smear and has no relationship to the truth of the matter. The fact is that citizens in the UK pay less for their service than we do in Adelaide, and we pay less for our service—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:—than any other capital city in Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has answered the question. I suggest to the member for Giles, who has been giving a running commentary during Question Time, that he no longer continue with that practice.

HOSPITAL CARE STUDY

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of the Government's response to the initial findings of the Australian Hospital Care study released last week?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Reynell for her interest in what was a very important study, the first results of which were released last week by the Federal Government. Several years ago the Federal Government commissioned, as part of a study into indemnity insurance, a study of adverse outcomes in Australian hospitals. The cases studied were for the calendar year 1992; 28 sites were selected in New South Wales and South Australia, and a number of hospitals in both States participated in the study.

The study covered a variety of types of hospitals, in both the public and private sectors, and clearly there was an opportunity, because of numbers, to allow an extrapolation from the two States across the whole of the health system of Australia. I note with some surprise and concern that 16 per cent of hospital admissions during 1992 were assessed as in some way involving an adverse outcome. As I said, according to the Federal Minister, that can be regarded as being reflected nationally. If that is the case, that means that 10 000 to 14 000 deaths related to treatment in the health care system may be regarded as being preventable. That is clearly unacceptable.

We must recognise that by definition the index population comprises those who are ill, potentially needing heroic measures to prolong life, and clearly they are in hospital only because of their underlying illness. Nevertheless, Ministers from around Australia, and certainly I and the Government in South Australia, believe that one adverse outcome because of misadventure is one too many, and the aim ought to be none. The Health Ministers' forum last Friday supported the establishment of a national task force to report on the further work that needs to be done to devise strategies to improve the outcomes of the health care system.

That inquiry will be chaired by Dr Bruce Armstrong. At the State level, we had an inkling of the results within South Australia because of the fact that we were participating in the survey and, having an inkling of those results, we had already taken some steps to convene a seminar of key stakeholders to discuss actions forthwith, and that will happen within the next few days. Luckily, one of the authors of the report, Professor Bill Runciman, was available in South Australia as a major player in the Royal Adelaide Hospital anaesthetics and intensive care area, and he will be a participant in the forum.

We have also made plans, at my insistence, to discuss the report at the conference of Health Ministers next week in Alice Springs, and a special report from the authors will address whether anything can be done immediately. However, we do need the support of the professional associations—Governments and administrators can only do

so much. The study found that the leading factors which could alter outcomes and prevent adverse effects are quality assurance and peer review, and that was the situation in about 56 per cent of the cases. Interestingly, the survey is quite specific in saying that the problems are not caused by a lack of resources in the hospital sector.

Indeed, many of the problems arise through an inability or lack of desire to follow recognised protocols; of course, some are caused by human error, and all the legislation in the world will not stop that. Given that the survey said that the problems are not caused by a lack of resources, and there was little evidence of problems caused by lack of hospital staff, I was a little disappointed but not at all surprised to hear the Federal Labor Party candidate for Adelaide, Gail Gago, speaking on television and making a link between hospital deaths and accident and staffing levels. It indicates that, once again, Ms Gago has got things wrong. Health Ministers of all political persuasions across Australia have grasped this nettle.

There has been no political point scoring whatsoever on the matter, even though there have been some opportunities for that. Unfortunately, the Federal ALP candidate for Adelaide could not see the greater picture; she had to go for the political easy grab. I believe that she is disavowing her professional role, and it is a pity she is politicising the ANF. I would once again draw a comparison with Dr Brendan Nelson, who had a role in the AMA. Immediately he was preselected for the seat of Bradfield for the Liberal Party, he resigned his position with the AMA, and I call upon Ms Gago to do exactly the same because, unfortunately, her continued use of her position to take quite clearly partisan political positions is undermining professional nursing.

PRISON PRIVATISATION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Correctional Services concerned by a report from Britain's highly respected Chief Inspector of Prisons, Judge Stephen Tumim, that Group 4's remand prison in the UK offered prisoners the easy life, where prisoners had easy access to hard drugs? In *The Times* of 26 August 1993, Judge Tumim is quoted as saying that prisoners in Group 4's prison at The Wolds near Hull enjoy, and I quote:

A regime of corrupting lethargy in which prisoners lie in bed, bask in the sun, enjoy easy access to hard drugs and ignore high quality education facilities.

The report goes on to state that inmates have repeatedly pleaded not guilty to prolong their stay at The Wolds remand prison and that tables in the visiting room have had to be lowered to stop sexual activity between inmates and visitors. Judge Tumim said, 'For many inmates it is a wholly acceptable life and they are anxious to delay their cases coming to trial.'

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Again, we have a Deputy Leader telling part of the story, and I doubt that the Opposition can produce in this House a single document about any private prison operating about which we are not aware and in which fabricated matters have not been discounted since. That is another document that has since been discounted.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: This is a joke.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Leader of the Opposition interjects, 'This is a joke'. What was a sick joke in this State—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would advise those members who want to continue to disregard the authority of the Chair that they will do so at their own peril. I have given the last warning to the Leader today. I do not want any more interjections when a question is being answered, or I will enforce the Standing Orders. That is not an idle threat.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: What was a sick joke in this State was the fact that under the previous Labor Government it cost 25 per cent more to keep someone in gaol here in South Australia than it did in other States. It was the previous Labor Government which installed a heated swimming pool in the Adelaide Remand Centre and a swimming pool at Port Lincoln prison, which installed glass walled squash courts in Mobilong prison and which became an international laughing stock because of the recreational facilities it provided to prisoners. What is more, Group 4 was one of many British organisations that looked at the prison system in this State and indicated it was an example of what should never happen anywhere else in the world. It was the same Labor Government that built a fine default facility with a five foot fence around it, where prisoners could come and go as they pleased and often had trouble getting back in again, because they were drunk after they had been to the pub. That is the sort of prison that was run under the Labor Government in this State, and that is the sort of prison this Government has been fixing.

That is the system that we have turned around in respect of cost. After our being in government for only 18 months it now costs 24 per cent less to keep someone in gaol here in South Australia than it did under Labor. My department makes no apologies for those cuts in costs; it is proud of them. Only last night my Chief Executive Officer was pleased to be able to tell members of this Parliament in a briefing that the main reason that the change in cost structure was possible was the entry of the private sector into the South Australian prison system. My Chief Executive Officer and departmental staff know full well that the threat of competition has pushed down the price, and competition has now pushed down the price further, so that the taxpayer is spending less on keeping people in prison.

The misinformation about Group 4 was circulated by the British prison officers union. So, we now no longer need to fear the private sector in this State. We have seen the misinformation pushed by the unions. The fact is that after that report was written the British Government awarded yet another prison contract and two more prisoner transport contracts to Group 4, based on the quality of its prison management and its transport service. To put that transport service in context, this is a company that transports in excess of 100 000 prisoners a year—more than are transported in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia put together. It is a company with a good record. The fact is that this is a good decision, which will save taxpayers' money. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to pay far more to keep people in gaol, let him stand up and say that and take the flak.

OLD PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I ask the Premier what parliamentary facilities will be provided and to whom in Old Parliament House and at what cost, and will the facilities include a bridge between Old Parliament House and Parliament House?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: At this stage the estimated cost to do up the whole building and maintain its heritage is \$600 000. In terms of a bridge between the two buildings, if the proposal continues, the bridge that was used by this Parliament for 50 years would be reinstated.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources provide details on moves to increase Aboriginal involvement in national parks? I have been interested in recent comments highlighting the need to improve resources for our national parks, so I ask the Minister specifically whether there are opportunities for Aboriginal involvement.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: To answer the question, yes, there are opportunities, and I am very keen to ensure—

The Hon. R.B. Such: It's a win-win.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is a win-win situation, and I am very keen to ensure that these opportunities are provided for Aboriginal people. I think most members would be aware that providing ample resources for our national parks system is a significant issue. The issue was not addressed by the previous Government and we are very keen to address it in the very near future. The issue has been overlooked, particularly in a State that has more than 20 million hectares of land under the parks and reserves system; that is 20 hectares for every man, woman and child in South Australia under our national parks and wildlife system.

I am keen to promote further involvement by traditional workers. We are already moving to improve and increase programs for Aboriginal involvement in a number of reserves, including the Witjira, Gammon and Coorong national parks, just to name a few. I believe very strongly that traditional owners can play a role, not only in management and interpretation but also in linking our parks system to eco-tourism. I am very keen to see that happen. Funding has been made available in the budget to ensure that that does happen.

As I said previously, our parks possess untapped potential that could and should be at the centre of new promotional opportunities for this State. Certainly, opportunities are there for involvement by Aboriginal people, volunteers and also private operators and private enterprise. I am particularly keen to provide opportunities for Aboriginal involvement as a matter of urgency.

ASBESTOS

Ms WHITE (Taylor): What will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations do to address the huge problem that exists because there is no register of asbestos present in Housing Trust homes? In the six months that I have been a member of this Parliament, several constituents have complained to me about removal or disturbance of asbestos in their Housing Trust accommodation without proper safety procedures. In each case this has arisen because work persons have been unaware of the presence of asbestos. The most recent complaint came to me from a woman whose floor beneath an asbestos backed lino was sanded in her and her baby's presence.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for her question. I thought I answered at length a similar question on this subject within the last week or so. I referred to a pamphlet which the Housing Trust produced and to the fact that, if any tenant finds any asbestos in their

property about which they are concerned, they should contact the regional manager, because we have qualified people who will go in and remove it. If the honourable member has any other question, the procedure is that the Housing Trust will move in and remove any loose asbestos if a tenant is concerned that anything in the property has loose asbestos within it. Of course, if a tenant puts in something which contains asbestos and then moves on, the Housing Trust will have no knowledge of that. I say again that, if tenants are concerned that there is loose asbestos in their property, they should contact the Housing Trust and it will have it removed. In fact, it was on Wednesday 31 May, in response to a question from the member for Mitchell (page 2411 of *Hansard*) that I referred to this matter.

ELECTRICITY TRUST EFFICIENCY

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Can the Minister for Infrastructure provide the House with any detail about improvements in the efficiency of ETSA and its contribution to the South Australian economy and how it will be placed to perform under the Hilmer national competition policy adopted by COAG?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The last full financial year was the best year in the Electricity Trust's 50-year history in terms of operating performance and profit. For the 10 months to the end of April this year the Electricity Trust is outperforming its record of the year before. Its operating surplus, before additional Government contributions, of \$163 million based on that 10-month figure is an increase of \$4.1 million over the 1993-94 record of \$158.9 million surplus, and it is \$24.7 million higher than the budget of \$138 million.

One might ask how the surplus is being accounted for. It is being accounted for principally through increased sales and increased economic activity in South Australia. Industrial and commercial increases in sales are the result of the improvement in the economy, as are residential sales. That is despite the fact that during the period from 1 July last year there was a reduction of up to 22 per cent for small and medium businesses and a 15 per cent reduction for residential customers in their off-peak tariffs. Despite the tariffs going down, we have increased revenue because the sales volume has increased substantially.

The Electricity Trust of South Australia is gearing itself up to meet the challenges of Hilmer. It is doing so not only by reducing its costs of operation and of tariffs to business and residential customers, securing South Australia's position as a low cost of operation State, but at the same time by making a significant contribution to the Treasury in South Australia. There was a large contribution from ETSA and from EWS, and so there should be if they are good Government trading enterprises properly focused and delivering benefits to all taxpayers of South Australia. I remind the Opposition that those dividends going to the Treasury have meant no new taxes and no increases in the taxation base in the budget only a week ago. The performance of our Government trading enterprises is assisting all taxpayers and the economy of this State.

I acknowledge the work force and management of the Electricity Trust for clearly focusing on a strategic direction and implementing the plan for the benefit of South Australians. In doing so, they are ensuring that generating capacity for power will remain in the regional economy of South Australia. We will be able to meet competition from interstate as a result of Prime Minister Keating's Hilmer

report and maintain and preserve our position in terms of generating capacity if we continue the reforms, productivity and efficiency gains with ETSA. That is good news for the employees of ETSA, because it will secure their position in the long term. They will not be subservient to interstate power generating capacity or to private sector co-generation capacity in future from the opening up of the national electricity market as a result of Prime Minister Keating's thrust.

I commend the work force of the Electricity Trust on what they have been able to achieve over the past couple of years, more particularly in this last year. The changed structure has worked, and we will have to continue to work on it to ensure that we keep ahead of the competition interstate. With regard to Clive Armour, in particular, the new General Manager of the Electricity Trust, I acknowledge that his management style and interaction with the work force has ensured a cultural change and new direction to bring benefits to all South Australians.

JULIA FARR CENTRE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Does the Minister for Health stand by his answer to my question regarding Mark Higgins of 1 June:

At the moment the parents would prefer that he be transferred from the Julia Farr Centre to another institution, and the IDSC case manager is negotiating this at present.

I have again been contacted by the family and they have reiterated that they would prefer that Mark not be moved from the Julia Farr Centre, believing, supported by medical evidence, that the Julia Farr Centre is the proper facility to cater for Mark's great medical needs. The advice to the Minister is contradictory to the facts of the situation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is now commenting. The honourable Minister for Health.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The advice that I gave was the advice that I had been given: as I indicated, I read from letters that I received between being asked the question and the end of Question Time. The simple fact is that in these matters the whole trend of care of people who need the types of therapies which at present are available at the Julia Farr Centre is altering: it is moving to provide it in the community, and that is the modern thrust of health care. That has been recognised for years and years, and there is no question about that. It is not a trend in South Australia since this Government came to office: it has been a trend around the world for years.

The Julia Farr Centre, according to a report commissioned not by this Government but by the previous Government, adopted strategies that would see the provision of appropriate care for people in the community. That is not this Government's direction: it is in the recommendations of a report commissioned by the previous Government following trends around the world for year after year.

In this instance, I am more than happy to re-examine the information that I was given. However, it would appear as if the member for Torrens, like a number of ideas that the present Opposition has, is locked in a time warp. There is no question but that the trend towards the provision of better and appropriate care in the community is worldwide. All I can say is that there may be some misconceptions by people who do not understand that the talk of community care does not mean, dare I say it, dumping people into the community: it

means appropriate care facilities, transport to rehabilitation facilities—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens has had a fair go.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —and care workers in the community. That is the sort of thing that is offered. In fact, it is the provision of almost the same care in the community. I will certainly look at the exact circumstances again, but there is no question that what is happening at Julia Farr Centre in general reflects community devolution from around the world.

POLICE NEWSLETTER

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I ask the Minister for Emergency Services, following his answer to the member for Playford yesterday, what information contained in issue number 61 of the departmental publication, *Police Post*, was erroneous or misleading? Yesterday the Minister told the House that he had spoken to the Commissioner of Police as soon as he became aware of the existence of that issue of *Police Post*. The Minister said:

The document contained information which was erroneous in some respects and which was misleading in others.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I do not have a copy of the document in front of me, so I will be happy to bring back a report to the honourable member and give him those details.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Deputy Leader interjects. We have had a day of misinformation thrown into this Parliament by the Labor Party. The last attack was on Group 4, a company with which we have signed a contract to manage the Mount Gambier Prison, a company about which in 1994 the report from which the Leader of the Opposition did not quote stated (and I quote from a report that was put together by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons—

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would ask for your ruling with respect to Standing Order 98, I think, that the Minister has to actually answer a question—

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When the House comes to order, the Chair will give a ruling. Ministers answer questions in a manner which they think is appropriate. It is not for the Chair to direct them. Answers should be, in the view of the Chair, precise and as short as possible. The honourable Minister for Emergency Services.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I asked a question about a Police Department publication. I am now getting an answer about the Correctional Services Department.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a frivolous point of order. The honourable Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is clear that the Minister for Correctional Services is enlarging—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am dealing with the Speaker, not with you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles has a point of order. He has been in the House for a long time and he has been a Minister. I therefore suggest his point of order will be spot on.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you for your confidence, Sir. The Minister for Correctional Services is clearly enlarging upon an answer to a previous question. Personal explanations are available for that, if the Minister wants to enlarge on a previous answer. Whilst he may surely answer the question in any way he wishes that is related to the question, he cannot do so in relation to a previous question on a totally different subject. That is clearly out of order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am appealing to the Speaker's commonsense.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the Chair has already ruled, it is up to Ministers to answer questions as they see fit. Could I say to the honourable member for Giles—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles was one of the most skilful people at giving lengthy answers, perhaps not giving the detail that the questioner desired, when he was a Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I know full well why the Labor Party does not want me to continue with this line. They know, I am sure, what Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons in the UK said in his latest report of Group 4. That information was also provided to the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and it is as follows:

There is evidence that Group 4 has been performing very well in its contracts with the Home Office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will round off his answer.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons praised the quality of staff at HMP The Wolds which is managed by Group 4, and said the prison was an enormous success. The court escorting service supplied by Group 4 provides better value for money, costing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Minister that he has adequately answered the question. Leave is withdrawn.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I refer to a farcical situation that occurred on the steps of Parliament House yesterday, 6 June, at 1 p.m. Two rallies or protests on two separate issues were held simultaneously. That was rather unfortunate and could easily have been avoided. One group was politically oriented and heavily supported by union organiser, Mr George Apap, who is, I believe, well known to both sides of this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation.

Mr LEGGETT: Yesterday, Mr Apap decided to throw his considerable influence behind a protest against this Government and the proposed closure of the Port Adelaide Girls High School. We have a democratic right to protest in an orderly manner on whatever issue we want. Personally, I do not agree with yesterday's protest by the Port Adelaide Girls High School, but that is immaterial in the context of my remarks this afternoon.

The ALP organised rally, together with the Port Adelaide Girls High School support group, presented a petition to Education spokesperson, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, which will ultimately be presented to this Parliament. As I have said, this is a country in which we have freedom of speech, and I respect protests made anywhere in an orderly manner, such as this one. Indeed, I respect protests particularly on the steps of Parliament House. We have witnessed many over the years, both very large ones and very small ones, of all types—political, non-political and social.

However, what the general public does not know about yesterday's saga is that the other protest rally group that involved a social issue was organised by that non-political group weeks and weeks before yesterday. This organisation, when arranging its protest rally, sought and gained permission from the Presiding Officer of this Parliament, which is, of course, correct procedure. Permission having been granted, the organisation put into operation its advertising campaign to promote the rally. It was quite an extensive undertaking and done with very little money.

Mr Apap also organised his rally and, rightly, sought permission to use the steps of Parliament House. He went to the Adelaide City Council—and that was his first mistake—to obtain permission. Although someone there said they would organise it with Parliament, unfortunately that was not done, and no permission was given to Mr Apap by Parliament until much later on. He was told that another group had also booked the steps of Parliament House for 1 p.m. and Mr Apap was offered a time slot of 2.30 to 4 p.m. When a compromise was offered by the group opposing prostitution in this case, Mr Apap refused, claiming that he had already advertised for that time of day. Even though he still had time to change the time of his rally, he refused. He and the organisers of the education rally refused to listen to a compromise and we ended up tragically with a very farcical situation.

Sadly, we had two protests about two totally different issues. It was an unsatisfactory situation for both parties and unnecessary. I believe that Mr Apap was totally and completely out of order. It was a display of arrogance by Mr Apap, and one day I hope he considers other people for a change. There was a distinct lack of wisdom and tolerance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair clearly indicates that no criticism can be levelled at the staff of Parliament House in relation to what happened yesterday. One group had gone through the right procedures and was granted permission; the other group, unfortunately, did not. In handling this matter, the staff did everything strictly in accordance with the procedures laid down. I want it clearly understood that no criticism can be made against anyone in relation to the administration of the House. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Today the Minister for Emergency Services, in dealing with our details about Group 4's record in Britain, said that a leading British judge was wrong; the Murdoch newspaper

The Times was wrong; the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee was wrong; and the Governor of Hull prison was wrong, just as last week the Police Commissioner of South Australia was wrong. The Minister for Correctional Services has entered into a deal with Group 4 to run the Mount Gambier gaol, which he wants to see as South Australia's first private gaol. Group 4 runs private gaols elsewhere, and by all reports does not run them very well. It also operates a prisoner escort service and it does not seem to have a great record there, either. In fact, in Britain Group 4 is a joke. Members only had to watch the Clive James show last Saturday night to see the audience reaction to the very mention of Group 4.

Unfortunately, the shortcomings of Group 4 and its record in its home country are serious matters for the South Australian taxpayer. The first privatised prison in Britain is a remand gaol, The Wolds, in the north of England. In February this year the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee found that the cost of running that prison had blown out by a massive 39 per cent under Group 4's management. It won the contract with a bid of £21.5 million over five years, but the actual cost is estimated to be £29.87 million. The blowout in Australian dollars is about \$17.6 million. That comes from a Public Accounts Committee report this year—in February 1995. There were also important questions raised as to why Group 4 had won the contract in the first place, given that its original bid was not the lowest received. Group 4 had significantly underestimated costs and had not included water, gas or electricity costs at all in its initial contract. I am told that two tenders were lower: one by £2.5 million.

British MPs apparently took interest in the fact that one of the eight members of the evaluation panel that awarded the contract to Group 4 later left the prison service and actually joined Group 4. There are many details we would like to know about the awarding of the Group 4 contract to run Mount Gambier, and the contents of that contract. One of those questions is: was Group 4's the lowest bid and, if not, why was it accepted? There are also concerns about how it runs The Wolds, in Britain. The highly respected Chief Inspector of Prisons in the United Kingdom, Judge Stephen Tumims, said that prisoners do not want to leave The Wolds; life there is too good. This is from a judge whom the Minister for Correctional Services today insulted, just as he insulted the UK House of Commons Public Accounts Committee.

Following a nine day inspection, the Chief Inspector of Prisons in the UK—a judge—reported that drugs were easy to find and that there was a high level of assault. In the 12 months to 31 March 1993 drugs had been found on 46 occasions and some prisoners said that drugs, including heroin and cocaine, were easier to obtain at The Wolds than in other prisons. Inmates could stay in bed as long as they wanted, and few used the excellent facilities for physical or mental education. As far as prisoner escorts go, Group 4 has had a chequered and unflattering history, as detailed in the initial part of today's Question Time. Of course, later, prison officials tried to claim that they were not all Group 4's fault, but since then there have been disturbing accusations that Group 4 has toughened up on prisoner escorts.

In May 1994 the Governor of Hull prison called for an inquiry into Group 4 after a prisoner arrived at his prison slumped unconscious in a pool of vomit and blood. A separate inquest found that another prisoner had died because of a lack of care by Group 4 guards. All this is distressing, but they are just a sample of the reports that have led to Group 4's having such a poor reputation in the United Kingdom.

There is no doubt that prisons are not easy to run: escapes occur, attacks occur, and drugs are a problem in many gaols regardless of who runs them. But these reports from the United Kingdom, from judges and from Public Accounts Committees, are certainly no winning recommendation, as the Minister seems to allege, for Group 4's winning the contract for Mount Gambier gaol. There are many questions left to be answered.

Mr KERIN (Frome): During the recent parliamentary break I had the honour of launching the inaugural copper trek from Burra to Kadina as one of the highlights of Burra's Jubilee 150 year. It was a significant event and, importantly, it aimed to give young people a better idea and appreciation of those who pioneered the mining areas of South Australia, of which Burra and the Copper Triangle were two very important ones. I launched the walk at the Burra Community School on Tuesday 2 May, and it was concluded at Kadina on Saturday 13 May. On the way, many of the schools in the relevant areas were included in the walk. This included children from Mount Bryan, Burra, Booborowie, Farrell Flat, Mintaro, Clare, Watervale, Blyth, Port Wakefield, Riverton, Paskeville and Kadina. As well, many other family members and groups joined in the walk along the way.

