

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 28 September 1995

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 27 September. Page 64.)

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I support the motion. I commend Her Excellency for the continued diligence that she pays to the discharge of her duties in the office as Head of State and point out to the House that I will forever support the arrangement that we have currently wherein the Head of State is separate from the Head of Government and presides over Executive Council, which is the decision-making and authorisation body of Executive Government, to ensure then that all decisions taken by Executive Government through Executive Council are constitutional and in compliance with the law as it stands. That is the only safeguard we have, for if we for one moment imagine that if we dispensed with the office of Head of State, expecting that, because it appears to be ceremonial, it would continue to be exercised by the Head of Government in the same fashion, then we are asking too much.

If the Head of Government has the duplicate powers of Head of Government and Head of State, then Head of Government can simply decide without there being any formal meeting of Executive Council when and if subordinate legislation will be introduced on what things and it can decide whether or not that is a lawful act. Naturally, then, such enormous power, unaccountable other than to the Parliament, in the hands of Executive Government on the day, would result in some abuse in due time, I am sure, in the same way as we saw it happen in America. I remind members of what happened there. Most of us would recall the President of the United States of America authorising a deliberate crime, a break-in, in the Watergate building, to try to get information in this instance about his political opponents and what they were doing.

We therefore need to be careful, whenever we consider dispatching any of the things which we regard as being merely ritual and serving no useful purpose, because they may appear to be ritual and they may appear to serve no useful purpose, but they indeed do serve a useful purpose. I refer to things in this Chamber, such as the conduct of members in the precincts of the Chamber when it is in session. It is not appropriate for us to consider that we can simply, for instance, take it upon ourselves to conduct a conversation with other members of the general public who may be sitting in the Speaker's or Strangers' Gallery across the barriers of the Chamber and likewise bringing members of the general public onto the floor of the Chamber. Where do you draw the line?

If you begin to talk to somebody across the barrier immediately behind me on this side and similarly on the other side, fairly soon there is no reason at all why one inch, six inches or ten inches ought to be considered the dividing line. In due time, I am sure, we would find that members of the Parliament would be bringing people with whom they wish to have discussions onto the floor of the House. Some

members might think that funny, but I have seen the way in which, over time, if we do not observe these things, we find they are eroded in significance until eventually we are confronted by a crisis. So, we need to draw the lines and have them codified, in the same way as we do in the behaviour of citizens under the law, in a fashion that ensures we all understand why it is the way it is. We should ensure that we do not dispense with any of those things to the history books, unless we have carefully analysed the consequences of doing so and what we would propose to put in their place as an alternative.

In some measure, that is also a reason for my concern about the current debate on whether or not Australia should become a republic. I am a very staunch believer in the great benefits to any society of a nation which covers such a vast area as does Australia, an area where there are multiple time zones involved, and where there is a wide range of climate conditions, from tropical rainforest, to subtropical, to cool temperate rainforests, and from those rainforests through to deserts.

Quite clearly, it is not sensible for us to contemplate having a republic that would provide us only with a single-level legislature, making the laws governing our behaviour and authorising bureaucrats to gazette, as it were, subordinate legislation in a regional context after consultation with an elected administrative body in that regional context. Pretty soon, we would be in a hell of a mess. I can illustrate that point by referring to a decision which was announced overnight and which was defended by the immediate past Premier but one of South Australia, as a member of the ABC board. Indeed, he was defending the South Australian right to have parochial current affairs programs and other measures provided by those broadcasting agencies—television and radio—which are controlled and operated by the ABC in South Australia. He was beaten in that decision by people on the ABC board from the East Coast who have built themselves an ivory tower in Sydney and who consider that anything that happens outside Sydney or Melbourne, or other communities sort of mendicant to them along the East Coast, perhaps Brisbane included, is irrelevant in the national interest.

Current affairs that affect people who live in South Australia or Western Australia, or the Christmas or Cocos Islands and the like, are irrelevant and do not require any explicit consideration at peak viewing or listening times on television or radio. Nothing could be more unwise. Yet that has occurred because we have this notion that all wisdom flows from the East Coast. That is where the prosperity and the population of the nation seems to have established itself in the majority, so the rest of us as a minority are pretty well increasingly ignored—if not ignored, we are certainly disregarded when we voice our arguments about our personal needs.

On reflection of the activities that were undertaken in this Chamber 100 years ago, I now find that arguments of convenience and arguments of the Left have taken a fair toll on the institutions which have otherwise provided us with the cohesion we have had as a nation in the Federal system which was debated in this Chamber at that time, 100 years ago. In consequence of those debates, we decided to become a single nation, with single defence, single migration, single foreign policy and single trade arrangements for each of the sovereign States which, by their resolutions, became States instead of colonies, and federated into one insoluble national federation. Of course, now the notion is that the Australian

nation ought to be governed singly and alone from one legislature that is not, therefore, representative of the regional interests and needs.

I am saying that there ought to be parochial concerns. If those concerns are not met, the cohesion we in Australia have had will deteriorate over the next 100 years. It would not surprise me, in fairly short order, to see pressure building for the dismantling of what has been one nation because, if we dispatch the federation to the history books, I see no reason why the people of Western Australia would regard themselves as having empathy with those in the east. We in South Australia would be the meat in the sandwich.

My argument on these points ought not to be construed to mean that I believe the current structure of States and territories should remain forever but rather that there ought to be no such territories as currently exist: they all ought to be States. They therefore all ought to have equal rights within the Federal structure. That is the case in the Federal structure of the United States and Canada, and in my judgment it needs to become part of the way in which we proceed into the next century. We ought to allow for the parochial development of the different benefits that can be derived by the human beings who live in different parts of this continent and the islands surrounding it that form the nation of Australia. Let us not overlook the fact that the islands to the east are Norfolk and Lord Howe Islands, themselves generating great revenue for their inhabitants from tourism; to the south, Heard Island; and, to the west, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands. As an aside I will say that, given that the islands were unoccupied and uninhabited prior to the time of Queen Victoria, the Clunies Ross family was granted title to them. As a family they were the original inhabitants and had dominion over those lands.

It is quaint now that, for instance, were they to take a land claim to the High Court, that claim would be granted against the administrative decision by Canberra to remove their sovereignty and ownership of those islands—that is, if we are to be consistent in our Mabo decisions. That might cause a little bit of angst and political pepper in the nostrils of the left, but nonetheless it would occur. If the Clunies Ross family were not so totally dispossessed of their property and rights by the administrative action of the Government in Canberra at the time, they would have the funds now to take that matter to the High Court. It would be interesting if as Australians a few of us tested it just to see where it stood, by supporting them financially in an action if they chose to bring it.

I leave that matter and turn now to some other things which I see happening in the State of South Australia and which are being exacerbated by the indifference of Canberra and the kind of madness that has taken over in the allocation of our scarce resources to the kinds of programs we ought to pursue. I refer to the general principle of benefit cost analysis of the things we do. We introduce poker machines and we do not give a darn about the consequences of people who become addicted to gambling or other people whose businesses will be so adversely affected by the decision made by people who change their spending habits to 'invest' their money in poker machines instead of spending it on the consumer goods and services that they previously purchased from those other businesses. We know, as I warned at the time, that there are serious implications for the economy. Small businesses have gone broke and many of them have become less profitable, and many citizens have gone broke because they became gamblers.

Businesses went broke because suddenly they had less custom than they were otherwise obtaining. They may have

been marginal at the time but, equally, those that were more profitable are now less so and on the margin of their existence in consequence of the shift in consumer preferences and the way people spend their money on poker machines. The other folk who went broke are those who did not know they had a propensity to become addicted to gambling but who have become addicted. They have spent not only the money they had in their purse and from their wages but also everything they could borrow on their credit cards and by way of overdraft until they finally tried to pay off the house mortgage by having a wild fling that lasted 24 hours or more. Then, unable to pay their mortgage, they find themselves dispossessed of their homes, their marriages break down and their families are destroyed. Their lives crumble around them and they are then left, albeit as a consequence of their own poor behaviour and judgment, destitute, and we as taxpayers have to pick up the pieces. This has serious implications for the children as well as for the communities in which they live, quite apart from the devastating consequences in their own lives.

I asked for that sociological study to be undertaken at the time that the House first debated the Casino legislation and then when it finally passed I asked again. When there were other debates along the way about further extending the provisions for gambling, I also asked. At one time I was even given an assurance by then Premier, John Bannon, that we would have such an analysis done with due rigour into the sociological and economic consequences for the individual, the family, small business and so on, but that has never been done. There are now rumblings, albeit Johnny come lately, too late at that, that such studies ought to be undertaken. I am pleased to see that happening but I am disappointed that it was ever necessary. We should have been there and done that 12 years ago.

We have diverted funds away from those things which we could otherwise have been doing in the budgets we have passed into those things that are band-aid measures, which patch up problems in the social context. I am not disparaging the efforts we make in that regard. I am simply saying that when we do it we need to remember that, as I am sure you would recognise, Mr Speaker, we are not going to get those benefits that we would otherwise get when we made those outlays on advancing our knowledge of how to do things better, cheaper, more effectively and efficiently.

Let me give the House illustrations of that. For instance, we have literally cut the guts out of our research into primary industry in all its forms and we do not have the revenue resources available to invest in research in new primary industries such as the farming of fish or other water or aquatic animals—salt or fresh water—and we do not have the money to invest into research into getting greater benefits from more sensible farming of our native animals. For instance, in the lucerne breeding programs undertaken between 1978 and 1994 we spent about \$9 million and the benefit that the community of Australians has derived from that expenditure is \$198.5 million.

We invested \$1.3 million into oat breeding—the development of appropriate varieties of oats to be grown in the different soil and climate types in the range appropriate for cereal production. We invested \$1.3 million and the benefit was \$90 million, which is a 69:1 benefit to cost ratio. We have invested \$1.5 million in developing disease resistance in the same kind of plant breeding programs. This involves rust or nematode resistance in cereals. The benefits have been \$155 million, and we would not have had those benefits

unless we outlaid the \$1.5 million. It is a benefit to cost ratio of 103:1.

We have to be absolutely barmy if we continue to cut the amount of money we are spending on scientific research of that kind. We have to be barmy, because where will the prosperity come from? Where will the leading edge that we currently have come from? Why is it that we do not bother to contemplate the consequences of those decisions before we actually commit ourselves?

The kinds of things that further illustrate the point I am making include a consideration of the lag time between the commencement of the expenditure and the research and development and the first year of impact or benefit and these are contained in a table: I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard*. Mr Speaker, I assure you that it is of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

LAG TIMES BETWEEN THE COMMENCEMENT OF R&D
AND ITS FIRST YEAR OF IMPACT

R&D activity area	Number of observations	Average lag time (years)	Minimum (years)	Maximum (years)
Plant improvement	31	5.9	1	13
Mechanisation	7	6.0	1	20
Pest & disease control	6	4.4	1	14
Agronomy	19	5.6	1	34
Postharvest	3	3.3	2	6
Processing	8	4.0	1	8
Market research	4	1.5	1	3
Extension	13	2.5	1	10

Mr LEWIS: Industry itself continues to provide more and more money for this kind of research while Government seems to provide less and less. It is all very well for us to chase what might appear to be the expansion that can come from tourism expenditure in this State. I am not being disparaging about that, but the expenditure to put on the odd Fringe Festival or to tizzy up the Art Gallery, the Museum and so on, at a cost of about \$20 million dollars, might yield us short term and long term a darn sight more money in these stringent financial times than if that expenditure were committed to the kinds of programs to which I have just referred and the benefits of which I have illustrated by the figures I quoted and the tables I incorporated.

We must take a more sensible and realistic appraisal of the consequences of continuing to cutback—not just maintain—the amount of money invested in that area. If we do not take that seriously and simply listen to the squeaky hinges in making our budgetary allocations, we will come undone. We will lose the leading edge and the competitive advantage which we have created for ourselves and which came to us as part of our heritage from our immediate forebears who set about establishing a prosperous society. If we lose that, it will cost us a darn sight more to get it back up to speed, let alone to get ahead.

It is interesting to consider that, in spite of the cuts made to science and its applications in research and the development of new technologies over the last 30 years—and it has been growing apace for 30 years or so—from its limited resources of 17 million people on a planet that sustains over 2 billion people, Australia produces 4 per cent of the world's technologies. We have not done that just by chance: we have done it because we have set about doing it. We ought to be jolly proud of it and it ought to be a significant part of what we teach our children in primary and secondary schools as part of their civic studies. We have developed world class research expertise in many areas. We ought to recognise the significance of ongoing R&D in maintaining and improving our standard of living, our competitiveness in an increasingly

competitive world and our success, then, in the international market place.

We ought to develop a national integrated R&D and an S&T program where innovation policy is based on long distance foresighting to ensure that Australia's research and development activities are focused and coordinated. But in this State we should not cut whole programs without contemplating the consequences. For instance, we chopped the National Weed Research and Control Program from our Department of Primary Industries. The funds are not there. It is not that we have cut it horizontally or shaved a bit more off from the bottom line: we have taken a vertical chop with an axe and committed that to the history books. No further research is being done into weed control and/or the costs and consequences of doing nothing about it. There is no money; the program is dead; it is finished.

Furthermore, we need to ensure that we have the intellectual capacity and training required in that area. We need to ensure that we have the infrastructure there and that it is properly maintained. I could speak for five hours without even referring to a note about how infrastructure has been allowed to run down or to be sold off where it has been very relevant to the kind of research and development that I refer to, and this also relates to the training of technicians in TAFE and so on.

We need to ensure that we retain that and the programs to develop and capture from other areas the necessary research outcomes and technologies to achieve those goals. With very limited resources, I must say that the Minister for Primary Industries, the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations have done an outstanding job. Their resources are more limited than most of us probably understand because we have been too busy focusing upon squeaky hinges and the people who, albeit in necessitous circumstances, nonetheless have taken our focus away from creating wealth and placed it upon redistributing it. I am not saying that we should not be compassionate: I am simply saying that we cannot be compassionate unless we are first prosperous. The people

who are starving and who need shelter will not be able to be helped because there will not be any prosperity or profits to redistribute.

I wish to continue in that vein by saying that integrated research and development in science and technology and innovation policies are essential for the continued maintenance of Australia's state of development. The sustainability of our current lifestyle and level of prosperity, our rate of economic development, our social, manufacturing and other significant agenda from the public sector and Government as well as the competitive advantage upon which our industries rely are at stake in this debate.

Sustainability and continuing competitiveness rely on effectively developing and implementing change. If we cannot do that, we will go down the gurgler, because change is brought about by developing and applying new innovations and technologies that emerge from research. Instead of our being the prosperous country that we have been, capable of providing shelter and succour to those less fortunate than the majority, we will become a country in which it is simply necessary for us to do what I regrettably have learnt has been happening in some of the former republics of the USSR. For instance, when winter comes, old people with Alzheimer's disease are simply turned out into the cold to die in much the same way as have other less civilised societies in other parts of the world throughout history. If you were a North American Indian and you became too old to look after yourself and found that you had become a burden on your family, or if you had lost your mind, your family turned you out if you had not already walked out yourself. Walking out in the middle of winter initially brought about discomfort but, if you have ever been in circumstances where frost bite gets to you, you would know that, finally, you feel so warm and sleepy that you become inclined to accept your fate and lie down and die.

I do not want that for this country, and I am sure that all members here feel the same, but I warn all members that at present we are not paying enough attention to the means by which we have obtained the leading edge that we have. The kind of direction about which the Premier speaks and upon which he has attempted to focus our attention is the direction in which we must go, not only in electronic data processing, the new sunrise industry of society and civilisation, but also in the more sophisticated area of more effective and efficient production of food. With those remarks, I want all members of the House to recognise the importance that will have for them next year and for their children, the next generation, in the next century. That is more important than the debate about the republic or the problems that beset Paul Keating and the Labor Party at present.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): First, I would like to support the member for Ridley's concerns about research. However, my concern is not only with the agricultural area where research has been slashed and made more difficult but also with other areas of the State. I started my career working for the Northfield Agricultural Centre doing research on calf muscle DNA. Much of that valuable work, which was not done nationally or in any other State but which was done for the benefit of South Australian producers, is no longer able to be done. I still have some friends at Northfield, and anyone who leaves invariably is not replaced. They are being shuffled around and starved of resources and funds. I believe we will start to see the effects of that critical shortage of research money in the short term rather than the long term. In the past

a great deal of Australian agriculture has been built on the excellent research carried out in Australia, and our vast agricultural exports are dependent on that research. It is a shame to see it now slowly being eroded because it is seen as an easy area to cut. That might be so, but I believe our producers will pretty quickly see the results of those cuts, and it will not be good. Agriculture is not seen as a cutting edge industry; it does not have the sexiness of the information technology tag, but it is still highly reliant on updated technology.

Agriculture is still a very cut and thrust area in the international arena, and we must stay on top of the technology, as the member for Ridley outlined, in the areas of weed and pest control, and in producing ever better crops and produce. If we fall back in those areas we will lose our place in the market, and we will all regret that. Our export income and the viability of our agricultural sector, one might argue, are more important to South Australia than they are to many other States. I support the member for Ridley's plea for more research to be carried out.

I am pleased that the Governor's speech touched on a couple of issues. The first issue relates to agriculture and production and concerns the Bolivar pipeline. This must be the millionth time the project has been announced. I believe the project was started at least 10 years ago. The Government deserves credit for continuing this project, but it always fails to mention not only the hefty input from the Federal Government, which is covering most of the financial contribution toward the project, but also—and we will see evidence of this in the coming year—a fairly hefty contribution from the growers themselves.

The growers in the Virginia area will be responsible for much of the financial input in making that pipeline viable. They will have to pay for the water from the pipeline and they will have to ensure that they make up the gap between Government funding and the actual cost of the pipeline. However, we all hope that it will be successfully concluded and result in great benefits to the Virginia area. My electorate includes part of Virginia as well as Angle Vale and Penfield. For the first time acreage in those areas will benefit from the availability of water.

We all know that water in the Adelaide Plains is severely restricted. New bores are not allowed, and many farmers have had their production capabilities restricted by that rule. A lot of good work is taking place in market gardening and floriculture in the areas of Bolivar and Penfield. Expert work is being carried out in the area of cut flowers, and the growers have always indicated their willingness to try new products and new markets.

The second issue mentioned by Her Excellency the Governor related to the registration of the births of stillborn babies. My son suffered problems immediately after his birth and was in danger of dying. I fully appreciate how parents feel about their stillborn babies. As a mother, you carry your baby for nine months and you feel very strongly and deeply for it. I believe parents should have the dignity of having their baby's birth and existence in this world registered and acknowledged. However, most of the initiatives, if I can call them that, outlined in Her Excellency's speech I am not quite so happy about.

The Government and the Premier repeatedly gave assurances that any local government reform, any amalgamations that would occur, would be voluntary. In answer to direct questions we were told, a number of times, that amalgamations between councils would be voluntary. This

was supposed to be the starting point. However, in a climate where there was widespread recognition that there should be local government reform and councils were already preparing for it—and there was the Victorian example that local government reform was and is possible—the Minister for Local Government Relations decided to send the matter off to a ministerial advisory group. The group was given a wide ranging brief, one might suspect, because the Minister did not have a clue about what he wanted out of the process or how it might be achieved—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: He would have a lot better idea than you. Do you understand the brief?

Ms HURLEY: I understand it a lot better than the Minister, I think. At least I have consulted with the councils a bit better. However, the Minister set up this process which was longer than expected. The councils, the Local Government Association, and whoever else was interested, were given a very short time to put in submissions about a matter that was so critical to their long-term future. Nevertheless, we had a fairly representative group on the ministerial advisory group—the so-called MAG group—and eventually it came down with a very thick report that dealt with a number of issues, not only amalgamations but widespread changes to the way in which councils operated.

The Government's initial response was a very strong commitment to the report. The Minister's press release was quite euphoric—that this would be the way of the future and the way in which local government was to reform itself. The Government was supported by its backers in big business. It was very anxious to have this happen. For a while it talked tough. For a couple of weeks it was extremely hard about this but, in the end, it could not deliver what big business wanted. After much ringing of hands and discussion, it caved in to its backbenchers and the Government came up with a new formula to appease this huge gang of backbenchers who are nervous about their seats and the process.

We are yet to see the results of this compromise. We have heard a bit about it. There have been reports in the media and various rumours circulating through the councils, but it was announced in the Governor's speech that we should have the local government reform legislation in our hands fairly soon. I am very anxious to see it because the Government's process and attitude has been marked by great indifference to local government and the Local Government Association. This has been a characteristic of the Government's attitude all along; that is, it has not been prepared to allow this third tier of government be responsible for the direction of its own destiny. This Government has been prepared, in a very Kennett like manner, to dictate what local government will do. However, its backbenchers have shown more nervousness and perhaps more practicality and sense in rejecting the initial response. I will be very interested to see what happens with the compromise and whether it will listen to local government this time around.

The Labor Opposition was keen to listen to local government and has had discussions with it. We held a Labor Listens meeting, which was very well attended by representatives from both metropolitan and country councils. They were angry at the way they had been treated by this Government; they were angry at the indifference that they had been shown by this Government; and they were angry at not being consulted.

One of the things about which they were particularly angry was the concept of compulsory competitive tendering. The MAG report talked about councils being forced to tender out

up to 50 per cent of their income. In effect, that would mean councils tendering out nearly all their services. One might wonder whether this is the hidden agenda behind big business and other businesses being so keen to force amalgamations on councils and to introduce this reform. It has been shown in the United Kingdom—the only other place to introduce this sort of measure—that big business eventually benefits from compulsory competitive tendering. The large companies, such as Serco, to which the Government has been talking, have garnered all the business arising from the tendering out of services. Evidence from the United Kingdom shows that those services inevitably decline and that the recipients of those services have difficulty in finding a responsible person to whom to complain as the services gradually deteriorate and that they have to pay more for them.

As we encourage local government to get into a more community service oriented area, we shall find that compulsory competitive tendering will force councils out or cause those services to be run on a much cheaper, shoddier and more ineffective basis. For example, the Elizabeth City Council runs a child care centre. Under compulsory competitive tendering, that management would be let out every four or five years, so parents could be facing a different management structure and way of operating every five years.

We have to consider whether private companies operating for profit on a restricted budget will provide as good a service as the council-based service. This is so even in the parks and gardens area. We have examples of private companies, keen to win the tender, putting in a low tender price and then finding that, contrary to their expectations, the regular council employees were doing a good job within their limited budget and, those companies being unable to maintain the standard of service provided by council employees and still make a profit, standards have slipped. As they are on a four or five-year contract, the ratepayers complain to the council and the council has to renegotiate with the private contractors who, apart from being paid, have no particular loyalty or desire to serve the ratepayers of that area.

Problems with responsiveness have been noted in many areas, and I suspect that is what we shall soon see coming out of the Victorian experience. The agenda is to force down the level of services by holding or reducing the amount of funding. This is what we have seen with the Government's health budgeting system. The money has been held or cut and hospitals have had to cut services to meet those budgets. That is exactly what will happen to council services.

Another area in which I have a particular interest is housing. Some time ago a customer satisfaction survey was carried out among Housing Trust tenants, and the results generally were excellent. There was a high level of satisfaction among tenants with the services that they get from Housing Trust staff over many areas, including telephone contact, visits and information provided by the trust. That reflects a long history of service by the Housing Trust, pride by the staff of the Housing Trust in their jobs, empathy with their clients, and recognition that they are doing a very good job performing a vital and well recognised service to the people of this State. It is imperative to maintain that pride in and commitment to the South Australian Housing Trust. I am not sure that this Government will maintain that commitment; I will be watching closely as the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is negotiated.

In the area of maintenance, there was not quite so much satisfaction. About 23 per cent, or one in five tenants, were not happy with the standard of maintenance provided. I

expect that that would vary considerably around the State. In my electorate there is a lot of old housing stock that needs urgent and ongoing maintenance, and a number of complaints have been made to my office about the standard of maintenance.

Maintenance is an area from which it is so easy to cut funds. It is a soft target in the budget process, but it is very hard for the tenants, and hard for the Housing Trust staff, when requests for ordinary routine maintenance have to be knocked back because the region has no money left for maintenance. This is happening all the time, and it involves not only maintenance but also modifications required to help people live in houses. One of my constituents is about to go into a wheelchair, but she is facing the possibility of having to move from the area, where her family and friends live, because the Housing Trust cannot afford the modifications required to her house. That is very sad.

The second matter that has caused problems is the new credit policy. I have been told that in the last financial year there was a 31 per cent increase in the number of evictions among Housing Trust tenants. This is actual evictions: people thrown out of their house. The total number of tenants evicted last year was 165, so that means that 165 families were thrown out of their Housing Trust home onto the street. The new credit policy does not allow those people who are evicted to access any of the other Housing Trust services. Assistance with a bond to get into private rental is not available to them. In my office I have had an instance where a family with four children was evicted from their house. Those children were farmed out among separate relatives and did not know where they would go from there.

In my view the Housing Trust has always had a correct policy of broadly based public housing, so that anyone who does not own a house is able to access public housing. One of the basic rationales behind public housing is that it is housing for a last resort; for these people who cannot manage and cannot get a roof over their head, the Housing Trust is always there for them. That is no longer so. If you have any sort of debt, the chances are you will be down the eviction trail. If you have an old debt you will not be able to get into the Housing Trust; you will not be able to get a bond to get into private rental; you will not be able to transfer to another Housing Trust home. That is causing a great deal of hardship in many areas, and over the past three months I have noticed in my office a great increase in the number of complaints about this matter.

In other smaller areas, the Housing Trust is cutting back in many ways. There is no longer support when people move into a private rental house and need help with the bonds for essential services such as gas and electricity. The Housing Trust will no longer help with that. A single mother with a couple of young children cannot get help with furniture removal or other ancillary services. These sound like small things to the Government, which is not aware of the difficulties confronting poorer people. The Government dismisses it, but it causes a great deal of everyday hardship for people in poor circumstances.

There was an article in the last *Weekend Australian* that dealt with the new rich. People were apparently keen to emphasise this; through their own merit they had made their way up in the world. The family income, among the group under discussion, was over \$100 000 a year. These people all seemed to be interested only in their own further advancement. Many had come from a poor background and made use of the social security net that has been built up in this country

over many years. They have taken advantage of the good public education system, secure affordable housing in this country and high quality basic services. They have a good education, have been given that lift up and are now comfortably off. However, it seemed that all those people were prepared to forget about those less fortunate than themselves. When asked about it, one said that he gives freely to charity. That is really not good enough. We need to maintain those sorts of services in our society so that our free and equal society can continue and so that people born into poor circumstances can make their way up to these comfortable circumstances and can achieve what they want to if they want to.

That situation is deteriorating in our society because of this attitude by people who are comfortably off that they do not want to be taxed any more or do not want to give anything of their own back to the society from which they might have come. They are sending their children to expensive private schools so that they can network and be insulated from any of the problems in society. They have turned their backs on the people from the sorts of background from which they have come.

The people in this Government are part of this attitude. Nowhere is that better illustrated than in the attitude the Government has taken to education. My electorate predominantly comprises young families, and education is important to them. They are people on either social security benefits or very low incomes. Public education is very important to them. Most are very keen to improve the lot of their children in society, and public education is one way—perhaps the most important way—to do this. This Government is taking steps that will erode the quality of that public education, so that anyone who wants a decent education will probably end up going to a private school.

Mr Rossi: They do that now.

Ms HURLEY: They should not have to send their children to private schools to get a decent education.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: They may send their children to religious schools for religious reasons, and that is fine, but equal quality education should be available at public schools. The Government's attitude to public education is revealed in the cuts it is making to school services officers, the SSOs. The SSOs are of critical importance in education. In the schools in my area the school services officers play a vital role in helping many of the disadvantaged children who come to public schools in catching up on some of the things on which they miss out in their early years, including the developing of good speech and an ability to read and write and good social behaviour. Many children in these disadvantaged areas have behavioural problems and have not been encouraged by their parents; or, if they have been encouraged, sometimes their parents do not know how to do that most effectively.

The school services officers play a vital role in catching up these children so that they have a good start in life. Most of the SSOs in the public schools in my area come from the area. They usually start off volunteering their time and gradually it gets to the stage where the school is able to offer them a few paid hours. They understand the area, understand the children and are very effective in what they do. That is quite apart from the basic jobs that SSOs need to do such as answering telephones, doing the accounts and taking care of the grounds.

We have had a suggestion from the Government that volunteers are able to do that job. Just one of the uninformed

and unintelligent responses from the member for Lee was that unemployed people should be able to be stuck in those jobs to do them. I do not know if any of the schools in his electorate invited him to see what SSOs do. Last week I went to many of the schools in my area and saw that very little of what SSOs do could be done by casual volunteers dropping into the school at any time to take over that work. It would not be possible unless you had an SSO to do volunteer coordination. Most of those schools are losing an SSO who had to cover all these other jobs.

If one looks at the regulations, it can be seen that volunteers are not even adequately covered by insurance at school. Any volunteers working at a school have to use up all their own insurance or benefits before they are covered by Education Department insurance. For example, if someone doing casual, part time or shift work was able to help out at the school, but injured themselves and was away from work for a few weeks, they would have to use up all their holidays and sick leave from their work before they would start to be covered by the Education Department. I cannot imagine volunteers flocking in under those circumstances.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Families in my electorate work very hard with their limited income. They give what they can to the school and they work very hard for the school. That may be good enough for the wealthy people in your area; they may be able to give enough to support the school, but in my area they are unable to give any more. Most of the schools in my area have approximately 80 per cent school card recipients. Those parents are not able to pay any fees, much less increased fees, to cover the sorts of services with which this Government is dispensing. They are the basic facts of the matter: you are overlooking the people who are too poor to give any more. All the time you are increasing charges in other areas to make them even poorer. What is happening under these circumstances is that support for families who are trying to get ahead is fast disappearing.

I note, particularly in my area, that we have had the Para District Counselling Service and Carelink both cease operating, whilst other charges have increased, with a toughening up by Government departments in what they will do. This 'core business' term, used to cover the retraction of all sorts of services, is causing great hardship for people in my area. I have had an unprecedented number of people coming in to my office telling me that their essential services, such as gas, electricity and even water, have been cut off because they cannot afford to pay the Bill. They cannot go to the Para District Counselling Service for help with funding; they are redirected to FACS. They cannot go to Carelink for help in managing difficult children or their family circumstances; they are told to go to FACS. Could FACS get an increase in staff and resources to cover this? No. So, families in my area are left without the support they require to help their children to contribute to society in a meaningful way.

I now come to the subject of jobs. Again this Government is talking about jobs in Information Technology while allowing a number of international companies into the area. Texas Instruments in Elizabeth is about to close down and go away. That Information Technology type job is disappearing while the Government buys in jobs in other areas. It is simply not good enough while the Government is also shedding jobs for basic working people in services like TransAdelaide and EWS. As the water management is sold—and no-one will convince me that it is being anything other than sold, and soon to be in councils, no doubt—all those jobs for working

people are disappearing while the support for those people is disappearing.

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

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I rise to support the motion of the member for Frome and to congratulate Dame Roma on her opening speech. I also congratulate her on her tireless work representing the Queen in our State. It was not until I came into this place that I realised just what a dedicated and tireless worker she is. Another person of a similar calibre was Allan Glover. He was one of the great men we will remember on Eyre Peninsula. He was a successful farmer, husband, father and community worker, with time for everyone and everything. He will be greatly missed, especially by the people of Eyre Peninsula, and I take this opportunity to offer my condolences to his wife Ronda and his children Peter, Marilyn, Steven and Lisa and their families.

My electorate of Flinders was mentioned several times in Her Excellency's opening speech and, with its enormous size of 34 000 square kilometres and its enormous potential, I was not surprised. After the negative speech we have just been subjected to, it is my great pleasure to talk about some of the positives of this great State, some of the things that will create the wealth that we must have to be able to afford all the services that we all want for the people who live in this State. In the 21 months since I have been elected to represent Flinders in this Parliament, the advances in aquaculture alone have been nothing short of phenomenal. This has happened in several areas: research, development of existing industries, setting up new industries, preservation and conservation of the resource, protection of the environment, and in reviewing current structures.

Aquaculture is a form of primary production. It is quite distinct from the harvesting of fish in the wild, even if that harvesting is limited by quotas. Wild fish are not put in the ocean by human effort. The production of animals—fish, molluscs, crustacea—by means of aquaculture is basically similar in concept to growing chickens or pigs for meat under intensive farming methods. In late January 1995, Premier Dean Brown asked the South Australian Development Council to examine development opportunities for the aquaculture industry in this State. The purpose of the review was to outline the structure of the aquaculture industry as it currently stands, to identify its sustainable competitive advantages, to identify its growth potential and to identify any impediments to the industry in achieving its growth potential.

I am indebted to the South Australian Development Council, more particularly the review committee, whom I will be quoting in my remarks about aquaculture. The committee established to undertake the review was comprised of: Robert Thomas as Chairman, Michael Angelakis, Ted Chapman, Daryl Evans, Rob Lewis, Vic Neverauskas, Joe Puglisi, Jim Raptis, and Neal Grant as Executive Officer. I was delighted that Daryl Evans and Joe Puglisi of Port Lincoln had an input into the review, as both have many years experience in many branches of the fishing industry. Aquaculture is the farming of aquatic species, including fish, molluscs, crustacea, and covers breeding hatching, rearing, cultivation and husbandry for the sale of these species.

The value of aquaculture production in 1994-95 is estimated at \$87 million, which will increase to more than \$100 million next year. Significant production sectors in 1994-95 were: tuna, \$90 million; oysters, \$5 million; and barramundi, \$3.3 million. Minor production sectors were in

fresh-water crayfish, \$1.15 million; abalone \$.03 million; rainbow trout, \$.24 million; and mussels, \$.1 million. Rock lobster and snapper are developing aquaculture sectors. By the year 2000, the total value of production of the existing aquaculture industry is expected to be \$280 million, as mentioned in the Governor's speech. This should be regarded as the minimum achievable in the current business climate, and the true value of aquaculture in South Australia could easily be underestimated. At this figure, it will be the single largest sector, by value, of South Australia's fish production. Significant areas of production by the year 2000 will be tuna, oysters, abalone, mussels and barramundi, the great majority of this being in my electorate of Flinders.

In addition, there are considerable opportunities for the aquaculture of other species, both for human consumption and those for other uses which are not included in the above value estimates. In Port Lincoln we are also developing scientific, technical, education and support services. They are other income generating areas which will grow with the growth of aquaculture production. Overseas visitors are already coming to Port Lincoln. I am proud that South Australia has established an international reputation as a producer of quality seafood, mainly through the efforts of companies involved in producing and marketing captured fish products. The South Australian aquaculture industry can benefit from this reputation.

The State has manifold competitive advantages in this aquaculture. These are: a consistent supply of quality product; a clean environment, which is an outstanding competitive advantage world wide; suitable coastal waters; suitable areas for aquaculture in fresh water; sustainable aquaculture techniques to maintain the environment; availability of suitable land, a premium in most other places in the world; climatic diversity both on land and in the sea; a low incidence of disease; a range of species; ability to supply fresh seafood product to overseas markets during the northern hemisphere winter; an established marketing infrastructure; many examples of world leading fish farming technology; a significant research capability; and a program to provide high level education and training in the aquaculture business. There are, however, impediments to achieving the potential of aquaculture for this State. Accordingly, the Government has given clear directions to the Department of Primary Industries of South Australia to give greater emphasis to the needs of aquaculture. The head of the aquaculture unit in Primary Industries (PISA) will report directly to the Chief Executive of PISA rather than to the Director of Fisheries.

The first licences granted for aquaculture 10 years or so ago involved seven departments and five Ministers. The approval process is still a barrier, and therefore it will be streamlined. Most applications to carry out aquaculture involve, as a minimum, approval for a change of land use which requires approval as development under the Development Act 1993. As regards considering and approving applications regarding aquaculture, the Development Assessment Commission will delegate this power to an aquaculture committee especially for this job. In theory, the approval process appears to be an orderly way of handling applications, with certain departmental representatives being delegates of Ministers to approve applications in respect of land use. There was a major backlog of about 130 applications at the time the aquaculture committee of the South Australian Development Council made its first report in April this year. Some of those applications were more than two years old. The major stumbling block in the process was the

failure to produce management plans for certain areas. Mr Graham Broughton, deregulation officer in the Premier's Department, has been given the job of streamlining the processing of applications.

Lease tenure, which has been a source of grave concern, has also been addressed by the Liberal Government. Tenure agreements for aquaculturists carrying out animal farming or fattening in waters under the control of the State were quite unsatisfactory for the aquaculturists. The tenures were all annual licences, not leases. Many people had invested substantial amounts in assets which were located in specific areas of State-owned water-covered land, for which they had very short term tenure. Such a procedure was commercially high risk and unsuitable for banking. I am pleased to say that the Government has established a basis for secure tenure of lease sites.

The tuna farms, which have been established in Boston Bay, have been the subject of theft of farm fish, a significant loss to the industry, especially when you consider that each of these fish can be worth more than \$2 000. Amendments to the Fisheries Act will provide aquaculture licensees with adequate protection from theft. Access to brood stock is another sometimes contentious area which has held back development and which has been addressed by this Government.

I digress for a moment to highlight the achievements and perseverance of a pioneer in abalone breeding, Don Morrison of Louth Bay, situated about 25 kilometres north of Port Lincoln. Mr Don Morrison began research and experimentation on farming abalone in 1982. He was the first person in Australia to get abalone to spawn in captivity and the first to grow the larvae to small animals. He was at the forefront of research in the world. At the time, there was some work going on in California in the United States and some Government subsidised work in Japan, but no abalone farms. Professor John Grant and Trevor Dix of the Tasmanian Fisheries Department were also trying to get abalone to spawn. Don Morrison has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of his own money to get to this present stage of knowledge and expertise in the culture of abalone. He has received no Government money and, in fact, the story of the past 13 years has been one of hindrance, conflict and setbacks from the Government, bureaucracy and other sections of the fishing industry. I wonder how many people would have persevered for more than 13 years before at last receiving some income from their work.

The aquaculture of abalone is on the threshold of blossoming into a multi-million dollar industry creating employment in regions that need such opportunities more than anything else, while also bringing income into the State for the benefit of all who live in South Australia. I wonder how many people will ever pause for a moment to thank the Don Morrisons of this world for the benefits derived from their initiative and sacrifice.

Access to brood stock is of paramount importance to abalone hatcheries which will be offered a choice of two mechanisms. First, hatcheries can utilise the existing access system under which they are required to use nominated licensed divers to collect brood stock requirements, after giving divers appropriate notice. Secondly, hatcheries can access abalone brood stock through the market mechanism by purchasing a small quantity of quota through direct negotiations with quota holders. Access to the wild fishery by hatcheries would be via a permit under the Fisheries Act

allowing permit holders to collect their own brood stock and to dispose of the surplus brood stock as they wish.

Farming tuna is a world first that was developed in Port Lincoln. When quotas for southern blue fin tuna threatened the viability of operators, the idea of growing out the tuna caught in the wild to a more valuable market size was born. South Australian based tuna fishermen, in consultation with Japanese and South Australian researchers, the latter from the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI), developed a system for the harvesting and subsequent agistment of tuna. The principal market is the highly prized sashimi market in Japan.

Under the system, tuna fishermen catch their respective quota in the southern ocean and then transfer the live fish to pens located in Boston Bay, Port Lincoln. The tuna are held for periods of up to eight months, depending on the production and marketing strategies of the individual tuna farmers and also the market demand in Japan.

Over this period the tuna are fattened and conditioned on a diet of pilchards. However, manufactured diets are being tested. The fish are harvested as sashimi tuna for the Japanese market, where they can fetch up to \$50 per kilogram depending on the size and condition of the fish. The sashimi market is highly selective and very demanding on quality. Production of tuna in Boston Bay is about 2 000 tonnes per year worth an estimated \$50 million to \$80 million based on a price range of \$25 to \$40 a kilo but, as I said, going up to \$50 a kilogram and higher. In a SARDI trial some of the fish have been kept for two years or more in an attempt to grow tuna to spawning size and maturity.

The aquaculture of oysters is another success story which had its beginning in my electorate. In fact, the five major lease areas are all on Eyre Peninsula: Denial Bay, near Ceduna, Smokey Bay, Streaky Bay, Coffin Bay and Franklin Harbor, Cowell. Small numbers of leases are also located at Louth Bay near Port Lincoln and at Nepean Bay, Kangaroo Island, which is also in the electorate of Flinders. The 85 current licensed leaseholders occupy a total of 600 hectares. Leases range from four to 10 hectares, with the industry generally indicating that 10 hectares is the most viable manageable unit size. Total production possible from the leases is about three million dozen oysters a year or about 3 000 to 3 500 tonnes of product.

Rock lobster, which is better known as crayfish, is an industry that has experienced enormous highs and lows over the years, and again it is in Port Lincoln that experiments have begun this year to harvest crayfish in the wild and hold and grow them out to achieve high returns. The initiative came out of an aquaculture group of rock lobster fishermen who combined with the Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishermen's Association to set up a commercial experiment in Boston Bay. Port Lincoln rock lobster fisherman Neil Bicknell said that the trials had proved that lobsters could be held in commercial densities. One or two lobsters have been held in aquariums and a dozen or so have been held in reticulating tanks for longer periods.

However, this was the first successful trial at such a magnitude as we understand it in Australia. The farming of lobsters will give fishermen greater control of the sale of their product and, therefore, greater stability in their industry. Fishermen will be released from the situation where they are at the mercy of overseas buyers during times when there is a glut of lobsters on the market.

The farming of mussels, already a success in the Eastern States and New Zealand, looks set to also be a success in Port

Lincoln, where juvenile mussels spontaneously colonise the nets surrounding the tuna farms. Development licences have been granted to a major fish processing company for a research and development program on this species at four sites near Kangaroo Island. This program is being undertaken by the South Australian Research and Development Institute. Any large scale development is dependent on the results of this research program, but production in 1995-96 is expected to be worth \$100 000. Applications for development licences for keeping mussels in Boston Bay are currently under consideration. No specific lease area has been determined for mussel farming; however, interstate and overseas experience suggests that leases exceeding five to eight hectares are viable for single owner-operator ventures. However, to be financially viable, mussel farming relies on a significant volume of production, and current lease applications in Port Lincoln are actually for 20 hectare sites.

Barramundi is another fish which is new to my electorate, although it is currently grown at two other locations in South Australia. Among those interested locally is Peter Schaefer of Port Lincoln, who is researching recirculating tanks with a view to setting up a Barramundi farm. Intensive fish farming technology based on bio-filtration and recirculation of water has been developed. The technology allows for intensive fish farming in a very small area and with minimal water usage. Recirculating fish farm technology is used around the world but the particular design in South Australia is unique in all aspects including efficiency of water treatment, utilisation and space. South Australia is home to this technology.

This is the kind of initiative that will benefit all the people of this State through increased export earnings. South Australia has established an international reputation as a producer of quality seafood while the seafood industry has established a reputation for consistency in the supply of quality product to the international and domestic markets. This reputation enhances the ability of South Australian seafood suppliers to secure favourable, long-term supply contracts. Our clean environment is an outstanding competitive advantage world-wide in marketing this seafood. South Australia has a global reputation as having a relatively clean and unpolluted environment. This is especially true in regard to aquaculture undertaken in coastal waters because the State has extensive areas of coastline with little or no urban development.

We on Eyre Peninsula have at times bewailed our separation by distance from the centre of the State's activities; however, this distance has now become one of our biggest assets in relation to aquaculture. In South Australia there are extensive areas of relatively low lying coastal land adjacent to good quality oceanic water. Most of this is in my electorate, some being in the South-East of the State. Numerous small and shallow embayments around Eyre Peninsula have only small regional centres nearby. Waste water from the larger regional centres of Port Lincoln, Ceduna and Streaky Bay is either fully treated or disposed of on land, thus minimising risks and the perception of possible contamination. In many instances, coastal land is inexpensive and infrastructure, while somewhat deficient, can be made adequate for commercial viability.

Despite having few significant catchments of fresh water, South Australia has areas where sufficient surplus water exists to support aquaculture development: Kangaroo Island is one of these places. One of the biggest concerns with the expanding interest in activity in aquaculture relates to

environmental sustainability as a significant component of established and proposed developments. Tuna farming in Boston Bay is managed to minimise the range of possible impacts on the bay, and the industry is committed to an environmental monitoring program and the development of an environmental code of practice. The oyster industry is one of the most regulated in the world with a view to minimising environmental impacts. This regulation is in the form of limits on stocking densities, available area for development, proportion of water beds allocated for leases, site rehabilitation, insurance and a commitment to an environmental monitoring program and industry environmental code of practice.

The Environment Protection Authority has sought the support of PISA to develop a similar environmental code of practice with the freshwater crayfish farming industry on Kangaroo Island. The perception that the industry in South Australia has given a high priority to conducting its activities in harmony with the environment is a major advantage in the industry in the political arena which also influences the long-term marketing prospects of the industry. This is especially important where markets understand that farm management is such that it will not affect the long-term viability of the operation through either disease, habitat or political influence.

Throughout much of the world, coastal land has been heavily developed through industrialisation and urbanisation. In both cases, this has affected not only the quality of adjacent water but also the availability of coastal land. South Australia's geographical spread across a range of latitudes provides scope for the development of a range of species and techniques for aquaculture. The waters of the Southern Ocean are generally stable in temperature while the waters in the gulfs reach tropical ranges in the summer months. While it is acknowledged that the aquaculture industry in South Australia is still in its infancy, there have been few incidents of disease in fish farming activities due in part to the rigorous management practices put in place by industry participants.

The ability to market fresh seafood product to overseas markets during the northern hemisphere winter is an advantage to all Australian producers. This advantage can be further enhanced through aquaculture operations which are land-based and at least partially isolated from climatic variations. For example, South Australian barramundi farms are able to market product throughout the year. Farmers in northern Queensland and the Northern Territory are restricted to the summer months only and, as a result, South Australian product dominates the marketplace during the Australian winter. But the story does not stop there. Anything that is growing needs continual monitoring, and it is recommended that the industry be reviewed again in six months. One of the aims of that review will be to see whether impediments identified in the first review still remain.

A strategic plan for the aquaculture industry needs to be developed so that the provision of the necessary State infrastructure keeps pace with the rate of private investment in the industry. Part of that plan should be to consolidate into one Act all or the majority of matters relevant to aquaculture. The aquaculture success story is not only for fishermen: there are numerous spin-offs for other industries. For instance, artificial food for tuna is being researched and manufactured locally in Port Lincoln. Equipment is needed, most of which has to be purpose designed and built—again, in Port Lincoln. Adequate research and education are essential if the potential of aquaculture is to be fully realised and collapses in the industry are to be avoided. The Government has taken

significant steps in this regard. South Australia has a significant research capability through the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) and both the Flinders and Adelaide Universities.