As members would no doubt be aware, last century the mining areas of South Australia, notably Burra, Kapunda and the Copper Triangle, benefited enormously from the skills of the Cornish immigrants. There were actually some Cornish people on the first boat to reach Kangaroo Island in 1836, and since then it has been a continuous movement this way, even until today. The 'Cousin Jacks', the distinctive nineteenth century Cornish group, mainly came to South Australia in the years from 1840 to 1880. Whilst some were farmers or farm labourers, teachers and clergymen, the majority were miners or people connected with the mining industry, such as engineers. They came to Australia for different reasons, but the majority were escaping the mining industry in Cornwall, which had gone into decline in about 1850, raising many hardships. To them Australia offered a new opportunity and a bit of adventure. The Cousin Jacks were recognised as probably the best hard rock miners in the world.

South Australian mining companies, notably the South Australian Mining Association at Burra and the Wallaroo and Moonta Mining and Smelting Company, recruited hundreds of miners and their families to come to South Australia, offering them two to three times the wages they would get in Cornwall. With them they brought many distinctive characteristics, which we still see today in many of the chapels and other buildings around the place. Their entertainment preferences also carry the day, with the festivals and brass bands in these areas being part of that heritage. The Burra Jubilee 150 copper trek to Kadina was an opportunity for students to commemorate the efforts of the Cornish miners in South Australia, and at the launch it was terrific to see the number of young and not so young people take the opportunity to dress up in the clothes of that period.

As we headed off on the trek there was terrific enthusiasm among the walkers, and that was still evident a couple of hours later when I quit. As I drove off into the sunset it started to rain, which might have dimmed the enthusiasm later in the day. The walkers closely followed the route used years ago as restless Burra miners sought new prosperity in the mines of Wallaroo and Moonta. This route was also well used in 1864 as many of the miners returned to their homes and families in Burra when a very serious strike occurred,

closing down the Moonta and Wallaroo mines. I would like to congratulate all involved with the Jubilee 150 copper trek on the success of the event and the opportunity it gave many of the young ones. In particular, Robin Page and Leonie Fretwell did a terrific job, as they have done with so many other Jubilee 150 events in Burra this year.

I urge any members who have not recently made the visit to Burra to do so. If they do, I also encourage them to go for a short drive along the Burra-Morgan Road to see at first hand a road about which they hear so much in this Chamber. Any members who have not visited Burra will probably be amazed at the heritage attractions in the town and at the number of places worth visiting. For example, there is the historic school, a magnificent old building, which was actually built to accommodate 800 children and is well worth a visit.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I rise to defend the Port Adelaide Girls High School against the disappointing attack a few moments ago by the member for Hanson. I was a part of that rally as were my colleagues the member for Price and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles in another place as Opposition spokesperson on education. We were there defending one of our local schools. I do not know what the arrangements were in terms of permission or who did not have permission: all I know is that out there on the steps of Parliament House yesterday were a group of committed people, including students, fighting for the survival of their high school. It is very disappointing when a member such as the member for Hanson comes into this place and criticises a school for simply trying to fight for its own survival. This school has been waging a battle to keep the doors open, and this battle will continue. I encourage the school at every opportunity to take that battle to the Government.

As local members of Parliament with constituents who attend that school (I know I can speak for my colleague the member for Price) we stand side by side with that school in its battle against this Government and will continue to do that. That group had every right to be on the steps of Parliament House yesterday. It had every right to put its arguments forcibly to this Government. Whether or not the other group had permission really does not bother me. Yesterday's affairs on the steps of the House could have been conducted better, and the school does not deserve to be criticised by that other group as it is being criticised. It does not deserve to be criticised by the member for Hanson, because a lot of very good people are working hard to save that school. I am disappointed that for their actions they are now receiving criticism.

I commend those who are behind the efforts to save the school. I refer in particular to the efforts of Mary Witts, Chairperson of the Port Adelaide Girls High School Support Group. My colleagues on this side will find it almost disbelieving but I also want to commend the work of George Apap. I stand in this House in defence of George. Of course, George came under a scurrilous attack from the member for Hanson but he is not able to defend himself. I am prepared to stand in this Chamber on this issue and defend George Apap's right to organise a rally to help that school with his wealth of experience. He should not be subjected to such a scurrilous attack. George Apap, Mary Witts and all those involved in the support of the Port Adelaide Girls High School have my support and should not be subjected to this scurrilous rewriting of events of yesterday.

This is but a school that is in a desperate fight for survival. It is up against a Government that is imposing a most unjust and unfair treatment upon it. The people concerned were simply on the steps of this House exercising their democratic rights and voicing their opposition to actions of this Government. The other group involved on the steps of Parliament House yesterday could have given far greater courtesy to that group. It could have provided an opportunity for both groups to be heard. It did not need to be a competition over who could yell the loudest. I am disappointed that the other group chose to make it difficult for the Port Adelaide Girls High School to get its message across. But get their message across they did and for that they should be proud. There were a lot of young people on the steps who, in my eyes, acted and behaved well in excess of their years. They were very mature people fighting for a just cause.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair advises the member for Hart that there is in place a process, which was administered by my predecessor and about which to my knowledge no-one has ever complained, whereby people book a time to use the steps of Parliament House so that they may have an opportunity to state their point of view. The process is designed to ensure that all groups, no matter what cause they support, have an opportunity. One group was authorised and had sought permission a considerable time ago. Mr Apap, who I understand was organising the other group, did not seek permission or go through the process. The staff here keep accurate records and go through the process in a most meticulous way. I therefore hope that the member for Hart was not criticising the administration of this matter, because I understand that any criticism to be made results from the fact that Mr Apap did not go through the correct processes. The honourable member for Flinders.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I draw the House's attention to a unique industry that has now been founded in Boston Bay in Port Lincoln, involving tuna farms. In 1982-83 catches peaked in the wild fishery but then fell dramatically. Five years ago Joe Puglisi decided that something was needed if the industry was to survive. At that time 15 kilogram tuna were being sold to the cannery for 90¢ per kilo. Now that the tuna farms have been in existence for five years they are selling 60 kilogram fish for a price of \$25-plus per kilo to the sashimi market in Japan, sashimi being a delicacy to the Japanese people. Five years ago there was no income from the farming of tuna fish, whereas this year we expect to make \$80 million, with an expected \$200 million in the next few years. Like all good ideas, this one was born of necessity, and it is a credit to people like Joe Puglisi, tuna boat owners and the people in the industry who have created this business. It is bringing people from around the world, and it is surprising to me how few people in Adelaide and South Australia are even aware of it.

A major research project was undertaken in 1990 by the Tuna Boat Owners Association jointly with the Japanese Overseas Fishing Cooperative and the State Government. The Japanese Overseas Fishing Cooperative put in \$2 million to assist with funding. During this research the project examined the capture of tuna from the wild and the transport of tuna from the wild into cages in the bay. It looked at the different holding systems, which over the past five years have evolved greatly. More recently, an aquaculture management plan has been undertaken for Boston Bay. The effects on the bay and its environment, including the effects of the nutrients put into the farms and of the dispersal of those nutrients, have been

investigated. This aquaculture management plan was undertaken with considerable consultation involving the public, Government and industry.

More recently, a nutrition research project has been undertaken with the National Agriculture Research Centre. SARDI and the tuna boat owners have recently had their first trials of a soft food pellet. That pellet is to supplement the pilchards that have been brought from America and Japan into Boston Harbor to feed fish in the tuna farm.

The Marine Science Centre, which was built this year on the shores of Port Lincoln, acknowledges the importance of the fishing industry to that area and to the State. Not only do we have tuna but we also have oysters, abalone and crayfish. We are the premier fishing port in Australia. Our harbor is five times larger than Sydney Harbour.

Joe Puglisi, who developed the farm idea, spoke at a luncheon meeting at the Tunarama Festival for the ABC Businesswoman of the Year award. Mr Puglisi pointed out the value of the tuna farms also for tourism. As he said, they are unique. Japanese tourists will love to visit the farms at Port Lincoln, catch a tuna and take millions of photographs to show back home. They will be marvellous ambassadors. Sashimi is such an expensive delicacy in Japan that to serve a meal of unlimited sashimi to those Japanese tourists will be a never-ending talking point and excellent publicity for Eyre Peninsula, Port Lincoln and South Australia.

Another television personality, Rex Hunt, was impressed with the fishing along the Eyre Peninsula coastline, so the region is receiving further positive publicity as a result. He, too, was impressed with the scale of the tuna farm operations. As he said, they are an innovation that is leading the world.

It is not only Japanese tourists who will be interested in this initiative. Tourists are coming from as far afield as America to look at what we are doing in tuna farming. It is important that we devise packages that are specifically designed to suit tourists in this boutique industry. Hundreds of jobs are being provided as a spin-off from tuna farms. The tourism potential, research and development, and education in and the manufacture of food all involve employing people. Therefore, that one innovative idea has created a great number of jobs in an area that badly needs them.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I support the Government and the Premier's statement today on the important issue of the Hindmarsh Island bridge and the traditional beliefs of the Ngarrindjeri people. All members will share the Premier's concerns, especially as he described the matter as being of grave concern to his Government. It is a matter of grave concern to all South Australians.

Our Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Parliament have been very long and loud in their rhetoric about reconciliation. A number of members in this House, including myself and yourself, Sir, have spoken on many occasions about what is needed to make this truly a nation united in all its peoples, no matter from which cultural background they come. The Prime Minister, whenever possible over the past few years, has been loud in his rhetoric. He has a right to be so, because the powers of the Parliament are clearly set out in this section of the Constitution:

The Commonwealth Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make law for the peace, order and good Government of the Commonwealth in respect to . . .

It is directed to people of any race for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws. The Government has done that in respect of Aboriginal people. In this matter, the Prime

Minister is clearly failing not only the Ngarrindjeri people but all the Aboriginal peoples of Australia.

We all know that there is a body of thought within the community which is suspicious of claims of tribal custodianship of land and, indeed, the nature of sacred sites. There are those who believe that, whenever a development is mooted, a sacred site will be discovered. That might have more to do with having an impact on the development than the nature of the site. I hope that that suspicion is generally unfounded and that it is a prejudice that is held by only some people. Unfortunately, because of the controversy surrounding this case, that prejudice is openly being touted not only on the streets of Adelaide but on radio stations and throughout the Commonwealth.

If our Prime Minister is genuine about reconciliation with the Aboriginal peoples and between all groups in society, I suggest that he listen very carefully to the words of our Premier today. The current course of inaction by the Commonwealth Government has done more to put back the cause of reconciliation than all the years of racism in this country. What we have before this Parliament, before all South Australians and before the Commonwealth generally is an appalling situation which, for the good of everybody, needs to be cleared up.

The member for Ridley was pilloried some months ago for endeavouring to have the matter looked at. Because what he was saying was not politically correct or fashionable, it was easy to make fun of him. I am sure that people in the community would not make as much fun of him today as they tried to make some months ago. There are responsible people in this House who have repeatedly stood up not because they are against what the Aboriginal peoples are trying to achieve in terms of the preservation of their culture and heritage but because they, like you, Sir, have had long experience of and understand the issues and are not scared in this or in all other places to try to speak the truth.

I am concerned for the standing of our Aborigines, especially for the standing of traditional leaders as custodians of the Aboriginal dreaming in the eyes of all Australians. This fiasco has dented the credibility of many good Aborigines in the eyes of the general community. It needs to be sorted out. If the Prime Minister is prepared to sacrifice the good of the Ngarrindjeri people and of the Aboriginal peoples of Australia all on the altar of expediency rather than expose a grave error of judgment on the part of one of his Ministers, he does not deserve to be Prime Minister. He is the Prime Minister for all Australians—Aboriginal as well as white. He now has a major problem on his hands, and we look to him to sort it out.

PORT ADELAIDE GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr FOLEY: I refer to my earlier contribution during the grievance debate concerning the protest on the steps of Parliament House and the role of Port Adelaide Girls High School. I clarify that I in no way implied any criticism of the staff or officers of this House. In fact, I have neither sought nor been given any explanation, nor have I wanted one. I accept the answer as to what happened. I was not critical of that, Sir. I simply wanted to defend the Port Adelaide Girls High School in terms of the way in which the protest was conducted. By no means was I at all concerned about what

might or might not have been the events of yesterday. There was no criticism implied or meant.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) and the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL 1995

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June. Page 2569.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): This is another typical Liberal cut, slash and burn budget. The Liberal philosophy is that, if there is a problem, it must take the dry solution and fix the problem quickly without regard to the less fortunate people in our community and the impact of that action as it translates into job losses and the diminution of public services. In other words, there is no element of social justice in the Government's mind when it makes hard decisions. I realise that hard decisions must be made in Government, and I can sympathise with the Treasurer. However, the Government should take into account some of the implications of its decisions, especially when cuts are made to certain public services and institutions.

I contrast the Liberal Government's approach with that of the former Labor Government, which in 1993 put in place a debt reduction strategy that had a more balanced approach. It sought to pay back the debt over a longer period without directly affecting services, without increasing taxes and charges above CPI and without privatising public departments and services. Economic fluctuations come and go in cycles in the economic world where there are peaks and troughs. The policy generally adopted by Australian Labor Party Governments in office is to batten down the hatches in bad times and maintain services to needy people. Our policy is to keep costs and charges down and pay off debt when times are good. Difficult times will get better, the economy will pick up and things will improve.

Throughout modern history we have seen a pattern of radical change every 70 years or so. Such change causes fairly major disruption to society, to the general community and to people's lives. These disruptions usually occur as a result of major inventions which affect people's lives, and I quote examples such as the emergence of the motor vehicle and then later the emergence of aeroplanes. However, the latest and most serious disruption to our economy has been caused by the massive impact of technology, where we have seen the loss of thousands of jobs. This factor seems to escape most people and many experts, who never seem to mention it because they are too busy blaming Governments of whatever political persuasion. However, little blame can

be attached to whatever Government is in power in whatever area because of Government policies.

That is a small factor in the current situation, and the greatest factor in this case is the impact of technology. The technological revolution has had a major impact on the lives of people in industry and throughout the whole economy. As I say, the impact of technology has little to do with Government policies or performance. The Brown Liberal Government is taking the State back to the 1920s. I have always said that I believed Liberal members in this place were about 30 years behind the times, but I have had to change that view. As a result of some of the measures introduced in this place, we are going back to pre-Playford days. I had a lot of respect for Sir Thomas Playford and the things he did in his time, particularly in the 1930s, to put the State on an even keel. Sir Thomas Playford in his record breaking term as Premier of South Australia put many things in place which served this State well over a long period, especially in regard to public safety and health.

Sir Thomas Playford always said that some things are best done by Government. He related that particularly to public safety and health issues, and I agree with Sir Thomas entirely. One of Sir Thomas's first actions in the 1930s was to take over from the private sector the electricity supply for Adelaide, and later in the 1970s we saw Premier Dunstan take over the public transport system. In fact, the private operators at that time begged Premier Dunstan to take them over to get them off the hook because they were incapable of running their services. Services were a shambles, buses were never on time and the companies were incapable of providing appropriate services. Now the Government is looking at turning back the clock and returning to such a situation.

The Tonkin Liberal Government went down the privatisation track to some extent in its term of office from 1979 to 1982. Obviously, the Government has learned nothing from that experience. After the 1979 election of a Liberal Government I particularly remember that Premier Tonkin and his Government got the shock of their lives as they did not expect to win, and it took them some time to get over the shock of being in office. They were not prepared to take action immediately—thankfully—and, as you would remember, Mr Acting Speaker, as a member of that Government, the term of office in those days was three years. It took time following that election for the Tonkin Government to get into the swing of privatisation, and the result was that some time later problems started to surface, but they were put right by the Bannon Government when it was elected to office in 1982.

A lot of outsourcing occurred, but luckily the public sector had remained fairly well intact. The Government did not sack workers or entice many of them to take separation packages; indeed, such packages were virtually unheard of in those days. Luckily, the public sector work force remained fairly well intact, and on many occasions it had to correct work that was sent out to the private sector under contract. I had friends who worked in various departments who told me that time and again work came back that was not done properly by the private sector, and it had to be fixed at double the cost by the Government's public sector workers.

Clearly, the State Bank's collapse was a tragedy for South Australia, and no one from this side of the House denies that it was a tragedy. However, that tragedy had little to do with the previous Labor Government.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr De LAINE: It would have happened if the Liberal Government was in place at the time. That collapse had nothing to do with the Government. That is fact. The collapse was as big as it was because of amendments forced through by Liberals in the Upper House to take away the reporting mechanisms. These provisions, which were in the 1983 State Bank Act, were put in place by the then State Premier John Bannon.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order!

Mr De LAINE: That was forced on us by Liberal members in the Upper House, and Government members know that that is a fact. Let me put the situation in context. State debt in 1993 was virtually the same in terms of the ratio of State debt to gross State product as it was at the end of the term of the last State Liberal Government in 1982—approximately 27.5 per cent—that is, in 1993 it was almost the same as the level at the end of the Tonkin Government in 1982. I contrast the position with that applying during many of the Playford years when State debt was double that figure—it was in excess of 50 per cent. Nothing has been said about that by the media, the Government or the Treasurer, but they are indisputable facts: we had double the State debt in terms of gross State product back in the Playford years and virtually the same debt during the last Liberal Government's term from 1979 to 1982. Those figures make the position clear. Between 1982 and 1989 the then Treasurer (John Bannon) achieved the remarkable feat of getting State debt down from 27 per cent to just over 15 per cent of gross State product. He did that without the cut, slash and burn policies of this Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr De LAINE: As I said, it was between 1982 and 1989. The then Treasurer announced in 1989—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Price has the floor.

Mr De LAINE: In September 1989 the then Treasurer announced that he had balanced the books and that State debt was under control. He achieved a ratio of State debt to gross State product of about 15 per cent, and he did it without the cut, slash and burn policies of this Government. He did it by careful budgeting and good financial management. We saw few service cuts, no excessive tax and charges hikes and no privatisation.

We all remember the current Premier's election promise: no increase in taxes, no new taxes, and no fees and charges up more than the CPI or the rate of inflation. In fact, in recent months we have seen over 1 000 increases in fees and charges, including over 300 above CPI, and that is indisputable; they have been gazetted for everyone to see. So much for the election promises made by the Premier and the Liberal Party. This budget also makes savage cuts to health, education (including TAFE), and the police, the three most crucial areas in the State which affect people enormously. Of course, these cuts really only affect the working classes and the disadvantaged in our community. The rich and powerful have the resources to cushion themselves from the effects of these cuts.

I am particularly angry with this Government for causing me to spend so much time in my electorate, on a day-by-day basis, trying to put out fires caused by this Government's policies, cuts and privatisation efforts. I could better use this time to look after constituents and help them with their everyday social problems caused by these hard economic times.

Instead, I am trying to put out fires and fix up problems caused by this Government's outsourcing policies in particular.

One problem is the Government's decision to close the Port Adelaide Girls High School at the end of this year. My colleague the member for Hart referred to the protest rally that took place on the steps of Parliament House yesterday. There was a reasonably good roll up as there is a lot of feeling about this issue in Port Adelaide. At the rally yesterday, the South Australian Institute of Teachers, representing its approximately 15 000 members, pledged its full support for the high school. The United Trades and Labor Council, representing more than 200 000 workers, also pledged its support in the efforts to keep the school open.

The reason for the school's closure, given by Minister Lucas, is that it does not provide enough curriculum choice, and I do not accept that reason. The school has purposely been run down to achieve the Government's aim. Enrolments are down and the Government says that that justifies the school's closure. This year's enrolments total 140, yet 11 private schools, mostly in the eastern suburbs, had enrolments of less than 140 and still receive State and Federal funding. They will not be closed; their funding will be maintained, but at Port Adelaide, where people do not count, this Government will close the school.

The State has only three all-girls high schools. The Government has announced it will close the Port Adelaide Girls High School at the end of this year, and it is telling families to enrol their daughters at Gepps Cross or Mitcham schools. The latest rumour is that the Gepps Cross school is under threat and will probably be closed, and that does not augur well. I had heard the rumour that the Port Adelaide Girls High School might be closing and in last year's Estimates Committees I asked the Minister, Rob Lucas, from another place:

I refer to the Port Adelaide Girls High School. . . In line with your stated commitment to the education of women and girls, will you give an assurance that this excellent school will, first, continue to operate and, secondly, will continue to be able to provide single sex education?

The Minister's response, in part, was:

I have taken no decision to change the current arrangements with the Port Adelaide Girls High School. We are committed to the continuing provision of single sex girls' options at high schools.

Despite this assurance, a short 18 weeks later the Minister announced, 'The school will close at the end of this year.' It was a disgraceful decision and it was done in a disgraceful way. It was done only the day before the start of this school year. Many students had enrolled and bought uniforms, only to find that the day before school started this year the decision had been taken and announced to close the school at the end of the year. Many parents immediately re-enrolled their daughters in other schools and had to pay out again for other uniforms; it was disgraceful. It is a unique school. I have said before that it is an excellent school and provides accreditation in many areas. It looks after disadvantaged girls who cannot get places in other schools; it runs some very valuable programs, and it is an absolute disgrace that it should be closed.

It is part of the Port Adelaide local community. This year it celebrates 70 years in operation and it seems terrible that, in its seventieth year, it should be closed. However, it has the support of the local community, the local school community, SAIT and also the United Trades and Labor Council. Certainly, pressure will be put on the Minister and this

Government to maintain that school. A protest rally was held yesterday and support was given. The Kennett Government tried to close the Northlands school in Melbourne and, two years down the track and \$3 million of taxpayers' money later, the courts have overturned the decision, rolled the Kennett Government and his Minister, and reopened the school. The school in fact was reopened several weeks ago. It was a top community effort by the people in Melbourne.

Mr Caudell: How many go there now?

Mr De LAINE: I do not know what enrolments total, but it is significant. I refer now to a question I asked the Premier last week:

What does the Premier intend to do to protect the delivery of services by the public sector to the people of South Australia by restoring the morale of public servants who deliver these services? Because of the policies and savage cuts to the public sector right across the board by this Government, the morale and confidence of workers in these areas are at an all time low, which is seriously affecting the delivery of services to the community.

In part, the Premier answered:

First, the claim made by the honourable member is quite incorrect . . . You do not have a huge lift in productivity and a gain in efficiency unless you have the support of your own staff.

It was claimed that new efficiencies have been achieved because of the staff involved. I would submit that those efficiencies have surfaced because of the pure fear of the public servants involved: they fear for their jobs and they are probably performing well below their best. The Premier shows how uninformed and ignorant he is of the facts when he says that the morale of the public sector is at an all time high. That is absolute rubbish: it is at an all time low. I get around and talk to different departments and the people who work in them, and everyone is fearful for their jobs. They know that further cuts are coming, their morale is at rock bottom and it is affecting services. I do not know how the efficiencies the Premier talks about have been measured, but certainly services have suffered and the morale of the staff is down. Once that happens it is very bad for the whole economy and the delivery of public services. An article on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* in relation to the South Australian Police Force stated:

South Australian police will stop enforcing speed camera fines and ban other revenue raising measures as part of a planned industrial campaign against the State Government. And it could cost the State Government between \$500 000 and \$1 million a week in lost revenue.

It does not make good sense to make cuts, to upset the police and to cause that sort of money to be lost every week. It is not very good economy. The article continues:

The State's 3 500 police are expected to take action this month over what they describe as a funding and morale crisis gripping the force.

Mr Alexander, the President of the Police Association, a former colleague of the member for Florey, described police morale as 'the lowest in memory'. Mr Alexander said:

. . . the \$10 million cut inflicted on the Police Department in last week's State budget has made industrial action almost inevitable.

The police have always acted very responsibly, but this has been taken too far. They are talking about industrial action and the President of the Police Association says that the morale of the Police Force is 'the lowest in memory'. This highlights what I have been saying. This low morale goes right across the board—in every area of the public sector where services are delivered to the people. The Premier

seems quite oblivious of it, and that proves he is quite unsuitable to be the Premier of this State.