However, by far the most exciting development has been the establishment of the Marine Science Centre at Kirton Point on land made available by Port Lincoln City Council. The centre, attached to Flinders University, will be opened on 1 October. The project has been supported magnificently by the fishing industry and local people who, together, have contributed close to \$700 000 which, with an anticipated \$750 000 of Commonwealth funding, will mean a small outstanding debt on opening day. The current estimated cost is \$1.5 million with an additional \$380 000 extension to house the present SARDI fishing research staff located in the Port Lincoln area. Campaign chairman, Ross Haldane, said that Eyre Peninsula sports clubs were losing about 280 young people from the region every year. Nevertheless, when approached for funding, each contributed as they were able. The Port Lincoln Orienteers (a non-profit club) donated \$10 which, as Ross said, may not seem very much; however, it is the principle behind the gift that has shown the strength of our community support.

It is an example to the rest of the State which will be hampered by the enormous debt inherited from the mismanagement of the former Labor Government and which will, for a long time to come, affect what the Government can do. Local people working with the Government, and prepared to back their requests with action of this kind, will find a ready and willing partner in the Brown Liberal Government. The Flinders University and the South Australian Department for Employment, Training and Further Education have established a partnership program to provide higher level education and training in aquaculture in South Australia.

It is intended that this partnership will provide a focus for collaboration between research and extension agencies, education providers and the aquaculture industry. Courses in aquaculture are in place at secondary level, thus leading into tertiary study. My Federal colleague, Barry Wakelin, the member for Grey, has joined with me in establishing a scholarship for postgraduate study at the Marine Science Centre. One of the most exciting aspects of the Marine Science Centre at Port Lincoln has been the interest shown by qualified people from overseas wanting to come here and carry out research. I can see this as an expanding area of overseas income for the State.

I turn now to an issue where the Government recognised the need for reform, on which, indeed, it has introduced significant reforms already, but in relation to which the Government has been hampered by the Democrats in another place in doing all that needs to be done. I refer to WorkCover. Some of the negative practices that were allowed to develop under the previous Government have been addressed. Workers need protection—I have not found anyone who will argue against that. Nevertheless, WorkCover premiums present a significant block to employment and therefore advancement of industry. It must be recognised that excessive demands on business simply mean that businesses do not grow and therefore do not employ.

I have been informed of several alarming examples of the cost of WorkCover to employers. I mention just one example today. The cost of WorkCover to Lincoln Bacon Specialists for the 1995-96 financial year has been estimated at more than \$101 350 on a payroll of \$1 million. The WorkCover levies for 1994-95 were \$68 658, and reimbursement for

claims in the same period amounted to \$20 558, leaving an excess of \$48 100 paid to Workcover for 1994-95.

WorkCover, of course, is not the only overhead. Add superannuation and payroll tax and the outlay by Lincoln Bacon Specialists for the past year is in the vicinity of \$170 000. Even this is only part of the overheads incurred by the business in employing staff. While generous conditions of employment are to be applauded, we all—and workers especially—must ensure that we do not price ourselves out of a job. The cost of WorkCover must be brought to a more acceptable level. The Government's legislative changes have already meant that WorkCover has reversed decisions to increase levy collection this year by \$40 million. The Parliament should not stand in the way of further Government amendments, which would reduce levy rates to a nationally competitive level.

I have been astounded at the ignorance that perceives Eyre Peninsula as a dust bowl that should be forgotten. Eyre Peninsula grows 40 per cent of the State's grain in a normal year and as much as one half of the State's grain in a good year. Take that income out of the State and everyone suffers. As mentioned in Her Excellency the Governor's speech, this region supports annual primary production valued at \$1.75 billion. Our agricultural community has suffered to a greater extent than any other section of the Australian nation over the past decade. However, there are pointers to a bright future for this section of the economy. It has been said that one person's loss is another's gain, and I can foresee this coming true in the prices paid for grain.

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): For the benefit of the Minister on the front bench, I have already made a speech as the member for Peake so, unfortunately, I cannot have the privileges of a maiden speech. However, it is a pleasure to rise and support the adoption of the Address in Reply, and to thank Her Excellency the Governor for her delivery of her very valued and important speech on the opening of the third session of the forty-eighth Parliament.

We in South Australia are very fortunate indeed to have a person such as Dame Roma as our Governor. She has attended to her duties in one of the greatest traditions, and she is admired and respected by all South Australians. It is to her credit that she is able to visit all parts of the State. Her Excellency has a very wide interest in the State, has a keen concern for all sectors of the community and also enjoys a wide general knowledge of South Australia, be it the commercial, industrial, social or welfare area—in other words, across the whole spectrum. Certainly, I would dearly like to see Dame Roma continue to be the Governor of South Australia for many years to come. I must also say that I am very much a monarchist and I will have no part whatsoever of a republican system.

In Her Excellency's address the Government took the opportunity to inform the Parliament of various issues that it will look at during the term of this session of Parliament. In her speech Her Excellency said:

With many of its economic and financial reforms in place, my Government is giving priority to the achievement of long-term social benefits for the people of South Australia.

It is a tragedy that we have in Opposition a group of people who seem to be hell-bent on destroying anything that the current Government wishes to do for the benefit of the people. Certain people within the Opposition have set out to

knock every issue, every form of development and every effort to restructure and reorganise some of the Government departments where the bureaucracy was developing into a huge monolith and outstripping the benefits to the people.

The cut backs to the bureaucracy started some five years ago, so it involves not just the Liberal Party. Previous Administrations in this State—by stealth more than anything else—had started to rein in the costs to the taxpayer. Now that the Liberal Party is in government, that is simply a no-no. Part of the problem is that the Government is caught up in a situation where no effective wage and/or salary increases have been granted to certain public servants since 1990. So, it is of no surprise that we have these concerted little campaigns around the place seeking quite large pay increases. It was an horrific problem to reorganise the finances of the State, to sort out the deficit and to arrange a satisfactory level of financial management.

Whilst I have been a great supporter of Auditors-General in the past and the freedom that they enjoy and the opportunity they have to inform all members of Parliament exactly what is happening with the State finances—and I will do anything I can to support the Auditor-General in fully reporting to the Parliament his independent point of view—there is no doubt that we are having difficulty in the area of debt management. I will seek further explanation from the Auditor-General when he visits the Economic and Finance Committee in a few weeks. The Auditor-General, at page 51 of his report, 'Part A Audit Overview,' states:

The purpose of providing this commentary is to continue the focus of previous reports, particularly my report for 1992-1993 and to assist readers to better understand this subject. The commentary that follows illustrates that debt management is an area that requires close management as it has a significant influence on the State's public sector finances. The estimated net interest payments for 1994-95 of \$719 million demonstrate this point.

That issue has already been dealt with in this House during Question Time in the past two days. However, on page 52, the Auditor-General states:

Short-term interest rates are normally lower than long-term rates (though exceptional periods occur occasionally).

It does not follow, however, that it is always the right decision for Governments (or, again, other borrowers) to borrow on the basis of short-term or floating interest rates, for a number of reasons including:

- borrowers with fixed interest obligations at the time of interest rate rises will, to that extent, be protected from those rises and may thus save in interest as compared with having borrowed short-term; another way of making this point is that, in these circumstances, the borrower will make a capital gain;
- the use of long-term, fixed interest rate debt will lead to greater stability in interest costs over time and would be appropriate for a borrower who, for whatever reason, placed a premium on such stability.

In 1992-93, the Auditor-General said:

Fundamental to achieving the minimum costs of funds has been the trend over the past two years to shorten the maturity profile of SAFA's net debt thereby taking advantage of applicable short-term interest rates.

While there are benefits from this position, there are also risks to be monitored and managed. For example, a high reliance on short-term debt could cause difficulties when raising new borrowings concurrently with rolling over existing debt especially when there are disruptions in the market or market confidence. Short-term interest rates are also subject to greater volatility, which can cause budgetary problems for highly indebted borrowers.

The Treasurer has received a letter dated 27 September from Standard & Poor's. The letter, referring to the Auditor-General's 1995 report, states:

Dear Mr Baker, As you may be aware, Standard & Poor's recently visited SAFA and held considerably detailed management discussions as part of the broader South Australian rating review. Following those discussions, and further financial analysis, Standard & Poor's considers the operational direction and procedures currently adopted by SAFA as reasonable for an entity managing the debt portfolio of a State with a current AA rating.

More specifically, Standard & Poor's considers that the strategic approach adopted by SAFA to gradually extend the portfolio duration at the end of 1993, rather than move quickly to lengthen duration, was appropriate at the time. While, with hindsight, this strategy may have resulted in a slightly higher cost of funds, few financial market commentators or analysts accurately predicted the sharp rise in interest rates that occurred early in 1994. Without the ability to forecast perfectly, a gradual approach to portfolio rebalancing is seen as appropriate for a borrower with SAFA's financial profile and market standing, and consistent with broader debt management objectives such as market liquidity, stock volatility and potential maturity profile.

As indicated by the above, Standard & Poor's views cost minimisation as only one facet of debt management. Costs objectives must be weighed against the risks involved in attaining a desired cost outcome, as must a myriad of other operational and regulatory restrictions. Indeed, the Auditor-General's Report makes this very point on page 56 where it says that 'the fundamental objective of debt management (is) the minimisation, over the long run, of interest costs to State within acceptable risk parameters.'

I trust these words are of some assistance.

Yours sincerely, Duncan Warwick-Champion, Associate Director State Finances.

I think that answers any criticism that we may believe is in the Auditor-General's Report of the way the Treasurer is handling the State's finances. We have to look at the whole picture, the whole outcome, as it was perceived by us, as it was presented, and as it will be in the future. Given a fair and reasonable opportunity by the Federal Government and the people of South Australia, this State will rein back the costs and development will progress as we expect. But keep knocking, harping, and criticising in the way it has been done, and the confidence and opportunities for South Australia to grow and develop will be destroyed. If that is what the Opposition wants, let it be further on its head as the State slowly sinks into the morass of hopelessness.

I am annoyed at the performance of some members of the Opposition. I would have thought that they would realise that it is time everybody got together and supported a stronger and better South Australia. We saw the performance on opening day in another place when members stood up at the special sitting of Parliament to elect a member to replace the Hon. Barbara Wiese. Barbara Wiese was under criticism in the media, and in the Parliament, as a result of certain allegations, and they did not really concern me. I do not recall one of those who sang her praises the other day standing up before I did to say that they believed in her integrity. I was the only member of Parliament—a member of the Opposition at the time—who stood up and said that I could not accept what was being said about her, and that I believed very strongly in her integrity.

I have known her since 1970 when I first came here. Barbara was a member of the typing pool and was a relieving typist. I had complete and utmost faith and confidence in her ability to carry out any request made of her. At one stage, when we were told that we had to leave Parliament House and open electorate offices, I offered her a position. She then explained she would not be able to accept it. That is the high regard and confidence I have had for Barbara. I was very disappointed at that time when she was under attack by one of my colleagues, but nobody else stood up and defended her. Nobody stood up in this Chamber and defended the Minister.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What absolute nonsense!

Mr BECKER: Not before I did; nobody stood up and defended her one little bit. How the hypocrites in the Opposition can carry on as they did is beyond me. It demonstrates what is going on within the Opposition at the present moment. It is not good for government in this State if we have an Opposition that is totally in disarray, totally disorganised, and not getting behind the effort to try to rebuild the State, as we expected it would, in a bipartisan way. In the closing years of the previous Government we were asked time after time to support the then Labor Government in a bipartisan way for the betterment of South Australia. Let it all be judged in the future as to who is right and who is wrong, and we will see who has the interests of South Australia at heart. Her Excellency went on under the heading 'Financial position':

Since you were last called together, my Government has introduced two budgets.

That was a very historical occasion when the second budget was brought into the Parliament. For many years I could never understand why we brought in the budget in August and dealt with it in September through to late October, sometimes early November, for that current financial year, 1 July to 30 June. Ever since I have been here I have always done everything I could in the Party room and in formulating policy to suggest that the State budget should be brought down early in the calendar year and be passed through Parliament so that, come 1 July, all Government departments, authorities and trading enterprises know exactly where they stand and so that their operational or financial performance can commence on 1 July and finish on 30 June the following year.

So, at long last we have moved towards that, although not all the way. However, we are gradually getting there and we had an early delivery of the State budget. It involves a tremendous amount of cooperation by Canberra, and the Federal Government ought to bring down its budget in late January or early February so that the States know the situation well in advance when they are preparing their budgets. That is where a lot of community organisations were trapped by the Opposition, which led them to believe that, as soon as the budget was brought down, they could raise issues with Government backbenchers to try to upset the budget arrangements. The budget is locked in and fixed and will not and cannot be altered. If it is altered it means that the Government has lost the confidence of the Parliament and there has to be another election. It is about time these little issues were explained to these community organisations that want to get out there and cause mischief in the belief that they are making a contribution to the State.

The Auditor-General referred in his report to the budget Estimates Committees. Again, I campaigned strongly for many years and it was not until we were elected to Government in 1979 that we were able to bring in Estimates Committees for the betterment of the Parliament and the people of South Australia and to demonstrate open government and greater accountability. The Auditor-General comments on the Estimates Committees on page 36, as follows:

One of those implications concerns the Estimates Committees which were established in 1980 and which represented a potentially very useful step forward in improved systems of financial accountability. The bringing forward this year of the budget and the hearings of the Estimates Committees has, however, had the effect of detracting from the usefulness of those committees because they have had available far less information than previously with respect to the just completed year. The committees did not have my report

in respect of the 1994-95 financial year nor the annual reports of major financial agencies.

For example, the committee examining the Department of Treasury and Finance did not (and could not because of timing this year), as it has previously, have access to the important information contained in the annual reports of such bodies as the department itself, the South Australia Government Financing Authority and other Government financial institutions. Committee scrutiny without access to information of this kind is bound to be less effective than it could otherwise be.

That was mentioned in Committee B, which I chaired. However, the Opposition with its experience, with the opportunity of a little work, research and homework could have ferreted out the information in regard to the various Government undertakings, seeking reviews and figures at that date and asking for opportunities from the various Ministers. While the Auditor-General may highlight those issues, it reflects badly on an ineffective Opposition that is not doing its work and, as was quite obvious, had not done its work in relation to the two budgets we have presented. It has missed lots of opportunities to raise the questions and issues as it should have done.

The Estimates Committees are still the best form of dealing with the budget in the Parliament. The Auditor-General's Report, of course, is always very handy. When the budget estimates come around next year, these documents will be there. There always has to be a changeover period, which causes a few difficulties. It is like drawing new boundaries: some miss out and some are far more fortunate than others. It is a matter of experience, ability and using the opportunity to examine the various lines. The chances were there when the public servants were present in the Chamber, and the information could have been obtained.

The financial position has slightly improved, as mentioned in the Governor's opening speech, by some \$36 million. That is healthy, and let us hope we can obtain a reasonable standard of success in dealing with the budget. It is also pleasing to note that the Government has been able to carry out its promise with the creation of some 27 400 jobs since January 1994, and employment in South Australia is the highest it has been since the recession, and certainly for five years, which is good news.

We do not hear much good news about what is happening in South Australia, including the various suburbs. I know that the industrial complexes in my electorate are busier than they have ever been, and they are putting on people. There is a greater air of confidence and they appreciate what is happening in South Australia. You only have to go doorknocking some of these smaller companies and go behind the front door to find out what is really going on in some of our so-called small businesses. They are doing extremely well. They have to rely on exports and many people have been working long hard hours under difficult conditions to continue the export growth and development of their business. It is happening, and it is up to us to support these companies, individuals and partnerships to ensure that the growth will be maintained.

The Governor mentioned the infrastructure for the economy and community, particularly in relation to the extension of Adelaide Airport's main runway, and the preparation for an environmental impact assessment will commence shortly. I believe it will take about 15 months. The extension is due for completion in the second half of 1998. I hope I will live long enough to see it, because I do not believe it. I am yet to be convinced that it is an economic proposition. There are only two major airlines operating in Adelaide at present using 747 aircraft: Singapore Airlines and

Cathay Pacific, and they use them because that is all they have. They got caught in ordering large numbers of these aircraft. I notice that Singapore Airlines does not always use the large 747 but a shorter version, the 747B, to come here. I believe that those airlines will be looking at using airbus aircraft in the future; in other words, an aircraft similar to the Qantas 767.

The only international airline using Adelaide Airport successfully, I believe, with about 85 per cent loading, is Air Garuda. That Indonesian airline has taught us a lesson. If you are genuine, if you really want to attract people to your country's tourist destinations, then you organise your aircraft to pick up the people, offering them a package to where you want them to go. I firmly believe that, if we ever want to do anything as far as tourism is concerned in South Australia, there is no point in relying on Qantas. Forget it. It just cannot seem to get its act together. Forget the other international airlines. We need to charter aircraft and, as a State, put together package tours, develop the whole service, and arrange everything for them.

For example, we should charter a 767 to commence from Hong Kong, to go to Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Japan or wherever you want to pick up the people, organise them to stay at your own international hotel of a significant standard, and from the moment they arrive have them organised to see certain spots. Not all Asians are alcoholics. Our wineries appeal only to certain types of people. There are other better destinations. We should have an airport and a runway at Kangaroo Island that can take 737 aircraft. We should have the same in the Flinders Ranges and at the opal fields. If we have packages where these people can come in, see the main attractions of the State as add-ons to their destination, along with affordable accommodation, we could guarantee that they are here for three or four days.

The only way to do it is to control the airline and the accommodation. If we leave it up to others to do it for us we are taking the easy option, and we cannot expect fast growth or fast development. We have to kick-start that type of industry in South Australia. We must kick-start tourism by doing it. Once we prove that we can build up something and be successful at it, we can sell it off to private enterprise. However, I believe that the State has to do it and be prepared to carry losses in the name of tourism development promotion. We will not do it unless we make a concerted effort. It is no good saying, 'We want the people to go to Barossa Valley, McLaren Vale' or wherever. They do not want to go there. We must do our homework and find out what they are looking for. There is much to offer on Kangaroo Island; it is brilliant. There is much to offer in the Flinders Ranges, and there is a unique opportunity to take them up to the opal fields, where they can wander into the opal mines themselves. We could even organise it that they select the opal they want, watch the person cut it for them, and sell it to them in a brooch, ring or whatever.

We have to be more far more entrepreneurial—I do not think we have done enough in the area of tourism. The opportunities are there. Extending the runway will not make any difference to exports; I am convinced of that. As yet, nobody has come up to me and said, 'Look, I am desperate to export this or that.' It is a matter of management. In the past, the difficulties that people have had with airlines have been simply due to poor management by all concerned. You have to follow through your product. Occasionally, you should check it through, follow it through, and go with the product to make sure that the airlines are doing the right

thing. There is just too much of a slap-happy, couldn't care less attitude by the transport industry in handling our exports in this State. That is where we ought to crack down on them—and crack down on them hard. We should just say to these organisations, 'If you can't accept something at the front counter and guarantee that it catches the next aircraft to Melbourne to go direct to Singapore or whatever, then you ought to be put out of business.'

Nobody seems to worry. Everybody seems to be happy to sit back and complain, as we have had from the Opposition time after time: do not bother about the facts, just get up and have a damn good old whinge. That is why I am getting tired of this grizzling attitude that everything must be done this way or that way so that everybody can have an easy time. It is about time we bent our backs, put our shoulders to the grindstone and really got on with the job of building up South Australia and making it a far better State for everybody to live in.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I commend Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on her speech. As outlined in her speech, it is evident that much has happened since that December day in 1993. I believe that a lot more has happened for the better, and we are on track. Programs are in place in all areas of Government, as outlined and, whilst the Government is wisely focusing on restructuring the South Australian economy by getting debt under control, we have not forgotten all other areas of government. I can assure members opposite that under Dean Brown this Government is not only restructuring and getting the debt under control but it also has a social conscience and is sensitive to the issues that are before us. We cannot deliver welfare without creating wealth.

On 11 December it will be two years since we were voted into office. In my first speech in this place I said it was an honour and a privilege to be a member of Parliament, and I was certainly honoured to be a member of the Dean Brown Government. I feel just as enthusiastic today as I did then, and the honour has not been diminished. Over the past 18 months I have visited many organisations in my electorate, including Neighbourhood Watch, school councils, business centres, groups such as elderly citizens associations, clubs in the area and important groups like citizens' advocacy. I have had a good overview of what goes on in society in my electorate. The message is not negative, as the members opposite would want us to believe. People in the electorate are realistic. They know there were problems and they know they had to be solved. That message is certainly out there in the community.

Progress has taken place. Employment in South Australia is at its highest level for almost five years and now it exceeds the pre-recession peak, with the creation of 27 400 jobs since 1994. A lot has happened, such as the agreement with the Commonwealth Government (and we must not take anything away from when it does have positive contributions) over the extension of Adelaide Airport's main runway and, again, that is on track. It is no secret that the Premier has done much to ensure that that will take place. The proposed Adelaide to Crafers highway will commence construction in 1996. So, a lot of good things are happening in the State, including, of course, the Southern Expressway. Tourism is on the move and South Australia is getting its share after all the years of not being regarded in the same league as some of the other States. We have a lot to offer. We are offering that in South Australia and we are well on track and on the map.

In the environment, South Australia has taken the lead in proposing to the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria the restoration of the Murray River. As all members would know, South Australia is the gift of the Murray. As the old historian Herodotus said, Egypt is the gift of the Nile. There are similarities. If we do not recognise that gift from nature (or the gods, as the Egyptians would have us believe) and, if we neglect it, we will surely suffer not only environmentally but also economically, because, as we know, much results from the contribution of water from the Murray. It is a sensitive area. This Government recognises that and has taken steps to ensure that that gift is fully appreciated and comes to fruition to provide for South Australia a sustainable economic and environmental future through sensible water distribution policies.

Of course, members are aware of the initiatives that this Government has taken in cleaning up water catchment areas. I am aware of what is happening in the Torrens River catchment area. In fact, I have attended one of the board meetings and know that things are on track. For the first time a framework is in place to ensure that not only do we have projects necessary for the economic well-being of South Australia but those economic projects are being delivered in an environmental framework which will ensure even greater economic benefit in the future. That has been a policy of the new Government which came into power when so much had to be done in December 1993. Progress is being made.

Certainly, I disagree with members opposite that we have run out of ideas. How can it be said that we have run out of ideas? One just has to look at the *Advertiser* article of Wednesday 20 September headed 'Hundreds of jobs tipped in growth boom'. I commend Greg Kelton for his article, which states:

South Australia is leading a national employment trend with a new survey predicting major growth over the next three months. Hundreds of new jobs are expected in areas such as electronics, health, information technology, transport, manufacturing and engineering.

They are broad areas, so no-one can say that we are focused on only one area. The article refers to health, information technology, transport and manufacturing. In other words, we have a holistic approach in delivering to South Australia what our people deserve. I am honoured to be part of the team that is delivering so much after so many years of economic drought. We cannot blame the weather for the mismanagement that occurred in the past.

Over the past 18 months and more recently there have been complaints by organisations such as the Institute of Teachers about basic skills testing, that we were going the wrong way and that we were making enormous cuts and the like. However, when we look at the situation in its proper perspective, that is not how the position is seen out in the community where people know there have been difficult times. True, they would have liked us to deliver more, and the Government is the first to say that it wanted to deliver more. However, it is no good giving more today and making people hungry tomorrow. Certainly, that was the mentality of the previous Government which said, 'We'll give you something today; here is your sandwich, but you do not have a basic sustained diet for the future.'