If you want to assess morale and how things are working, you do not go to the departmental heads, because they will not tell you the truth: they protect their own backs. You go to the people on the floor—the people at the work front who actually deliver the services—and ask them how they feel. That is the only accurate way you can find out what is going on, and I learnt that many years ago. If the Premier were to do that, he would find a situation that is very different from the one he espouses in this House. I do not support the Bill.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I support the Appropriation Bill, the second budget handed down by the Brown Liberal Government. I have had the pleasure of being a member of Parliament for the past 18 months, and I have been privileged to witness at first hand the passing of both the 1994-95 budget and now the 1995-96 budget. As we reflect back in history we recall the tightness of the first budget handed down 12 months ago. It was tough in many areas, but above all it was a responsible budget. That is what good government is all about—being responsible. The first budget pointed South Australia toward economic recovery. Now, with this second budget, for 1995-96, we see our deficit under control and an overall debt reduction in the first 18 months of government of \$1 000 million—\$1 billion in real terms. When one considers what this Government inherited from the former Government, it was laughable to read criticisms of the 1995 budget in the Friday edition of the *Advertiser* by the Opposition Leader, the Hon. Mike Rann. The article was headed 'Rann condemns one \$1 billion black hole' and the Leader tried to explain Labor propaganda garbage by suggesting that the State debt had increased by \$1 000 million since Premier Brown took office in December 1993.

I do not know where he obtained this figure, but it is far from the truth, and it would be advisable if the Leader tried another line of attack. He should first remember that the real black hole that his Government left was a black hole of bankruptcy. It was good to see him thoroughly stitched up by the Treasurer in Question Time. In view of what we inherited in December 1993, this recovery is incredible, and the Premier, the Treasurer and all Cabinet Ministers are to be congratulated for getting this State well and truly back on track. As the Treasurer reported to the media, the reduction of \$1 billion is a saving of more than \$500 per family that the Brown Government can spend on essential services and job creation. That is responsible government; job creation is still the single most important issue and aim for any responsible Government.

There is growing confidence in this State and, as I move around my electorate to small businesses, residential areas, schools and community centres, I realise that people are still very much aware of the debt that we inherited. Secondly, they applaud the Government for its efforts in promoting industry, small business, tourism and other essential services in South Australia. I was helped to letterbox a leaflet in my electorate over the last weekend, headed 'South Australia is coming into the home straight'. There has unmistakably been a significant turnover in the history of government in this State, without any new taxes or increases in taxes. That the Opposition can still criticise this Government is astounding.

In basic terms—for I am an amateur economist—the same philosophy applies whether we are budgeting at home with small amounts of money or in government, where millions of dollars is handled. As citizens we all have to act responsibly

and work within specific boundaries. If we overspend, we have to adjust and ultimately pay our debt. So it is with this State budget. You cannot spend more than you earn, because if you do you will soon be bankrupt. We are all accountable. That is basic economics, as I see it.

That is exactly what happened in South Australia under the previous Labor Government: we had a debt of over \$8 billion—\$8 000 million. The debt was out of control, with interest of over \$900 million per year. Sometimes the public needs reminding that this debt is still being reduced. We still have a long way to go, but we are on the home straight. The brakes are on the debt and our economic future is in good hands, yet tough decisions still have to be made to safeguard our future. It never ceases to amaze me how the critics are still prepared to criticise and white-ant this Government, despite the fact that crucial business investment figures in South Australia are well above the national growth rate. We still see negatives reported in the papers. I refer to a front page article in the *Sunday Mail* of 4 June headed 'South Australia for sale: plan to privatise schools, roads' by reporter Brad Crouch. In part, the article states:

A master plan to privatise all Government services, including schools, hospitals, family crisis care, public housing, roads and railways is behind a giant British firm's move in South Australia. Serco Ltd has laid out a blueprint which would see contractors control every aspect of State and Federal services.

The article goes on to refer further to the sale of essential services. It stated:

A spokesman for the Premier. . . said Government philosophy is already heading in this direction with contracting out of water, prisons [etc.]. . . 'The Government is willing to listen to any proposal put to it that achieves cost savings. . .'

My views on privatisation are, I think, the opinion of the majority. If we want efficiency in government, privatisation needs to be encouraged. It not a dirty word, as Labor would have us believe. Competition will always ensure the very best. The Opposition will always resist such an operation, because its philosophy is totally opposite and is opposed to the free enterprise system of government. Throughout history, Labor Parties have focused on government control. For them that is the be-all and end-all, and it is called socialism. Cecil Parker said that socialism is workable only in heaven, where it is not needed, and in hell, where they have it. Norman Mailer says that the function of socialism is to raise suffering to a higher level. That is precisely what Labor did between 1983 and 1993: it raised suffering to a higher level. In this 1995-96 budget, economic development initiatives give South Australia hope for the future. There is hope, and people are starting to feel this hope.

This Government's strategy is to boost exports and encourage long-term investment. The \$160 million package includes \$20 million for works associated with the upgrading of the Adelaide Airport runway (and I have a particular interest in that and also in the curfew and the road which will ultimately go under Tapleys Hill Road); \$8.8 million in employment incentives for business; \$8 million for tourism; \$5.4 million for consultancies; \$2.6 million for strategic development for key industries such as wine; and \$1.5 million for Government overseas trade offices. The level of job advertisements is 23 per cent higher than last year, with small, medium and large businesses all playing an important role in this recovery. The predictions suggest that employment growth will continue at about 1.5 per cent in the payroll tax sector during 1995-96 and accelerate to 1.75 per cent in

later years. Overall, employment growth in the State will be higher than in the payroll tax sector.

I now want to examine key areas of Government which are constantly under the microscope, in the limelight and especially targeted by the Opposition. First, I want to look at Family and Community Services, which is a good place to start, and applaud the work done by the Minister, the Hon. David Wotton. I am privileged to be on the Minister's FACS committee and I see at first hand the strategic job he does in overseeing this department. As the Minister himself says, the Department for Family and Community Services is the cornerstone of the State Government's commitment to assist families and individuals through times of need and conflict. The 1995 budget of \$203.3 million represents a \$9.5 million increase over the previous year. This, says the Minister, has been achieved by carrying over savings of \$2.9 million from the previous year. The total FACS budget represents a figure of \$175 per year for each man, woman and child in South Australia.

Two important key areas of the budget for any Government will always be education and police, about which I want to speak briefly. It is important to list the highlights of the budget announced by the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Rob Lucas, because the Opposition tears into education and talks about how it has failed since the Brown Government came to power. Highlights of this budget include the completion of the \$4 million 'Cornerstones' program, which is providing training for 4 000 junior primary and early childhood teachers to identify and assist children with learning difficulties. Some of the other highlights include a \$29 million increase in education spending and no increase in class sizes, so South Australia will have the lowest student:teacher ratio of all States.

I should like to point out how this Government is attacked by people like Clare McCarty, who incidentally was very generous and gave the Government a mark of one out of 10. I think that she would get nought out of 10 for her efforts. Indeed, she would be lucky to get nought. There will be 406 teacher salaries for special education, which is 21 salaries higher than required by the formula, and grants up to \$8 000 (involving a total of more than \$1 million) will be given to schools to assist with the implementation of the new curriculum statements and profiles. So the list goes on. Education is really progressing in South Australia, contrary to what the Opposition tells us.

It is also important to note that this Government's election commitment to provide 200 operational police officers during its first term in office is on target. The Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, expects 135 of these officers to be operational by 30 June 1995—another 25 days. The 1994 Audit Commission Report states:

In 1992-93, South Australia spent around \$26 million or 15 per cent above the amount assessed by the Commonwealth Grants Commission as sufficient to provide a level of service similar to the average of other States.

To combat this over-expenditure, the police budget has been reduced by \$2 million in recurrent expenditure. At the same time the Government is introducing professional work practices to improve the efficiency of the Police Department. We have a very efficient Police Department, whose goals in 1995-96 are no different from any other year: to reduce the incidence and effects of crime and enhance public safety, to improve road safety and efficient management of traffic and to minimise the effects of disaster and emergency situations in our community. I have been fortunate to be a member of

Minister Matthew's backbench committee. I draw the attention of the House to the editorial in the *Advertiser* of Friday 2 June which I think sums up the budget very well. Headed 'A good record—so far,' it states:

South Australia's Treasurer, Mr Stephen Baker, was able to produce if not a beautiful then a pretty set of figures with his second budget. Last year, his debut with this annual ritual, he was somewhere between prudent and harsh. . . He has been lucky with the economy in general and his lean husbandry is paying off.

The *Sunday Mail* on 4 June, under the heading 'A no-pain budget is just the tonic,' states:

Along with debt reduction comes the second phase of Government spending control—even though health and education must shoulder a share of additional cuts. In the words of the Treasurer, Stephen Baker, South Australia is moving out of the red—without any additional tax burden on those who can ill afford to carry the cost.

The editorial goes on:

South Australia should applaud an administration which has made sense out of financial chaos without having to resort to 'bully-boy' budgets suffered by those over the border in Victoria.

I close appropriately with the comments of the Treasurer in the report that he handed down to Parliament. He said:

The process of budgetary adjustment is being built on a firm foundation of ongoing and sustainable reductions in spending—not on short-term one-off measures. Moreover, this is a budget which continues the emphasis on economic expansion and job creation. It is directed to securing lasting benefits for the State and South Australians.

That is what it is all about: it is about responsible government. The Treasurer continues:

It is a strategy to achieve financial, economic and social benefits that will last.

Mr WADE (Elder): I support the Appropriation Bill. This is not a slash and burn budget, this is not a budget born of panic: this is a reasoned, commonsense, forward thinking budget—the type of budget that has been sorely missed in this State for the past 11 years. I noted the recent articles by a former Premier, who complained that his Labor successor took the tack of attempting to rein in the State's increasing debt, a debt actively entered into by this former Premier who now says that debt, to him, is not a problem. That is all right for him to say, but his successor tried to hold back the tidal wave of debt and failed miserably. That was partly due to administrative incompetence and partly due to insufficient scrutiny of the workings of the commercial public sector. Irrespective of this failure, the debt remains and must be paid by those who could not run off to Victoria, take lucrative termination pay-outs, or retire with enough stash to see them safely through the turbulent waters ahead.

In 1993 our State was like the good ship *Poseidon*. Above deck was stacked the highest level of net debt of all the States—a taxpayer-funded debt that the Labor Government had nearly tripled in the first two years of the 1990s. Added to that, the then Government also stacked on nearly double the interest costs of servicing that debt. Also packed on the deck was an amount above the national average—\$241 million per year of additional moneys that the Government was spending on public services with. I am sorry to say, no obvious higher level of service provision.

To add to this continual overburden on the deck, Labor stacked on the costs incurred by moving from a below average to an above average taxing State. With all this top-heavy public infrastructure, wasteful spending and spiralling debt above deck, what did Captain Bannon and his

buccaneers use for ballast; what was in the hold to stop their good ship *Poseidon* from toppling over at the slightest nudge?

Below deck, where the Labor Government had turned off the lights, private business investment in this State had dropped 34 per cent between 1990 and 1993. The ballast space allocated to private, non-residential building work was emptier by 98.9 per cent over the same four-year period, and total employment in the State had fallen by 5 per cent; that is, 30 000 people had lost their jobs. Tourism had dropped by 13.1 per cent since 1990, and South Australia's share in the nation's tourist trade had dropped from 11 per cent to 7 per cent. Fewer and fewer tourists were coming to South Australia, and who could blame them, with a wobbly, swaying, lurching, top heavy *Poseidon*, whose captain had abandoned the ship, leaving his lieutenant and his buccaneers with no direction, no leadership, no discipline and no hope? Any sane person would have been relieved to hand over such a mess to a new command. This is a perfect example of incompetence above and beyond the call of duty.

Some 18 months after the Liberal Government took over the helm of our State's ship, we see a very different picture. Rather than wallowing in some stagnant backwater, the ship has been given new direction and the people have been given new hope. To quote Admiral Grace Murray Hopper, a person no doubt well known to all members (they can see me afterwards if they do not know who she is):

A ship in port is safe, but that is not what ships are for. Sail out to sea and do new things.

That is what this Government is doing. Our first two budgets have been designed to bring us back to even keel. We needed more stable ballast and less cargo on deck. We needed buoyancy brought about by a sustainable economic recovery, growth and a more productive public sector.

A primary stabiliser was business investment. During 1994-95, business investment rebounded strongly and grew by 22 per cent in real terms. With new confidence gained from a Government with clear objectives, business increased its expenditure on plant and equipment by 27 per cent last year. Consumer spending in the hospitality and service groups increased by 23 per cent. Clothing and soft goods retailing increased by 15 per cent. The ballast, as members can see, has been put back in place: the ship is stabilising.

Manufacturing industry employs 105 300 people and accounts for nearly 20 per cent of our gross State product. Over the 1994 period, employment growth in this sector was four times the national growth rate. Investment in the manufacturing sector grew by 24 per cent during 1994. Average employment in the State was nearly 2 per cent higher in 1994 than in the previous year. It was the strongest employment performance this State has seen since 1989. The underlying trend of State employment for April 1995 was at its highest level for four years. Until now, the 90s have been a disaster for our State, and we owe it all to Bannon and his buccaneers.

Tourism brings spending power to this State, and in the first five months of 1994 South Australia attracted 20 per cent more tourists than in the previous year. Australia as a whole attracted 13 per cent more tourists, so we are tracking better than the national average. Now under construction is \$148 million worth of major projects in this State, whilst \$1.2 billion worth of projects has been approved and \$1.2 billion worth of projects is proposed, totalling \$2.548 billion of construction project work that is under construction, about to be constructed or is proposed for construction due to the new

confidence people have in our State. This is a ballast worth working for. The ship's ballast has been stabilised.

The overburdening cost of the public sector infrastructure has been trimmed by an estimated 9 200 full-time equivalent employees. The actions taken will ensure that the public sector's net debt will fall below 20 per cent of gross State product by June 1998, and that is a manageable percentage. That takes the overburden from the deck of the vessel. So, as I was saying, the ship has been stabilised. South Australia again has ballast. It has strong leadership and determined direction.

What does this mean to my electorate of Elder? Basically, it means jobs and a future for families. It has meant, on figures from the Department of Social Security, a reduction in the first four months of this year of 501 from our unemployed ranks. In other words, in the first four months of this year 501 people have found jobs in my area. That is a 7 per cent increase in employment in that time. Members can ask: is the Liberal program for recovery working? Do not ask me; ask those 501 South Australians from my electorate who gained employment this year. Ask them if they have more confidence in their future. Ask them if they have a renewed hope in the State's future. However, you will have to call them after hours, because they are all out at work. I support the Appropriation Bill.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I wish to address briefly the issues involving asset sales and privatisation. The Opposition has had a very measured response to asset sales, very carefully considered in view of our position that the debt needs to be reduced. However, the difference in our position from that of the Government is that we advocate proceeding in an ordered way in response to the debt situation, measured over a reasonable period. This Government, I believe, is using the debt as a reason to ram through its own ideological position which can be basically characterised as public bad, private good.

The Minister for Infrastructure has made much of retaining, for example, the hard assets of the EWS in South Australia. His view seems to be that the contracting out of services is all right as long as the Government retains control of the policy and the assets. Interestingly, the new view of business is that it is the service sector which is the growing area of industry around the world. Yet the Minister is content not only to lose the service component of the EWS but to lose it to overseas consortia, organising this in such a way that only foreign controlled consortia would be eligible to tender for this contract. Then he is content to have the successful foreign controlled consortium use our State to move into the Asian market and pick up the market share over there.

In Question Time today he said that South Australian residents have the cheapest water and sewerage rates in Australia. South Australia is commonly claimed to be the driest State in the driest continent, and here in Adelaide we have to contend also with a particularly difficult water supply situation and hard water. The personnel and management of South Australia's EWS have worked efficiently to achieve the cheapest water supply in Australia, but they are about to be swept aside. They are to be taken over by a foreign company, whichever one it is, with a dubious record in their own country.

The most valuable asset of the EWS, the personnel who form the services sector, is about to be sold cheaply by this Government. This Government appears to be proud of keeping its ageing physical assets and happy to lose its

innovative staff. In terms of the cost of the water, I would like to read from an article in the *Financial Review* of 12 April this year, as follows:

The Industry Commission suggests the direct outcome of the reforms on the water supply industry is an 18 per cent reduction in water costs for commercial users (2 per cent for industry). Residential customers are expected to pay an extra 7.5 per cent and other consumers (principally agricultural users) to face increases of up to 31 per cent. The impact of reforms already implemented is beginning to flow through in NSW, where the corporatised Sydney Water Board increased its annual dividends from \$80 million to \$108 million last year. In Victoria the Melbourne Water Corporation returned a record dividend to the State of \$315 million—up 60 per cent.

That is what we have to look forward to under the scenario put forward in this privatisation proposal. Even if the situation we have seen in England does not apply here; even if the private company is able to contain its costs as it has not been able to in its own country, the residential users can look forward to an increase in the rates they pay compared to commercial and industrial users. This is what I particularly object to in terms of being a local member; that the residents will have to bear the burden of this cost structure. The reason I particularly object to it is that once again it puts the bulk of the burden on people who can least afford to pay. People in the middle and upper classes will be able to afford what the Government has called 'small increases' in these sorts of costs, but people on lower incomes or on benefits are unable to bear these additional costs, because it adds to other cost hikes that we have experienced in the past year or so in gas, water and transport.

So, although this Government is able to trumpet that it has imposed no new taxes, there has been a greatly increased cost to the residents of my electorate, and not only in terms of the bills they have to pay because services have been cut in order to pay for other areas. I refer particularly to the Para Districts Counselling Service, Career Link and various other services such as Debt Line. These people have no place to turn to when their financial situation becomes desperate. I noted in last week's *Weekend Australian* an article that said that there was no evidence of an underclass in Australia. If members read it carefully they will see that the security of the families cited in that article relied on one or all of good, cheap public housing; good, quality, cheap public education; and a solid social security net.

This State Government has shown no commitment whatsoever to public housing and appears to be twisting and turning in its efforts to hive it off to the private sector. In fact, in this budget it has halved its commitment to building new public housing units. It has cut its staff, cut consistently into the maintenance budget, and public housing in this State is very much on a steep, downward path. In this budget there have also been cuts to education, eroding the excellent standard that has been built up over the years of Labor Government. We have already seen increased class sizes: now cuts in this budget will be to areas such as special programs. Special programs mean Aboriginal education and those extra staffing formulae that provide for priority projects or disadvantaged schools.

That means that, in areas of disadvantage, a number of schools in my electorate that are officially classified in that way will lose their extra teaching allocation. Not only will they have increased class sizes but they will lose the ability to cope with the extra problems they have in their school. There will also be cuts to school services officers. This will have a major impact on schools in my area, because those

school services officer positions provide employment to people in our local area and provide an opportunity, with parental support, to introduce innovative programs in our schools. The loss of those school services officers is devastating to our school communities, and it is absolutely devastating to the teachers, to the parents and to the children.

It will mean that disadvantaged children will not have the extra help they so desperately need, and those children who are not disadvantaged and who are keeping up will be further disadvantaged because teachers will be spending much more of their time with disruptive children and will not be able to introduce the innovative programs they currently introduce. This Government seems carelessly set on a path to do its best to create an underclass in certain areas of this State. It will not be in the electorates of Government members, except perhaps for marginal electorates; it will be in electorates such as mine.

I and, I am sure, the people in my electorate intend to protest about that as vigorously as possible to put our point of view. I am sure that that will be overwhelmingly expressed at the next election. I can see very little good in this budget which, in an underhand way, seeks to undermine the living standards of the people of South Australia.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I rise to support the Appropriation Bill and to recognise the second budget of the Liberal Government. Our first budget for 1994-95 set in place the foundations for positive change towards a future in which South Australians can once again feel pride in this great State. The results of that first budget are already apparent in many areas, and better than we had anticipated. The horrendous financial mismanagement of the previous Labor Government left a legacy of debt of such massive proportions that even the most hardened economic rationalist fled for cover when asked for a comment on that legacy. Economic recovery is the linchpin to rebuilding the State's finances in conjunction with reducing the billions of dollars of State debt, and this budget is a clear indication that we have already initiated a massive reduction and massive turnaround at a rate faster than the Audit Commission recommended.

The Liberal policies outlined at the last State election and followed through in this budget hold no secrets or hidden agenda. Understandably, the Labor Party is in a constant state of confusion with this 'no secrets or hidden agenda' strategy. Economic recovery through industry and business investment shows a commitment by my Government and by the Premier to social as well as economic policy. The increased investment activity of business creates opportunities for the unemployed to provide for themselves and for their families, and it provides greater opportunities for our youth to plan their own future prosperity. It is therefore heartening for all South Australians to know that our economic performance during 1994 and 1995 has been our strongest since the late 1980s and, in fact, it is estimated to increase in real terms by 22 per cent to over \$2 500 million.

The upward trend in investment growth is already evident in areas such as information technology, tourism, the wine industry, manufacturing and other major industries. The Treasurer's budget papers point out that, in the first three quarters of this financial year, manufacturing employment was 16 per cent higher than in the previous year. This is in an industry that was decimated by the previous Labor Government's inability to understand business management and, indeed, industry needs.

Employment growth in this area was all the more remarkable when you realise that for the 12 months to

February 1995 manufacturing employment growth in South Australia was four times the national rate. Business optimism was revived across the board with small, medium and large business creating job opportunities recording a 23 per cent higher rate of job advertisements than last year. Employment growth is at its strongest since the late 1980s—a further, positive indicator that Liberal Government strategies to revive our economy are receiving a positive response. Employment grew by 2 per cent during 1994-95, which brought the unemployment rate below 10 per cent for the first time since 1991. The teenage unemployment rate fell by 2.6 per cent in the first nine months of 1994-95.

The policy undertaken by this Government on debt reduction should not be understated. The financial crisis is not yet over and Government must continue to play its role alongside the private sector by reducing its massive inherited debt, and it must be seen by all South Australians to administer taxpayers' funds responsibly. In his budget speech to this House the Treasurer reassured all South Australians on these important matters by announcing that Government debt and Government spending are under control. He went on to say:

The South Australian budget is moving out of the red in the quickest and most significant turnaround in the history of Government in South Australia. We are doing that without imposing extra taxation burdens on South Australians. There are no new taxes or adverse changes in taxation rates in this budget. Indeed, there are two significant concessions. The days of living on the credit card, an exercise turned into an art form by the previous Labor Government, are gone. We are tearing up the bank card. . . Tough decisions have been necessary as we continue to endure a climate of high interest rates and large wage claims. All South Australians can be assured that their funds are now being spent wisely and not squandered on meaningless or exorbitant programs.

The first two budgets of this Government have reduced net debt to gross State product from 27 per cent to 22 per cent. By 20 June 1998 net debt to GSP is expected to fall below 20 per cent. With the budget deficit under control and our asset sales program fully under way, the major significant achievement of these two budgets will be the reduction of State debt by more than \$1 000 million—a \$1 billion reduction, which is a tremendous step forward in cutting back the debt, improving our credit rating and getting this State working efficiently again.

Even the Labor Opposition should now recognise that there is no credibility in maintaining the argument that we should live with high debt and continue to spend more than we earn when we will save more than \$800 million in interest through asset sales to reduce our State debt. This is about Government getting out of areas in which it should no longer be involved, and spending money where it really counts in areas such as health, education and other essential services.

The Labor Opposition is displaying almost paranoid tendencies in its efforts to discredit the policies and strategies of this Government to lead us out of virtual bankruptcy and into a prosperous future to the point where it has deliberately overlooked the increased spending programs in areas in which the previous Labor Government chose to ignore. This budget provides a \$29 million increase to the education budget, which again indicates this Government's commitment to education. This is additional expenditure which will support the continuation of the early years strategy—this Government's No. 1 priority in education. This \$10 million strategy targets the early years of education over a four year period and began in schools this year.

A further \$2.5 million has been allocated this year which, when combined with the \$2.5 million from 1994-95, will

allow for the completion of the \$4 million cornerstones program, which is providing training for 4 000 junior, primary and early childhood teachers to help identify and assist children with learning difficulties. There will be a further expansion of the reading recovery program and other early intervention programs in schools—an area identified by us over previous years as one of the most serious. There will be a continuation of increased provision for speech pathology and guidance officer services, as there will be a continuation of the eclipse and first start early intervention programs in children's services.

There are many more highlights in the education budget, and I will continue to identify just a few. However, in this short speech I cannot provide a full list of all the advantages that this budget provides for education. The budget provides about \$500 000 for the introduction of basic skills testing for all year three and year five students. A new specialist learning centre for students with behavioural problems will be created at Elizabeth Vale Primary School, and the existing program at Brahma Lodge Primary School will be extended to cater for lower primary children. This is an area where we are looking at equity across the board. We are not targeting Liberal held areas and putting money into only those areas, which was a great criticism I had of the previous Labor Government when it came to extending budget moneys to assist students learning in schools in such a discriminatory manner.

This budget will also create 26 new child care services this year, providing over 600 new child care places; \$200 000 will be provided to increase support for young children with special needs in country area preschools and metropolitan child parent centres; up to \$100 000 will be spent on a new 'parents as teachers' pilot program supporting the role of parents as first teachers in early childhood development; and \$442 000 will be spent on a new child care business initiative called Kids Biz to improve administrative practices in 30 community-based child care centres.

This year we are spending an extra \$29.4 million on education and children's services. That is a total of \$1 138 000 million. Our schools will continue to be the best resourced of all the States, so that even after budget changes our pupil-teacher ratio will remain the best of all States in Australia. The number of support staff in South Australian schools will still be about 10 per cent higher than the national average. Ninety-six per cent of all classes in our schools have 30 or fewer students in them, contrary to the comments by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. We will continue the \$10 million early years strategy, and we will identify and assist those children with learning difficulties.

In the area of health, taxpayers provide \$1.476 million to run the State's public health system. The Labor legacy of inefficiency demoralised our hospital and health systems. Members of the public—the taxpayers—found it extremely difficult to be admitted into our hospitals unless they were prepared to wait over 18 months or longer. In 1993, prior to the election, patients were forced to wait in chairs in corridors because of the number of bed closures under the then Labor Government. It is therefore pleasing to note that for the year to 31 March 1995 there was a reduction of 9.7 per cent in the numbers on waiting lists. Even more significantly, the numbers waiting for more than 12 months were halved. This occurred during a period when hospital admissions actually increased by 3.8 per cent. The primary health care pool has been increased from \$1.5 million last year to \$2.5 million this

year for projects to improve and extend links between hospitals and community-based services.

Modbury Hospital has been the object of the Labor Opposition's most concentrated attack of misinformation and out and out untruths. The member for Elizabeth, the member for Torrens and Peter Duncan put together a small group of 25 misled individuals, encouraged out of Labor-held electorates in districts such as Paralowie, Burton, Gilles Plains, Dernancourt and Para Hills, to become the Modbury Hospital action group, not to mention that Paralowie and Burton are in the Lyell McEwin Hospital catchment area rather than in the Modbury area.

The 25-member group agitated at the drop of the proverbial hat and attempted to subvert the privatisation of management at Modbury Hospital. The 25-member group slowly diminished to a handful, obviously learning the error of their actions and that they were being used by that triad of left-wing loonies.

The member for Elizabeth has continued that unwarranted attack on Modbury public hospital. The honourable member's campaign against Modbury Hospital has achieved one result for which the honourable member must take credit, and that is that people in the Modbury catchment area, which contains approximately 300 000 people, are now confused by the information presented by the honourable member about privatisation and the Modbury Hospital. The honourable member has made them unsure whether Modbury is a private or public hospital, with the result that our constituents in the north-eastern suburbs might put their health and lives at risk should they need to seek emergency treatment. In their confusion, they might bypass Modbury's public hospital system and seek another hospital known to them as public. In fact, that has already occurred.

The member for Elizabeth must take all due credit for her fear and scare campaign based on pure political mental thuggery, without thought for the health and well-being of people in our communities. I trust that, should a tragedy occur, the honourable member will believe that her efforts were well worth that pathetic campaign.

The member for Elizabeth has not been satisfied to carry out just the odd one or two campaigns. Just recently, the member for Elizabeth, in another frivolous, negative article in the Messenger Press two or three weeks ago, complained about the outsourcing of contracts from Modbury to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and claimed that there had been a waste of taxpayers' money.

I must suggest that the leftie loonies from the Labor side of politics need to update their business practice skills and save themselves from further embarrassment from the incredibly stupid comments made on behalf of the Labor Opposition in South Australia. The member for Elizabeth certainly has a lead in the stupid comment rating.

The honourable member has dealt with health matters in South Australia in the same way as her campaigning skills, scaring the public by overdramatic and incorrect information. In that article, what she got right and correctly pointed out is that profits can be made by subcontracting out health services at Modbury Hospital, but she then claimed that, somehow, the Government was wasting taxpayers' money. That incredible, crass contradiction ignores the fact that it is because of profit in any business that the quality of service will improve and increase. In the case of Modbury Hospital, the improvements to benefit our community already exist, with a further six intensive-care beds and six high-dependency beds, which

have been added to Modbury Hospital's facilities since the opening of the private management area.

When that article was being printed and the honourable member was making her comments, Healthscope was close to finalising a contract with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, one of South Australia's premier teaching hospitals, that will enhance anaesthetic and intensive care services through making the head of anaesthetics at the hospital a university teaching position, namely, a senior lecturer in anaesthetics from Adelaide University. That will give teaching status to anaesthetics for the first time at Modbury public hospital. The contract ensures that Healthscope provides services that are equal to or better than those that are provided by the previous public sector-managed hospital. How they choose to provide those services, whether through private or public sector contracts, is completely up to them. The Minister had this to say about the same article:

I am personally delighted that they have chosen to enhance the academic status of the hospital and it sends a clear message to the community that if the public use this hospital they will be provided with the very best services free of charge.

If Modbury Hospital management can provide services more cost efficiently, a contract in the public sector or the private sector becomes irrelevant. The member for Elizabeth would appear to encourage a return to the past when her Labor colleagues spent taxpayers' money without dollar-by-dollar accountability and then sought more taxpayers' funds and overseas borrowed dollars, all of which brought us as a State close to bankruptcy, incurring a State debt of \$8 billion. The honourable member should realise that taxpayers' funds will be used, no matter which public hospital is involved, to provide whatever services are required. Is it not reasonable to expect that each dollar spent provides the best possible values and therefore reduces the overall dollars used, which can then be reinvested in our health systems? I suggest that the honourable member should also consider that, if democracy is served by freedom of speech, would it not also be served by responsible comment?

I now refer to a couple of our positive strategies outlined in the budget under the Family and Community Services portfolio. I am very pleased to be Chairman of the Minister's backbench committee. Family and Community Services has an allocation of \$230.3 million, which includes a \$9.5 million increase over the previous year. I commend the Minister on bringing down a responsible budget in that most complex of all portfolios.

There are three components of the budget, which include \$77.6 million to be spent on FACS programs and administration; \$89.2 million in support and sponsorship to external or contracted providers for the delivery of family and community welfare services; and \$63.5 million in concessions that aid more than 270 000 people, including Seniors Card holders, social security recipients and pensioners in the payment of council, power and water bills and subsidised transport costs.

Obviously, I am running out of time, but I commend the Premier, the Treasurer and all Ministers on this responsible budget.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I also support the Appropriation Bill, the second budget brought down by the Brown Government. Clearly, the budget indicates that we are now well down the road to fixing the State's massive financial problems, although I would not suggest for a moment that some tough decisions will not be needed to get

us back to a state that we all desire. We have slashed overspending, reinforced our commitment to major reform and finally set South Australia on an economic growth path. By about early 1996 we probably will have fixed most of the mess created by the Labor Government in the most significant financial turnaround in the history of government in South Australia.

Four key issues had to be dealt with, and we had to get them right. We had to cut State debt and Government spending. If we were to create the right environment for growth, there could not be any tax increases. We had to stimulate economic development and, at the end of the day, start to produce jobs.

When this Government was elected, South Australians were paying about \$3 million a day just in interest on the State debt, and our tax rates were among the highest of any State in Australia. Our State debt was blowing out, day in and day out. We were looking at more than \$9 billion worth of debt, and that was still out of control. But we have been able to turn that around in a short 16 or 17 months. As a result of our first two budgets we will have reduced debt by \$1.5 billion by the end of the financial year. That equals a sustainable, long-term, proactive future and opportunities for South Australia.

In the first two years we have actually achieved three-quarters of the debt reduction strategy that we set out for our first term of office. More than \$800 million in interest costs will be saved for the taxpayers of South Australia by 1988-89. That in turn will be put back into further stimulating the economy to increase job opportunities and economic growth and to put even more money into health, education, and law and order.

In the first two budgets we have also provided more than \$300 million to start to bring to account the massive unfunded liability for public sector superannuation which the previous Labor Government had no ambition whatever to address. That is something that clearly had to be taken on board, it was a commitment we made and we are sticking to the commitment. In other words, we are clearing the balance sheet for future generations.

As to the cutting of Government spending, when the Liberals came into office the previous Government had overspent by \$300 million on the recurrent budget and that was compounding out. This year for the first time we can see we have come in \$10 million better than has been budgeted and that clearly shows that the Treasurer and this Government are on track. With the 1995-96 budget we will have slashed two-thirds off the recurrent deficit in our first two years. But what is most important is that our Government is meeting the targets despite higher interest repayments put on us partly through the Federal Government and its lack of responsiveness to its debt blow-out. That has a huge impact when we inherited the massive debt figure I have just quoted.

Clearly, the Government had to save even more than we had anticipated because of wage increases and higher repayments. Yet, as I said, there was still a \$10 million saving in the last budget. Despite the increases about which I have just spoken, the underlying deficit for 1995-96 will be reduced from over \$300 million to \$114 million, and by 1997-98 we will have a slight surplus, something that most South Australians have been calling for for years. So, clearly the reforms that are being put in place are still enabling the South Australian Government to maintain priorities in both education and health. In fact, we spend about \$8 million a day just in the areas of education and health. I have just met a

member of the Western Australian Government and he told me that, whilst Western Australia's population is about 200 000 or 300 000 more than ours, they are not putting as much as we are into those areas. That is why we lead the way in Australia with education.

I said that we would not be able to increase taxes and, as per the commitment from the Government, there are no tax increases in this budget. Therefore, South Australia is now quite competitive because we have a tax regime that is 20 per cent lower than that of our major competitor States. Obviously, that is an important part of the strategy to give us a competitive edge in order to look after small business, large employers and, most importantly, families. It is interesting that Labor's solution was to introduce taxes and further hurt the hard working mortgage belt areas of South Australia and the needy—the very people the Opposition claims they are there to help. How two faced they are with those comments.

As to jobs and economic development, the performance of South Australia has been great during 1994-95, showing our strongest growth since the late 1980s. Business investment has bounced back strongly after years of decline and shows a 22 per cent increase in real terms. Of course, the strategy is to continue to boost exports and to encourage long-term investment. To that end I commend the economic development program incorporating a \$160 million package for economic development and including urgent areas of works such as the runway extension at Adelaide Airport at a cost of \$20 million and the \$2.6 million for strategic development of key industries, including the wine industry, which is so important to my electorate.

Another initiative was the \$300 million Building a Better Future program, which will provide \$300 million in additional private funds for community projects over the next two years. The overall capital works program in South Australia this year is worth \$1.15 billion and will support about 18 000 jobs. Within that in the southern area we now have the commencement of the Southern Expressway, which will create 1 900 jobs during construction and hundreds and hundreds of jobs from the benefits to secondary industry and our local community. After 10 years of promises by the previous Government and two election platforms which produced nothing, I am delighted to see the commitment to the expressway in this budget. So costs are down and business can now grow and create more jobs, but of course that cannot be done in one year: it will take some time.

I now touch briefly on the area of health. Contrary to what some people say, an enormous amount of money is going into these areas. For example, I cite the upgrade of the Flinders Medical Centre accident and emergency unit at a cost of \$5.8 million; day surgery facilities at FMC; and last year an additional \$2 million in value for the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital. The police are getting a new police station at Darlington, which will benefit the southern area, encompassing a \$9.9 million project. That development has been needed for a long time. We will see an additional 135 operational police brought in and part of the benefit of that is the seven extra detectives, and the Aldinga Police Station, who came into the southern area in the past 12 months. I am pleased to say that in my electorate five Neighbourhood Watch programs are currently being launched and that is after promises by the previous Government with years of waiting and nothing happening. We have \$1.6 million being spent on crime prevention in a pro-active strategy.

With respect to tourism in the southern area, we will see millions of dollars poured into Wirrina, Granite Island and

the McLaren Vale Visitors Centre. This will give us extra opportunities to market our area and create those much needed jobs. As to transport, Panalatinga Road, from Bains Road to Wheatsheaf Road, will have \$2 million of work as outlined in the budget and that will be a first-class facility for the residents of Mawson. The Minister is looking at improving the rail cars, with a total budget of \$159 million for the Clyde rail cars, many of which will come into operation in the next 12 months. Also, \$10 million is being spent upgrading the Seaford to Noarlunga railway line and nearly \$1 million is being spent on the Noarlunga interchange. Members can see that the Government has a commitment to providing better transport in the southern areas.

Turning to schools, nearly \$1.5 million will be spent at Willunga High School this year; the Woodcroft Heights Pre-School Centre will be opened, all being well, by the beginning of term 4 at a cost of \$500 000; and millions of dollars has been budgeted for Christies Beach High School and Seaford year 6 to 12 facilities. The Government is honouring its commitments and promises to the south and getting on with the job of giving the south a fair go. Members can look right through the capital works program and see many more initiatives, but the bottom line, as I have already said, is the \$1.5 billion that will be spent on those capital works programs during 1995-96.

In looking at the economy, we need to remember a few facts, but not the sort of tripe that I see pedalled every day in this Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition and his negative clan, who want to just trot out innuendo and scaremongering to mislead the South Australian community. Let us look at the facts. Let us acknowledge that 12 100 additional jobs have been created in this State during our first year. Manufacturing employment during the first three-quarters of the year was up 16 per cent and job advertisements are up 23 per cent on last year.

We are serious about tourism and we have seen international visitor numbers up by 20 per cent, which is something that the Leader of the Opposition could never achieve when he was Minister of Tourism, yet he is keen to tear down Wirrina and other tourism projects to get cheap political point scoring on the board. He will fail on all counts. Retail sales are up nearly 15 per cent and the manufacturing growth rate in South Australia is four times the national rate. Members should not forget that this is the sector which under Mike Rann and the Labor Government shed more than 22 000 jobs in South Australia in just three years. What a dismal record the previous Government had, yet the Opposition still does not want to get in and assist this Government to get the State going.

Spending on the key services of education and health remains above other State averages, and we have a commitment to the best education standards in Australia. Our pupil-teacher ratio remains the best of that in all Australian States, and 96 per cent of all classes have 30 or fewer students. I place on record that I will continue to fight for improvements in those two areas for all my constituents in Mawson. The budget allocates more than \$1.3 billion to our public health system, including \$70 million worth of new capital works and a considerable sum for new technology. With respect to community safety, the Government's commitment was to provide an additional 200 operational police officers during our first term and, as I have already said, 135 of these will be operational by the end of June.

The goals of this Government and the commitment and goals we have as members of that Government are very

simple. I have spoken to people in my electorate about these goals time and again, but they need to be clearly highlighted this afternoon. The goals are: to cut the deficit; to put every dollar we earn into asset sales in an effort to remove the State debt; to continue to reduce the size of Government, but still deliver world-class education, health and community services; and to deliver the right environment for business. Having just travelled overseas, I can tell members of the House today that, in world-class terms, we are certainly delivering world-class education, health and community services. That is what we were put in Government to do.

At last, I am happy to say that South Australia is starting to achieve and succeed once again. The structural changes are in place and the outlook for South Australia is the best it has been for at least a decade. I remind members of a few points: what did Labor do about our credit rating? It lost our credit rating which has cost us year in and year out, and we must turn that around. That was massive neglect by the previous Government, but one never hears the Opposition referring to that in the House. What about the debt levels? Don Dunstan can say they are not important; perhaps his cafe is freehold; perhaps some of his pension can be used to reduce the debt.

The fact is, we are not free of debt; we must reduce that debt, and anyone with an ounce of sense clearly realises that. That is why we are selling off BankSA, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and other non-core assets. That money is going immediately into debt reduction which, once we get that debt reduction down to a balanced budget, will then enable us to concentrate on those proactive areas. The Opposition does not like reminding the people of South Australia but Labor caused many of the problems but is not prepared to be part of the solution.

The Federal Government is not helping much, either. It will not come across and provide health insurance deductions for those people who should be given those incentives so that those who cannot afford private health can get a better go under Medicare. The Federal Government cut South Australia's funding by \$98 million this year; it is camouflaging its deficit, including its recurrent budget, and showing false figures just before an election. It is taxing our valuable car and wine industry, and that will cost jobs in the south. The Federal Government could not care less about the southern areas. Its election budget is purely that: an election budget compared with this Brown Government's budget, which focuses on long-term planning for a stable and viable future for South Australia.

Certainly there is still a way to go, and it will not always be a smooth track, but who thought it would be? No-one, if they thought about it for a moment, believed that South Australia would get back to a balanced budget in a short time. There must be some pain, but the good news is that we are back in business; there is light at the end of the tunnel, and for once it is not the lights of another oncoming train, as was the case when we saw devastation and debacle one after another under the previous Government. The Opposition wants to continue to scare, mislead and work against South Australia's recovery, but it is on the wrong train. The majority of South Australians and this Government are on the right train, and the Opposition knows it.

Members on this side of the House will continue to work with the Government to ensure that South Australia does have a long-term future. There is a good future for South Australia, and this budget is an integral part of the blueprint that, in time, will completely see our great State back in its old position: one I have longed for and enjoyed through much of

my life until now. It is a position to which I am personally committed as part of the Brown Liberal Government, and that is to return South Australia to its status as one of the leading States in Australia.

That is where South Australia was year in and year out until certain people entered this Parliament—people who were hamstrung by the unions, who were not committed to being businesslike, who were not prepared to look at the signals, who were not prepared to listen to the business sector of this community, and who went in and bankrupted the State. We are turning it around, and we will be one of the leading States in Australia. It will not be tomorrow, but I am confident that it will happen by about 1998-99. In the meantime, whilst we have had to inflict a bit of pain, and people voted for us to do that, that pain has been kept to a minimum and the situation has been carefully considered.

After this budget I believe the majority of that pain will be over and we will see an almost completely proactive Government instead of a Government very carefully balancing how it runs the affairs of this State. It will be proactive but reactive to the disasters, the debt loan and the mismanagement it inherited. It is good news for South Australians; it is particularly good news for the people of Mawson, and I make my pledge, as I did last year—and I will continue to make this pledge for as long as I am in this House—to work for the best interests of the people of Mawson. I commend the budget to South Australians.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): The State Liberal Government is suffering at the hands of its Federal Liberal counterparts. While Dean Brown is desperately trying to talk up the State's economy, his Federal Liberal mates are talking the national economy down. Business is suffering in South Australia; small shop owners are walking away from their premises on a daily basis. Two of my constituents did so in the past month, one a small business operator sent bankrupt and the other a fruiterer in a shopping complex.

The latter case was particularly tragic as his wife was working to earn enough money to buy the fruit her husband sold. If Government members go out and talk to people the way I and members on this side do, they will hear case after case where people are just hanging on, fearing any one of the many predators to whom they owe money will foreclose on them. These are not people who shirk their responsibilities: these are people who are trying. I am not talking about the high fliers or the quick-buck merchants: I am talking about every-day battling business people—those people who were told by the Liberal Party at the last election that a change of Government was the only remedy for the State's ailing economy.

Members opposite are in Government now and, quite frankly, they have not fixed a thing. I suggest that members opposite go out and talk to people trying to build and sell houses, and that is only one instance. Developers in my electorate tell me that real estate sits on the market for months; that the Valuer-General's figure used to be lower than the market value but now that figure, in many cases, is way over the market value figure. Dean Brown's Liberal policies are dividing families. Because of school overcrowding, class sizes in many cases are well over 30.

A case which came to my notice recently gives the true picture of class sizes. A family I know had to send their children to two different schools because the son could not be accommodated into a year seven class, which already had 35 pupils. The son attends one school and his sister attends

a school several kilometres away. If this Government really wants to change things for the battlers in the community—and this is often said to me—I suggest that members opposite talk to their Federal Liberal mates and tell them to stop running the country down.

Members interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: You are always saying that to me; you cannot take a bit of your own medicine. The Dean Brown Government's exercise in privatisation is another gross failure. In her contribution, the member for Newland spoke of the Modbury Hospital, extolling the virtues of privatising the services. I hope that she and members opposite take note of this. Last Friday a constituent came into my office who was very upset and annoyed with statements that the Premier had just made on the radio regarding Modbury Hospital.

Mr Condous: He's been a Labor voter all his life.

Mrs GERAGHTY: That is just a typical response: you cannot accept that people who believed and supported you at the last election are angry and in trouble as a result of what you are doing. My constituent's wife had just had a very serious—

Members interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Just a minute; listen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens would facilitate debate and make life easier for herself if she addressed all comments through the Chair rather than be antagonistic and address comments directly to members. That way, the Chair will remain in control and the honourable member will be cooperating. I thank other members to do as they have done for most of this debate and listen in silence.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Thank you, Sir. My constituent's wife had just had a very serious and distressing encounter with this newly privatised Modbury Hospital. She had been booked in by her doctor for a certain procedure, only to be told after a 45 minute wait that no-one was on duty that day to perform that type of service. This was after the patient turned up at the hospital at the appointed time, for which her doctor had made the appointment in January for June this year. She attended the hospital only to be told that no operators were scheduled for that day and to come back at some later time. We have just been hearing that Modbury Hospital is running smoothly, servicing clients and servicing the community.

My constituent was most annoyed, because he heard the Premier saying that morning that the newly privatised Modbury Hospital was running extremely well, with no waiting and no delays. That is just fantasy land. Added to that, my constituent was doubly annoyed, as prior to the privatisation members of his family had attended the Modbury Hospital for treatment, which they received, in his words—not mine—in a proper, respectful manner and had not been fobbed off. So, that hospital privatisation exercise is shaping up as a failure.

Now the Government wants to sell the management of the State's water supply and sewerage. As I have said on many occasions, I am incredibly fearful for the outcome of that exercise. As I have often said, it is simply privatising for no other reason than a cash injection into the State's budget. When the Government has sold ETSA and EWS and whatever else it can lay its hands on, all that will be left is the money. The Government will have the money, but it will last only a short time, so all those cash injections put in by EWS and ETSA that we have been hearing about will cease.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Actually, there is an old saying that applies to this situation: you do not pay off your mortgage by selling the house.

Members interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: People do have to do that, unfortunately, but in this case it is not the way to run Government. The Government will sell off the assets and have nothing, and what is worse in the Government's case is that the revenues from those assets will simply be gone forever. By the time the Labor Party gets back in there will be very little left, and in the meantime the communities out there will be suffering. They are suffering now, and they will suffer even further. The very basic, essential services that we rely on for our everyday existence will no longer be the responsibility of Government, so there will be no safeguards and our communities will continue to suffer.