We acknowledge that decisions have had to be made. What does the community really want on these issues? Over 80 per cent of parents agreed with basic skills testing, and there were not the problems that the Institute of Teachers claimed. I am very much aware of the problems confronting

SSOs. As a former teacher I know only too well the excellent work of school assistants.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services has recognised the importance of SSOs in the school community. For SAIT to have a campaign against the Government is a little bit insensitive to the community. It is a bit like accusing a firefighter of starting a fire. Although the State was in an economic mess and although much has happened in the past 18 months, from the examples I have provided I believe we are on track—but a lot more still needs to be done. The Government had to make some difficult budget decisions concerning our schools so that we could continue to provide them with more resources than schools in other States. We still have the lowest student-teacher ratio of all public schools in Australia and the lowest ratio for non-Government schools in South Australia. South Australian schools have almost 10 per cent more support staff than the national average. I know it is difficult to accept that the number of support officers has to be cut. It is not easy, but that is the reality we face because of the former Government's mismanagement.

I believe that SAIT is trying to divide the education community. It has distributed information sheets in the community which outline the work that SSOs do. I acknowledge that there is no question about the importance of SSOs. As a former teacher I remember quite clearly the suggestion that there might be extra SSOs and one fewer teacher at a particular school. The Institute of Teachers jumped up and down and said, 'No, SSOs are different; they cannot do the work of teachers.' The Institute of Teachers was the first to object to that flexibility which could be put in place; however, when it suited the Institute of Teachers it said that SSOs were all inclusive and all important. I agree with that, but let us put it into the proper perspective. If the Government gets this State back on its feet—and I am sure it will—the money will be there to provide all that we need. However, that will not occur unless we are realistic about what we have to divide. You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

The previous Government's mentality was to pick up the crumbs and throw away the loaves. Members opposite have a go at the Government when it has to make some hard decisions, but it was the Opposition which not only threw away the loaves but burnt the oven so that we could not even bake anything. We have to be realistic about what we can provide. This Government will continue to provide that base in the near future and for the twenty-first century. Even in these difficult times the Government is still able to provide training and development allocations for schools within my electorate. For example, the East Marden Primary School will receive \$849; Hectorville Primary School, \$540; Newton Primary School, \$475; and Norwood Morialta High School, \$6 489. Those amounts are for training and development on top of what the Government has delivered for the new drama centre at Norwood and the rebuilding of schools.

Again, in my electorate, which is the area that I know best, \$140 000 has been allocated to the East Marden Primary School for the replacement of the heating plants in two buildings. It will receive a share of \$5.6 million in grants for maintenance and minor works. In this way, the Government is addressing all backlog maintenance and essential minor works in schools as part of its overall commitment to capital works projects. When I was elected, I visited all the schools in my electorate to see what problems they had. I could see that there had been a lot of neglect over the past 20 years. Even in these difficult times, when schools put forward their case, the Government responds. Projects are in place which

will alleviate some of their problems. No doubt the Government would like to do more, but it cannot do so without the necessary funds.

The Government has made great progress in reducing the State debt by \$1.3 billion in 1995. The budget deficit for 1994-95 has been reduced to \$239 million, \$36 million less than the original target, and in 1995-96 it will be reduced to \$114 million. The Government is still focusing on the development of the State's great natural strengths in food production, mining, tourism, key manufacturing sectors and information technology. I believe that the Government is on track.

Earlier this morning, the member for Napier mentioned the problem of maintenance in the Housing Trust. That is no different from the backlog of maintenance in schools. She told us this morning that that maintenance is not being done and that the Government is not providing the funds. What happened during the past 11 years when the previous Government brought the State to the eleventh hour? What happened to the backlog of maintenance in education and other Government services then? I know that there are problems with the maintenance of some Housing Trust dwellings: I have visited them, and I would like the Government to do something about them. As soon as the economy picks up, I will be the first to voice the concerns of my constituents to the relevant Ministers so that that work can be done, but it would be irresponsible of me as a member of the Government and this House to ask for something which at this time was not sustainable. That would prevent the State from providing all the services that the community needs.

I am very much aware of the difficulties of the people who come to see me and members opposite, but members opposite do not have a monopoly on compassion for and understanding of people in difficult economic situations. That is a fallacy. As members opposite would know, I have spent most of my teaching career in the Labor heartland. I understand the concerns of the people in my electorate who are less fortunate than the average person. We must make sure that their problems are redressed. That is happening. Where it can be demonstrated that there are real needs, this Government does act to meet those needs.

I find it very difficult to understand why we are continually attacked when we are not even halfway through a term: we are being judged on the long-term perspective. Judge us on what we have done so far on the limited resources available to us. The newspaper article that I cited earlier puts this Government and the progress that has taken place into perspective. Again, I quote from the *Sunday Mail*, 'Rann hit on river plan stance'. This Government has an initiative to clean up the Murray River. I believe that one of the most important things we must do as a Government is to ensure that the Murray River flows cleanly and that it will provide a future for South Australia. The article states:

Industry, commerce and rural groups have hit the State Labor Party's opposition to a levy plan on households to help clean up the River Murray. The State Government's initiative to negotiate the plan to clean up the River Murray for future generations has been broadly applauded.

We are accused of not having a broad perspective on the problems of South Australia, but we are getting things done. We have a vision for South Australia, and I believe we are on track and will continue to stay on track not only for the next two years but for the next decade, if the people of South Australia wish us to continue to prepare for the twenty-first century.

It has been my great honour to represent my electorate over the past 18 months. Some people ask me, 'How do you make the change from teaching to being a member of Parliament?' I understand that teachers have a much higher approval rating than politicians—about 58 per cent compared with 12 per cent for politicians. I suppose that is why I continue to tell people that I am a teacher but, if you put the two together, I am not doing too badly. The important aspect is what this Government is doing for the State. I know that at times the public is not fully appreciative of all the things that need to be done. I can well understand people would have liked us to do some things differently and to deliver more services. As I said, I know that the Premier, Cabinet, indeed the whole Government, would like to be in office at a time when we did not have the economic restraints we have today because we would be able to deliver more.

It concerns me when people criticise the price paid for the Myer-Remm site, but we had no choice. When one considers the \$900 million, I ask the questions: how many SSOs could we employ for \$900 million; by how much would \$900 million shorten the hospital waiting lists; how much more could we do to clean up our waterways with \$900 million; and how much more could tourism be promoted with \$900 million? We could provide far more for South Australia's future if we did not have the difficulties imposed by the enormous debt left by the previous Government.

Mr ROSSI secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

HENLEY BEACH BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 280 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide a bus service to the West Lakes Mall Shopping Centre for residents of East Terrace, Henley Beach was presented by Mr Condous.

Petition received.

SCHOOL SERVICES OFFICERS

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore school services officers' hours to the level that existed when the Government assumed office was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to abandon plans for the Southern Expressway and instead develop more realistic and value-sensitive alternatives was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S SPECIAL AUDIT REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the special audit report of the Auditor-General for September 1995.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995—Report, 1994-95

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—
South Australian Ports Corporation—Report, 1994-95

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—
Highways Act 1926—Lease Properties—Report, 1994-95

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Environment and Natural Resources, Department of—State Water Plan—Report, September 1995.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Today, the Coroner has handed down his findings in relation to the inquest into the death of Nikki Robinson. Members will recall the tragic death of Nikki Robinson on 1 February 1995. Today, our sympathy goes out to the Robinson family and all those families affected, as it has since the epidemic arose.

The Coroner made a number of recommendations which, in his opinion, are likely to reduce the possibility of a recurrence of such a tragic event. The Government welcomes the validation that the report gives to many of the actions which have already been taken prior to the publication of the Coroner's report. The Government will pursue the other recommendations individually or in association with national or local government authorities.

The Coroner's report proposes a reliable system of providing information with respect to communicable disease outbreaks to medical practitioners as expeditiously as possible. Soon after the epidemic arose a number of meetings were held and a method of notifying general practitioners with greater certainty was put into place. This involved the cooperation of the Australian Medical Association, Divisions of General Practice and all major pathology laboratories. The process will ensure saturation coverage of all general practitioners' offices in the event of any public health emergency. This places South Australia at the forefront of public health notifications. I intend to raise this matter with all Health Ministers from around Australia.

Given that local government carries the legislative responsibility for the bulk of food hygiene inspections, the South Australian Health Commission has already enhanced its lines of communication with relevant local government authorities by facsimile transmission of relevant material.

We endorse the suggestion that the National Food Authority establish a standard for the presence of coliform bacteria for meat to be used for the manufacture of uncooked fermented smallgoods. As a result of these events, the CSIRO is already conducting a study with the objective, amongst others, of establishing such a standard.

The Health Commission has now made it a practice to access the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report through the Internet to avoid any delay of access to relevant information. I point out to the House that notification through the

international network of epidemiologists may well precede publication in any journal.

The Health Commission has already developed a protocol which will see in the future a multi-disciplinary project team formally constituted, rather than the current practice of informally convening such a team. The manager of the project team will have the specific task of ensuring that all relevant officers receive all relevant information. The Health Commission already has in place a number of standard questionnaires. Bearing in mind the fact that each outbreak of disease needs to reflect specific circumstances because of the peculiarities of each disease, it is important to recognise that pre-preparation of questionnaires would be counter-productive and potentially misleading. Nevertheless, the commission does ensure that the preparation of relevant questionnaires is conducted under the supervision of qualified epidemiologists.

The matter of the interviewing of relatives is always a vexed question given the emotional overlay of the presence of sick children, something which the Coroner acknowledged. The Health Commission conducts its interviews with relatives as soon as possible in consultation with treating clinicians. To do otherwise may jeopardise the validity of the information obtained. The intent of the Coroner's recommendations regarding data analysis is, in fact, current practice. However, to improve the process, the commission will, in future, ensure that other available and appropriate experts have a formal role in the review of data.

The Coroner suggests that consideration be given to amendments to section 30 of the Public and Environment Health Act. His report identifies the difficulties associated with some of those potential amendments, and those issues will be given careful consideration. The food recall process in this instance was carried out in accordance with long established protocols which are consistent with the recently established National Food Authority protocol. There is a national review into recall procedures currently in progress, supervised by the National Food Authority. South Australia will play an active role in this national review.

The largest number of officers authorised under the Food Act is in the local government arena. Prior to the publication of the Coroner's Report, the commission had briefed local government to make them aware of the amendments to the food legislation.

The Coroner finds that, had the epidemiological investigation by the Health Commission established a connection between Garibaldi garlic mettwurst and the HUS illness on Friday 20 January 1995, Nikki may not have eaten Garibaldi mettwurst the following day and become ill.

In the event, the Coroner found that the connection was not confirmed until Monday 23 January 1995 by the micro-biological investigation. The E.coli 0111 involved was the first such instance causing an outbreak in Australia. The Coroner has found that the connection on Monday 23 January 1995 occurred at about noon.

Within three hours, at 3 p.m. on 23 January, the Acting Minister for Health, on the advice of the Health Commission made a public statement announcing the connection and the product recall. In other words, the Government acted as soon as it was advised to do so. The Coroner has found that the commission acted with commendable zeal in giving this advice to the Government at that time. The Coroner notes that even one of the prime movers of the micro-biological investigation described that action as a 'brave step'. The Coroner has, at the same time, recommended some changes

to the epidemiological investigation. He has also questioned certain aspects of the recall procedures. The recall procedures had no bearing on the death of Nikki Robinson.

With the benefit of hindsight, a Coroner's investigation has reflected on all the events and made recommendations to improve the procedures for the future. As I have emphasised, many of the recommendations of the Coroner are already being implemented. I also emphasise that the Government has at all times sought to ensure that all the facts of this matter are fully established. This included providing additional resources to ensure an expeditious inquest. That is an overview of the action the Government has in hand in relation to the Coroner's recommendations. The Government has demonstrated its good faith from the outset. We are not afraid of the truth. We established the inquest, we funded counsel assisting and the Robinsons. We are acting swiftly to address the recommendations not already addressed. As to the body of the report, the Coroner has made his assessment of the evidence; the Government will now examine those findings and their implications.

NORTH WESTERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Today marks the beginning of a new era in health services in the northern and western suburbs. I inform the House of the formation today of the North Western Adelaide Health Service. In August last year I announced the Government's intention to amalgamate the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Service. Such an amalgamation will enable a regional approach to health services in the northern and western suburbs, which will also address the long-recognised need for a higher and more comprehensive level of services in the northern area. A direct result of this amalgamation will be the increased provision of services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and its elevation to major teaching hospital status.

Through this mechanism the Government also kept the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a major teaching hospital, despite Audit Commission recommendations to downgrade the hospital. The new board of the North Western Adelaide Health Service met today for the first time. I am pleased to announce that the chairperson of the new board is Ms Adele Lloyd, a very successful South Australian businesswoman who manages a number of well-known South Australian companies. Ms Lloyd will bring a management expertise that is forward looking and soundly based in good business and management practice. I am also delighted that the board today elected as the Deputy Chair Mr Geof Motley—a highly respected Adelaide business and sporting identity—whom I appointed to the board because I believe his personal insights and business experience will be of great value to the board. I am delighted that the board shares that view.

The board comprises four members each from the former boards and a staff representative from each campus as well as a representative from the University of Adelaide. A regional approach to the development of services and facilities will allow complementary development of services in the northern and western suburbs and allocation of finite resources to areas of greatest need.

The new structure, with its single board and administration, will be able to engender major efficiency savings whilst bringing together the strengths of both campuses at each

hospital. Purpose-built, step-down facilities will be constructed at both hospitals for patients leaving acute care but who still need nursing supervision and monitoring. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital campus will have a 60-bed private hospital built on its grounds to take account of the 20 per cent of private patients presently occupying beds at the public hospital. The amalgamation offers a ground-breaking opportunity and challenge, and I am confident that the board of the new service will bring together two first-class facilities, each with a proud history, and fashion them into one exemplary health service for the people of the north-western suburbs of Adelaide.

WATER PLAN

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Prior to coming to Office, the Government made a commitment to prepare a water plan for South Australia which would define the location, quality and quantity of all the State's surface and underground resources. The plan would provide the vehicle to develop strategies that address environmental degradation and water resource management issues, and to implement the State's obligations with respect to water reform under the Council of Australian Governments Agreement. Today I am delighted to table that plan, *Our Water, Our Future*—a two-part document which presents a challenge to all South Australians.

Many of our rivers, lakes and estuaries have lost the diverse and abundant wildlife which thrived in them in past decades. Polluted discharges to sea have degraded the marine environment and affected our enjoyment of the beaches. It is time for us all to realise that environmental degradation has more far reaching consequences. In the long term, it will be reflected in social effects, such as reduced quality of life and an inability to sustain economic activity, because the resources on which it is based are damaged.

The quality of our water resources has deteriorated; for example, salinity levels are rising in our rivers and ground water, and algal blooms occur commonly in our rivers, lakes and estuaries. Much of our water is used inadequately or is locked away in unused allocations or, in the case of urban stormwater and treated effluent, wasted because its potential has not been fully recognised. We need to achieve more sustainable use from our water and infrastructure assets to support economic and employment growth over the long term. The water we allocate for development needs to be treated as a valuable commodity. In the past, we have taken its availability for granted. Many people do not understand water processes, nor how water should be managed. Good information is hard to come by but is crucial to achieving good water resource management.

This water plan is a vehicle for change. It is not a prescription for who should have water or what dams, pipelines or other infrastructure should be built. Rather, it creates a policy and planning environment where individuals, the private sector and communities can make and act on better decisions on management, use and development of water and water infrastructure. These new directions mark a very significant change in water resources management in South Australia. The Government will continue to play an important role in regulation, research, and overall goal setting, but will step

aside as far as possible to allow local interests to do what they do best.

These new directions will provide a set of management tools and information to enable local and regional management groups to pursue local and regional agendas for high value development of water resources, free up new sources of water and ultimately to reduce costs. Wider consultation and local management processes will provide more opportunities to improve environmental and social outcomes, because these issues are often best understood and tackled at the local level. The plan will endeavour to enhance and maximise the value of water for irrigation by expanding the current system of tradeable property rights which attach to water allocations. In addition, negotiations will target interstate trade being permitted along the Murray River, but only where it is ecologically sustainable and where it meets certain social and physical requirements.

A strategy will be developed for the conjunctive use of urban stormwater, recycled effluent and local ground water as a means of extending the range of useable water resources and promoting efficiency in their use. The strategy will include working with MFP Australia and the CSIRO, establishing demonstrations and researching key technologies. Several of the strategies in the plan begin a process of implementing the Council of Australian Governments' 'Agreement to Implement the National Competition Policy and Related Reforms', signed by the Premier in April 1995. They include a nationally consistent set of policies for water pricing, water allocation, water for the environment, trading in water rights and structural adjustments in sectors affected by water reform. South Australia could potentially receive up to \$900 million in competition payments and financial assistance grants between 1978-98 and 2005-06 if it implements this framework within the agreed time frames.

Finally, the water plan is directed at achieving increased economic growth, better environmental outcomes and improved quality of life for South Australians. It has been developed through an extensive consultative process. I have pleasure in tabling this plan and I urge all South Australians to accept this exciting challenge in helping pioneer a new generation of water resource management in this State.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: My attention has been called to the presence of distinguished visitors in the gallery, members of a visiting United Kingdom parliamentary delegation. On behalf of the House I welcome the delegation and invite the Right Honourable Dame Angela Rumbold, leader of the delegation, to take a seat on the floor of the House. I ask the Premier and Leader of the Opposition to conduct Dame Angela to a chair and accommodate her with a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTION TIME

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Minister for Health's statement to the House, can the Minister now say why he failed to take decisive action under the Food Act to ban the sale of Garibaldi products when it became clear that they were the cause of the fatal HUS outbreak? The Coroner has found that the powers to prohibit the sale of food under section 25 of the Food Act

should have been used after Garibaldi refused to provide information on 23 January. The Coroner said:

In my view, the mere indication that those powers might have been used would have engendered cooperation from Garibaldi. If not, then they should have been resorted to on that day.

When asked on 8 February in this House why he had not banned these products, the Minister for Health told this Parliament:

First, we have done everything that was appropriate. Secondly, we have done everything that was necessary. Thirdly, we have taken action in the appropriate time.

You did not even threaten to ban the products—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is now commenting. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It does not surprise me that the Leader of the Opposition would address matters such as this in that way and not quote the fact that the Coroner also refers to two previous incidents in a most unusual fashion, both incidents which occurred under the previous Government. There were 100 guests at a wedding reception in 1991 who became ill with food poisoning and no action was taken, and in July 1992 the Health Commission investigated an incident of food poisoning involving a family from Port Pirie and, again, no action was taken. That would seem to be a relevant factor in the Opposition's consideration of this matter.

It is also important to note that the Coroner quite specifically recognises in his report the value of a voluntary recall, the reason for that being, as the Coroner quite categorically identifies, that it is really only any company that is selling smallgoods that actually knows the relevant information. The Coroner identifies that, immediately compulsion is brought into these sorts of matters—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —there is the potential lack of cooperation with the company. The Coroner recognises that.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Premier provide to the House details of the appointment of the South Australian Constitutional Advisory Council?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Some months ago, I informed the House that the Government intended to set up a South Australian Constitutional Advisory Council. The council is to have broad terms of reference to look at a range of issues. It will not decide whether or not Australia should become a republic or whether South Australia should be part of it: it will look at the implications of what might occur in South Australia if Australia did become a republic. Under those circumstances, it will look at what options will be available for South Australia: whether we should have our own independent Head of State; how that Head of State should be appointed, and what their powers should be. Also, the terms of reference go well beyond that. One term of reference looks specifically at the issue of the Federation of Australia: what powers or redistribution of powers there should be between the Commonwealth, the State and local government. It will also look at a range of broader issues as outlined in the original terms of reference that I cited to the House.

I am able to announce to the House today that Professor Peter Howell of Flinders University has taken on the role of Chair of the Constitutional Advisory Council. The other members comprise: Fran Awock, Joy Battilana, Rosemary Craddock, Michelle Fielke, Jim Forbes, Audrey Kinnear, Michael Manneta, Matthew Mitchell, Brad Selway, Patrick Conlan and Vickie Chapman. Those people represent a very broad cross-section of views within and representation of the South Australian community. I invited each of the political Parties with representation in this Parliament to nominate a representative, and I am delighted that all three Parties have responded. That representation, I think, will put forward a strong case for a range of options that can be adopted in South Australia under the various circumstances of which I have spoken. We expect that the inquiry will conclude within one year and that it will provide broad community debate in South Australia, which could possibly lead to this State's putting forward a case to any national conference on the Constitution.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Why did the Minister for Health fail to ensure that the Health Commission exercised proper supervision over Garibaldi in relation to the recall of contaminated food? The Coroner has found as follows:

It is my view that the Health Commission should have been more proactive in the recall process and exercised a far greater degree of supervision over the company, particularly in determining the width of the recall.

The Coroner found further:

The South Australian Health Commission played a far too passive role in the entire process.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Elizabeth appears either not to have heard or not to have read my ministerial statement. The simple fact of the matter is that the food recall process in any situation such as this instance is carried out under long established guidelines. Those guidelines were not brought in by this Government, and I believe that they were not even changed by the previous Government, although it might have: I am not sure. They are long established guidelines which have stood the test of time not only in South Australia but nationally. The simple fact is that these long established guidelines have always been the practice of every health commission or department of health in Australia, and they were followed.

Those long established protocols are completely consistent with that which has now been established by the National Food Authority, which is a more recent body. So, there were established protocols which were given the imprimatur of the National Food Authority, and those protocols were followed. As I indicated in my ministerial statement, a national review into those recall procedures is being supervised by the National Food Authority.

I further indicated in my ministerial statement that South Australia will play a very active part in that recall review, because there is absolutely no doubt that it is important to feed in the information which has come from this tragic event so that other States can benefit in the future and, indeed, if it is possible to avoid similar tragedy in South Australia we will do so. However, I reiterate that nothing was done in this exercise which was not part of a completely well organised and well established protocol.

INNOVATE SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report to the House on the highlights of Innovate SA and say what the program of 150 events has achieved? During the past two weeks the innovation and technology capabilities of South Australia have been on show through Innovate South Australia.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to advise the House that Innovate SA has been to date a resounding success. It is three weeks into a four-week program with some 100 exhibitions of various businesses and academic institutions from South Australia demonstrating to South Australians, the wider national community and, importantly, to the APEC conference held in Adelaide recently the innovative and creative spirit in South Australia. We have taken the Innovate SA program one step further with the Commonwealth Government's program to remarket Australia overseas, particularly in the APEC region.

South Australia is the first State in Australia to be involved with Inventive Australia and, in this instance, it will be Inventive Australia, Creative Adelaide. We will be taking South Australia's innovation, technology, sophisticated manufacturing, research and development into the APEC marketplace, particularly Djakarta, Manila and Shanghai, to demonstrate the sophisticated nature of the manufacturing base of South Australia. It is another first for South Australia in repositioning this State in that marketplace. I would like to commend Jan Forbes, who said at a function earlier celebrating South Australia's success in attracting Motorola to South Australia, 'What we ought to be doing is demonstrating our capacity in innovation, research and technology—despite our small population—to the national market.'