I would like to know what kind of administration Dean Brown's Government is. It strikes me that it is a Government which has misled the people of South Australia—certainly at the last election—and which is now causing great hardship for families and particularly the elderly. I believe that members opposite will pay quite dearly for that at the next election and that we will see a much needed change but, sadly, that could be somewhat too late. I oppose this budget and I would hope that, if members opposite were not willing to do so publicly, they would at least speak quietly to Dean Brown and his Ministers, remind them of what is happening out in the community and continue to emphasise that people are being severely disadvantaged and are hurting.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I rise to support the Treasurer and this Appropriation Bill and to look at a responsible document, which turns around the situation in South Australia. Before I do so, because members of the Labor Party have been here criticising the Government for its financial decisions, I would first remind them of what some of their counterparts in Canberra did with their budget only a short time ago. An article in the paper stated that most people thought the Federal budget was a joke, but the *Oxford Dictionary* states that a joke is something that creates laughter and happiness.

I cannot see that the last budget, which Keating totally supported and went out and sold around Australia, was a responsible budget. He tried to con the people of Australia that in the lead-up to an election year he would produce a budget with a surplus of \$718 million, but the reality was that it was actually \$8 billion in deficit. The reason for the \$718 million surplus was that the Government was selling the furniture in the house. Yesterday I received a prospectus asking me whether I was interested in investing in Qantas, and the Federal Government has indicated that it will sell off half the Commonwealth Bank, which it swore it would never do. It does not care about doing this.

Members opposite sit over there and criticise our selling off State assets to try to reduce the debt, in which we had no part whatsoever, while their Federal counterparts are selling two of the most important assets that this country owns: the Commonwealth Bank and Qantas, the national airline carrier. Every country has a national carrier: Singapore has Singapore Airlines; Malaysia has its Malaysian Airline System; Britain used to have British Air, which has now been privatised; and Switzerland has SwissAir. They all have their national airline carriers operating into their countries.

What are we going to do? We are to sell off an airline with a reputation for being one of the safest and which provides

some of the finest pilots and service in the world. That will go bang because Mr Keating, in an election year, wants to provide a \$718 million surplus.

What else has he done? This is the man who criticised Hewson for his GST and said what a hypocrite he was to tax bread and such things. I asked the Australian Taxation Office to send me the latest sales tax figures, and they contain some interesting items. Let us look at passenger motor vehicles, which are manufactured in this State and represent one of the most important industries here. What did Keating say in the budget two years ago? He said:

Again, it is worth referring to One Nation, which announced: 'From tomorrow, the sales tax on new cars currently subject to the 20 per cent rate will be permanently lowered to 15 per cent—a saving on a new Commodore or Falcon of around \$800. With cheaper cars we will drive new cars, which is good for the environment, good for road safety and good for one of our most important industries.'

What did he do in this year's budget? There was a turnaround. The Federal budget stated:

Now that passenger motor vehicle sales are at a high level, it is appropriate to restore the sales tax rate to the general rate of 21 per cent from tonight.

It did not go back to 20 per cent; it went to 21 per cent. We have to bear in mind another thing: on 1 July it will go up another 1 per cent to 22 per cent. Let us consider another point in this article, as follows:

What happened to the commitment to 'permanently' lowering the sales tax to 15 per cent, consideration for the environment and the concerns about road safety? They have been exposed for what they are—lies, just as the Federal Government has lied about the actual tax level.

It has been 'restored'. The usual English interpretation would suggest that it should go back to the 20 per cent that applied in 1992. Wrong. The figure has been set at 21 per cent and the Federal coffers are getting a record rake-off from new vehicle purchasers—

and there will be another 1 per cent from 1 July—

What all this means is that Keating has brought new and doubtful meaning to the English language.

The Opposition talks about new taxes. We have not brought in any new taxes; we have stayed with the CPI. I have this budget document which refers to things happening from 1 July 1995. Here is a Prime Minister who worries about ordinary working class people, the ordinary guy, the young boy and girl who get married at 21 years of age, with the Australian dream of creating a nice household with a garden in the front and at the back, bringing up a couple of kids, taking them to the local primary school, battling for 20 or 30 years to bring up their children the right way, and who need assistance. What does the Prime Minister do? He decides to give them a new sales tax on building materials just to help them along and increase the cost of their home by another \$2 000.

From 1 July the things which are to go up are: prefabricated timber cupboards, cabinets, storage units and kitchens of a kind ordinarily used for household purposes. Then we have builders' hardware. How can you build a house without nails, rivets, washers, screws, bolts, nuts, brackets, door bells, door stops, door and cupboard catches, hinges, house numbers, letter boxes and locks? Then it goes on to timber floor coverings, taps, nozzles, tap handles and shower heads. He does not want people to have showers. Then it goes on to wall and floor tiles, plaster goods, bonding, setting and sealing agents, paint, putties and pigments. All those things will go up to 12 per cent from 1 July, so there is not much time.

The Prime Minister is also thinking seriously about the environment. I received a letter this afternoon, and the outside of the envelope had the reference, 'Recycled paper. Please reuse.' But what do we find? The document issued to me by the Australian Taxation Office, referring to recycled paper products, states:

The following recycled paper products will be taxable at the rate of 22 per cent from 1 November 1995:

- writing, drawing or printing paper (including pads of writing, drawing or printing paper);
- paper of a kind ordinarily used in accounting ledgers or accounting journals;
- envelopes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is wondering whether this interesting debate can be related to the State budget.

Mr CONDOUS: I am coming to it now, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member seems to have related almost all of his address to the Federal budget.

Mr CONDOUS: But it is important, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I will tell you why. It is important because we have listened to continuous debate from Opposition members telling us about increased taxes and what philanthropic and big hearted people they are because they are worried about ordinary people on only \$300—the working class representatives. But what are they doing? They are stabbing the working class where it hurts most—in the hip pocket. No one can be hit worse, especially young couples trying to establish a home. But people fell for it.

If one went into a supermarket today and asked a woman with a trolley and three children, 'Madam, how many of the 60 items in your basket do you think carry sales tax?', she would not know. She would not know that the Yo-yo biscuit which has been made by Menz in this State for the past 120 years has a 12 per cent sales tax on it, and she would not know that Berri fruit juices, our own cooperative in South Australia, are being taxed 12 per cent. The same goes for toilet paper. Apparently one is not supposed to wash, because that is another 20 per cent.

Let us get back to the State budget, which is important. Yesterday the member for Hart said:

Please don't treat us like mugs; please don't treat us like fools.

The Labor Government over the past 11 years treated the people of South Australia with so much disgust and disregard that it became sickening. The amazing thing was that it wanted to hold on to its full four years of power rather than turn around and be honest enough to realise that it had denigrated and stripped this State to nothing. The member for Hart has some heavy baggage to carry because he was the senior adviser to the Premier—

Mr Foley: Not to Bannon; to Arnold.

Mr CONDOUS: Well, to Arnold. The disgraceful part about it is that, with regard to this Appropriation Bill, Opposition members should have stood up and said, 'Members of the Government, we apologise for having left the Treasury bare and leaving you with a debt of \$8.9 billion.' How many incoming governments have taken over and been forced to run a State with the appalling financial situation that we found? Not only was the safe bare—

Mr Foley: What about the Adelaide City Council?

Mr CONDOUS: Don't worry about the Adelaide City Council. I left the Adelaide City Council—not just me, but Jervis and Wendy Chapman before that—as one of the wealthiest capital city councils in Australia, and Henry Ninio

is carrying on that fine tradition as well. The council is rock solid. Whoever follows him will not have to worry about scavenging, cutting and everything else to run a budget, because it is a solid council with good financial backing. It is the envy of many councils, so you cannot say that.

I feel very bad about having to go to the electorate and say, 'I am sorry that we are cutting down, but the reality is that either you want us to continue spending like the previous Government or to act responsibly, to run the State like a business and to give your child some hope for the future.' Believe me, one of the most appalling things that I have had to face as a politician is the plight of many thousands of young educated South Australians who have finished their tertiary or university education and who want only one thing, and that is to retain their dignity by going out and making a contribution to the growth and development of this State. However, having qualified, they have had to move either interstate or overseas to seek employment. Why is that? Because over the past 11 years we have become the laughing stock of Australia.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: We were the laughing stock. Frank Blevins referred earlier to the Remm-Myer Centre. I did not think that there was anything wrong with that centre. In fact, I thought the Remm-Myer Centre was good for South Australia. I do not blame Bannon at all. I will go on record and say that I worked with John—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has a dramatic speaking style, and the legitimacy of that style could be greatly improved if the honourable member addressed the Chair and referred to members by their electorates or simply as 'honourable member'. In the last two sentences, the honourable member has transgressed by referring to the member for Giles as 'Frank Blevins'. When he referred to Bannon that was quite legitimate, because the former Premier is no longer a member of the House. There is a distinction between how he can refer to sitting members and how he can refer to former members. I ask the honourable member to resume his interesting contribution but to vary his style so that the Chair does not have to keep pulling him up.

Mr CONDOUS: I must say that, in the six years I worked with former Premier Bannon, our working relationship was really first class. I honestly believe the man was an honest person with integrity but, unfortunately, the people he trusted and put into positions let him down very badly. I know of his passion to get the Remm-Myer Centre developed, because he believed it was going to be good for South Australia, but what let him down was the union movement. It was a farce. When the Adelaide City Council first passed those plans, the estimated cost of that shopping centre was \$190 million. What occurred on that site was some of the most disgraceful union thuggery that has ever happened in the history of this country.

People who work on that site today are still receiving millions of dollars in WorkCover payments. I know members of my community who were ordinary little labourers, sweeping the floors of the new development and who were earning \$1 000 a week. I know of the negotiations that occurred with workers on the Remm-Myer site after young ladies came to my office and said that they were appalled because every time they walked down the mall they not only received wolf whistles but were mentally raped. They were disgraced—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. This is a budget reply speech and I fail to understand the relevance of wolf whistling on the Remm-Myer site to the State budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Once again, the Chair would say to the member for Colton, already having drawn his attention to the very wide ranging debate that he has conducted, that this would have been better subject matter for the 10 minute grievance debate which has no limit to content. The honourable member should direct his comments more towards the budget.

Mr CONDOUS: I am trying to show those areas where there were failures in respect of the finances of this State. It was negotiated between the Lord Mayor and the unions that everybody on site would be paid a special levy not to whistle.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That is true. That was put into the award and they were paid that levy. They are the sorts of things that went on under the previous Government. That is why the cost of just the shopping section of the Remm-Myer Centre blew out from \$190 million to in excess of \$600 million. What is happening in the real world, in the streets of our electorates, is that we are paying the price. By acting responsibly, this Government is making an attempt to bring the debt under control and to provide people with the future that they want.

I know from just talking with ordinary people out in the electorate that they have a lot more confidence. They are not picking up the paper every morning and reading about the State Bank disaster. They are reading positive news. They know that overseas investors are putting money into South Australia because they have total confidence in the Government of this State. I have said this before and I will say it again: all I want to do is be part of a team that acts responsibly on behalf of the people I represent to bring about solid management, good government and a good future for our children. That is what it is all about. The only way we will do that is to run this State like a business.

If we find that we have to cut back and look after our spending, so be it. However, I am positive that the Treasurer has looked at this, not over a short period but long term and, in drafting the budget, has decided that his ultimate aim is to deliver as soon as possible a surplus budget so that we in South Australia can say that we are now banking more and collecting more than we are spending. That is something that has not happened. I believe that Opposition members should not stand up and criticise. In fact, they should hang their heads in shame for what went on over the 11 years that their Party was in Government, because we inherited one of the most disastrous eras of any Government in the history of this State.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 8.15 p.m.]

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Last night I sat in this Chamber listening to debates addressing this Bill before us. Some of the speakers were fairly positive, and I do not have to tell members that they came from this side of the House. As to others, what can I say? There are none so blind as those who cannot see. Gloom and doom was forced upon us. The scare tactics that have already been filtered over the airwaves were thrust upon us last night, and again the biggest con job under the sun was under way by the Opposition. Some members present cannot read the signals: they cannot accept that things are improving, and the only way they know to get their message across is by frightening people, feeding them enough

concocted atrocities that, hopefully, some will start to have second thoughts and might just be seduced into believing the kind of deceit that was offered to the House. Members opposite remind me a bit of spoilt children who cannot have their own way: they make a mess, they do not know how to fix it and, when someone comes along to clean up their mess, they jump up and down screaming how unfair it is. It is a case of 'We could not fix it, so we will not let you.'

It is an absolute disgrace that members opposite can sit there and pretend to be fighting for the community when they made the mess in the first place. They can go out there with beat up stories and display their economic impotence; they can try to frighten and bully people into believing that the Brown Government does not care; but do they really think that people are that stupid? Do they think that people have not seen and heard for themselves what this Labor Opposition is all about? They have watched and waited for 10 years to see a Labor Government improve their quality of life, put some value back into education, give them jobs, the best public health system and restore confidence in the South Australian economy. It did not happen.

They killed the job market; quality of life diminished; they took learning out of education while they let some of our schools deteriorate through lack of maintenance. And look how sick they let our health system get. That is the stamp of a Labor Government. And what was given to the people of South Australia? A bank with nothing left in it, a bankrupt State and a debt to be shared by us all. Like the rest of you, I am fed up with hearing the rhetoric. We on this side of the House know who made the mess and know who has to clean it up, so why cannot all those opposite accept the fact that we have a job to do. As tough as it may be, members opposite know that they made the mess and, instead of jumping up and down, bleating and bellowing, the pretentious crusaders of the community are not going to fix the problem and this definitely will not give them any credibility in the community.

I will spend only a short time addressing this Bill, as much has already been said, but in doing so I would like to congratulate the Treasurer and his staff on what must have been a most difficult task of maintaining a disciplined budgetary process. When we were elected to government, South Australia was overspending by more than \$300 million a year. We were paying almost \$3 million a day interest on debt. Government debt is now under control and, as the Treasurer has already indicated, the days of the Government's living on credit cards are gone. We are putting the brakes on debt, reducing it by \$1 billion in 1995-96. And this is what the community wants. That is why it made the decision at the last election. It knew that the State was in trouble. In fact, the community realised it was in more than trouble; the State was in so much of a mess that every man, woman and child would have to bear the brunt of this State's financial mismanagement for many years to come.

The community set a mandate. It chose a Government and gave it the job of repairing the damage and restoring confidence. This budget reiterates the Government's commitment to the hard work necessary to repair and restore the State's finances. We have come through what must have been the hardest year. Some tough decisions had to be made, but it was pleasing to note in the Treasurer's comments, when delivering this budget to the House, that the South Australian budget is moving out of the red in the quickest and most significant turnaround in the history of Government in South Australia. And we are doing that without imposing extra taxation burdens on South Australians. I can remember only too well

the grim reality we all had to face in view of the Audit Commission findings and the budget that followed. The message was loud and clear that we had to pull our belts in if we were going to get the State back on track.

With last year's budget we saw many changes, and it was not change for the sake of change; it was change to address the damage done to this State by the economic and financial disasters of the late 1980s and early 1990s inherited by us from the previous Labor Government. We saw introduced a new culture of public sector management, accountability, structural reform, support for industry and small business; learning was put back into schools whilst at the same time a whole new focus was placed on early childhood. Major capital works programs were undertaken in many of our schools, and I am looking forward to further allocations of funding in this area, especially in my electorate.

However, I will not be the first to acknowledge that it has not all been good news. We have had to face cuts in many areas whilst we prioritised in others. We as a community have had to face what previous Governments have been afraid to face; that is, that you cannot spend what you do not have. One of the biggest achievements in my electorate last year was the announcement of a new primary school on the Woodend Estate, Sheidow Park. Commitment for this school was given by the Premier prior to our winning government, a promise that was gladly received by the community.

The school had its official opening on 21 May this year and many in this Government joined with the school community in celebrating that special day. As a southern member, I also had the pleasure of enjoying a football match on our own home ground, the Southern Sporting Complex. As a Vice-President of South Adelaide I was sorry to see the end result of the game, but as a southerner with a dedication and passion for many sports, the real achievement was seeing over 10 000 people at what a former Labor Minister described as the 'Taj Mahal'. Members may recall his saying that we would never have this complex in the south.

The upgrade of the Noarlunga Interchange, again, is another major achievement under way. Yesterday morning, while I was getting on the train, people were handing out pamphlets at the interchange to tell us of the progress of the development and the stages we may expect over the next few months. That was the most read pamphlet on the train that morning. It outdid the *Advertiser* by miles, from just looking around at the bright green leaflets. This year we can add the Southern Expressway and the \$4 million allocation for redevelopment work at Christies Beach High School, another school that has suffered severely from lack of maintenance for many years. The school will really appreciate the fact that it has now been recognised.

I would also like to acknowledge the thing that is most important to me, and I know that I share this with my southern colleagues Lorraine Rosenberg and Robert Brokenshire; that is, that, with the Liberal Government in office, the outer southern suburbs are finally being recognised. We are getting our roads, schools and even employment possibilities addressed at last. My business community is signalling a whole new confidence in the economy. Across the State, manufacturing employment during the first three-quarters of this financial year was 16 per cent higher than in the previous year. Further investment growth is predicted during the next 12 months in areas such as information technology, tourism, wine, manufacturing and other major industries. Closer to home, we have welcomed a range of positive announcements such as the production of a world car

at Mitsubishi and a \$73 million expansion at the Mobil Adelaide refinery.

We welcomed the Transitions Optical plant at Lonsdale and a \$4 million aged care complex at Christie Downs. Under this Government, South Australia can foster an economy that is more competitive and more productive and thus better able to support desired living standards whilst ensuring that the public remains protected against failures in the market. In finishing I would like to reiterate that Government spending is under control and Government debt is under control. The task of repairing the State's finances is well under way and all South Australians can be assured that their money is being spent wisely and not squandered on meaningless or exorbitant programs, and we can look ahead with some confidence.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): So far, unfortunately the speeches on the budget have been as predictable as one of the pamphlets that I understand is soon to be circulated. As I understand—but I could be wrong—it will be circulated at taxpayers' expense. If that is the case—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I am glad that the member for Fawcay has asked about the Labor Party pamphlet which was entirely paid for by Labor Party funds. The member for Fawcay can always ask those questions in this House: I welcome the free kick. Let us return to the budget.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Speaker, I would like to know why the member for Colton is alleging we have not finished something. What is it that we have not finished?

Mr Condous: You have a blank paper.

Mr QUIRKE: I see. I suppose that is for a few more signatures for the member for Colton's petition which he presented in the House and which he ratted on when he voted the other way when the Bill came in. I am quite happy for the member for Colton to interject on that if he wants to; that is fine. At the end of the day the member will find that when members on this side say something out there publicly they carry it through.

There are a number of positions in this budget. When this document came down last week there was a smugness about Government members (particularly the front bench) in respect of this budget, because they anticipated that they would be able to pull the wool over the eyes of everybody in South Australia for another year. What was going on last week was a clear cut example of the old pea and thimble trick. The only difference this time was that there was no pea under any of the three thimbles.

In last week's budget we were told that it was a new dawn. I do not know about other members around here but if this is the new dawn then I am very interested to see how the whole thing goes. I do not think there will be a lot of sunshine for a while yet—it must be a very cloudy dawn. It may be a new dawn but it is certainly a cloudy one, because in terms of this budget there are a couple of things missing. The first is any real leadership to get South Australia out of the mess it is currently in. Secondly, if asset sales are taken out of this budget you find that each year debt is rising. We are told that by 1997-98 the Government will bring in a budget that will be balanced on recurrent expenditure. I hope that is so because the budget papers indicate that there will be, by the end of financial year 1995-96, a further blow-out of debt to the tune of about \$900 million *vis-a-vis* 1992-93. If that is the case then, putting the asset sales to one side, the value of all those assets has gone.

The Opposition is the first to admit that a debt reduction strategy needs to be part of the budgetary process. We believe the debt reduction strategy is something which needs to be developed and which needs to be understood in terms of the usual household mortgage for most of my constituents. The situation exists where over a period of time a gradual control of that debt can be evidenced—and not at the expense of teachers, nurses and police. When the Opposition asked some questions of the Minister for Emergency Services yesterday we found a couple of statements. One statement was that the police had better learn to do the same work with less money. The Minister made quite clear in Question Time yesterday that as far as he was concerned the police had better get used to having fewer resources. That is a pity and it is something about which this Government was quite unequivocal.

When the Government was in Opposition it made its case clear. In 1992-93 we used to sit in here and listen to the monotonous and sickening tones from the then shadow Minister for Emergency Services who told us that there would be more police out on the street. He told us that there would be more resources and that we would have this great age of crime control. We now find that the police budget has been cut. The other interesting thing we find is that about two months ago I asked the Minister a question in this House about how many more police were on the payroll at this point compared with the case 12 months ago. I was told, after a convoluted set of figures, that it was 12. Now I find, according to the Premier, that there are 135 more out there.

We actually find that a number of the jobs done by police officers, particularly in headquarters and other parts, are now being transferred to police on the beat. Again, it is a pea and thimble trick. The other warning I give is that the Minister has made much in here about the 400 Police Force jobs, which could be done by civilians, being done by police officers. There may be some truth in that. It may well be the case that there are some persons in the Police Force who are doing a job that still has to be done where parts or even possibly the whole of that job could be transferred to someone who is not a sworn police officer: we accept that.

The only thing is that, when a police officer is hurt in the line of duty or for one reason or another may have an illness, that police officer needs what is the equivalent, in an industrial sense, of lighter duties and is quite often transferred into these backroom jobs. I hope that the good personnel management that has been a part of the South Australian Police Force will continue. We do not see the sorts of headlines in South Australia that we saw as a result of the *Four Corners* program and in the papers yesterday regarding the level of corruption, because we actually have great pride in our Police Force in South Australia and have come to expect very high standards from them. That works two ways. It works two ways because police officers in South Australia know that if they get injured on the job they will be looked after.

About 12 months ago a superannuation Bill was introduced not only for public servants but for police officers. At the end of the day when we had debated and sorted that Bill out (it took nearly six months) we were all in agreement. It took a while to drag the Government to the altar on it but we were all in agreement that those accident benefits and all the other benefits for police officers needed to be maintained and continued. That is now the case as a result of the legislative program which occurred in this place in 1994.

In regard to the police there was never such a group (and I am talking about the Police Force as a whole) which was

told one thing by the Liberal Party in opposition but which found when the Opposition came to Government that the opposite was true. For a moment I will talk about the budget, the Police Force and the budget containment strategy, which I believe was pamphlet No. 61 of a thing called *The Police Post*. I find it very dangerous in a democracy that a Government and a Minister believe that they have the right to interfere at that level in the Police Force and have the document withdrawn. I say no more than that, except that the Minister has gone on record about the need for a police board to make the police more responsive to Government policy.

I do not want to take up all my time on that matter, but I want to make a couple of points clear. If the Minister had approached us on that topic, we might have been able to develop a bipartisan approach to future policing needs in this State. His actions in recent days now make that absolutely impossible. I want to make quite clear that we will not agree with his notion of police boards or any of the rest of it. I put that plainly on the public record tonight. We are concerned about the direction in which the Government is attempting to drag one of the great institutions in South Australia, the South Australian Police Force.

I have spent a bit of my time on that issue tonight. We have not always seen eye to eye with the police or, indeed, with the Police Association on some issues. On many issues we have agreed with it. There has been a body of agreement between the association, the Police Force and the Labor Party in this State. What has happened since the previous State election is that the Government seems to want to take the Police Force in South Australia down some new and dangerous roads.

Before I refer to other matters in my speech on the budget, I suggest that the Minister would be wise to seek the counsel of some other Ministers who have had discussions with the Opposition and developed bipartisan approaches to difficult community issues. We always extend our hand on important and significant legislation, legislation that we believe is in the community interest. Sometimes that has been at the initiative of the Labor Opposition: at other times it has been at the initiative of Ministers in the Brown Government, and to that end I commend them. There are a few—I have even mentioned them in the House—who are doing a good job in difficult circumstances. I cannot say that about the Minister for Emergency Services, because he is dragging us into a dangerous future and into an uncharted course about which we have some concern.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: For the information of the member for Fawcay, so do many sworn, serving police officers in this State. As for the overall budget strategy in South Australia, one of the most important problems that we need to address is the level of economic activity that we were told in 1994-95 would give us a growth rate of appropriately 3.5 per cent. In fact, the projections in the budget that was brought down last year—the first Brown budget—were for a growth rate of about half the national average. At that time, of course, the Brown Government had predicted a national average of about 5 per cent. Those figures presumably came from the Federal budget expectations. The Government believed that South Australia would obtain about 3.5 per cent. It went on to say that the anticipation would be about 3.25 per cent for the next couple of years afterwards. The result last year was .1 per cent.

We are told that one reason that the ABS figures were so bad on the day that they came out—the Government brushed

up the response a bit a couple of weeks later—was the drought. I must be missing something, but I think that South Australia did not do too badly in agriculture last year vis a vis New South Wales and, in particular, Queensland. The drought in Queensland has been going on for three years, and Queensland had nearly 7 per cent growth. What happened last year is that we saw no growth here.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: May I please seek your protection, Mr Speaker, from that gaggle of harpies who have been going on non-stop?

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Mitcham and others allow the member for Playford to continue his remarks without interruption.

Mr QUIRKE: I thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. I return to the growth rate of .1 per cent. It means that, if we are not careful, we will see a flight of brains, capital and talented people to other States and to other spheres of economic activity because they see no future for themselves or for their families here in South Australia.

One thing that was absolutely essential in the budget was to sort out the problem so that South Australia could at least reach, for the next couple of years, the same level of growth as the eastern States—the average. Indeed, last year we reached the all-time low of being bettered by Tasmania. To my knowledge, that has never happened before. We all know of Tasmania's problems since Federation. One reason why it sought and obtained the guaranteed five seats down there was that it believed, when it joined the Federation, that, unfortunately, it would never be able to compete with the big eastern States. It got itself into a mind set. Unfortunately, I see evidence of that in our community. We need leadership on those matters. When growth rate figures in South Australia are persistently well below the national average, when they are behind even Tasmania, unfortunately there will be long-term ramifications.

When is a tax not a tax? The answer, according to the Government, is when it is a charge. You can put up a thousand charges one week, but the next week you have not put up any taxes. The argument is that the Government has not put up taxes; it has put up a range of charges. At the end of the day, one of the main problems with the budget strategy—it will be interesting to see how we develop it in the Estimates Committees—is that most of the figures that we will use—we have used them in the past—to examine the budget in every detail have been the end-of-financial-year statistics supplied by the relevant departments.

In fact, when we go into the Estimates Committees process, we usually have some reports by various departments or Government instrumentalities. We also have material that is provided by the Auditor-General, and we use it throughout the whole process. I imagine that the Auditor-General will deliver his document on time, and by 'on time' I mean in plenty of time for us to use it in the Estimates Committees.

The usual time for us to receive that document is the last sitting Thursday before we go into the Estimates Committees procedure, which of course is tomorrow. I do not know whether that will be the case—I have heard nothing to the contrary—but there are a large number of other documents that we will not see until well after 30 June. That raises one of the problems of bringing down the budget as early as this. I know that it is to be concurrent with the Federal budget, which now comes down at about the end of April or the beginning of May. Some States, and this one in particular,

have decided to fall in line with that. One of the problems that we will face when we go into the Estimates Committees is a shortage of a large number of documents so that we can examine the budget in detail.

I raised that issue with the Treasurer during Question Time. I do not know how we will overcome it. However, we would need to have a series of three-quarter statements to give us some idea of how some instrumentalities are going so that we can ask proper and probing questions during the Estimates Committees procedure.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I am pleased that in bringing down our second budget we can point to the obvious success of the Brown Liberal Government. We all know what has happened in the past 10 years, and that is now the history of this State. The key word is debt, and debt means interest. Interest means cost as to someone else's investment. It is a positive situation if the investment is returning interest, but the rhetoric I have heard in this House last night and today from the Opposition defies any logic and any economic competency whatsoever.

The Brown Government is not acting in that way. Interest payments were going on top of a capital debt and we had a compounding monetary situation. You, Sir, being a businessman in your own right, will understand what that means. If the State pays more and more interest every year, it goes on top of the capital debt and it ends up paying interest on that total. When the debt continually rises, you know, Sir, what the end result is: it is a visit from either the banker or the bailiff, and many farmers I know have experienced just that. South Australia's debt was compounding—out of control. I am not saying that as political rhetoric but as a matter of fact, because that was the situation until about the last 12 or 18 months.

The Leader of the Opposition in his speech last night said that our debt was the same as when the Tonkin Government left office. I could not believe that. I was in my office and I heard it. I got *Hansard* today and read it with my own eyes. For the benefit of the House, this is what he said:

Labor believes in the need for a debt reduction strategy that keeps the fundamentals and the social fabric intact. A measured and balanced approach is required. It needs to be acknowledged by members opposite and understood in the broader community that the debt levels prevailing when Labor left office were similar to the levels that prevailed when the Liberal Government under David Tonkin left office.

In my whole life I have never read or heard so much drivel. I am not taking a political side in this and I will leave it to the experts. Just ask Moody's Investors Service or Standard and Poor's, the people who keep the record in this country because they check our performance. These are the people who take an independent assessment of our risk and our performance. What has been our performance since 1950? The net interest paid in 1950 was \$30 million, in 1960 it was \$40 million—the interest is increasing—in 1970 it was \$58 million and in 1980 it was \$158 million. The Tonkin Government was in office from 1979 to 1982, and in 1982 it was \$160 million—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Will the honourable member listen? However, when the Labor Government was swept from power, our interest bill was \$926 million. What sort of an increase is that? We can tack that onto the debt we already had and, with a population of 1.4 million people, we can work it out.

Mr Foley: It is 1.47 million people.

Mr VENNING: The member for Hart can give me even a close figure and I will agree with him. Even a simpleton can work out that, if we divide \$900 million by 1.47 million, we get a debt of \$643 for every person—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I did not calculate the extra point. That is the debt for every man, woman and child. But that is not the debt: it is just the interest in one year. If we add the \$643 to the rest of the debt, the debt per man, woman or child is over \$7 000, yet the Leader has the temerity to claim that the debt is no worse than when the Tonkin Government left this place. That is blatant dishonesty and that is what gets me about this place. Members say things like that and they are not brought to account. It is a total disgrace and it reflects on the system of our own parliamentary democracy.

Our net financial debt was \$9.6 billion and it will be down to \$8.5 billion by 30 June. That is a pretty fair performance. As I know from business, it is easy to run up debt but it is very hard to pay it off, especially paying interest as we go. People pay interest and then they pay off principal, and it is a difficult situation. Therefore, I congratulate the Treasurer for bringing our debt back to \$8.5 billion. The Treasurer has forecast that in 1996-97 debt will be down to \$7.65 billion; in 1997-98, to \$7.46 billion; and in 1998-99, to \$7.1 billion. True, it is slow progress, but it is progress in the right direction, and certainly after two Brown Liberal Governments State debt will be back to a figure that is almost manageable. I believe the sum of about \$2 billion would be a working overdraft for this State.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: That would take about seven or eight years with the current rate of repayment. Our debt to gross State product was 28 per cent, that is, it is the interest paid against total income. If my farm debt was 28 per cent, I would ring the banker tomorrow. Do members know that the suicide line for farmers is 30 per cent? How far are we away? We are just 2 per cent underneath that line. The debt was 28 per cent and I am amazed that in the time the Brown Liberal Government has been in office and made all those difficult decisions—

Mr FOLEY: Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw your attention to the reference to members by their name and not their district. My understanding of Standing Orders is that reference should be to the Premier or the member for Finnis. I ask that you draw Standing Orders to the attention of the member for Custance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brokenshire): The point of order is correct and I ask the member for Custance to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr VENNING: In deference to you, Sir, I agree, but I did refer to the Brown Liberal Government and not to the member for Finnis in any personal manner. I apologise if I did contravene Standing Orders. We have seen a phenomenal result from the Government in bringing debt from 28 per cent down to 19 per cent of gross State product. Members hear how the Victorian Government is doing well, but I understand the Victorian rate is 23 per cent. And 19 per cent is back almost in the realm of respectability. I say 'almost' because it needs to be back to about 12 per cent, but the figure is heading in the right direction and, as long as we keep it facing the right way, I shall be pleased and confident that we will be able to achieve that goal. It has been a phenomenal performance and even better than Victoria's performance.

Clearly \$3.156 billion was lost in the State Bank debacle and it will take at least two terms of the Liberal Government to get that back. I am happy and most South Australians would be happy with that performance. We cannot get the position back in four years and we all know that, but I would be happy to do it in eight years and, if we can knock it out in 12 years, it will be a good performance.

I just reflect on the last Government, when I was a junior in this place. It lost \$60 million in Scrimber. It did not even rate a whimper in this place. Minister Klunder just sat there and shrugged it off. He shrugged off \$60 million. To retrieve that loss and cut the education or health budget by that amount, just look at the pain it causes. The Minister just shrugged it off and did not even bother to go down to the South-East to see the problem first hand. He just laughed it off, as did all the others. I will never forget that. We are spending this sort of money and we are getting the maximum value for it. People in our Government have budgeting experience in business outside this place.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Hart has just arrived and is yet to prove himself. Labor scoffed off these losses and chose to ignore them. This shows a total lack of economic competency. Look at the Opposition: as far as I can see there is not a business brain among its members. If the Leader had any brains last night he would have kept quiet. If I were the Leader of the Opposition—and heavens above, I hope I never am—I would have congratulated the Government and come up with some further good ideas, so that in four years I could say, 'I helped the Liberals get out of trouble with my good ideas.' But what does the Leader do? He throws in all his negatives—none of which has any credibility at all.

All it does is cause people to concentrate on the gloom and doom about the State, and it really upsets me. Fancy saying in the debate last night that the debt left by Labor was the same as the debt left by Tonkin. That is a blatant untruth; in fact, it is a lie. I do not know how anyone can say that in this place and go unchallenged. It is a ridiculous situation. There is something wrong with our system when people without any financial competency at all can be elected to Government. We are here to manage a State. This is the highest court in the land in relation to managing South Australia. Political decisions can be made overriding all financial advice, and one must have a little bit of economic nous to understand how things tick.

We know that in the past the Labor Government's front bench lacked economic nous. There was not one bean counter among those who sat on that bench, and look at the result. I respect quite a few members who were in that Government, and I particularly respected Premier Arnold: I had a lot of time for him. I did not blame him for the State's demise but he was part of the system that destroyed it. I wish the member for Hart well in his crusade over the next few years. He can prove himself in his position but he has a long way to go yet, and he has a lot of friends in front of him who need to lift their game 1 000 per cent, be much more positive and give the State some confidence.

Have a look at the Opposition: it comprises union officials, being rewarded for years of faithful service; career politicians, younger people who have graduated from being employees of previous members of Parliament; or lawyers who were not long enough in practice to gain much experience. The overwhelming fact is that Labor failed, and they all know it—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat; there is a point of order.

Mr FOLEY: Sir, I draw your attention to the content of the honourable member's contribution. This is a budget debate speech and I therefore ask where the relevance of union membership in the Labor Party ties in with the budget.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! It is a frivolous point of order, but I do ask the member for Custance to try to concentrate on the main frame of the debate.

Mr VENNING: I did digress a little but I will get back to the theme. These people stand in this place and wail gloom and doom, and this is the problem. Wailing gloom and doom breaks the confidence of the State. Many people are just waiting to move back into South Australia, but when they hear comments like that it makes them pause and think about it. I am asking the Leader to be positive and to come up with ideas that can be added to those of the Government, and then in four years he can say, 'We played a part; our ideas got the State moving.' But this harping and carping is not doing us or anyone else any good.

This State, under Playford, led Australia. I ask members to check the statistics, and I know the member for Hart will do that. Look at the performance graphs of this State over the past 40 years. Just check the history. A sudden change in direction occurred in those graphs; check when it happened. The man who is now giving us advice, former Premier Dunstan, did turn the State around: from vertically up to vertically down. It is ridiculous that he now has the temerity to tell us how we ought to be managing this State. Dunstan was doom to South Australia and we have so many problems to thank him for, including one very poor financial decision involving the way we sold off our railways.

Premier Bannon added to that when he allowed another rail authority to operate in South Australia. Now we have three rail authorities in this small State—what a disgrace. If ever I saw a weak negotiator it was Bannon. We were in a marvellous position to get the best possible deal. AN should have been the national freight carrier, and that is plain common sense. But what happened? It went to open negotiations and we ended up with three systems. AN really has nowhere to go and now merely has what is left of the national rail system we had.

This budget spends our State money very wisely and it is well targeted, particularly in my electorate of Custance. I acknowledge with gratitude the Government's allocation of \$3.5 million for the replacement of the Tanunda Primary School. It concerns me that the community is taking a little while in deciding where they should build that school, but I am encouraged that that decision will be made shortly and confident that the whole community will agree that the best decision has been made. An extra \$150 000 has been allocated to the Barossa Tourism Marketing Board, and an extra \$6 000 for the Barossa Valley tourist office. At last we have a Government that recognises our potential in tourism, and it is taking off like a rocket. Every week tourism increases. The optimism—

Mr Clarke: You're the No. 1 attraction in the Barossa Valley.

Mr VENNING: I do not care. If people pay money to see me, I will take it. The Barossa Valley itself has a new air of confidence; of getting up and doing things. The tills are starting to rattle over. I also acknowledge that ETSA is spending \$300 000 on its regional board. I am pleased to note that yet another \$3.4 million will be spent on our roads. Ever

since I entered this place, five years ago, one of my campaigns has been the Morgan to Burra road. This issue has been going on for 60 years. Members of Parliament have been going to fix up that road but there was always a political reason why it did not happen.

I acknowledge the work done by the member for Frome. The road from Spalding to Burra has been completed and the people who live there are absolutely delighted. In the key stud area of South Australia—probably Australia, if not the world—there is now a sealed road to drive on between Spalding and Burra. Already we have seen an extra 20 kilometres of sealed road on the Burra to Morgan section. I am confident that before we go to the polls again I will be able to drive on bitumen along that entire road, and I invite all members to do the same. I still have the rocks in Parliament House.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Would the honourable member like to see some rocks? He hasn't had a rock from my little collection. In my maiden speech I distributed rocks to members in this place. In relation to health, we introduced significant increases in the efficiency of the State's health system, and I know there has been some pain in that. I know the adjustments have hurt a lot of people, but I will be keeping a watch on that situation. The Government continues its support for country hospitals, in which country people need to convalesce or spend their last days in remedial care. I know what my country hospital meant to me and my family in the past few days, because my father was able to spend his last days in his own community.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I point out that members are tending to get somewhat noisy. They have had their chance, and I would appreciate their showing some courtesy towards other members. The member for Mitchell.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your protection during this very important debate. The second budget of the Dean Brown Liberal Government was delivered on Thursday 1 June.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I draw your attention to the appropriate title by which members should be addressed: the Premier should be referred to as the Premier or the member for Finnis.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The point of order is correct, and I ask the member for Mitchell to refer to the Premier as the Premier or the member for Finnis.

Mr CAUDELL: Thank you, Sir. The philosophy outlined in our election platform has been maintained. There have been no new taxes, and for the member for Ross Smith's benefit I repeat that there have been no new taxes. The ALP budget after the first bail-out of the State Bank must not be forgotten; it must not be forgotten that our interest rates went up by 45 per cent after that first bail-out and that the ALP increased our taxes by more than 10 per cent across the board, to make us one of the highest taxing States in the Commonwealth.

It is unfortunate, but we must all remember that within two years under the ALP our debt doubled from \$4.2 billion to \$8.5 billion. Under the ALP, our interest bill went from \$158 million after the Tonkin Government in 1982 to \$907 million, where it is today. It is worth pointing out that interest is now South Australia's third highest expense under its recurrent expenditure. Only education and health have more money allocated to them than the interest bill.

The interest cost on the ALP debt costs us approximately \$2.5 million each and every day of the year, without any let-up for Good Friday, Anzac Day or Christmas Day. There is no respite: \$2.5 million per day. That daily interest cost would go a long way towards sustaining one primary school in the electorate of Mitchell for a full year. Let us look at the progression of our debt since 1950. In 1950 our debt was \$284 million with an interest bill of \$30 million; in 1960, \$752 million with an interest bill of \$40 million. Given his speech, I appreciate that the member for Ross Smith is not really keen to hear the figures, and we will address later the items he raised.

In 1970, the South Australian debt was \$1.4 billion with an interest payment of \$58 million; in 1980, \$2.2 billion with an interest cost of \$158 million; and in 1995 the debt at the end of Labor rule had grown to \$9 billion with an interest cost of \$907 million. The good news in the budget—if there could ever be good news associated with such a debt—is the fact that we have already achieved \$1 billion in asset sales which, besides reducing our debt, will also reduce our interest costs by over \$100 million in 1995-96.

We must—and we will—return the recurrent account to surplus. Under the ALP a deficit in recurrent expenditure was not called a deficit, over-expenditure, a shortage or even running out of cash: it was called ‘borrowings’. Under an ALP Treasurer, the financial document gets down to the bottom line and states, ‘Financing requirement—\$470 million; borrowings—\$470 million; Consolidated Account deficit—nil. So, under an ALP Treasurer, in order to overcome a deficit or shortfall we write it down as borrowings and then write down the deficit as nil.

The level of borrowings under the ALP Government from 1982 to 1992 is also worth noting. The ALP Government borrowed \$4.2 billion just to patch up the little shortfall in its operation. The ALP had a debt management strategy—or its members have mentioned the need for one in their speeches over the past couple of days—and it is obvious what that debt management strategy was: if it sits long enough, tax it; if you cannot see it, borrow it. That is the philosophy Labor had all the way through its period in Government.

In the seven years from 1984 to 1992, the recurrent expenditure needed to be propped up by \$4.2 billion. Included in the recurrent expenditure was the interest on debt; so, when the Labor Government had to pay interest on its recurrent expenditure, it borrowed money to pay for that interest. It borrowed those moneys, which increased the debt, to pay the interest on that debt. If we followed the ALP’s philosophy on debt management (and it is so simple that it is a wonder no-one thought of it before), based on the current interest payment of \$9 billion it would not be very long before we absolutely doubled our current debt. Based on that strategy, within five years we would double our current debt of \$9 billion to \$18 billion—a magnificent strategy. It is a wonder no-one thought of it before. The South Australian economic indicators traditionally roll on, with minor variations—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith is out of order.

Mr CAUDELL:—but those indicators are always below those of the rest of Australia. Business investment in 1985, 1986 and 1987 ran at \$630 million; in 1991-92, between \$630 million and \$580 million. Our population growth during that period has been .4 to 1 per cent, whereas during that same period the Australian population growth has been about

1.75 per cent. In 1989, 652 000 people were engaged in full-time employment; in 1994, it was 646 000. One can see that during previous years South Australia could sustain minor fluctuations in Australian economic activity, but it could not sustain a major debt spike which came down the line in 1990-91 and which was man-made and introduced by the ALP Government.

The interest in servicing that debt is causing the problem. We cannot borrow, as the Australian Labor Party has done in the past. We need to reduce that debt so that we can reduce the level of interest payments and put the operating account into surplus. We have already cleared \$1 billion with the sale of the former State Bank and the Pipelines Authority. There is a need to reduce that debt level further. A further \$1 billion reduction in our State debt down to \$7 billion can be substantiated quite easily.

Unfortunately, we now have a problem in finding a further \$2 billion and getting it down to what I would call an acceptable level that we could sustain with our economic activity in order to pay the interest costs and reduce the debt further. Past management of the economy of South Australia by the Australian Labor Party would suggest that our population levels would not sustain sufficient activity to service a debt of about \$7 billion.

As the Premier and Deputy Premier have shown over the past 18 months, we need efficiencies in government and financial competence to reduce our costs in line with those of Queensland and Tasmania. The report in the *Australian* at the weekend has Queensland as the lowest taxed State at \$1 048 per person and South Australia at \$1 152 per person. We need to reduce our costs to attract businesses to South Australia to increase economic activity and employment. But this may not be enough. We should be lobbying the Federal Government for increases in migration levels for those willing to settle in South Australia. This State needs the economic development, the critical mass for development of infrastructure and the population base for revenue in order to reduce the debt.

New South Wales and Victoria say that immigration of 50 000 people per annum is more than enough and that Australia cannot sustain a higher level of immigration. It is easy for New South Wales and Victoria to say that that level is sufficient when they attract 67 per cent of immigrants. South Australia’s population in the meantime increased by only .4 per cent during the past financial year. If we were to double South Australia’s population, it would represent an increase of less than 10 per cent in Australia’s total population. With assistance and the removal of quotas for business and skilled migrants into South Australia, we would be able to provide sufficient economic activity and employment to overcome the debt problems that have been caused by the Australian Labor Party.

Looking at the speeches of both the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, one can understand why it has been said in this place that the Australian Labor Party deceived the population of South Australia, just as it has tried to deceive this Parliament. But that is not surprising from a Leader of the Opposition who welves on his bets. The Leader of the Opposition made two particular statements. One, to which the member for Custance alluded, was that the debt levels on leaving office were similar to those which prevailed when the Tonkin Government left office. When the Labor Party left office in 1993, the debt level in nominal terms was \$8.5 billion. When the Tonkin Government left office in

1982, the debt level was \$2.6 billion in nominal terms. If that is the same, I am a monkey's uncle.

The other statement made by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition was that under Labor the debt fell throughout the 1980s until we had the problems with the State Bank and SGIC. It is obvious that I and the members of the Government went through a different schooling system from the Opposition. I should like to read—

Members interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Not only can't they count, but they can't read.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the House to listen to this important debate. The member for Mitchell tends to encourage non-parliamentary behaviour at times. I ask him to concentrate on his speech, and I ask members to listen.

Mr CAUDELL: I should like to read into the record some of their mathematics. It may be that they read from the bottom and worked up, but I do not know. In 1982 the debt level was \$2.6 billion; in 1983 it was \$2.9 billion; in 1984 it was \$3.3 billion; in 1985 it was \$3.4 billion; in 1986 it was \$3.7 billion; in 1987 it was \$4 billion; in 1988 it was \$4.2 billion; in 1989 it was \$4.4 billion; in 1990 it was \$4.6 billion; in 1990 there was an almighty jump when it went to \$7.1 billion; in 1992 it went to \$8 billion; and in 1993 it went to \$8.5 billion.

In each instance the debt went up by at least \$200 million. Yet, according to Labor's mathematics, that debt fell throughout the 1980s. It fell through the sky and hit everyone on the head, and that is about the closest that it went to falling. It fell right through: it went from black to red on the balance sheet. It is obvious that when the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition made that statement they had their tongue in their cheek. Otherwise, there is no way in the world that they could have said anything like that; they could not have believed that they were speaking the truth.

The Opposition believes that the Government should seriously consider a longer term plan that will allow us to reduce our debt. The debt of \$2 billion in real terms, after asset sales, will still be at least \$2 billion higher than it should be. I assure Opposition members that it will take a long time for South Australia to get back to anywhere near the debt of \$2.6 billion that we handed to them in 1982. If we were to get to that level in real terms of \$4.8 billion, it would still be a long time.

We had another pearl of wisdom from the Leader of the Opposition when he referred to a debt incurred for an intelligent investment—the State Bank, which lent money to people to explore and drill for sand at low tide. The Leader of the Opposition said:

A debt incurred for an intelligent investment that will earn income in future, reduce costs of Government or provide important infrastructure for the country in the future is desirable. We need to pay off our mortgage—our debt.