From that remark the Economic Development Authority and the multifunction polis put together this four-week program. I commend Anne Bosio, from the Economic Development Authority, who has principally coordinated—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —yes—Innovate SA and who has done an outstanding job in presenting South Australia to the marketplace and, more importantly, made South Australians aware of what we have achieved, are achieving and are capable of achieving in innovation, research, development and modern technology. The success is demonstrated by the fact that the Waite Campus open day attracted over 4 000 people; the North Terrace technology trail had an exceptionally high attendance—above expectations; in excess of 10 000 people attended Visions at the Levels over the weekend, with 850 people touring the MFP wetlands and over 400 people visiting the School of the Future and Motorola.

I would like to commend all who took part in the project: first, those who have been involved in the underwriting, namely, the EDA and the MFP; and, secondly, those officers who coordinated the program and advised all schools in South Australia about it. I also thank Australia Post, which has made the program available to the wider community in this State. Clearly, there will be indirect benefits from Innovate SA, and they will be documented. There is a clear demand for MFP tours of the wetlands, and they will be conducted on a regular basis in the future.

Several events are still to be held: open days at the University of Adelaide, Thebarton and the Australian Water

Quality Laboratory; next week the Manufacturer of the Year award will be announced; and the final event is the launching of the innovative kit and road map to enable future innovators to gain assistance in South Australia, demonstrating to them how they can take their creative and innovative skills to the marketplace in the future and pursue career options and challenges that they might want to take. Clearly, as a successful program, we will be running it as a biennial event again in 1997 to showcase innovative, creative South Australia to this country.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Health explain why a further ministerial announcement was not made on 24 or 25 January when it became obvious that the announcement made on 23 January was too narrow because it did not refer to all forms of mettwurst with use-by dates between 26 January and 12 April 1995? The Coroner found as follows:

Having become involved to the extent that he [the Minister] did on the 23rd, in my view it would have been prudent for a further ministerial announcement to have taken place either on Tuesday 24th or Wednesday 25th to extend the announcement made on the 23rd once it became clear that it was too narrow.

Evidence was given that people were still buying these products in February.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In any public health or epidemiological matter the most convenient and best instrument to use is the retrospectoscope, and that is the instrument that the member for Elizabeth is using.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth was warned yesterday about continuing to interject. I do not want to have to warn her today. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The simple fact is that after the announcement was made publicly, three hours after the advice was provided from the commission regarding the microbiological evidence of E.coli 0111—and I repeat, as I said in my ministerial statement, it is the first time in Australia that this particular bug has led to this group of symptoms—a ministerial statement was made. At that stage and in the ensuing several days there was no reason to believe that anything other than the appropriate recall notices were being issued and that the standard procedures were being undertaken. I am informed that this appears to be the first case in which a major manufacturer did not cooperate completely in the voluntary recall procedure, so there was no reason to suspect that everything was not proceeding normally as it had in every previous incident of this type.

FARM FORESTRY PROGRAM

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House what arrangements have been made to help farmers, particularly in the South-East of the State, to determine the extent to which they will engage in growing eucalypts as part of a farm forestry program?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this matter. As members know, for a long time we have been growing *pinus radiata* in the South-East of South Australia where there are very large Government holdings. There is interest by the private sector in growing pine trees, and that interest has been there for a long period. However, with the advent of the need for

hardwood chip by the Kimberly-Clark organisation, 60 farmers are now engaged in growing *eucalyptus globulus*, or Tasmanian blue gum, for that operation, which is now export replacement for the hardwood chip that had to come from overseas for pulp.

Further to that, as a result of what is happening in other States, in particular Western Australia, two large companies are looking at the South-East of South Australia and Western Victoria with a view to putting in up to 50 000 hectares of *eucalyptus globulus* in the Green Triangle area, because there will be an export woodchip business going from the port of Portland as well as a hardwood timber industry in the South-East. Primary Industries (Forestry) is at present evaluating the benefits to farmers for that. It has mailed 500 letters to farmers who are interested in becoming involved in farm woodlots and getting into a contract arrangement with one or other of these major companies. Again, it shows the potential of the South-East for diversification in farming enterprise and the potential for export in the growing of trees.

We are looking at the Upper South-East as well to see what varieties could be grown there. With the draining of the Upper South-East as the salinity project comes to fruition in the next few years, an industry could also be developed there. There is great potential in the Green Triangle, which is mainly the Lower South-East of South Australia and Western Victoria, to get a very large industry going. I am pleased to say that Primary industries (Forestry) is at the forefront in advising south-eastern farmers on that project.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I ask the Minister for Health why he told this House on 7 February:

If customers of Garibaldi fail to remove products, that is something over which we have no control.

The State Coroner today said:

It is my view that the Health Commission should have been more proactive in the recall process and exercised a far greater degree of supervision over the company, particularly in determining the width of the recall. The South Australian Health Commission clearly had the power to do so. Ironically, some of the Garibaldi officers were surprised that the Health Commission did not take a more directive role.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The question that the member for Elizabeth addresses relates to the recall procedure, and that is exactly what I addressed in answer to her previous question.

MOUNT LOFTY

Mr EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Given his mid-year announcement that the Mount Lofty summit development would be proceeding, will he provide an update on the progress of that redevelopment?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The development of the Mount Lofty summit is extremely important for South Australia. It is recognised that Mount Lofty is a major tourist attraction. Many hundreds of thousands of people from within this State and tourists to this State visit that site annually. Earlier this year I indicated that a procedure would be followed regarding the development of that site. I am pleased to inform the House that work is proceeding on schedule for this long awaited project. The House will be aware that the Government has already committed \$2 million to infrastructure.

A South Australian architectural firm, Raffin Maron Pty Ltd, has been engaged to undertake stage 1, which entails the preparation of a detailed design brief and cost estimate as well as recommending technical solutions for the provision of infrastructure to the summit and the St Michael's site. Stage 1 has been completed. Both sites will be connected to the main sewerage system, water will be obtained from groundwater sources and all electricity lines will be underground. The total cost of the project is estimated to be about \$3.8 million. The redevelopment will provide boardwalks, viewing platforms, landscaping, walkways, car parking, restoration of the Flinders column, a bistro, a tourist goods outlet and an information centre, toilets and an outdoor plaza. Work is now well under way on the detailed design. I know that all South Australians look forward to this project as an indication, yet again, that this State is back on the move.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): What action will the Minister for Health take, now that the Coroner has found that Health Commission officials did not consider a complete recall of Garibaldi products because they failed to obtain the information they required on 23 January? The Coroner found that if the Health Commission obtained the information it required on 23 January 1995 it would have known that it was not possible to identify the date of manufacture of any particular Garibaldi product or the source of meat used in the manufacture, or that the source meats were used in both mettwurst and salami. The Coroner said:

In my view a prudent health official would have urgently considered a complete recall of all products in those circumstances.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The whole matter of the recall has been addressed and readdressed, and now there is an attempt to go through it again. The simple fact of the matter is that the food recall processes in all of these matters—in 1991 under the previous Government, in 1992 under the previous Government under the same legislation, and now in this instance—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Exactly. The Leader of the Opposition says it is about action. In relation to those previous recalls, the Coroner noted that there was no action by the previous Government. As I indicated, this goes to the heart of the recall process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The recall process was carried out, quite specifically, in relation to long established guidelines, which were recently given the imprimatur of being adopted as a similar protocol by the National Food Authority. All of those mechanisms to recall the product were followed.

WEST TERRACE CEMETERY

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations explain the charges which are levied for the provision of information at the West Terrace Cemetery? In this morning's *Advertiser*, Denis Brien claimed that a fee to provide genealogical research information was morally contemptible and that it intruded into people's religious beliefs. Would the Minister please explain the current situation?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I am happy to respond to the article. The choice of words was extraordinary, unnecessary, and quite inflammatory. The article surrounded a complaint by Denis Brien, who had been to the cemetery to conduct genealogical research on his six aunts and one grandparent. The filing system in that cemetery comprises handwritten files dating back to the origin of the cemetery. Over the years various family members have visited the cemetery and spent hours going through records to put together a family tree.

I want it clearly understood that, if a member of a family walks into that cemetery to seek information on a particular family grave, or a licence as we call it, there is no charge. A fee is charged only when people conduct a genealogical search. As I said, some of these searches can take several hours of the staff's time.

Similar charges have been in force at Enfield Cemetery for a couple of years, and they have been totally accepted in that area. What is most important is that the money raised from that fee is put back into the cemetery, and it is used in several ways. We use it to upgrade our new computer base, so that, in future, families who visit cemeteries, particularly West Terrace, will be able to use the computer and search through past records. It is all part of the plan to upgrade West Terrace Cemetery to become one of the State's premier facilities in respect of the historic, cultural and tourism potential of this significant and historic cemetery. The charge, which is only \$7.50 for 15 minutes, is based on the FOI fee. It compares quite favourably with a search at Births, Deaths and Marriages, where the charge is \$26. What we have here is absolute overkill. The cemetery has introduced a very reasonable charge, which will be used to upgrade the cemetery.

I commend David McGowan, the Manager of the cemetery, who has supported a lot of the work being done to upgrade the cemetery. To give him a little plug, I suggest that, if any member has a free Wednesday evening, they might like to do the candlelight and torch tour of the cemetery. They will learn a complete wealth of history of South Australia over the course of an hour and a half. The tour is highly recommended.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): What response has the Premier received from his Federal Liberal Leader, John Howard, to back down from the threat to block legislation for the leasing of airports—a move which would prevent the upgrade of Adelaide International Airport and cost South Australia millions of dollars in lost exports? John Howard has stated that the Coalition will block legislation for the leasing of airports. The passage of this legislation is the condition for upgrading Adelaide Airport.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have a fundamental problem with the Federal Labor Government in Canberra in that it said that, in the first batch of airports to be leased out, Adelaide will not be included—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—and that it will be at least the end of 1997 and possibly 1998, under the Federal Labor Government, before we have any chance whatsoever to lease out our airport. Therefore, John Howard is simply blocking the proposal until after the next Federal election. We have so far had an unsatisfactory response from the Federal Labor

Government on the chance to lease out the airport. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will join me in putting real pressure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—on his Federal colleagues in Canberra to ensure that they include South Australia in the first batch of airports to be leased out. So far they have refused to allow that to occur, which means that Adelaide will not be able to lease out its airport at least until the end of 1997. I have already had discussions with John Howard in respect of when Adelaide Airport might be leased out, and he and I are having further discussions next month on this issue. At this stage, John Howard has not said that Adelaide must be included in the second, third or fourth batches. I am putting a case to him to see whether it can be included in the first batch.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If the Federal Labor Government has been unable to deal with the airport problems at Sydney Airport, that is on its head. All we want in South Australia is the chance to get ahead and redevelop our airport terminal as quickly as possible and to install air bridges. To do that we need to lease out the airport terminal as quickly as possible. The proposal put forward by the Federal Labor Government means that we have to put up with what we have got for at least another three years, and I find that totally unsatisfactory.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Deputy Leader and member for Mawson are not assisting the Chair with their ongoing commentary.

AMBULANCE SERVICE

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the House of what progress has been made in reforming the South Australian Ambulance Service to meet the needs of all South Australians?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Wright for his question and ongoing interest in the provision of an ambulance service in South Australia. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that, while change and progress within the Ambulance Service still has some way to go, it has come a long way from the days of the Labor Government when the Ambulance Service was divided by bitter infighting, the days when ambulance officers were forced into the streets against that Government. Those days are well behind the Ambulance Service as it moves forward in patient care and service delivery, from which all South Australians will benefit.

Recently I had the privilege to officiate at a graduation ceremony for three distinct groups from the Ambulance Service. It was a significant night of firsts. Each group were first graduates of their type. The first group of graduates was a new group of patient transport officers—officers who have responsibility for the carriage of non-emergency patients. Members will well remember that, during the days of the Labor Government, it was not uncommon for patients to have to wait for up to five or six hours to be transported from one hospital to another or to a hospital for a non-elective procedure. Those days are—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is warned for the first time.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—now well and truly behind the Ambulance Service as it now has a patient transport service. It has a dedicated group of officers who specifically respond to the needs of patients and program times for their carriage to hospital or to a medical facility and officers who ensure that they meet those times. As Minister I now see the difference in the service compared with my first days in office when I was inundated with complaints about patient transport. I now receive no complaints at all about that aspect of the Ambulance Service.

The second significant group comprised graduates receiving the first diploma of applied science in ambulance studies. It is a professional qualification that recognises the skills and expertise of ambulance officers in this State, and it demonstrates that South Australia is getting a higher standard, better qualified and better trained ambulance officer to implement high patient care standards to ensure that the best possible care is provided to our patients. Thirdly, we had the graduation of six paramedic ambulance officers—the first in South Australia. I have spoken in this House about the work in the field of those first six officers, about the lives they have saved, and about the trauma to patients they have helped reduce through being able to put their new skills to use. It was a significant night indeed: three groups, three firsts for the South Australian Ambulance Service. Of course, it should be remembered that the three groups would not have graduated had it not been for the change of Government.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Under what circumstances will the water contractor be able to seek Government approval for increased charges for water and sewerage services? Will the Government have any contractual commitment to approve increased charges, and will the Minister table those sections of the contract dealing with pricing before signing the contract?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Once again the Opposition has it fundamentally wrong. One cannot help but believe that it is on a deliberate path of misinformation to establish a myth in the community. I have said constantly and consistently since this contract was first announced 18 months ago that all price setting for water and sewerage in South Australia will remain with the Government of South Australia as it has for decades past—no change!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader for the second time.

LAND TAX

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Treasurer advise what the Government has done to fulfil its pre-election promise to exempt newly created building allotments from land tax? When land developers subdivide property, land tax has been payable on increased land values.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in house building and land subdivision. The Government has announced that it will provide some land tax relief for subdivision effort. Consideration was given to this matter before the election, and in at least one other State there is recognition of subdivisions in terms of land tax relative to

the natural state of the land before subdivision. In South Australia the situation is that, for three years, we overbuilt and the supply of land was generated through the subdivision process. The tap has been turned off due to three years of oversupply, and the same problem is occurring in every jurisdiction across Australia. Therefore, the demand on land will remain low for a while yet.

Under those circumstances there are two problems: first, those who have subdivided land and who expect the demand to continue are paying not only their bills and the interest on the money they borrowed to do that but also high land tax bills; and, secondly, inevitably when the downward trend stops and demand starts to move up again, we will have pressure on land supplies and there will be a price escalation. So, for the benefit of home owners as well, we want to make sure that there is an adequate stock of subdivided land ready to be taken up when the demand increases. The Government has put forward, and will continue to put forward by regulation over the next three years, land tax relief which will then apply only if the land were in its virgin state.

The conditions will be: first, that the relevant land has been subdivided in the preceding 12 months; secondly, that the subdivision has resulted in the creation of building allotments which are or will be made available for sale to the public generally; and, thirdly, that the person who subdivided the land carried on the business of land development and is the legal owner of the land or any unsold subdivided portions as at 30 June immediately preceding the assessment tax year. The cost of this is approximately \$600 000 per year. However, it will mean that there is relief for subdividers who will be in some difficulty. New householders will be the major beneficiaries, because they will not be paying a huge price for land when the demand starts to pick up.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Before signing the contract to outsource the operation of Adelaide's water supply, will the Minister for Infrastructure release a copy of those sections of the deal that guarantee the maintenance of community service obligations such as pensioner rebates?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Here we go again with another fishing expedition. I have said before and I will repeat it: community service obligations such as the pensioner remission scheme for water are not administered by SA Water. The honourable member should at least get her facts right. The Department for Family and Community Services undertakes the subsidy for water in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright is out of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Minister for Family and Community Services, under the authority of the Cabinet and the Government, will continue pensioner subsidies in the future as in the past. I repeat: no change.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education outline another successful State Government employment initiative that has been described as one of Australia's most innovative job creation programs?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Wright; he is a very capable member who has raised an important

issue in the House. The scheme to which he referred is the employment brokers scheme, the first of its kind in Australia. We are operating this in conjunction with private employment agencies, in particular Skilled Engineering, Speakman Stillwel and Clements. In effect, the idea is that we create a full-time job out of what might be several part-time jobs. So someone may spend two days with employer Y and three days with employer X. It is an innovative scheme that has been described by the President of Drake International as brilliant, and it has tremendous potential. It has already delivered many jobs—in the hundreds—and we have just introduced a significant boost in funding to create even more jobs under that scheme. It is an example of how this Government is innovative and creative, tackling a very serious employment issue—unemployment, which has been created by the policies of the Federal Labor Government.

In South Australia, with our commitment to do something about it, we have introduced this very successful employment brokers scheme, and it is providing the equivalent of full-time employment by matching up various part-time arrangements. So, in effect, the employee gets the benefit of a full-time job even though they might spend time with different employers. That is another exciting example of how we are leading not only Australia but the world.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Will the Minister for Infrastructure table the complete contract for outsourcing water and sewerage services on the first sitting day after—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The member for Napier has the call. The Chair cannot hear the question.

Ms HURLEY: Will the Minister table the complete contract for outsourcing water and sewerage services on the first sitting day after the contract is signed?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The simple fact is that the Premier yesterday, in a ministerial statement to this House, indicated the procedures the Government would follow in relation to outsourcing contracts and keeping the House fully informed in relation to those contracts. I also draw the attention of the House to the very clear guidance of the Auditor-General in relation to outsourcing contracts. The matter is being addressed by the Government. The Premier has reported to the House, and those procedures will be followed.

CROP YIELDS

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the house of the seasonal predictions for the South Australian harvest? This morning, the Minister and I were fortunate enough to attend the Yorke Peninsula field days, and there certainly appeared to be a new confidence, both with farmers and traders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister does not need any assistance from those around him.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I would normally start by saying how full the reservoirs are, but I will not because that is under another ministerial portfolio.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I'll tell you about the grand final later.

The SPEAKER: Order! No, the Minister won't.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Having just flown up to the pastoral field days this morning—and the member for Goyder was there yesterday (and the honourable member was with me)—I can say that 62 000 people have already attended the pastoral field days this week. It is the best feeling—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: It has a lot to do with the season. Rural producers are not only now looking forward to a better season, which I will explain in a moment, but there is no doubt that there is general belief in the rural communities that there is an upturn in commodity prices generally around Australia and, of course, overseas. What that will mean—and I explained this in speaking to them—is that, in the next few years, farmers will have a chance to plan a better future for themselves and their families. That is terribly important. We have gone through the worst five years since the last depression. We are now entering into another phase, and we should understand that and help plan for it.

Given the commodity prices, financially the season could be one of the best on record. We still have to get some finishing rains but, given the ability for wheat farmers to lock in a fixed price today of some \$215 for their wheat crop compared with that of only two to three years ago when they were getting a first payment of some \$80 or \$90 a tonne, it just shows how things are changing. However, all that can happen only if we have adequate rains.

The rain that fell last weekend—in spite of this Government—was about an inch over much of the north of the State, and that was of tremendous benefit. There will need to be about average rains in October. Then we are quite likely to be looking at a \$1 billion grain crop in South Australia. Of course, that is very good news for those people who have been completely forgotten by the Opposition, that is, the rural communities in South Australia who create the wealth for this State.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Has a meeting of Liberal Party members of Parliament been called for later this afternoon and, if so, will the Premier be using the meeting to try to defend State Government actions and reporting in light of the strong and damaging criticism made by the Auditor-General in his annual report, which was tabled yesterday?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What I found amusing was that there were only four members of the Opposition here at the beginning of Question Time today. They were all being briefed on something—which factions they are currently sitting in. I hear these constant stories about who sits in which faction, whether it is in the right. The right seems to have grown considerably in the past 24 or 48 hours, and it would appear by the very significant absences—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —at the beginning of Question Time, when the important issue of the Coroner's report was being discussed, that there were some matters of higher importance, at least for the backbench members of the Labor Party. I have not called a meeting of Liberal members of Parliament this afternoon, as the honourable member suggests.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have not called one for tomorrow.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Would you like three or four more guesses? I understand that the Treasurer has invited members of the Liberal Party who would like to come along for a very detailed briefing on the Auditor-General's Report to attend at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: To me, that makes a great deal of commonsense.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the House wants to proceed with Question Time, I suggest that members show a little courtesy to one another and allow the proceedings to go ahead without being constantly interrupted by interjections, which are most unfortunate and unnecessary.

PIGEONS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Are you prepared to dispatch the perpetrators of the assaults on the dignity and comfort of us mere humans by those in elevated positions in the portals of Parliament in the same way as was done a few years ago? In short, will you get rid of the pigeons that are pooping on us from atop the pillars at the entrance of the House? Just over a couple of weeks ago I had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is trying to hear the question.

Mr LEWIS: —some very important guests from overseas. I had shown them around the Parliament and on dusk, after the Parliament had been closed—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Not he—he and she. That arose in consequence of our leaving through what I would describe as a little dog door. When I closed the door behind me, it banged and frightened the roosting birds, which not only took off but lightened their loads as they went. I had to return to the hotel with my guests before we could go to dinner so that they could change their clothes. In further explanation of the importance of this matter—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I understand that these birds are particular about what they do and to whom they do it. We have spent thousands upon thousands of dollars cleaning this building in recent times and that has largely been necessary because of the way in which it has been defiled by pigeons. I do not think we ought to go through the process again so soon. It is better that we deal with these feral pests in the way we have in the past before they create the kind of problem that they previously created. What is more, it will make it safer for us to come and go.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am aware of the bad manners of pigeons. It has been brought to my attention. As with many large buildings in the city, unfortunately pigeons have taken it upon themselves to make this building their home. It is a difficult problem but we will do whatever is necessary and possible to try to get rid of them. I am aware of the action taken by one of my predecessors to deal with this problem in the past and I will have inquiries made to see whether that action is appropriate on this occasion.

GARIBALDI CORONIAL INQUIRY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Health now direct the release of the balance of the documents asked for by the Leader of the Opposition in a freedom of information request dated 8 February 1995? The Health Commission has steadfastly refused to provide crucial documents relating to the Health Commission's response to the HUS epidemic once the source of the contamination was traced to Garibaldi Smallgoods on 23 January 1995. Although the Opposition was provided with some documents in July this year, we are still waiting for compliance with that FOI request, even after the Ombudsman directed the Health Commission to produce the full set of documents to him.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This matter has been addressed on a number of occasions before. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition and I had an earlier discussion about documents. I am certainly prepared to take advice on that and, depending upon that advice, to provide whatever I can.

TOURISM

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of recent significant promotions of South Australia by the Tourism Commission?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Hartley for his very timely question. Indeed, I have just been to an important function where the President of Collingwood believes that Central Districts will beat Port Adelaide. One of the important issues that has occurred in tourism in the past 12 months has been the recognition by many writers about how important South Australia is. Last week, and for the first time in the national Ansett magazine, we had a 15 page insert on South Australia. That was the first time there was such an insert, which was titled 'Discovering South Australia'. That was the first time any national airline has taken the time or made the effort to promote our State. It is an absolutely magnificent insert and I congratulate Ansett. I also take the opportunity to congratulate Tourism Commission staff on their work with Ansett to make sure that a story covering all parts of South Australia was included. The wine industry, in particular, has been given special reference. It is fantastic that at last one of our national carriers has decided to promote our State in this way and it has done it so well.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. Why has outsourcing or contracting out of support services at the Parks Community Centre been implemented without consultation with staff who have been carrying out these essential services over many years and why were tenders not called? In the areas of security, cleaning, maintenance and grounds, the Government has brought in private contractors to perform duties without consultation and without calling tenders.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer that matter to the board. I always have a concern if we go out without calling tenders and, if that is the case, I will be asking some questions of the administration. I will take the question on notice and obtain a report for the honourable member.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OUTSOURCING

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister representing the Minister for Education and Children's Services inform the House whether there has been consultation with the British company SERCO with regard to outsourcing in the Education Department and are schools already outsourcing? If so, where are the funds coming from? I have been informed that school funds have been cut and that outsourcing is already practised and paid for by school fees.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The honourable member opposite often gets a bit carried away, but I will come back with a considerable reply for her benefit.

PALM HOUSE

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources provide details on work to restore the historic Palm House in Adelaide Botanic Gardens?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will talk about that. I thank the member for Lee for his question. I am sure that all of us at some stage have visited the old Palm House in the Botanic Gardens. It is a very important part of our heritage, and some of the older members of the House, in particular, would have visited this important landmark on a number of occasions. I am delighted to inform the House that final arrangements are being made for the official opening of the project on 3 October by the Premier and the Prime Minister. Up to 650 guests are expected to attend, including heads of botanic gardens from Indonesia, the USA, Spain, Singapore, Germany, China and major Australian botanic gardens.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: All members of Parliament would be very welcome to visit the site at any time, and I would be happy to arrange that. The Palm House is a unique example of classic German architecture and represents an important part of our cultural and botanic heritage. I think it is quite appropriate, recognising our early links with Germany, that the reopening of the Palm House will take place on German National Day and that one of the dignitaries will be the Deputy Consul-General for the Federal Republic of Germany. The Palm House was imported from Bremen in Germany in 1875 by the second Director of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, Dr Richard Schomberg, and has been a focus in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens for 118 years.

This restoration is a result of the Federal One Nation program as well as generous sponsorship by companies, individuals and supporters of the Botanic Gardens and the Palm House Restoration Appeal. The latest visitor count to our Botanic Gardens, something in which members might be interested and which includes the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide, Mount Lofty and Willunga, has reached more than 1.5 million a year, making our Botanic Gardens key tourist attractions in this State. To celebrate the reopening of the Palm House, guides will conduct special walks in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens from 4 to 17 October. I know that many South Australians, and I hope many members of this House, will be impressed by the work that has been undertaken.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the House that with a little cooperation 25 questions were asked and answered today.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I would like to spend a few minutes talking about the Coroner's report in relation to the HUS epidemic. I preface my remarks by expressing my personal sympathy and that of the Opposition for the family of Nikki Robinson. I also would like to say that our thoughts are with the families of the other children who are still coping with the effects of that tragedy and who will need to cope with them for many years to come. The important thing out of all this is that we learn from what has happened and ensure that wherever possible this sort of tragedy is not repeated. The Opposition feels completely vindicated for the continual questioning that it undertook earlier this year under very hostile conditions in this House when it refused to allow what was happening in the community to go by without comment or question.

I now wish to refer to the recommendations contained in the report. First, I note that the recommendations contained nothing about the role of the IMVS or the Women's and Children's Hospital in this matter. As we all know, there was no need for any recommendations to be made regarding those two bodies, because their actions in this situation were exemplary. They rose to the occasion and did everything that was humanly possible to care for the children and their families and to get to the bottom of what had caused the outbreak in the first place.

However, I want to spend some time talking about the role of the Minister for Health—or the two Ministers for Health, because there were two of them holding that position at the time—and about some of the issues related to the actions of the Health Commission. The report contains 12 recommendations, nine of which relate directly to actions within the Health Commission that need to be changed in relation to dealing with similar episodes. In particular, I refer to the Health Commission's role in terms of the recall procedures that we talked about so often in February relating to getting contaminated foods off the shelves so that more people did not eat the food and become ill. The Coroner states in his report:

A far too passive role in the entire process had been played by the South Australian Health Commission.

That is what the Opposition was saying day in and day out throughout that period. We need to have updated guidelines, with Health Commission officers who understand clearly their role so that they can act when situations such as this occur. Unfortunately, this did not happen. It is noted that there were insufficient advertisements in the newspapers, that contaminated food remained on the shelves of shops into February, and that people were still buying it and children still being contaminated at that time. That should not have occurred then, and it must not occur again.

Mr Becker: It's your legislation.

Ms STEVENS: This is not a matter of whose legislation it is but one of changing the situation and making sure that

it does not happen again. It is also a matter for the Minister of the day when he realises that the guidelines are patently inadequate—which was obvious at that time—to act to change the situation and take charge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Members may recall that in August last year the ABC Board tried to axe current affairs news programs in South Australia. I am sorry to see that they are at it again. As we know, they are trying to get rid of the *7.30 Report*, *Bottom Line* and *The Investigators*. I think the *7.30 Report* is important to South Australia because it gives us information on local current affairs and local politics—although some might not agree. It seems to me that the effect of what the ABC Board is doing is to emasculate the local content in favour of national issues, and I think people in South Australia will suffer because of that. We all know that there is not much of an effective Opposition in this place. Some members on my side have said, 'Don't cry for the ABC, because they have a go at us.' It is probably good that the ABC is able to have a go at us because no-one over there is capable of doing so. For the sake of democracy in this State, the ABC's role is important. One wonders why the ABC wants to get rid of the *7.30 Report*, because the South Australian program's rating is one of the best in Australia, certainly better than New South Wales where the program will now be produced.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CUMMINS: No, we haven't; we have Bannon on the board. That may be one reason why they want to get rid of local programs: they want to centralise on national issues prior to the Federal election—and one could be cynical about that.

It appears to me that centralisation of the ABC started in 1983 when the Act was amended and the criteria for programs changed from accountability to the community to national identity. Since then there appears to have been a slippery slide of getting rid of State matters in favour of national issues. One might say that what is being done is in breach of the charter. It is pretty obvious that when Hawke amended the Act in 1983 he was aware of that, because under section 6(4) it is provided that no-one can challenge anything that the ABC Board does on the basis that it is not complying with its charter.

It seems to me that it is not complying with its charter because, under section 6(1), the corporation is required to present State programs which reflect the cultural diversity of the Australian community. It is clear to me that, by centralising programs in New South Wales—hosted by Kerry O'Brien, who we all know deals with national and international issues—it will not be presenting State programs and it will not be reflecting the cultural diversity of the Australian community. To that extent I believe it is in breach of the charter, but Hawke, in his wisdom when he introduced the Bill in 1983, ensured that no-one could do anything about it.

I am so incensed about this that, at the next available opportunity, I will be moving that this House condemns the proposed change to production of ABC local current affairs programs, in particular the *7.30 Report*, and calls on the ABC not to interfere or reduce local production of current affairs and news programs in any way.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Once again I feel compelled to bring to the attention of this House what the

Government is doing to an essential community service provided by a group of very committed people in and around the electorate of Torrens. The North-Eastern Community Assistance Project (NECAP) has been in operation since 1980, when one local resident convened a meeting of other residents with the aim of identifying the needs of the community and to provide a Christmas party for the less fortunate children. Funds were generated and used to assist those less fortunate by providing food and various household goods at no cost.

A volunteer base was built up and training was used to establish a strong base for administration, management and the establishment of a thrift shop and emergency assistance policy. Government funding was provided in 1982 for a 20 hour per week staff position, and in 1987 further funding was provided by the grants committee of the Department of Community Welfare, which is now, of course, the Department for Family and Community Services. This increased that staff position to 30 hours a week. An important point to be brought to the attention of the House is that at every stage NECAP has endeavoured to supplement this funding with extensive and successful fundraising of its own.

While NECAP and I agree there is a need for change, we question the equity of a model based on the anti-poverty guidelines under which NECAP is forced to tender. NECAP and other small agencies are forced to compete with larger, better resourced agencies, and it is from here that our community anger stems. This Government is effectively cutting the funding, this most worthy organisation will suffer and, I believe it is true to say, so will many other smaller agencies. As a direct result those people in greatest need who are on lesser incomes in our society will suffer further hardship. NECAP will be reduced to becoming a completely voluntarily administered organisation.

I wonder how the Government can do this with the stroke of a pen. The service provided by NECAP is vital to the well-being of the overall community. NECAP provides meals prepared by volunteers as emergency relief, and for those in financial difficulties NECAP is crucial in providing financial and material assistance. There is also training for volunteers; it runs a thrift shop; the Christmas appeal continues, as well as many other activities. Since NECAP's inception, those who unfortunately struggle in life have always had somewhere to go when things have become too harsh.

To give this House some concrete examples of its activities, during 1994 NECAP had contact with nearly 20 000 people. This figure comprises 403 referrals to NECAP, either by word of mouth or directly through various agencies. What is telling is that only nine people were referred out for professional services, so NECAP is obviously a valuable organisation. Some 3 000 information calls and 69 volunteer inquiries were received, and 64 interviews took place; 790 people were interviewed regarding emergency financial assistance; 606 people sought meals from the food bank; and 247 people received Christmas hampers. The list goes on and is expected to increase by 25 per cent this current year. I cannot understand why the Government is effectively cutting the funds. There is no logical reason for it at all.

I am glad the Minister is here because I have raised this matter with him on other occasions. I urge the Government to reconsider its decision because, if it does not, it will be responsible yet again for causing further hardship to the strugglers and battlers in our community.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): A couple of weeks ago during the recent recess I had the opportunity and pleasure to open a new Riverland regional recycling centre, which I believe is a model for the rest of country areas throughout South Australia. I rise today to formally congratulate all of those who have been involved in this very excellent achievement. Recycling is not new to the Riverland region. Over recent years up to six depots have been operating, each with the capacity and ability to sort and process recyclable material. Generally the community has been keen to play its role, but difficulties have been faced by the operators which have prevented them from reaching anything like their full potential.

The recyclers in the Riverland have in the past been faced with a number of frustrations. The scale of their individual operations has not justified the capital expenditure necessary to establish more efficient businesses with respect to recycling. However, as most of us would know, by compressing recyclable materials the volume and therefore the transport costs can be reduced and then, with better presorting and collection practices, the supply from household businesses or industries can therefore be much improved. The recyclers have also been inhibited by the relatively small quantities they have had on offer with respect to competition from other suppliers in the market of processed recyclables.

Because of this achievement, recycling in the Riverland has developed now beyond the good intention status, and a worthy cause has now become recognised as an industry distinctly in its own right. All the factors that go towards creating a successful undertaking in the recycling industry have been brought together—whether it be the recyclable materials themselves, human resources or capital investment—to utilise and produce a product that is marketable and competitive against other suppliers. Whether it be cost, quality, best practices, innovation or new strategies, they are all relevant and have all been introduced in this process.

Observations tell us all that for recycling to be widely adopted as well as to be environmentally justified it must also be economically profitable, and all of those factors have been brought into play with the achievement of this new centre. Disposal of waste materials has been at a cost to the community and industry, and local government, as we all know, to some extent has borne a significant responsibility for overseeing rubbish collection and disposal. This has been at an increasing cost which comes out of everyone's pocket. Local government has also been faced with increasingly rigid land fill obligations, and the value placed on recycling now means that materials previously discarded, taken to land fill, poured into the ground or left in the open air are now seen as potential resources.

Other resources can be conserved in this process, with it becoming more widely recognised that money can be saved and profits made through the adoption of good recycling practices. One of the most heartening aspects of this Riverland recycling centre is the extent of cooperation between all groups, whether they be public or private, with an interest in recycling, which has led to the establishment of this venture. The ground work for sound innovative business has been laid and is one from which the whole local community can gain. The operators in this new initiative, Mike Hobby, Reg Lacey, Roy Payne, Con Sonnemann, Bob Sampson and Gil Schultz, were previously acting alone. Importantly, they have credited Statewide Recycling with the foresight to recognise that through regional cooperation

recycling in country areas can be a progressive and viable business.

These Riverland recyclers, together with Statewide, received a grant from the Environment Protection Authority to develop a recycling plan for the Riverland. The grant was made on the proviso that the plan should involve local government and be emulated elsewhere throughout the State. Thus, the regional recycling centre's project was established. ACI Glass added its support, and the Riverland project has been developed as a pilot scheme. The Government's role in this industry has been to support its expansion and to assist it to be more competitive without being dependent on specific subsidies. The industry is rapidly achieving recognition and credibility, making capital investment and developing skills, knowledge and technology. The Government, through the Environment Protection Authority, has provided grant money towards devising the strategy on which the Riverland Recycling Centre is based. Although country regions have experienced problems, they are now being active participants in recycling, and the developers of this facility in the Riverland should be congratulated together with all concerned.

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

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want to make a couple of points, but first I want to pay a debt where a debt is due, in particular to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Some time ago I said that if he listened to the wisdom of my advice and placed school counsellors in a number of primary schools in my electorate I would publicly thank him in this place. He has done so, except for one primary school, and he is remiss in that. Nonetheless, I give credit where credit is due. Even Attila the Hun, as he raped, burnt and pillaged his way through Europe, occasionally showed signs of compassion to those less fortunate than himself. Whilst I would draw the analogy between Attila the Hun and the Minister for Education and Children's Services with respect to what he is doing to our public education system, on this occasion he has shown some acts of compassion to the schools in my electorate. As I said, he has appointed school counsellors to all but one of the State primary schools in my electorate, and for that I publicly thank him. I have now discharged my debt to him with respect to that matter.

I also want to raise an issue involving a sporting club with which I am proud to be associated. I refer to the Kilburn Football and Cricket Club, which won back to back premierships this year in the A1 amateur league. It is a magnificent football club, but it has been subject to some scurrilous comments by members of the media sporting fraternity. Just prior to the grand final being played, on the Cornes and Cunningham radio show on 5AA, my club was referred to as a bunch of thugs who should not have been allowed to play in the premiership league in any event. That is clearly defamatory and entirely untrue.

The Kilburn Football Club has a magnificent history in amateur league football. It is a club which plays tough but fair, as the member for Colton will only too readily testify, as he is a supporter of the Henley Greek Football Club. Those two teams have a great deal of competitive spirit and they have always played very tough but fair. When Kilburn won its second only premiership this year, it did so against the odds. Having been thrashed by Broadview by 60-odd points in the second semi-final, it came out to win in a tough game,

with no malice. It was a tough match, and it was a game which see-sawed. Fortunately, right triumphed over might in that the Kilburn Football Club won its second premiership.

The Kilburn Football Club was beaten on two previous occasions during the year by the Broadview Football Club. However, it just shows that if a team loses the second semi-final it does not necessarily mean that it will lose the grand final. I also note that there have been comments in the written media expressing concern about the Kilburn Football Club. Again, as a proud patron of that club, I can only say that that is sour grapes. Kilburn showed all of them in the only way that it knows. It demonstrated its contempt for that type of demeaning comment on a great football club by winning the premiership in very tough conditions.

That leads me to my final point, which is the forthcoming SANFL grand final this Sunday. Whilst I am not a Central Districts supporter, on this occasion I support the underdogs. I note that the Minister for Industrial Affairs, who is a life member of that club, was wearing a small dog badge on his lapel, and he confirms with me that it is a mongrel—a term well known to this House and to me. Nonetheless, I fully support the Central Districts Football Club in triumphing over Port Adelaide. Whilst I have sympathy for Port Adelaide—many in my electorate barrack for that team—any club which can have Ian McLachlan and the Minister for Mines and Energy as its patrons or Vice Presidents is not one to which I would wish to belong. I fully support the sentiments of the majority of this House, which I know will be towards the Central Districts Football Club triumphing on Sunday.

Mr KERIN (Frome): Having played against Kilburn and hearing the comments about how fair a team it is, I join the list of politicians with a poor memory.

In the short time available to me today I wish to speak about a very special event in Port Pirie which I had the honour of attending recently. It was an event which was not only very special to a group of terrific people but was the type of event which gives a community like Port Pirie the heart and soul which makes it the close-knit and proud community that it is.

The Port Football and Community Sporting Club Debutante Ball saw 12 very special debutantes hold centre stage to the delight of their families and friends. They were 12 very special ladies who, despite disabilities, were taking one more giant step towards fulfilling their potential. It was to our knowledge only the second time in Australia that what can only be described as 'special' debutantes have been presented, the only other having been in Sydney.

This was no ordinary deb ball. We had 12 charming ladies and 10 wonderful partners whose courage far outweighed their disabilities. It was terrific to see the willingness of Damon Ganley and Anthony Dwyer to partner two of the girls. The debs were Alison Jones, partnered by Michael Viney; Julie Schenk, by Damon Ganley; Lesley Mudge, by Jeff Thiele; Sandra Brooks, by Daryl Brooks; Katherine Joppich was escorted by Darren Liebart; Marissa Gould by Ivan Nacinovic; Catherine Edwards was partnered by my nephew Peter Kerin; Kellie Martlew was partnered by Anthony Dwyer; Sandra Mark by Barry Puddie (who sang for us later); Lorraine Vermeeren by Daryl Vermeeren; Julie Agius by Allan Agius; and Raelene Hoskin was partnered by David Ayliffe.

This ball did not just happen; it was the culmination of months of hard and dedicated work by many people. Val Coad of the Leisure Buddy Service in Port Pirie has become

a close friend of all these people. Her work has been terrific. Put simply, Val has added to the quality of life for this group. Val's work towards this event and her ongoing efforts should be applauded. I know that she gets great satisfaction from these efforts, but I should like to acknowledge her work not only in helping these people but also being a special friend to them.

Marlene Murphy has devoted much of her life to the Port club and been involved in many previous deb balls. However, this ball was a new and special experience for her. It added an extra aspect to a long career as one of those volunteers whom organisations treasure. Marlene is a tireless worker for her club, and to see this group benefit from her many talents was terrific. Marlene now has a new group of friends, and I know that she treasures the experience.

A deb ball in Port Pirie is not complete without Mrs Gloria Connelly. She began working with debs in 1970, and since then 2 000 young ladies have benefited from Gloria's guidance. Mrs Connelly must have some terrific memories of those 25 years of helping debs and their partners, and I am sure that this particular group would have given her enormous satisfaction. Two other stars of the presentation were Chloe Heidrich and Claire Mudge, who, as flower girls, did a terrific job. Ex-Port football coach and one of Port Pirie's real personalities, Ron Redford, came back from his new residence at Victor Harbor to MC the ball and added a great deal to the evening.

I congratulate the Port Football and Community Sporting Club. The former Port Football Club was a famous club in the area. Recently it decided to extend its work within the community and changed its name. It now sponsors many sports, other than football, and this deb ball showed what a club can do when it looks beyond its own needs and into the community. Along with the help of many generous sponsors, the club provided the financial resources to ensure that dresses, suits, hairdressing and the essentials were absolutely no barrier to the participation of these people.

We all know that pokies are having many harmful effects on the community. However, the smiles of the participants and the crowd was an indication that here was at least one club very conscious of its community and its responsibility to its people. I thank Dennis and Midge Johnson and the board of the Port club. What they did for these people was universally applauded on the night, and they certainly gave some real credibility to having the word 'community' included in the new club name.

Everybody in our community needs some help to reach their full potential. Those who organised this ball achieved much in helping 22 people towards attaining their goals. This ball again showed how the Port Pirie community looks after its own. It also showed that this community is a leader. What they did for the debs and partners was absolutely terrific. I quote Ron Redford's words to the debs, as follows:

Not only has it been good for you, it has been very, very good for us.

I personally enjoyed this experience very much, and I encourage people and organisations in other communities to consider doing likewise for their special people.

Mr MEIER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction of Government Bills during the Address in Reply.

Motion carried.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY BELLS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended to provide that when any division or quorum is called the division bell will be rung for three minutes, with the clerk determining the three minutes by using the debate time clock.

This will apply until the building renovations have been completed.

Motion carried.

STAMP DUTIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to amend the Stamp Duties Act in respect of six separate issues.

The package of amendments either propose exemption from taxation in certain circumstances, or propose provisions that will ensure fairer and more equitable treatment under the Act.

The first matter dealt with by this Bill concerns the application of stamp duty on the transfer of registration of a motor vehicle between persons other than spouses.

Currently an exemption applies for the transfer of a specific interest in a motor vehicle between spouses (including *de facto* spouses), or former spouses.

All other persons however pay duty under the existing legislation. The duty is based on the full value of a motor vehicle at the time of registration, irrespective of whether the vehicle is transferred to sole or joint ownership, or whether a person is added to or deleted from a registration with multiple ownership.

This has resulted in an inconsistency between motor vehicle registration transfers and property transfers. In respect of property transfers, duty is based on the actual value of the interest passing. For example, if an additional person acquires an interest in property, duty is payable on the share of the property passing to the new owner.

This Bill therefore seeks to amend the Stamp Duties Act so that in the future duty will only apply to a share of the vehicle ownership where a person is being added to or deleted from the registration of ownership. A formula, for the purpose of determining proportional ownership, is proposed as part of the amendment.

The second matter deals with the stamp duty treatment of lease instruments where the rental payable cannot be ascertained or estimated, or is considered to be less than the current market rent for the property.

In some instances lease rentals are structured to be based on a percentage of business turnover. In other cases the leasing agreement centres around incentives offered to the lessee, such as periods of no rent, free fit outs or cash payments to take up the lease.

In these instances the ability to assess duty on market rental or on the value of the incentives is not clearly provided for in the existing legislation.

It is therefore proposed to amend the Act to provide the Commissioner of Stamps with the legislative authority to seek a determination of the market rental value where there is doubt as to the bona fide nature or value of the rent.

This power is consistent with existing powers for all other classes of property.

The third matter deals with the transfer of registration of heavy vehicles under the Federal Registration Scheme to the South Australian Registration Scheme. Heavy vehicles are classed as vehicles with a gross mass of 4.5 tonnes or more.

For a number of years Federal and State Governments have been working towards a set of more uniform National Road Transport laws.

A major concern however has been the impact upon stamp duty consequent upon the transfer of a heavy vehicle back onto the home State's registration system. Exempting the transfer of registration from duty will enable the abolition of the current Federal registration scheme to proceed.

A stamp duty impost on these transfers would have attracted widespread criticism and would have been unfair in a situation where the change in registration will not be at the owners' instigation.

Most other jurisdictions have indicated they will provide an exemption in these situations. South Australian already provides an exemption for vehicles transferring to this State where the vehicle has been registered in the name of the applicant in another State or Territory. However, the legislation does not recognise vehicles registered under the Federal scheme.

Accordingly, the Bill proposes to amend the Act to provide an exemption for heavy vehicles registered under the Federal registration scheme, on their transfer to the State registration scheme.

The fourth matter dealt with in the Bill relates to the treatment of leases, and in particular where there is an extension of a lease for one day.

On occasions the parties to a lease agreement wish to vary the covenants of the lease, for reasons other than the term of the lease, and registration of the variation can only be achieved by an extension of the lease.

Such extensions are generally for a term of one day. However, under the current stamp duty provisions, the variation to the leasing arrangement is considered to be a new lease and therefore assessable at a rate of \$1 for each \$100 of rent payable.

The result is that the taxpayer may have to pay double duty in respect of the one lease. This is clearly inequitable and a disincentive to business.

The proposal under the Bill is therefore to amend the lease duty provisions to ensure an extension of lease drawn for a period not exceeding one day, and for the sole purpose of varying a covenant other than the rent payable, is chargeable with a nominal \$10 duty. This will remove the possibility of double duty being charged.

The fifth matter under the Bill deals with charging orders imposed under the Enforcement of Judgements Act. The Enforcement of Judgements Act enables a creditor to be provided with a charge over the property of a debtor as imposed by an order of the Court.

The Government believes the incidence of stamp duty on charging orders is an unintended consequence of the Enforcement of Judgements Act. It is therefore proposed that the Stamp Duties Act be amended to provide an exemption from mortgage duty on charging orders imposed under the Enforcement of Judgements Act.

This approach is considered reasonable and equitable both from the Government's position and that of the taxpayer.