We certainly need to pay off our debt. Unfortunately, when the Labor Government incurred our debt it did not leave any assets behind for us to use.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 142, which provides that no noise or interruption is allowed in debates. It provides that, while a member is speaking, no other member may make a noise or disturbance or converse aloud or speak so as to interrupt the member who is speaking. I

have had trouble listening, so I ask for your ruling on that point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have heard the point of order. With respect, it applies to all members in the House. I ask that members listen to the member for Mitchell.

Mr CAUDELL: In the time left I would also like to deal with the closure of schools. It seems that the Labor Party has a very short memory when it comes to the closure of schools because in my electorate, in the past five years, the Labor Party closed three schools.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's—

Mr CAUDELL: It closed Glengowrie High School, the Oaklands Park Primary School—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CAUDELL: —and it closed the Dover Gardens Primary School. As I said, it closed three schools in my electorate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I inform the member for Mitchell that it is unparliamentary to speak over the Chair. I ask the member for Mitchell to remember that in future. I appeal once again for members to be tolerant to other members when they are speaking and to listen.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Mitchell referred to the Opposition as 'gangsters' and I ask him to withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I was not able to hear the remark of the member for Mitchell, given the extent of the noise in the Chamber, so I cannot rule on the point of order. I ask all members to show courtesy and listen to members when they speak.

Mr ATKINSON: For the record, Sir, it was the member for Colton, not the member for Mitchell, who is blameless.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The fact remains that I could not hear because of the noise, so I ask members to be quiet.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): The economic path that the Government is steering with this budget is the wrong path. But even more frightening than that is this Government's total incomprehension of the implications of the direction in which it is throwing the State. I say 'throwing the State' because all implications are that the Government is out of its depth. These boys are playing with big toys, big outsourcing contracts, big cuts to fundamental services, and lots of big rhetoric about how natural they are at managing the affairs of this State, what high flying business operators they are, and about how they have magically solved the economic woes of South Australia. We are in the home straight, says the Treasurer. It is a new dawn—

Mr Caudell: A new era.

Ms WHITE: A new era, and we are tearing up the bankcard. What fantasy!

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE: These guys are acting not like the skilled politicians they are employed to be—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In deference to the member for Taylor, she referred to the Government as 'boys with toys', and now she is talking about 'these guys'. I find those remarks both sexist and offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member for Taylor is generalising and it is—

An honourable member: Genderising!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Taylor is aware that, when referring to members of the House, she should refer to them either as honourable members or by their district. I suggest to the member for Taylor that, when she is referring to other members, she does so in the manner I have indicated.

Ms WHITE: Worse still, the Government believes its own rhetoric. Over recent days and months, we have heard these smug, arrogant platitudes from Government members as they tell us not to take any notice of the fact that our growth rate is abysmal, the lowest of any State, and that our unemployment problem is not being tackled. Glibly, the Premier refers to high technology as the saviour that will deliver employment to the State. Just how does he intend to make that happen? How will he transform the great pool of unskilled, unemployed in an electorate such as mine into a jobs ready work force? Well, it is obvious, is it not?

According to the Premier, we will achieve that most fundamentally important task by slashing the education and training budget. The Premier has cut \$25 million out of the TAFE budget at a time when the rest of the nation is focused on developing an innovative culture that will position us well in the global market. He has cut \$25 million out of our training budget at the very critical time that, even by his own rhetoric, requires us to provide a skilled work force for businesses who might invest in this State.

This budget is a systematic attack on basics by a Government whose economic performance does not match its rhetoric. Based on the figures for the December quarter, the rest of the nation has been growing at 5.5 per cent, but despite the Government's rhetoric all it can manage in South Australia is a paltry .1 per cent. I refer to the Government's rhetoric, its chants of everything being a win-win for the State, the new dawn, turning the economic corner and the new era—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE: I mention the Government's rhetoric because it is affecting its performance. Members opposite are starting to believe their own PR, and that is preventing them from listening to the electorate. An electorate that is asking why their children have less subject options at school. They want to know why their basic health services are being cut and why the Government is cutting police numbers. They also want to know why train and bus fares are increasing and why there is all this pain for a South Australian economy that has shown pitiful growth since the Liberals came to office.

The Government has not tackled the unemployment problem. The Liberal Government promised 3.75 per cent growth this year. It has achieved only a fraction of that. The Liberal Government promised 12 000 jobs in its first year. It claims it has created 20 000 jobs—more rhetoric—but we need 37 000 jobs just to keep up with the national jobs growth. This State has fallen behind because the Government has failed to meet even its own economic targets. What it has succeeded in doing is to break its pre-election promises not to cut services and not to increase taxes and charges. What it has managed to do is weigh the pain of these changes towards those who are least able to afford that cost.

By the end of the next financial year, almost \$100 million will have been ripped out of our schools, and 522 teacher jobs and 287 school services officer jobs will have gone. The

Premier's pre-election promise to increase spending on education and to increase the school maintenance budget by \$20 million—all gone. In health, \$65 million has been ripped out of the system. Despite the rhetoric, and the blatant untruths promulgated by the Liberal Party in its recent pamphlet to the electorate of Wright, the Federal Government has not cut funds to South Australian hospitals. In fact, the Commonwealth has increased funding to South Australian hospitals.

The South Australian Government must not continue to look to someone to blame for its budgetary decisions. It must face up to the fact that it is no longer a new Government. The ball is now in its court and it must take responsibility for its budgetary actions. Indeed, we saw a prime example yesterday in the House of this Government's reluctance to take responsibility for the implications of its measures. We heard the Emergency Services Minister lay the blame for cuts in his budget everywhere and anywhere except at his own feet. He quoted words uttered by the Police Association's President when the previous Government was in power. Well, I am sure that members would have been interested to read page 1 of today's *Advertiser*, where the current comments of the President of the Police Association are reported. That article makes interesting reading, and I quote as follows:

'There is a crisis in the South Australian Police Force,' the association's President, Mr Peter Alexander, said yesterday . . . Describing police morale as 'the lowest in memory', Mr Alexander said the \$10 million cut inflicted on the Police Department in last week's State budget had made industrial action almost inevitable. He said the Emergency Services Minister, Mr Matthew, had misled the public about the true nature of the cut and the 185 police jobs set to be slashed from the force. . . 'But we believe the community and the police themselves are being hurt by the Government. The fact that strike action is even being contemplated by what is one of the most conservative elements in society is indicative of the seriousness of the morale crisis and deep resentment in the force'. Mr Alexander also revealed that SA police would try to shift to a Federal award after being 'insulted' by the Government with a proposed \$1 a week rise under enterprise bargaining. 'Any credibility the enterprise bargaining process had has been shattered as a result of the budget cuts and the Government's attitude to police,' he said.

Mr Alexander ridiculed claims by Mr Matthew last week that police funding had actually increased this financial year, saying that the Government's own figures, when adjusted for inflation, showed a real terms decline of \$10 million on 1994-95. He also slammed the suggestion by Mr Matthew that 185 'non-operational' police would be removed from the force over the next three years without affecting front line police duties. And he rejected claims by Mr Matthew and the Premier, Mr Brown that, despite that cut, an extra 135 operational police had already been put on the streets and at least 200 extra would have been introduced before the next State election. 'The public should not be fooled by Mr Matthew's attempt to fudge the numbers. . . he has misled the public over the issue of police numbers,' he said. 'The Government's promise to deliver 200 extra police should be seen for what it is—a charade.

Again, we see a charade, false PR, all from a Government that is cutting the police budget by \$10 million or 250 staff, including 185 officers. All this pain will certainly be felt in electorates such as mine, but what of the Premier's promise of family impact statements that were to accompany every single Cabinet decision? Where is the analysis accompanying this budget to show that this Government has even considered the impact that these latest measures will have on families? Absent, of course, because all that was merely rhetoric. In this budget services are down and taxes and charges are up. Despite the pre-election promise of no new taxes or increases in charges above the CPI or inflation, we saw 800 increases in taxes and charges in July last year and we saw the land tax threshold decrease to include another 30 000 people in its tax

net, plus a 150 per cent increase in land tax on properties of \$100 000 in value.

In December last year we saw a 5.9 per cent increase in gas charges and, of course, we have recently seen over 1 000 increases in taxes and charges again. Add to this the massive cash grab from ETSA and members can bet that we will see a bit more of the same. This budget enshrines a policy of privatisation. It enshrines an ideology that says that private companies seeking to make profits will do a better job than the public sector. This Government believes that profit making companies will do a better job of running our hospitals, our prisons, our schools and even our water utility. We discussed previously what happened in Britain: disconnections to the poor up 50 per cent, charges up 67 per cent but profits for companies up 125 per cent and executive salaries up by up to 130 per cent.

Where is the analysis to show that outsourcing our water will be of benefit to the State? Where is the analysis of the social costs of this move, the impact on service to the community and the impact on jobs? What about the impact on pricing? What measures are there in this budget, in that deal, to ensure that, once we are at the mercy of these foreign companies, pricing can be controlled? And what of the community service obligations currently in place for our water and the commitment to a quality water supply? In relation to the EDS contract, what guarantee is there that, when the State has been locked into a single operator, the company will not come back to the Government and put up some weak excuse to renegotiate that contract? When we have let our own skills base deteriorate, how will we be in any position other than at the mercy of EDS?

The truth of this budget is about dismantling years of experience, skills and resources. It is about a preference for big business without the Premier's touted benefits to the State in terms of economic growth and employment. The Labor Opposition supports all moves towards a responsible debt reduction strategy that keeps intact those fundamentals that are a basic tenet of the South Australian community: free access to high quality health services, an excellent standard of education, an adequately resourced Police Force, a high quality water supply and, so importantly, proper high quality training resources to create the skilled work force we need to begin to tackle our significant unemployment problem.

Bill read a second time.

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

That this Bill be referred to Estimates Committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I move:

That the House note grievances.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Tonight we have heard a number of contributions from members opposite about the budget and, as we would expect from this Government backbench, it was doing nothing more than pushing the Government's line. Whilst I suspect that we have to accept that, it is a pity that some members do not show a little more independence when it comes to speaking their mind about what they think about the budget and do not simply capitulate to the whims and wills of the Minister. Tonight I want to talk about some issues within my electorate. We have heard a lot in the Parliament over the past 48 hours about the big picture: it is now important from a budgetary point of view to focus on some

of the issues within our own electorates. An issue I am extremely concerned about is the future of education in the electorate of Hart on the Lefevre Peninsula.

At present there are a number of high schools and primary schools under real threat from this Government. I attended a public meeting the other night at Largs North Primary School: the District Superintendent for Education was sent down by the Minister to explain to my local schools that their future was very bleak indeed. The message was that, over the next five to six months maximum, the whole educational profile of the Lefevre Peninsula would be under review by this Government. This Government intends to rationalise and reduce the number of schools—both primary and perhaps secondary. The Government does not have the decency to come into my electorate and say, 'We intend to close some schools.' It is saying, 'Well, community, let us consult. You work out amongst yourselves how you want to reduce and deliver education in this area. Come back to us; we will have a look at your ideas. If we like them, we will take a few of them on board: if not, bad luck.' Under this Government I will have fewer schools, teachers and resources in my electorate with less commitment to education this time next year. I am not prepared to accept that. I am not prepared to accept a situation where my electorate has to suffer a brutal onslaught from this Government when it comes to education.

Looking across my electorate, I ask what other impacts there have been on my community? Only eight months ago the Minister for Emergency Services gave me a commitment that he would look at reopening the Semaphore police station. It is a community police station that has provided excellent policing services to my electorate over many years—if not decades—and the Minister said he would look at reopening it. I am prepared to accept and admit that it was the former Labor Government which closed that police station, but this Minister said that he would look favourably at reopening it. This budget has blown that right out the window. Not only will my local police station not reopen but the Port Adelaide patrol base, the major regional policing centre of my area, will suffer a decrease in police resources. The Government is closing schools and taking police resources out of my electorate, but what else is it doing to my electorate? The Government is cutting schools, teachers and police resources, but what else is it doing?

The Government is attacking the fundamentals. The local Port Adelaide Community Health Centre will have fewer resources. There will be less commitment to health in my electorate. What is the Government doing to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? The singularly silent position of the member for Lee when it comes to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is staggering. We have heard not one word from the member for Lee about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There will be fewer nurses, beds and doctors and there will be longer waiting lists in my electorate. If you start to tally it up, there will be fewer teachers, schools, police, community health services, beds, doctors and nurses. The list is staggering. The unfortunate point is that it goes on: it does not simply end there.

What about transport? The future of the Outer Harbor railway line is forever under threat. Given the first opportunity, this Government will close that line but it will not close it whilst I am the local member. The reality is that public transport is under threat in my electorate. What about multi-trip tickets? It is not good enough to take away the teachers, hospital beds and nurses. Now the Government will jack up the price of transport. My electorate is dependent upon public

transport: there is a captive market. What is the Government doing? It is jacking up the price of multi-trip tickets. That is what the Government is delivering to my electorate. The Government is treating the electorate of Hart with absolute contempt.

I am absolutely outraged that this Government is delivering such a reduction in services and a massive escalation in costs and charges in my electorate, not to mention the increased water prices. When you turn on a tap under the user-pays system, up goes the price of water. What about Housing Trust residents? I have one of the largest concentrations of Housing Trust homes in my electorate—a point that I am proud of, because it delivers a great and important service to my electorate. What is this Minister doing? He is doing away with the free water allowance. He is charging more and more for water services. He is decreasing the level of maintenance to my constituents living in Housing Trust homes. It is an insult to people living in Housing Trust homes and yet another example of this Government's total disregard for the working people. It is absolutely hypocritical for the recycled Federal Opposition Leader in Canberra, little Johnny Howard, to talk about supporting the battlers. The very battlers that the member for Bennelong talks about are the same battlers that this Minister and this Government are absolutely belting over the head and ripping into.

I want to change tack to another serious note. This time last evening when we were debating the budget, there was a tragic and major fire in Port Adelaide. I pay tribute to the many firefighters who fought that terrible fire last night in the inner Port Adelaide area. Many of my close personal friends were at that site for some 10 or 12 hours. I want to pay tribute to the firefighters of the Metropolitan Fire Service who last night fought one of the largest blazes this State has witnessed for many years. There were some 100 firefighters at that blaze and I am sure we all have friends who were there. The effort of members of the Metropolitan Fire Service last night is a tribute to their courage, and all members of this House should join with me in paying a special tribute and congratulating them for their courage.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I refer to comments by the members for Taylor and Torrens about the budget and about playing with toys. I am afraid that members on this side of the House have more diverse backgrounds in economics, family and business than members on the other side. I also point out that, ironically, there are only 11 members on the other side: the present Liberal Government came into power in December 1993 at the eleventh hour. I say 'the eleventh hour' because Prime Minister Keating turned up in this State to ask members opposite what assistance he could give to get the State out of the debt situation in which his Government put us in the first place. Now they are telling us about school closures.

In the seat of Lee, which I represent, there were two school closures in their time of Government, namely, the West Lakes High School and the Seaton North Primary School. So much for school closures occurring only under a Liberal Government. They happened under the previous Labor Government and under the incompetent supervision

and advice of the member for Hart. I think that he has an empty head because he makes the most noise in this House for the other side.

I now refer to the economics of the previous Government and of some public servants. I remember that in 1975 until about 1980 the Labor Government encouraged public servants to take up TAFE and university study. The encouragement was that they would receive five hours leave to undertake studies as well as doing another five hours in their private time. During those five years more economists were put through TAFE and universities than at any other time. There was free education for most students and for most workers in the Public Service. Public servants who did those courses and obtained certificates were promoted to high places in departments.

What happened to all those economists and accountants? What was the bookkeeping of departments? It was absolutely atrocious under the previous Labor Government. Because you put more students through does not mean that you make better accountants and economists. They have to experience life and work through education, and anything provided free is not appreciated or used properly. If the situation continues, we might also need the Leader of the Federal Liberal Party, John Howard, to get the Federal Government out of the eleventh hour debt as Mr Paul Keating puts Australia through more financial difficulty.

Under the previous Labor Government there were no records of departmental car fleets. There were no lists detailing available Government land. In particular, departments did not know that they owned land in the electorate of the member for Hart. It is only since the Liberal Government came to office that there has been record keeping of what does and does not belong to the Government. We are now considering what assets we can sell.

Another typical example which is already well known is the State Bank and its subsidiaries. The previous Labor Government did not even know how many subsidiary companies the former State Bank had. Again, that is another example of the incompetence of the member for Hart, who was, I believe, an adviser to the then Premier.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I recall your ruling on the practice of members reading speeches. Could you please advise me on that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Over the decades, the practice of the House has been to permit the use of copious notes, as the member for Hart will be well aware. If the honourable member wishes to apply such a ruling stringently, then obviously it should apply to all members. I remind the member for Hart that it is not uncommon for the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to read important speeches in their entirety. It is a flexibility by which the House should abide.

Mr ROSSI: If the member for Hart wants to look at my notes, I shall be quite happy to show them to him. He also mentioned that the member for Lee has not commented very much on events involving the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The budget allocates \$800 000 for redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Health Service and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. To say that this Government has not looked after the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is in the area that the honourable member and I share, is misleading.

Also on the matter of health expenditure, \$1.3 million has been spent on the provision of a 40-bed psychiatric unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It seems that the honourable member cannot read these budget papers. There has been a

\$1.3 million amalgamation of the Seaton High School and the Seaton North Primary School. Of course, the upgrading of the high school has occurred under the Liberal Government, not under the previous Labor Government. There has been \$1.1 million expenditure on capital works in connection with the South Australian Water Corporation. Again, upgrading in the north-western suburbs of Adelaide has been undertaken by a Liberal Government, not the previous Labor Government.

The honourable member is complaining about his area not being looked after. What happened with the Semaphore jetty? Nothing. What happened to the rail link to Outer Harbor, in his electorate? The honourable member was an adviser to the then Premier. There are no industries or factories there. There was the Outer Harbor restaurant, and that was closed down during the Opposition's time in Government. Of course, there is the fabulous Port Adelaide council flower farm. What is the economic situation of that under—

Mr Foley: It's a council issue.

Mr ROSSI: Yes, it is a council issue affected by legislation passed by the previous Government regarding the record-keeping of council issues. We have no right to ask about or to delve into the flower farm operations because of the legislation, passed by the previous Labor Government, controlling local government. Again, it is because of the incompetence of the previous Labor Government that we are in this situation. It is very important that we be re-elected for at least another two terms so that we can get this State into a profitable situation for our children's future employment.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My colleagues have made many points in relation to the budget. I shall make a few simple points that I believe are worth making and are worth consideration.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind members that the majority of speeches on the budget over the past two days have been heard in silence. I ask members to follow that precedent.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Social justice and social development are fundamental, not incidental, to strategies of economic development and also to the sustained economic growth that is required to bring communities, and our community in particular, out of the long-standing recession in which we have been. That fundamental point has been completely overlooked by the Government in its approach. It does not care. The issues of social justice and social development and the need to balance all parts of society for long-term, sustained growth and sustained well-being have been lost.

We see a very narrow focus on debt reduction without understanding or consideration of the other factors involved—that is, factors about keeping a community together, about the whole community moving forward together, and reducing inequalities rather than making them greater.

Australia has been ranked as the second most inegalitarian nation among the rich countries. Measured in terms of the ratio of the income of the richest 20 per cent to the poorest 20 per cent, for us that ratio is nearly 10:1. Only the United States of America, where the ratio is about 11:1, has greater inequality. Britain has a ratio of less than 8:1. In Germany, Holland, Sweden and Japan the ratio is less than 5:1. Coupled with that in South Australia we are lagging behind the rest of Australia in coming out of the recession, and the people who are finding it hardest in this regard are those who are the most disadvantaged. So, it is—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Some farmers, I agree. So, it is all the more important to keep in balance economic recovery, social justice and social development and have a balanced approach. Again, we have seen in this Government's approach a very narrow focus on debt reduction which was a short-sighted election promise, a promise the Government made when it really did not need to make too many promises. We know that debt reduction is a factor that has to be taken into account but we need to understand that priorities such as investment, expanding economic development, investing in industry and, most importantly, fostering an appropriate balance between all three sectors of our community—the public sector, the private sector for profit and the private sector not for profit—are important. However, we have not seen that at all from this Government. What we have seen is a narrow approach and very quick debt reduction at the expense of balance and, as I said before, the people who come off worse in this sort of scenario are those people who can least afford it.

Many of those people reside in electorates like mine but they also reside in other parts of the State. Many of them are in rural areas. Much has been said about particular aspects of the budget. We know that education has been cut again, yet it is education on which development and economic growth depend. The budget to schools in general has been cut by \$47 million again this year in real terms, and it is again schools in the poorest areas that will feel these cuts the most. It is the teachers involved in school programs in special areas such as Aboriginal education and programs for students with disabilities where we will see this happen.

I have already spent much time talking about cuts in terms of health, but again this year we are seeing another \$45 million in real terms being taken out of the State health budget and this comes on top of the \$35 million taken out last year. We see ongoing examples of what is happening in that area, and the unbelievable thing is that we have a Premier and others on the Government side blaming everyone else but themselves. Primarily, they blame the Federal Government when in fact the contribution of Federal funds to the health budget has increased again this year as it has over recent years.

The other area of my responsibility concerns Family and Community Services and again the same picture emerges. The State's contribution to Family and Community Services has gone down by \$3.4 million. The Commonwealth contribution is up \$8.8 million. We see a reduction in capital works of \$2.1 million, and South Australia has gained \$10.3 million through the sale of land and buildings.

We are seeing a propping up of the budget in this area through the sale of assets and a reduction in maintenance and buildings. Both of those reductions are used to fund recurrent expenditure, but what will happen when we run out of areas to prop up the budget? How much value does the Government really place in its much touted family impact statements, which were an important part of its policy when it came to power? The Government claimed it would have a strong emphasis on the family, that every policy would have a family impact statement. What do those family impact statements look like in terms of education and health and in terms of cutting all the programs that affect families the most? What about areas like transport, water charges, housing and all those things that affect families the most?

Over the next few weeks we will have an opportunity to look in detail at every part of the Government's budget. In doing that we will be pinpointing and showing everyone in

the community just what is going on in our State. The fact is that the Government has no vision or commitment to look after the welfare of all the people in our State on a long-term basis. This Government has a narrow focus, a very tunnel vision, ideological approach, no creativity or imagination and, in the end, our State will not prosper. What we need to do is take a balanced approach, look at all the people in our community and combine economic development with social development and social justice for the good of everyone.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): In the 10 minutes available to me this evening I rise passionately and determinedly to defend and support the future of the Cadell Training Centre. Members in the House tonight and others will be aware of the statement on page 3 of today's *Advertiser* referring to a report on the future of the centre, entitled 'Cadell Training Centre future options', prepared by the Department for Correctional Services. I am extremely disappointed with the report and reject many of its inferences and recommendations, particularly the final and major recommendation concerning centralisation of prison facilities and the expansion of Mobilong to take the place of Cadell Training Centre.

From my perspective the report focuses almost totally on the negatives of keeping the centre open. It focuses on the least cost option almost at any cost and I believe the report is nothing more than a clinical, academic bureaucrat's Pandora in terms of weighing the case subjectively and in a biased way to ensure that the Cadell Training Centre is closed down. The report fails to recognise fairly the potential output available from the centre. The report indicates that the centre's current gross output is about \$300 000, and I will refer later to where that can be increased. The report also suggests that the level of purchases in terms of its purchasing contribution in the community at the western end of the Riverland region is worth about \$380 000, but that is at current levels of production only, and I will indicate how that production can be increased.

This report also significantly fails to fairly recognise the current under-capacity of the production area at Cadell Training Centre. At the moment, the majority of irrigation is presently disposed to pasture production, which is significantly less than would otherwise be available in terms of ultimate production if it were used for more intensive horticulture production. I do claim some personal expertise in this area. While the report indicates that \$300 000 could be generated in terms of additional output, on current production only 80 hectares, or around 200 acres, is currently under production.