The final matter being dealt with in the Bill, deals with stamp duty on the transfer of shares under the Clearing House Electronic Subregister System (CHESS) of the Australian Stock Exchange where the transfer does not result in a change of beneficial ownership.

Certain classes of documents are chargeable with nominal duty under the Stamp Duties Act where no change of beneficial ownership occurs.

All other States have taken the position of exempting transfer where there is no change in beneficial ownership, rather than charging nominal duty. This leaves South Australia as the only State currently imposing duty.

In order to ensure uniformity across all jurisdictions, as was agreed with the development of CHESS, it is proposed that the Stamp Duties Act be amended to provide an exemption from stamp duty where there is no change in beneficial ownership from transfers through the CHESS system of the Australian Stock Exchange.

In preparation of this Bill, consultation has taken place with those industry groups with an interest in the proposals or likely to be affected in any way.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Insertion of s. 42BA

This clause inserts new section 42BA into the principal Act, providing a concessional rate of duty on certain applications to transfer registration of a motor vehicle. The new provision will provide that, for applications executed after its commencement where there is only a partial change in the list of registered owners of the vehicle (ie. where the application only involves adding or subtracting a name or names to or from the list), the duty will be a proportion of the duty that would otherwise be payable, calculated in accordance with the formula contained in the provision.

The new provision does not derogate from any other provision providing an exemption in the Act.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 75

This clause inserts a new section 75 in the principal Act giving the Commissioner certain powers in relation to determining the duty payable on a lease of property. The provision provides additional powers in relation to two particular situations, as follows:

- where the consideration payable under a lease cannot be ascertained; and
- where the consideration payable under the lease is inadequate (ie. is less than the current market rent for the property).

In both cases the Commissioner will be able to assess the duty payable based on the current market rent for the property the subject of the lease. Subclause (1) defines 'current market rent' to be the consideration (whether in the form of rent or any other form) that a lessee might reasonably be expected to pay, expressed as a rate of rent per annum.

For the purposes of this provision, the Commissioner may cause a valuation to be made of any property to determine its current market rent and, having regard to the merits of the case, may recover the whole or part of the expenses of the valuation from the person liable to pay the duty.

Clause 5: Amendment of schedule 2

This clause makes a number of amendments to schedule 2 of the principal Act.

Firstly, it amends that part of the schedule that deals with duty on transfer of motor vehicle registration to provide an exemption from duty where the applicant provides evidence that immediately before the application the motor vehicle was registered under a law of the Commonwealth. This part of the schedule is also consequentially amended for consistency with proposed section 42BA.

Secondly, it amends that part of the schedule dealing with lease duty to provide that, in the case of a lease made by way of an extension of an existing lease, the duty is \$10 if the term of the extension is a period not exceeding one day and the sole purpose of the extension is to vary a covenant (other than a covenant specifying the rent payable) contained in the existing lease. Although this is the only substantive change, the lease provision has been recast so that it is easier to read and is consistent with proposed new section 75.

Thirdly, the schedule is amended to exempt from stamp duty charging orders made under section 8(1) of the *Enforcement of Judgements Act 1991*.

Fourthly, the schedule is amended to exempt from stamp duty an SCH-regulated transfer of a marketable security that does not result in a change in beneficial ownership and is not chargeable with duty as a conveyance operating as a voluntary disposition inter vivos.

Finally, Form A, which is obsolete, is removed from the schedule.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX (EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to amend the *Pay-Roll Tax Act* to exempt from pay-roll tax wages paid or payable by a motion picture production company.

The exemption is to apply where the motion picture production company satisfies the Treasurer that wages were paid or payable for the production of a feature film wholly or substantially within the State, and which will result in the employment of South Australian residents and will bring economic benefits to the State.

The amendment will provide an incentive to encourage motion picture production companies to view South Australia as a financially and geographically attractive location to establish a base from which to undertake feature film production.

This exemption will result in enhanced employment opportunities being established for the State.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 12—Exemptions

Section 12 provides for various exemptions under the Act. It is intended to include an exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of wages paid by a motion picture production company where the wages are paid to a person involved in the production of a feature film where the Treasurer is satisfied (a) that the film will be produced wholly or substantially within the State; (b) that the film will result in the employment of South Australians; and (c) that economic benefits will accrue to the State on account of the production of the film.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX (HOME UNIT COMPANIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act 1936. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Prior to the commencement in February 1968 of strata title provisions in the *Real Property Act* it was not possible to obtain separate titles where multiple dwellings were constructed as a single building complex on a single land parcel.

Home Unit Company Schemes provided for the acquisition of interests in individual home units through the purchase of a company share which entitled that person as the shareholder to the exclusive use and occupation of a defined home unit.

There has been considerable dissatisfaction with the assessment of land tax in relation to Home Unit Companies.

The nature of land ownership under these arrangements results in a degree of uncertainty and inequity in the assessment of land tax under the current provisions of the Act.

Land tax is currently assessed on the basis that the Home Unit Company is the legal owner of the property on which the units are built with land tax being assessed on the total taxable value of the property.

Whilst exemption is provided in respect of those units which are occupied by shareholders as their principal place of residence and the total taxable value of the land reduced accordingly, the Home Unit Company is only entitled to one concessional threshold thus resulting in individual shareholders who do not occupy their units frequently paying more land tax than would be the case if their interests were separately assessed.

Since the introduction in 1968 of strata title provisions under the *Real Property Act* the preferred mode of home unit ownership is on a strata title basis rather than through a Home Unit Company structure.

The current provisions of the *Land Tax Act* recognises individual unit owners under strata title ownerships but does not recognise shareholders of a home unit company as if they are owners for land tax assessment purposes other than for the purposes of principal place of residence exemption.

Clearly equity would be served if the individual shareholders were consistently treated as if they were owners for land tax purposes.

It is proposed by this Bill to amend the provisions of the *Land Tax Act* to provide for the recognition of shareholders in a Home Unit Company in existence in February 1968 as if they are the owners of the respective units to which their shareholding relates.

This change will allow for the continuation of principal place of residence exemption for Home Unit Scheme occupiers but will permit assessment of land tax on an individual basis where units are not occupied by their 'owners'.

The Government has consulted with relevant industry on the measures contained in this Bill and has appreciated their contribution.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection (2) dealing with Home Unit Companies. New subsection (2) sets out a number of criteria which are the defining characteristics of Home Unit Companies, and then provides that where a scheme satisfies the criteria outlined, each dwelling in the scheme will be taken to be a separate parcel of land and, despite the definition of 'owner', the shareholder who is entitled to occupy the dwelling (rather than the company) will be taken to be the legal owner of the land on which the dwelling is situated.

This provision will only apply to schemes established before 22 February 1968, which is the date on which the Strata Titles provisions commenced.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 10A—Exemption of certain residential land from land tax

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 10A of the principal Act to remove those subsections which currently provide an exemption in relation to Home Unit Companies.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 73—Powers of inspection and inquiry

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 73 of the principal Act so that it refers only to 'document', in keeping with the proposed new definition.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 74—Commissioner may cause a person to be examined before a local court

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 74 of the principal Act so that it refers only to 'document', in keeping with the proposed new definition.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 74A

This clause is consequential to the proposed new definition of 'document' and provides that, in relation to information stored on computer or some other device, a power to inspect or require production includes the power to produce or require production of the information in an understandable form through the use of that computer or other device.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 82.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): I have pleasure in supporting the motion and I thank Her Excellency, Dame Roma, for opening the Parliament this week in the third session of the forth-eighth Parliament. I congratulate Her Excellency, because she is now in her fifth year as Governor of South Australia and I thank her for her wonderful efforts as our Governor. I see Dame Roma two or three times each year in my electorate and her enthusiasm is a marvel and she is very well received by my constituents. I thank her for her enthusiasm and her energy, which have inspired us all.

I note from her speech that the Government's economic and financial reforms are in place and that the Government is giving priority to the achievement of long-term social benefits for the people of South Australia. The momentum of

reform will be maintained, which I fully support, its having been built on firm financial foundations and linked by the economic, environmental and social development strategies which incorporate technological change and new technology and to improved employment opportunities and community services. In some areas of our service delivery South Australia is now achieving international recognition for reform and innovation. This is a far cry from what we have seen in the past 10 to 15 years in South Australia. We are making real progress and I was heartened to hear Her Excellency's comments.

We now have an underlying deficit in the non-commercial sector of \$36 million. I say again 'deficit' because it is a good budgetary figure we are seeing and a lot better than we have seen for many years. The Government is to be congratulated on this great achievement. This session we will allow the sale of the timber processing operations of Forwood products. I welcome this move and we will be looking for the best possible price. We will also allow the sale of the bulk loading facilities of the Ports Corporation, the State Government Insurance Commission and Austrust, which should be finalised by December. The Government is also proceeding with the proposed sale of the South Australian Meat Corporation.

I wish to comment on the Meat Corporation, because it has been a large drain on the finances of the State. I do not support the principle or the idea that Governments should be involved in running an abattoir, particularly one that has been running at huge losses for many years. Abattoirs can run at a profit and run well. If one wants to see proof of that, one only has to look at the progress of the Port Pirie abattoir, which only two years ago was threatened with closure. The Conroy company purchased that outfit and we now see a profitable and successful enterprise there. I also note the recent sale of the South-East abattoir and I hope that some company will come along and take over the operations of SAMCOR. I am confident that this facility with its existing work force can be a most efficient operation.

Also mentioned in the speech was the sale of the loading facilities of the Ports Corporation. I refer specifically to the sale of the Cooperative Bulk Handling gantries and belts, which has been on the agenda for some months. I had hoped that we would see a decision before the coming harvest, but we will not, because it is only a month or so away. We are about to get a report on the future of deep sea ports in South Australia from the South Australian Deep Sea Ports Committee. I am tipping that that committee will tell us that the ports that need upgrading to maintain facilities that can handle these larger ships will be the Port of Adelaide and Port Giles on this side of the Gulf, as well as Port Lincoln. I am concerned that Wallaroo might miss out but, whatever the decision, it will make the sale of these facilities difficult, because it will affect their value.

Nobody expects the Government to give these facilities to Cooperative Bulk Handling. We need to establish a reasonable price and in the end I will support the sale of these belts only to Cooperative Bulk Handling Company. To sell them to anybody else would be to put a stumbling block in the way of a very efficient company. If a company does not have control of its shipping outlets, it will severely affect the efficient service delivery of the company and make management difficult and unpredictable. Whatever happens, I will be vigilant in making sure that Cooperative Bulk Handling is able to acquire these belts. They are not worth the figures that have been quoted. I pay tribute to the late Mr Allan Glover,

who is being buried tomorrow, for the work he did as Chairman of the Deep Sea Ports Committee. We will miss him. I look forward to the committee's report and how it will affect the sale of our port facilities here in South Australia.

The Kickstart program was referred to in Her Excellency's speech and it is now operating in 14 regional centres. I know how successful it has been, because the first of these programs in regional South Australia began in Clare in my electorate. It has been an extremely successful operation and I congratulate the Mayor, Bob Phillips, for his input. It has been a real boon for employment in our region.

I also welcome the recommendation of a task force which has reported on strategic options for Eyre Peninsula. This region supports annual primary production valued at \$1.75 billion, give or take a billion, because certainly seasonal fluctuations can have a big input in that. For pastoralists in the north of our State, amendments to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act will be introduced to provide much greater security of lease tenure. What welcome words are these! You just cannot imagine what it would be like to be a pastoralist in this State and to have this hanging over your head. There has been no certainty of tenure. What pastoralist would be encouraged to improve his or her facilities when they know they could lose their lease under these Acts? The proposals have been developed to combat all these problems. I look forward to the Government's coming down and putting in place an agreement so that our pastoralists have some surety of tenure.

I note, with satisfaction, an increased exploration effort in minerals and mining. The Department of Mines and Energy is cooperating with private companies to investigate the feasibility of establishing a new smelting industry in the north of South Australia, based on the local iron ore and coal deposits. The State is in the forefront of action to provide an alternative right to negotiate process under the Commonwealth Native Title Act. There we see it again. It is expected that the South Australian proposal will be approved in the near future to provide a more certain procedure to deal with native title claims and mining activity. The proposed Alice Springs to Darwin railway will have a great input in this and I will refer to that matter later.

I am also very pleased that an agreement has been reached with the Commonwealth on the extension of the new runway at Adelaide Airport. It is long overdue, and it has taken this Government to pick it up and run with it, even though some of the funding comes from a Federal Labor Government. Our local State Labor people were not able to achieve that. That, in conjunction with the tunnel to Stirling and the freeway, will make a big difference. Once again, it is tied in with the Darwin to Alice Springs railway line.

I am also pleased with Her Excellency's comments about the upgrade of the Bolivar waste water treatment plant and the treated waste will be piped to the Virginia-Two Wells area. This will turn a negative into a great positive. Once again, it has taken this Government to see the advantage in this. I want to pay tribute to the MFP for its involvement in this project. In this area, I know full well the problems regarding water and the restriction of development in the State, in relation to the Barossa Valley as well. If there is too much water for the Two Wells area, I hope that some can be piped further on to the Barossa Valley. This will irrigate extended horticultural crops and replace an environmental problem with an economic opportunity.

I was heartened to be reassured by Her Excellency that the Government plans the construction of up to 11 water filtration

plants to serve the Adelaide Hills and towns in the Barossa Valley, the Mid North and along the Murray River. These projects will proceed under the build-own-operate scheme, with the successful tenderers to be announced by the middle of 1996. I hope that this time next year the projects will be well under way.

Water quality, particularly in the Barossa Valley in recent days, has been absolutely dreadful. The bottles of water that I circulated to all members turned out to be a worthwhile venture. Most members are now fully aware of the quality of water that people in this region have to put up with. I was asked whether I faked the water or added something extra to the bottles. I certainly did not, and I want that put on the record. If anybody wishes to know who collected the water and from where, I am quite prepared to show them the documented information that says it was taken by independent authorities—in fact, experts—and that I just purely mixed together the samples, bottled them, and had the bottles professionally corked. If anybody wants a bottle, I still have three or four spares. There have been three extra bottlings to cope with the increased demand. I am pleased with the project, which highlights the problem of the people of this region.

Our only other concern in relation to this decision is that the Barossa vineyards need more water. The only thing that is restricting the Barossa from furthering its world famous reputation is water. One way of obtaining water is via the Swan Reach pipeline from the Murray River. There is an argument that we do not need to be putting filtered water onto the vineyards. That contra-discussion is happening in the Barossa. Certainly, by far the stronger argument is that the people living in the region want filtered water. I do not know whether we are able to duplicate the service or locate the filtration plant in such a place that we can satisfy all users, and I have had discussions with the Minister about that.

I was also pleased to hear that the Government will implement a new policy and program designed to nurture and develop the outstanding gifts of talented children in our education system, enabling children to take up higher level studies, extension courses and special extra curricular activities. This is a very good move to get away from promoting mediocrity, as Governments in this State have done for many years. We have gifted students and, at all times, we have to promote those gifts to let those people reach their full potential. The system we had in place did not recognise gifted children: in fact, it actually stifled them, bringing all the students along at one level. We are not all the same; we are not all created as equals; and we all have different strengths and different attributes. This is a good move in the right direction. It is not elitist: it is purely making the most of our opportunities as a State. Surely, a State's greatest potential, its greatest future, lies with its younger people—its students.

I note with interest the comments about new technology being applied to overcome disadvantages faced by students in more remote locations. This is an issue I have debated in this House many times during my six years here. We now have 19 interactive video sites linked across the State, and more are planned in what is becoming one of the world's largest electronic classrooms. This is a real plus, and I will give the Labor Government the kudos of being in power when the first one was switched on—and I was present for the switching on process about five or six years ago, when Adelaide TAFE was linked to Nuriootpa. Since then, we have seen great strides in technology. The costs have come way

down, and the expertise and operations system have certainly improved. Now it is a most effective alternative where face-to-face teaching is not available. I congratulate all those who had anything to do with that.

At the moment, South Australia is at the crossroads. Two years ago, South Australia was at its lowest ebb. We were almost as far down as we could go. We had a debt of close to \$10 billion. When the Federal debt was added to that, we were in a most regrettable situation. Nobody disputes these facts: nobody at all. The people of South Australia have spoken in the December 1993 election, and they judged decisively with regard to what they thought about the previous Government, what it had done to our State, and how close it took us to ruin. There was choking debt, and it is still there in many areas. The only way out of debt is to stop paying all of our ever-increasing taxes in interest on the debt, that is, money that we owe to other people. We have to pay the interest on it before we pay back the capital. For the past 20 years, this State has been borrowing and borrowing, and often borrowing just to pay interest. If this were an ordinary business—a farm, a small town company or a manufacturer—we would have gone out of business long ago.

It would have gone out of action because one should not borrow money to pay interest. An average banker would certainly not allow it and the bank manager would have visited and said, 'Sorry, unless you can invigorate your operation and generate more capacity to pay off your debt, we won't let you continue.' South Australia now has new management and we are in there to pay off the debt and we are doing just that. Governments across Australia of late predominantly have been Labor socialist Governments, and debt reduction strategy and responsible management have not been their concern. They believe that someone else will fix it and the pendulum will swing. However, the other side to that is the odium of having to make the tough decisions.

Well, we have a new Government and we have made the tough decisions. All areas of Government expenditure have come under scrutiny, and I am afraid that the two largest areas, involving education and health, have been the key targets because they have been the Government's key expenditure areas, the areas where it spends most of its money. I know that people are feeling the squeeze, and teachers, SSOs, pupils, nurses, aides, patients and doctors are all affected. Many of these people are our friends. Many of my farm colleagues have wives working as SSOs and I have had letters and telephone calls expressing their concern. Everyone is hurting. We have trimmed the fat, the gloss, the luxuries, the spares and the non-productive services—they are all going. The easy rides are over for the people concerned. We cannot carry passengers or tolerate waste. In this situation, many innocent people are being caught up and squeezed, along with everyone else. Certainly, it is a tough situation and the Government is aware of it.

What do the people of South Australia want us to do? Do they want us to back off and increase spending and so remain in debt for decades and be the other States' poor cousin, or do they want us to make a more concentrated effort so that we can be over the worst of it in eight years? South Australia can and will be great again, so we must stand fast against the criticisms, because I know the majority of South Australians—even those who are hurting—support what we are doing. If members want proof of that, they should just check the polls or ask people in industry. Our unemployment rate is still far too high but I am confident that this time next year we will see a big improvement.

I am sick of the carping criticism and negative comments from the very people who caused this disaster—the Labor Opposition. Are Opposition members naive? Have they short memories or are they just stupid? The polls say that it is the latter. I notice that a newer Opposition member has just returned to the House and it is good to see at least one member of the Labor Opposition listening to me.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It was not her problem and she should not allow her colleagues to carp on continually. New Opposition members should be more responsible than their colleagues. Certainly, I want the Opposition to be responsible and help the process of re-establishment, and this should involve the newer members particularly because they were not part of the problem and they do not have to wear the odium. They can criticise by all means, but they should offer alternatives at the same time. But, no, all we hear is knocking.

Certainly, what we are trying to do with SA Water is revolutionary. For Australia at least it is a new move in this direction by offering out our water and sewerage operations to private enterprise without selling the facilities or giving away the power to set fees. This is new and innovative ground and it may be difficult to accept, but what do we hear from the Opposition? All Opposition members do is undertake scare tactics and frighten everyone. We are probably one of the last States in Australia to have a fully Government operated and owned water supply system. We are trying to make changes for the benefit of everyone, particularly the working class people whom the Opposition purports to represent, but we are just not given a go, and I despair of that. I would have appreciated the support and ideas of the Opposition on this matter but negative scare tactics and blatant untruths about the Government's selling off our State's assets have been circulated instead.

If the program does not work—and it will work—I am sure the program can be easily reversed if we have to do that. People are hurting. I have constituent farmers whose wives are SSOs and they often tell me of their problems, but we have to get through the next two or three years, because I am confident we will then be able to ease some of these burdens. The same applies to our hospitals. Also dear to my heart is the situation involving the savage cutbacks to the Primary Industries Department (formerly the Agriculture Department) and our research and development efforts in that area. Labor had already cut deeply into this department, which had an Australia-wide reputation for its work in research and development, particularly its excellent extension networks.

Members will recall the restructuring in 1991 under Minister Kym Mayes when he changed the name from the Agriculture Department to the Department of Primary Industries. Two years later we had new Minister Lynn Arnold, who came in with the McKinsey report, and again we saw massive cuts and changes to the department's structure from top to bottom. Ours was already the lowest funded department in Australia, whatever criteria were used—*per capita*, per GNP or as a ratio of revenue to expenditure. We also saw the demise of the Rural Youth Movement in this period, and that has been a sad consequence.

Our new Government cut all departments across the board and, as the department had already been laid bare, it was asked to carry a very unfair burden. The department was not in a position to carry those cuts, and this has been a major cause of the problem. Certainly, the demise of Rural Youth concerns me, because that organisation trained so many of today's rural leaders.

If ever we needed Rural Youth in South Australia it is now, but alas that activity has all but gone. We have seen total Government neglect for over 20 years, and some bright bureaucrat will shortly open his or her eyes and say, 'We have a problem. We need a training scheme for our young country folk in prevocational training and personal skills.' What a waste and farce we have seen in this regard. We had a fantastic organisation doing just what was required, but what have we seen happen? Rural Youth has been wound down to practically nothing. Yes, we are hurting, but most South Australians are sharing the load. We want South Australia to be great again, and I am going all the way with our courageous team. Members opposite have short memories. They should wake up and think about our plight. Last week we sold the Remm Centre for \$150 million, incurring a loss of about \$900 million.

If members want to know what happened to South Australia, they should consider the circumstances surrounding that project. People say to me, 'What happened to the money? How could we lose that amount?' There, we lost \$900 million, and we all knew what happened because it involved total and absolute waste by a Premier who was advised against the project. However, he blazed ahead, and we witnessed the waste, the rorts and the poetry readings that went on. We have now incurred a \$900 million loss, which is a monument to the shocking administration by the previous Government. I am upset about what has happened. Certainly, the new owner of the Remm Centre has a bargain, that is all I can say, and South Australia will pay for that mistake over a long time to come.

Yes, the boat is full of water and we have the balers open, but when we get the boat speed up we will get rid of all the water and we will get faster and faster as we progress. We will then all feel much better about our situation. I am concerned about the cuts announced yesterday to the ABC's *7.30 Report*, which is probably the only current affairs program that many country people see. They cannot get the other channels—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You're right.

Mr VENNING: Of course I am right. For many years country folk have relied on that program in order to know what is going on in Adelaide and South Australia. Certainly, some folk get the *Advertiser* on only one or two days a week and even then it is two or three days late. The satellite service is an ideal service through which these people can get current affairs programs on the day they happen.

I am aghast to know what ex-Premier Bannon was doing in Canberra as our representative on the ABC Board. Why has he allowed this to happen? Does he not have a heart? Does he not consider that South Australia will be the loser? All we will get is Sydney and Melbourne news. How much Adelaide news will we get? If we wait up until 10.30 on Friday night we might get a bit of a trickle. I will support with all my might the motion which the member for Norwood, who has just spoken, has suggested that he will move, because this program is sacred to people in my electorate. Sitting down in the evening and watching Sydney and Melbourne news—because that is what we will get out of this networking program—I think stinks, to say the least.

However, I want also to be positive about the ABC. This year we celebrate 50 years of *The Country Hour* and ABC rural radio in South Australia. Ian Doyle and his team of tireless workers and reporters celebrate 50 years this weekend and next, and I compliment them on a fantastic job. As a rural member of Parliament I rely on them, first, for the

information I hear on the airwaves; and, secondly, if I need to get across a message they are only too ready to cooperate and put out the word to my rural constituents.