The report has identified an additional 20 hectares that could be brought into production on suitable horticultural land and, even under current production and adding the potential area that could be brought under irrigation, I would quite happily surmise that the increase in production of gross horticultural output could be well in excess of a minimum of \$500 000. The uncertainty surrounding the training centre over the past 18 months or so has undoubtedly contributed to low staff morale. I sympathise totally with the staff in these circumstances.

The staff, often without resources to manage the facility effectively, have been under a real handicap—not only in producing efficiencies in management but in demonstrating the very real potential that the establishment has to offer in terms of its horticultural and agricultural production. I refer specifically to the impact the proposed closure will have on the western region of the Riverland area, particularly focusing on the district councils of Waikerie and Morgan and the

Cadell community. Currently, the facility generates 65 jobs with an estimated flow-on multiplier effect of somewhere between 87 to 154 jobs, resulting in a direct injection of \$2.5 million in wages. I suggest that, given that the population of the Riverland's western region is between 6 000 and 6 500, this would have a dramatic effect in terms of the local economy.

The report supports an independent report prepared by the two councils concerned following professional advice at the end of last year. It shows that the annual loss in gross economic input to the area would be somewhere between \$3.4 million and \$5.2 million. The report also surmises that the impact of this would be less because it would be after tax. It also surmises that there would be less impact because some of the staff, who may choose to stay, may be eligible for unemployment benefits, and I will comment on that shortly, if I have time. The report indicates that the minimum total cost saving for Correctional Services throughout South Australia would be of the order of \$5 million over 20 years.

This equates to a saving of something like \$250 000 per annum. I reference that and compare it to the figure I just indicated of a gross annual loss of input to the community of between \$3.4 million and \$5.2 million, so that those comparative figures can be seen in perspective. The alternative horticultural uses, as indicated in the report, would generate a maximum of 10 to 15 jobs, and so the net loss would be of the order of 62 to 129 jobs. The effect on this small regional western end of the Riverland community would be unacceptable and disastrous.

I surmise it would have the ultimate effect of potentially closing one of the two hotels at Morgan, potentially leading to the retraction and closure of one of the two supermarkets in Waikerie, as well as having direct effects upon the future viability of the school and the ferry at Cadell. In fact, the whole structural impact on the community of Cadell would be devastating. The report fails to address the impact on the social fabric of the area. The prisoners at Cadell are part of an integrated management program. They make a valuable community contribution which facilitates their integration back into the community.

The report does not address the intangibles in terms of the centre's current contribution to the local community, and I cite things such as the CFS operating out of the Cadell Training Centre, Meals on Wheels, and prisoners who have been involved in land care projects with respect to the Murray River wetland areas. There have been and will continue to be working bees in relation to local churches, halls, cemeteries and local fund-raising activities. Cadell effectively bridges the gap between community life and prison life. The report fails to address totally the alternative horticultural uses.

It fails to address the potential from other intensive horticultural crops, and it fails to recognise the history of this facility in terms of its contribution to experimental horticultural crops, whether it be avocados, persimmons, walnuts, or whatever in relation to the Department of Primary Industries and SARDI. It fails to recognise the staff, who I quite confidently say would be some of the most stable, committed and cohesive within the Department of Correctional Services.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: As the member for Custance rightly interjects, the staff number 64 and make a valuable contribution to the area. Because they must live in a small rural community there is no doubt they are more effective and efficient in the delivery of services. Time does not permit me to fully address the inadequacies in this report and the full

impact of this potential closure. I point out that the report is strong on rhetoric in terms of the incentive needed to integrate prisoners. The report costs the complete fencing of the Cadell Training Centre at \$6 million.

The report fails to address the option of fencing part of the centre for use as a medium security prison. Prisoners housed in this part of the facility would then have the incentive of moving to the low security area. In the time remaining I reiterate that the member for Custance, the member for Eyre and I are committed to ensuring that this facility is maintained.

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): I want to take a few minutes to place on record my appreciation and the appreciation of all members in this place for the service rendered to this House by the Member for Eyre, our Speaker. On 30 May 1970 the Speaker and I, amongst many other members of Parliament in those days, were elected to this House, and the Member for Eyre and I are the only two members who remain. It is regretful that, during this week, nothing has been placed on record to mark the appreciation and esteem in which we hold the Member for Eyre, and I would like to do that now.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr BECKER: There was a mention. The member for Eyre and I served on the Public Accounts Committee from 1977 to 1979, and we were instrumental in forcing the then Government and the then Chairman, the late Charlie Wells, to release a report into the then Hospitals Department that they had been working on for some 3½ years. It was a notorious report given what it contained, and it was probably the most historical report that has ever been brought into the Parliament because it served to establish the role of a Public Accounts Committee around Australia, in New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and throughout the Commonwealth. If it was not for the member for Eyre and I threatening to release the report page by page in the House in debate the Chairman would never have signed the report. It was certainly the member for Eyre—

The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Eyre put his foot on the table at one stage and let it be known very plainly what he thought. The member for Eyre has represented his electorate and some 86 per cent of the State in a most exemplary manner, under very trying and difficult conditions. I therefore place on record the appreciation of the House for his 25 years of service.

I would also like to thank the member for Unley for organising the reception and all the members who attended. It was quite a surprise to see many members of my committee, Mr Gunn, his mother and other friends, and of course Her Excellency came along, and members of the Opposition as well. Due credit must go to the member for Unley for his organising ability and his culinary prowess, because the cake he made with a portrait of the Premier and the State emblem, the piping shrike, was absolutely superb. The member for Unley need never have any fear about going into cake making and cake decorating and doing extremely well. At this stage it is an honour to be here to pay tribute to the Speaker's 25 years service. We all look forward to his service to the Parliament and to the State continuing for many years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the member for Peake. I think it would be appropriate for me to acknowledge the generous and selfless praise which you have just be-

stowed upon Speaker Gunn when in fact you yourself shared those continuous 25 years of membership of the House. You too are deserving of praise, and I am sure the House recognises that. At the same time it is worth putting on record that you probably have the longest continuous personal record of serving on a Public Accounts Committee in the western world. I do not think I would be very far off the mark in saying that. I thank you for your congratulations to Speaker Gunn and extend the House's congratulations to you too on your 25 years of service.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I join you, Sir, in congratulating both the member for Peake, formerly the member for Hanson, and Speaker Gunn as the member for Eyre for their outstanding long service to their respective electorates and to this Parliament. It is something of an oversight that no mention has been made of it during the course of this week, but those two members have given long and distinguished service to this Parliament.

Of all things about which I could make some remarks in the course of this grievance debate, there is one which is relevant to the budget at the present time and which has disturbed me for more than eight years. I have always been willing to take my turn, wait and stand aside to ensure that people of any political persuasion in this place achieve what needs to be done, but in this instance I have waited eight years and that is long enough. I am talking about the way in which Government controls the provision of services to members of Parliament in enabling them to have an office located in their electorate to which their constituents can come to make submissions, present petitions and generally provide suggestions about how better to govern the State and explain their grievances. We are all familiar with what they represent.

My electorate office is in Sixth Street, Murray Bridge at present. For eight years I have drawn the attention of successive Ministers to the danger to members of the general public, given that the front four feet of the office behind sliding doors, which are totally glass, is a sloping floor, which dips at 16.5 degrees from the horizontal. If people were aware of it that would be okay, but they are not, and several people have suffered minor injuries as a consequence of attempting to put their foot down and finding there is no floor beneath it as they leave the office. They do not look where they are stepping because they are saying goodbye to my electorate assistant or to me. So now, when I see them out, I go to the door, open it and warn them to watch their step. In addition to that, it has always been unsafe from the point of view of fire, and only recently sprinkler systems have been fitted in consequence of the necessity to bring the office up to some reasonable standard. The proposal has been to rip the office down around me while I sit there and work so that the staircase to the first floor above me can be rebuilt.

My grievance is more serious than that because, acknowledging all this for so long, most recently I attempted to get the then Minister (Hon. Kym Mayes) to allow me to shift to the Woolworths shopping complex westwards up the hill a bit, and I arranged for a rent holiday from the landlords for myself or the Government as a tenant to begin with. However, Minister Mayes would have none of that, so the idea was scotched. I therefore remain in much smaller than average premises in Sixth Street. It is very unsatisfactory from the point of view of occupational health and safety, so I have attempted to find suitable accommodation elsewhere.

There has always been a difficulty between the Minister's requirement and local government. What I am now referring to, then, is the fact that some electorate offices cost almost \$30 000 in rent and cleaning costs, and several cost over \$25 000. However, with rent and cleaning costs below \$7 500, mine is off the bottom of the graph. I am not even talking about fit-out costs. One electorate office recently had a fit-out cost of over \$60 000.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I have to tell you that I am angry and absolutely fed up with the staff of the Minister's department in their bullying attempts to negotiate this arrangement. They constantly say that they have to accept the guidelines that are provided for their valuation of the premises, saying that it has to be done on the basis of square metres of floor space and that the Valuer-General will assess it. As far as I am aware, the valuers have not spoken to the two principal landlords in the town of Murray Bridge—as if it were even relevant to consider the rental value per square metre as the criterion by which rent values ought to be established. That is moo poo; it is absolute nonsense when you look at the fact that the smallest electorate office costs well above the average. I refer to the electorate office of Giles, which comes in at about \$18 400 a year. That is the smallest electorate office. One of the larger electorate offices is Hart, which comes in at \$28 000 a year. All I am asking for is a fair go, so it has nothing to do with floor space.

Members choose the site of their electorate office against a number of factors: the location, which provides amenity value to their constituents, ease of parking and so on; and they may choose to make a trade-off between that and the area of the office in square metres. Quite clearly that is because, as I pointed out, the smallest electorate office—that of Giles in Whyalla—is barely 45 square metres. The biggest is 205 square metres, and that is the Peake electorate office. The Hart electorate office is just under 160 square metres.

I seek leave to incorporate a purely statistical table, which sets out the area, the rent and cleaning cost and the expiry date of the leases of all offices of all members. I assure you, Sir, that it is purely statistical. I also seek leave to incorporate another purely statistical table which sets out the date the lease commenced, the fit-out costs and the outgoings associated with those offices that have been addressed since the beginning of this Parliament. I also seek leave to incorporate a purely statistical table in respect of the six electorate offices that are 75 square metres or less in area, showing the rent, the cleaning costs and the total cost to the State, notwithstanding their outgoings, and the sizes of which are comparable with the office that I seek to lease in Murray Bridge.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I simply remind the honourable member that the volume of statistical material inserted will rest with *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

| Member for | Suburb/Town | Address | Lease From | Fitout Cost \$ | Outgoings \$ |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| Spence* | Allenby Gardens | 574 Port Road | 1/11/94 | 29 993.00 | 1 817.67 |
| Bright | Brighton | 7a Sturt Road | 27/6/94 | 25 361.65 | 521.55 |
| Torrens | Gilles Plains | 511 North East Road | 1/2/94 | 51 819.33 | 1 595.69 |
| Hartley | Glynde | 462 Payneham Road | 9/5/94 | 30 529.00 | 809.25 |
| Wright | Golden Grove | Golden Grove Shopping Centre | 14/4/94 | 66 031.48 | 1 560.61 |
| Unley | Goodwood | 142a Goodwood Road | 7/3/94 | 31 584.00 | 1 389.00 |
| Custance | Kapunda | 81 Main Street | 1/8/94 | 43 000.00 | 506.78 |
| Elder | Melrose Park | 967 South Road | 1/3/94 | 7 783.00 | 5 183.94 |
| Hanson* | Mile End | 237 South Road | 1/4/95 | 18 850.00 | - |
| Reynell | Morphett Vale | 42 Hillier Road | 1/1/94 | 42 300.00 | 2 071.32 |
| Gordon | Mount Gambier | 5 Percy Street | 21/3/94 | 13 825.00 | 1 459.82 |
| Norwood | Norwood | 228 The Parade | 1/4/94 | 8 631.00 | - |
| Frome | Port Pirie | Shop C, Ellen Centre | 1/4/94 | 40 400.00 | - |
| Coles | Rostrevor | 163 St Bernards Road | 1/8/94 | 61 213.48 | 1 241.47 |
| Lee | Seaton | 2 Clarke Terrace | 1/5/94 | 34 766.91 | 253.00 |
| Hart | Semaphore | 34 Semaphore Road | 14/8/94 | 39 053.00 | 267.35 |
| Napier | Smithfield | 39 Anderson Walk | unknown | 31 350.00 | - |
| Peake | Torrensville | 229 Henley Beach Road | 1/3/94 | 34 886.00 | 3 292.77 |
| Goyder | Walleroo | 25 Owen Terrace | 10/3/94 | 21 000.00 | 604.40 |
| Total | | | | 832 176.83 | 22 554.62 |
| Average cost per project | | | | 37 186.87 | 1 326.74 |

*Project not complete, however, approval from the Minister for Industrial Affairs has been received.

| Electorate | Area Square Metres | Rate per Square Metre \$ | Rent per Annum \$ | Cleaning \$ | Total \$ | Expiry Date |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Adelaide | 80.00 | 287.50 | 23 000.00 | 5 985.00 | 21 985.00 | 30/11/96 |
| Norwood | 81.00 | 246.91 | 20 000.00 | 1 431.00 | 21 431.00 | 31/3/98 |
| Mitchell | 68.46 | 330.72 | 22 641.12 | 1 768.00 | 24 409.12 | Monthly |
| Hanson | 58.00 | 169.66 | 9 840.00 | 1 414.00 | 11 254.00 | Monthly |
| Price | 116.50 | 111.59 | 13 000.00 | 2 258.00 | 15 258.00 | 3/11/95 |
| Eyre | 121.50 | 97.69 | 11 869.80 | 2 693.00 | 14 562.80 | 31/10/95 |
| Flinders | 85.00 | 150.00 | 12 750.00 | 960.00 | 13 710.00 | 9/10/95 |
| Frome | 76.00 | 178.68 | 13 580.00 | 1 900.00 | 15 480.00 | 31/03/98 |
| Ross-Smith | 57.04 | 286.20 | 16 324.85 | 1 217.00 | 17 541.85 | 3/6/96 |
| Newland | 99.60 | 167.99 | 16 732.00 | 1 953.00 | 18 685.00 | 9/12/95 |
| Coles | 136.00 | 190.44 | 25 900.00 | 2 482.00 | 28 382.00 | 31/7/98 |
| Ramsay | 71.46 | 220.92 | 15 787.00 | 996.00 | 16 783.00 | 31/3/96 |

| Electorate | Area Square Metres | Rate per Square Metre \$ | Rent per Annum \$ | Cleaning \$ | Total \$ | Expiry Date |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Taylor | 93.50 | 181.82 | 17 000.00 | 1 300.00 | 18 300.00 | 31/7/95 |
| Lee | 121.00 | 103.20 | 12 487.50 | 1 214.00 | 13 701.50 | 30/4/98 |
| Hart | 160.00 | 161.88 | 25 900.00 | 2 011.00 | 27 911.00 | 14/8/98 |
| Heysen | 100.00 | 209.66 | 20 966.00 | 3 713.00 | 24 679.00 | 8/12/94 |
| Bragg | 91.82 | 156.70 | 14 388.00 | 1 403.00 | 15 791.00 | 5/11/94 |
| Waite | 78.04 | 119.83 | 9 351.76 | 1 212.00 | 10 563.76 | 23/4/98 |
| Peake | 205.00 | 85.37 | 17 500.00 | 1 228.00 | 18 728.00 | 28/2/98 |
| Finnis | 77.00 | 175.32 | 13 500.00 | 2 707.00 | 16 207.00 | 4/2/95 |
| Goyder | 92.00 | 70.65 | 6 500.00 | 3 340.00 | 9 840.00 | 9/3/98 |
| Giles | 46.45 | 370.00 | 17 186.50 | 1 135.00 | 18 321.50 | 31/7/96 |
| Fisher | 77.60 | 150.68 | 11 692.62 | 1 152.00 | 12 844.62 | 16/12/94 |
| Spence | 111.00 | 141.47 | 15 703.20 | 2 258.00 | 17 961.20 | 31/10/98 |
| Chaffey | 97.20 | 72.02 | 7 000.00 | 5 391.00 | 12 391.00 | 31/7/95 |
| Davenport | 70.02 | 242.79 | 17 000.00 | 1 212.00 | 18 212.00 | 30/11/96 |
| Bright | 99.00 | 188.86 | 18 697.50 | 1 248.00 | 19 955.00 | 26/6/98 |
| Kaurna | 150.00 | 73.33 | 11 000.00 | 2 244.00 | 13 244.00 | ongoing |
| Elizabeth | 72.34 | 173.06 | 12 519.16 | 954.00 | 13 473.16 | 15/12/95 |
| Napier | 67.32 | 173.06 | 11 650.40 | 885.00 | 12 535.40 | 15/12/95 |
| Light | 65.00 | 210.83 | 13 704.00 | 2 531.00 | 16 235.00 | 30/4/97 |
| Torrens | 126.00 | 126.98 | 16 000.00 | 1 240.00 | 17 240.00 | 31/1/98 |
| Morphett | 110.00 | 152.07 | 16 728.00 | 1 414.00 | 18 142.00 | 31/12/95 |
| Hartley | 130.00 | 92.31 | 12 000.00 | 2 245.00 | 14 245.00 | 8/5/98 |
| Wright | 96.90 | 200.00 | 19 380.00 | inc in rent | 19 380.00 | 13/4/98 |
| Unley | 98.00 | 173.47 | 17 000.00 | 1 236.00 | 18 236.00 | 6/3/98 |
| Colton | 64.50 | 245.79 | 15 853.20 | 1 180.00 | 17 033.00 | monthly |
| Playford | 78.00 | 126.28 | 9 850.00 | 1 953.00 | 11 803.00 | 25/3/98 |
| Custance | 92.00 | 138.48 | 12 740.00 | 3 045.00 | 15 785.00 | 31/7/98 |
| Kavel | 73.50 | 136.05 | 10,000.00 | 3 748.00 | 13 748.00 | 31/3/96 |
| Elder | 150.00 | 122.22 | 18 333.00 | 1 236.00 | 19 569.00 | 28/2/98 |
| MacKillop | 105.60 | 61.15 | 6 457.56 | 5 149.00 | 11 606.50 | 1/5/98 |
| Florey | 77.00 | 267.82 | 20 622.00 | 1 953.00 | 22 575.00 | 30/11/95 |
| Mawson | 100.00 | 210.00 | 21 000.00 | 957.00 | 21 957.00 | 2/7/95 |
| Reynell | 75.00 | 173.33 | 13 000.00 | 1 527.00 | 14 527.00 | 31/12/97 |
| Gordon | 108.00 | 165.00 | 17 820.00 | 1 448.00 | 19 268.00 | 20/3/98 |
| Ridley | 68.38 | 67.04 | 4 584.00 | 2 816.00 | 7 400.00 | Monthly |
| Average | 95.27 | 154.00 | 14 671.40 | 2 074.26 | 16 745.66 | |

Electoral offices of areas of less than 75 m² (which is the principal office and having a permanent lease of more than 12 months duration).

| Office | Area m ² | Rent \$ | Cleaning \$ | Total \$ |
|------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| Giles | 46.45 | 17,186.50 | 1,135.00 | 18,321.50 |
| Ross-Smith | 57.04 | 16,324.85 | 1,217.00 | 17,541.85 |
| Light | 65.00 | 13,704.00 | 2,531.00 | 16,235.00 |
| Davenport | 70.02 | 17,000.00 | 1,212.00 | 18,212.00 |
| Ramsay | 71.46 | 15,787.00 | 996.00 | 16,783.00 |
| Kavel | 73.5 | 10,000.00 | 3,748.00 | 13,748.00 |

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Well, I have tried that, but the Minister says he will accept the recommendations of the department; the department says it will accept the recommendations of the valuer; and the valuer says he is bound by the guidelines given by the Minister. It is a circular argument; it is a catch 22.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The member for Hart is well catered for, and would do well to shut up. I find it appalling that no-one anywhere will accept responsibility for this decision. I have tried to have it addressed for eight years, and I am fed up to the back teeth, so I am bringing to Parliament and putting on the public record my disgust with this whole process and the way in which it has clearly discriminated against me and my constituents. I guess it would not have mattered who the member was.

It is distressing to me that I should have to do this. The worst thing is that those who have been given the responsi-

bility for determining the lease value of the premises are people with whom I have had constant arguments over the valuation of shack sites in the course of attempting to get them freeholded. I simply dismiss those people as being incompetent. They should disqualify themselves. Indeed, we should get an independent valuer. However, I have gone past that point now and I am not prepared to listen to an independent valuer. It is not about area and the value, as it were, of each square metre of space: it is about what the member thinks is the appropriate location in his or her electorate to provide access for constituents.

In the tables I have provided the parameters from the smallest to the largest in terms of area and from the highest to the lowest in terms of the cost of rent and cleaning. Clearly, there is no correlation between any of those factors. Members use a number of factors to determine where they should locate their electorate offices. I do not see why these people in the department should expect me to pick up the cost: the rent they pay would be less than that for Custance, at Kapunda, for instance.

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

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed expenditure for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Tuesday 4 July in accordance with the timetables as follow:

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A*Tuesday 20 June at 11.00 a.m.*

Premier, Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs
 Legislative Council
 House of Assembly
 Joint Parliamentary Services
 State Governor's Establishment
 Premier and Cabinet
 Commissioner for Public Employment
 Auditor-General's
 Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs
 Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs—Other Payments

Wednesday 21 June at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Treasurer
 Treasury and Finance
 Deputy Premier and Treasurer—Other Payments
 State Services
 Information Technology

Thursday 22 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Environment and Natural Resources, Minister for Family and Community Services, Minister for the Ageing
 Environment and Natural Resources
 Minister for Environment and Natural Resources, Minister for Family and Community Services and Minister for the Ageing—Other Payments

Family and Community Services

Friday 23 June at 9.30 a.m.

Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing
 Housing and Urban Development
 Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing—Other Payments

Recreation, Sport and Racing

Tuesday 27 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, Minister for Infrastructure
 Economic Development Authority
 Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Minister for Infrastructure—Other Payments

Wednesday 28 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Tourism, Minister for Industrial Affairs
 South Australian Tourism Commission
 Industrial Affairs
 Building Management
 Minister for Tourism and Minister for Industrial Affairs—Other Payments

Thursday 29 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Health, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs
 State Aboriginal Affairs
 South Australian Health Commission

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B*Tuesday 20 June at 11.00 a.m.*

Minister for Education and Children's Services
 Education and Children's Services
 Minister for Education and Children's Services—Other Payments
Wednesday 21 June at 11.00 a.m.
 Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, Minister for the Status of Women
 Transport
 Passenger Transport Board
 TransAdelaide
 Arts and Cultural Development
 Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Status of Women—Other Payments

Thursday 22 June at 11.00 a.m.

Attorney-General, Minister for Consumer Affairs
 Attorney-General's
 Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs—Other Payments
 Courts Administration Authority
 State Electoral Office

Tuesday 27 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Youth Affairs
 Employment Training and Further Education

Wednesday 28 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Correctional Services
 Police
 Correctional Services
 Country Fire Service
 Metropolitan Fire Service
 Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Correctional Services—Other Payments

Thursday 29 June at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Primary Industries, Minister for Mines and Energy
 Mines and Energy
 Primary Industries
 Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Primary Industries—Other Payments
 South Australian Research and Development Institute

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Messrs Allison, Atkinson, Blevins and Condous, Mrs Hall, Mrs Penfold and Mr Rann.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Becker, Brindal, Leggett, Quirke and Scalzi, Ms Stevens and Ms White.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 8 June at 10.30 a.m.