I am also concerned about the proposed national heavy vehicle registration scheme. It is a grand idea, but I am afraid that they have got it all wrong, because it does not fairly reflect the user pays system: it does not sheet home the cost to those who do most damage to our roads, and it does not provide any incentive for people to do the right thing. We will see a higher percentage of people choosing to run the gauntlet and not register their vehicle, or at the very least they will swap number plates. Why should casual road users such as farmers, manufacturing companies, local government bodies, clubs and others pay the same rate as full-time road hauliers who use the same type of vehicles? We will be subsidising the road hauliers. No wonder the road versus rail comparisons are always stacked one way, because if the road hauliers paid for the damage they did we would not see the railways in such a state of demise.

The new national charges give completely the wrong message. The only fair way is to set a fuel tax so that the users will pay via the fuel they use and the road damage they cause. The State Government now has the problem of softening the blow where it can, because it will have to find concessions for farmers who currently receive them. Farmers have always been given a concession, and I will fight to keep that, but it will now be very difficult to apportion the concession equitably.

The scale of fees for weights is ridiculous: a truck of up to a tare weight of six to seven tonnes pulling a trailer will attract a fee of \$600, but if it weighs .1 of a tonne more the fee will increase from \$600 to \$2 100. If you have a seven-tonne truck pulling a trailer, you can imagine what will happen. Great problems will be caused in this area. There should be many more gradations. I do not know what our Federal colleagues were doing when they set up this program. Clearly, they have got it wrong and they are sending the wrong message. It will be very interesting to see what happens if this is implemented like it is.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to deliver the Opposition's contribution to the Address in Reply. I want to commend the work of Her Excellency in the conduct of her duties. The appointment by the previous Government of South Australia's first woman Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, has brought great dignity to the Vice Regal office, an awareness of community needs and an acute sense of duty. The Governor has a keen sense of history and is precisely the type of person needed to assist South Australia to respond to the political and constitutional changes required to take Australia to full nationhood in the next century.

It is usual in an Address in Reply debate to concentrate upon the detail of the Government's legislative program for the forthcoming period. My Address in Reply speech is, for the most part, not about this: it is concerned primarily with the things not mentioned in the Governor's speech. The most significant aspects of this Government's political, economic and social agenda—areas where Government policy is eating away at the community's standard of living and where this Liberal Government is selling off vital public services and assets to private and often foreign interests—will not be the subject of legislation or any proper parliamentary scrutiny. The public will continue to be sold short by decisions of Executive Government for which this Government has no

mandate. I am talking about decisions about which no mention was made before the last election, or decisions that fly totally in the face of the promises made by the Liberals when in Opposition.

It is all the things not mentioned in the Governor's speech that are central to the political debate in this State and the interests and welfare of ordinary South Australians. This is the Liberal Party which promised us when in Opposition 'to improve the representation of the people and to make Government more accountable to the people through Parliament'. So, why is Parliament not being allowed to debate any legislation on the privatisation of the management of South Australia's water? If the selling off of the management and control of our water is so much in the interests of South Australia, as the Premier and his Minister for Infrastructure maintain, why are they so frightened to bring the contract before Parliament for scrutiny and consideration?

If the case for privatisation really does make sense, why is the Government spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on slick, one-sided advertising rather than giving South Australians a real say? The fact of the matter is that this Liberal Government behaves more like a secret service than a democratic Government. It is a Government that believes that, by throwing money at the media through advertising and sponsorship and buying a few documentaries, it will buy political support. That is only partly working. This involves not only the issue of water. There has been a failure to release documents requested in February relating to the Government's mishandling of the Garibaldi HUS crisis, which is highlighted in the Coroner's report today. There has been the use of courts to deny the Opposition access to basic information relating to the contract that privatised the operation and management of Modbury Hospital, which has been highlighted by the member for Elizabeth.

The Opposition is still endeavouring to obtain information about the operation of the Government's basic skills test in our schools. When a community group with a legitimate interest was refused access to the SARDI commission report on a draft management plan for a whale sanctuary, the Ombudsman finally forced the Minister for Primary Industries to release the report stating that there appeared to have been a 'misuse of the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act'. Even information about whales is suppressed by this Government.

The Brown Liberal Government is now close to its mid-term point. Despite the media hype, it has presided over the worst economic growth rates in the nation. It has consistently given us anaemic growth in jobs, and the unemployment rate has varied only from between being the worst in the nation to the second worst. It has cut deep into the funding of our public schools and hospitals and their ability to cater fully for the needs of students and patients respectively. It has savaged vocational training and education. It has cut funding for police and reduced the personal security of the vulnerable, and it has distinguished itself as the Government most likely to persist in a politically lopsided waste of taxpayers' dollars on a royal commission into the beliefs of Aborigines called on the basis of one interviewee who has since recanted his story.

It is not only that this Liberal Brown Government has worked overtime at preventing adequate parliamentary scrutiny of its activities and at preventing the people of South Australia from having their say but also, after the Blaikie affair, we now have a Government that is led by a Premier about whom it will always be asked, 'Can we believe what

he's saying? Can we believe what he's telling us?' What Supreme Court Justice Olsson said about the Premier's evidence has cast a dark shadow over his premiership and his honesty and gives rise to serious questions about the Premier's fitness to lead the Government. The judge made it perfectly clear on more than one occasion that he unhesitatingly preferred the testimony of other witnesses to that of the Premier of South Australia.

The Premier's evidence could be described as the inverse of the celebrated Alan Bond defence: whereas Bond could not recall what did happen, Brown could recall clearly things which the judge ruled definitely did not occur. In Parliament and in the media the Premier is not under oath, but if we cannot rely on him to tell the whole truth under oath, in court, how can South Australians trust his word in this Parliament or in the media?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: We couldn't.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Exactly. We couldn't, as the member for Giles interjects. Let us talk about water privatisation, the word they do not want to hear. I refer to the Government's lamentable economic performance, its contempt for principles of open Government and accountability to the Parliament, and the cuts to essential social services. One issue above all others—apart from South Australians regretting the day they elected the Liberal Government—is the privatisation of the management and operation of South Australia's water and sewerage system.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has been corrected on many occasions for using the term 'privatisation' in relation to water, when it has been clearly stated that there is no privatisation policy.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): That is not a point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: South Australians do not want to see their water and sewerage system sold off on nothing more than Government assurances based on faith, hope and a lack of clarity. They want their say about what will happen to their water utility. The Government does not have a mandate from the people of South Australia to privatise, outsource, contract out, whatever it wants to call it, the operation of water and sewerage services in South Australia. It does not have a mandate to give a private company the right to profit from a monopoly to run these services without telling taxpayers the details of the deal.

Why did the Government not tell the people what they intended to do before the election? Because it knew that South Australians would recognise the risk of privatising our precious water supply and oppose its plans. South Australia is totally reliant on that supply. It has been critical in our development, and it is crucial to our future. The system was developed by successive Governments to provide the whole community with access to that most basic of our needs. Past Governments, regardless of political persuasion, have guaranteed that the water was safe to drink and safe to use for commercial and industrial purposes.

Past Governments made water available to almost every home in the metropolitan area, delivered to the kitchen or the bathroom, at the current cost of 88¢ a tonne—88¢ for every 1 000 litres of water guaranteed by the State. The Minister tells us what a great deal this outsourcing will be for South Australia over the next 15 years. No-one can predict the economic, geographic and social constraints that will affect our water supply in 15 years, including the Minister for Infrastructure—he who most wants to be the Premier of this

State. Yet here is a Minister who is prepared to take secretly the risk of contracting out the operation of our water and sewerage services for 15 years without a mandate, without making the details public, without the community's approval and without one single vote being taken in this Parliament.

The Minister said his political career was on the line. That was an understatement. While the Minister may believe he is shifting responsibility for things to go wrong to a contractor, he is mistaken: the Minister will remain responsible and he will be blamed. This has been a political gamble of enormous proportions by the Minister. He and his Government are placing at risk one of the best public utilities not only in this country but internationally. The worst feature of this gamble has been secrecy. The public was not told of the plans or given the opportunity to consider whether this contract will protect their short or long-term interests.

What are the risks? What are the benefits? Why are we doing this? The Minister has not given the public any information about this contract, yet it is absolutely legitimate that this Parliament and the public should know the details of the biggest ever contract entered into by any State Government in this State's history. The Minister is trying to sell us the deal that a contractor can pay a bigger dividend to the Government; pay its executives; make a profit; and, at the same time, deliver a better service at a lower cost to consumers. The Opposition, the media and the public want important questions asked and answered.

Let us look at some of those questions which have not yet been answered by this Minister. What will the contractor pay for the monopoly right to run our water and sewerage system? What will be the savings over the life of the contract? What are the Government's targeted annual returns by way of dividends from SA Water? In the event that dividend forecasts are not met, does the contract provide for SA Water to review the contractor's performance and profits, and what action can be taken against the contractor? What will be the minimum capital of the contracting company? Will the contracting company be registered in South Australia?

Is the contracting company required to lodge financial guarantees, and what are the details? What analysis and economic modelling has been done to arrive at a realistic assessment of potential economic benefits from the contract? Will the contract control the contractor's annual level of profit? What recourse will SA Water have should the contractor fail financially? Will the Government hold any securities against failure by the contractor to perform? Will SA Water have authority to direct the company to improve performance, and are there penalty provisions? Will performance indicators be made public? What will the contractor be required to do towards the conservation of water?

Will payments to the contractor include amounts based on volumetric throughput? Who is responsible for capital maintenance? Has the Government given any guarantees about the level of capital works? Will SA Water supervise maintenance programs? How will SA Water ensure that all work undertaken by the contractor represents best practice? What reporting systems will be in place by 1 January to ensure that SA Water is fully equipped to monitor the performance of the contractor and the systems? Will the management of SA Water be restructured to manage the contract? Will contract administrators be engaged to protect the rights of SA Water?

Will the Minister release projections for future charges to consumers necessary to support the contract and dividends to the Government? How often will charges be reviewed and

what criteria will apply? Is the Government bound contractually to increase charges to consumers under certain circumstances, and what are the details? What arrangements will apply for staff to transfer to the contractor? What controls will be in place on the use of subcontractors by the prime contractor? How will SA Water ensure that any subcontracts let by the prime contractor are at arm's length and on the best commercial terms?

Do the consultants used to assist in the preparation of contract specifications and evaluation of the tenders have any ongoing liability for their advice? Which consultants were given disclaimers against their advice? Will the salaries of senior water company executives be publicly disclosed as a condition of the contract? What sanctions will apply to the private company if it is found to have breached environmental standards? Will the Minister explain specifically what technology transfer will occur to South Australia as a result of the contract? What specific requirements exist in the contract to make sure the contractor keeps pace with technological improvements and does not saddle South Australia with inferior or outdated technology?

Specifically, what new intellectual property of the company will South Australia have access to as a result of the contract compared to the access it had previously? What specific goals and targets have been laid down for South Australian industry involvement? What have been the due diligence costs of negotiations to date, and what are they projected to be following the signing of the contract? These 37 questions are just the start.

I notice that one or two journalists apparently believe the Opposition guilty of something like fear mongering about this deal. Have they themselves asked any of these questions, or are sections of the media simply prepared to accept the Minister's glib assurances? Certainly the Opposition will continue to question any deal for which the Government has no mandate, that endangers billions of dollars of public assets and for which the Minister can offer no greater assurance to the people of South Australia than the words, 'Trust me.'

The Minister tells us that what he has in store for South Australia cannot be compared with the French and United Kingdom disasters in water privatisation, even though he is bringing the same people to this State to run it here. The Minister's motto appears to be, 'Never let the facts get in the way of a good story.' For South Australia's sake, I am sorry to say that the facts give us every reason to fear the consequences of the Minister's water plan. All the foreign companies bidding for control of Adelaide's water and sewerage system have extensive track records upon which they can and should be judged. It is bizarre that each of the companies lines up to say, 'Don't judge us for what we have done in the past; don't judge us for what we have done in England; and don't judge us for what we have done in France.' Different systems, different circumstances, different laws; same blunders, same botch up, same corruption, same allegations.

The system that the Minister proposes is literally identical to the French delegated management system, which has failed the French people and the French environment. The State Liberal Government has short-listed three tenderers for the sell-off of our water supply and sewerage system. Three foreign companies are behind the successful tenderer: North West Water from the United Kingdom; Lyonnaise des Eaux from France; and a joint bid by the English firm Thames Water and the French Compagnie Generale des Eaux.

Those companies have been trying desperately to Australianise themselves recently: bringing some locals on

to the letterhead, sponsoring a few things, a bit of Shakespeare, a bit of WOMAD and a few other things around the place trying to pretend that they are locals. The fact is that, without these four massive foreign companies behind them, none of these bids would have been considered by the State Government. No authentically Australian, let alone South Australian, bid was short-listed—a matter that brought criticism from the Australian water industry and the Federal Government. The management of our water system, built up with investment by the South Australian taxpayer and owned and operated exclusively by South Australians, will be sold to a foreign-driven company to run for profit. It is a foreign-driven company, foreign owned, foreign dominated, and disguised with a bit of a kangaroo stuck in the corner of the letterhead.

What about the record of these companies whose expertise we apparently so desperately need? The Premier tells us that these companies can run our water supply much more efficiently than the taxpayer through the EWS. One would not think that if one spoke to their customers overseas. Private water has been a failure in the home countries of these companies—France and Britain. It has led to more expensive water for consumers, poor investment in infrastructure, allegations of corruption and outrage at massive salaries for senior executives.

Let us look at Britain first. Since water was privatised in Britain, average prices have increased by at least 67 per cent; disconnections, because people cannot afford to pay their water bills, are up 50 per cent; profits for the water companies have increased 125 per cent; and, surprise, surprise, donations to the Tory Party from these firms are up 130 per cent—the biggest figure.

The past northern summer was one of the driest on record in Britain. There have been water restrictions and, in some areas, emergency water distribution. But it has been an even drier and hotter summer for the British public, thanks to their privatised water companies. That is because one fifth of the water supply in England and Wales is lost through leaky pipes. More than 800 million gallons of water a day is wasted. The water companies were simply not investing their massive profits in repairing these leaks. It was a low priority, according to the admission of their own industry association, the Water Services Association.

Which company has been labelled the worst water waster? None other than North West Water, one of the companies short-listed by this Government, which is coming to town tomorrow to do a big PR spread to tell us how hunky dory they all are. It has been reported in *The Guardian* that North West Water leaks enough water to meet the needs of more than 5.5 million people; that is, enough water for a city five times the size of Adelaide. Last year alone the private British water companies made £1.8 billion profit, and this year they are heading for a profit of more than £2 billion. They are snorkelling in excess. If these companies are making huge profits, where are they being spent if they are not being spent on infrastructure?

North West Water has another claim to fame. It boasts the best paid man in British water. The chief of North West Water is the hapless Sir Desmond Pitcher, who has an annual pay packet of £360 000 with share options worth £1.3 million. In total, that comes to well over \$3 million. When I was in England a few weeks ago, Sir Desmond Pitcher was on the front page of most British papers. He is a figure of fun who is despised throughout Britain. To be fair,

Sir Desmond is only one of many very well paid bosses in the private water industry in Britain.

Meanwhile, the company has opened a plush new £20 million customer care centre—again, money that people have said should be spent on pipes. There are also allegations that the private water companies have lost up to £1 billion on risky investments overseas—money that would have been better spent on fixing leaky pipes.

I notice that North West Water claims that the Opposition, and me in particular, has been mischievous and misrepresented the company's track record—look at the British papers, surface those front pages of the London *Daily Mirror* and *The Sun* and elsewhere in South Australia—so it is coming tomorrow to set the record straight. First, I point out that North West has fundamentally misunderstood Labor's stance on the privatisation of Adelaide's water and sewerage management. It says that we are campaigning against it in particular. It is wrong—we are campaigning against the lot of them. Labor does not prefer one of the foreign firms over any of the others. We oppose the privatisation of SA Water operations and management in principle and completely. We think that the performance of all the companies around the world is important and should be known to South Australians, so I do not resile from the negative conclusions that inevitably arise when we look at the activities and track record of North West Water.

The fundamental issue is: why is North West Water bidding for this contract? We do not need to speculate on this issue, because none other than North West Water has told the British public why. The company's own spokesman, Stephen Humphreys, is quoted in *The Times*—the Murdoch Press, so it must be right—on 27 February, under the heading 'North West Water looks to Australia for expansion,' as saying:

We remain convinced that expanding overseas is the right thing to do in view of the need to build up earnings that are non-regulated. It is an opportunity to build up a sustainable stream of earnings which aren't under threat from the whims of the regulator.

Here it is: the truth comes out. In other words, it wants to get its snout in the trough in South Australia to fund its activities elsewhere, because elsewhere there are stricter demands, regulations and controls. Despite all the rorts and price rises in the United Kingdom, it is coming to Adelaide because it sees the prospect of higher prices and higher profits to fund its other activities.

But do not just listen to Stephen Humphreys. We have also heard what Nick Greiner has said: that North West Water's agenda is full privatisation. Where is the Minister for Infrastructure? This is Mr Greiner, the former Liberal Premier of New South Wales, now head of North West Water Australia, saying that its agenda is full privatisation. He is Chair of North West Water, and he said:

All the Governments know that we are ready, willing and able if they choose to put the businesses up for sale. At the moment no-one has quite had the political courage. . . . at the end of the day their problems are not technical: their problems are political.

We are seeing the thin end of the wedge: first outsourcing, contracting out for a long period (15 to 20 years), then they will flog the lot. We know that since privatisation, in spite of skyrocketing prices, the companies have not maintained the infrastructure. Who tops the table for leaking pipes in the United Kingdom? None other than North West Water. Nearly four in every 10 gallons of water supplied by North West is wasted through leaky pipes, according to the Tory newspaper, the *Daily Telegraph*, of 26 August this year. A staggering 158 million gallons a day is lost through North West's failure to

maintain its pipes. During this latest UK drought, rather than fix the pipes, it has sought to commit environmental vandalism by raiding a river, according to the Tory newspaper, the *Daily Mail*, two days later on 28 August.

Meanwhile, as I have said, Sir Desmond Pitcher tops the water table for the pay and perks of its Chief Executive—not a record of which to be proud. Mr Knipe comes here tomorrow, no doubt saying that I have mischievously attempted to discredit North West Water's bid to win the Adelaide water and waste water contract. Instead of sending the monkey, instead of sending Mr Knipe, they should send Sir Desmond Pitcher to South Australia. Let us give him a big South Australian welcome and ask him about the track record of his company in Britain. It is not a record of which to be proud. It is not a record that has stood up to the scrutiny of the British press or the British Parliament.

The situation in France is little better. In the 10 years to 1990, the price of water in France increased by 170 per cent. In other words, in spite of all the rorts and price rises in the United Kingdom, they are coming to Adelaide because they see the prospect of higher prices and higher profits. In France, the price, on average, is 30 per cent higher where the management of the water supply is in private hands. Again, it is the public that pays heavily for private management.

But most distressing in France are the accusations of corruption and pay-offs to public officials and politicians by the private water companies bidding to run our water supply in South Australia. Last month—because I am a fair minded individual—I was in Paris and met with senior executives of both the French companies bidding for takeover of our water. Both companies have been embarrassed by court cases involving a series of allegations of political and corporate corruption of the most grotesque type. One of those allegations involves the alleged pay-off of a former mayor of Grenoble, who was also a Cabinet Minister, to secure the local water contract. According to the charges in the courts and newspapers of France and Europe, his rumoured pay-off was over \$A5 million.

The company was at pains to tell me that these were activities that allegedly occurred through a subsidiary company: it was a subsidiary company owned by their company, but it was a subsidiary. How could they be held accountable? In any case, they said, the rules regarding political donations had changed. I have asked them, by the way, whether they will rule out making donations to the South Australian Liberal Party. I asked both companies; the response of both companies was that they would obviously abide by the rules.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes. There have been allegations surrounding pay-offs to politicians in the Indian Ocean island of Reunion. I have asked both Lyonnaise and CGE for full written reports on the series of allegations and the proceedings currently before the courts; they promised to supply them, but I will not hold my breath. We do not want the taint of any political corruption in this State. We want to make sure, before this Government goes ahead with signing any deal with any French water company, that those allegations and court cases are resolved.

My meeting with the French water companies was interesting on a number of other counts. We have heard a lot from the Minister and the Premier about the jobs bonanza that water outsourcing will bring us. They claim that South Australia is set to become the Asian water industry centre. There will be jobs galore as we become an Asian headquar-

ters for the industry. That certainly does not match the reports I received first hand from the French water industry executives.

They already have substantial investments in Asia, with more contracts on the way in Malaysia, the Philippines, Macao, Thailand and the world's largest single market, China. They already have Asian subsidiaries and neither company supports in any way the claim that Australia would somehow be their huge Asian headquarters. Why should Adelaide be their Asian headquarters when they already have a presence in these other countries? Okay, the bid is kind of played up a bit, made to sound pretty good, suggesting that there will be specialised infrastructure here and a leap forward further north, but the fact is that they have substantial activities in those Asian countries and they certainly did not in any way match the rhetoric of the Premier or the Minister for Infrastructure in terms of the jobs to be created here. Their bids contain some commitments about investment in Adelaide and South Australia, but they were both already in the region.

On the issue of jobs, neither French water company ruled out further job losses in the South Australian water system in the event of their taking over. They hoped that any further job losses could be carried out on a voluntary basis. Labor is totally opposed to the selling off of the management of our water supply. After meeting with these companies, I am more convinced than ever that the sell-off is not in the best interests of this State.

This ambitious Minister for Infrastructure will always hanker after the premiership. It was in order to get one up on the Premier's shrinking information technology deal that he embarked upon this folly. The Minister will defend his actions unrelentingly—that is his right—but I am not so sure that the people of South Australia believe that their control of a valuable basic utility should be compromised for the sake of personal rivalries within the Liberal Cabinet.

The Minister will ignore all the evidence to claim his deal will not lead to higher prices. He may succeed in containing prices for a while, but he knows, and I know, what these water companies are about and why they are here. All I can say is that we in the Opposition have heard clearly what the water companies themselves are saying and we unhesitatingly prefer their evidence to that of this Government. We have heard Nick Greiner, Chair of North West Water, say that households and farmers pay too little for water and that it has been underpriced and undervalued. We have heard his message that the companies want to buy the water utilities outright and that this is simply a question of political will and timing.

There is another issue: the question of French nuclear tests. The Premier told the media that both French companies were opposed to the resumption by Jacques Chirac of nuclear testing in the Pacific. I asked their senior executives point blank. The response from Lyonnaise and CGE was that they were neutral on the issue. Once again, the Premier's testimony out of court cannot be trusted. Again, he did not tell the truth.

I refer now to education and the Brown formula for failure. The foundation for any successful economy is a first-class system of public education. The commitment of the Brown Government to quality education is only skin deep. The Premier and his Minister talk about a first-class education system, powering our future high-tech economic development, but again that is just talk. The reality is that the Brown Government has taken the razor to the education of

our young people and is committed to reducing the State's public education system, once a national leader, to the lowest common denominator. Dean Brown wants our school and TAFE system to be 'average'. That is the limit of the Premier's education vision. The Premier talks about South Australia's becoming internationally competitive. If so, it makes no sense to follow the example of countries that are the losers in the game of international competition by not investing in education. Targeting schools and TAFE for cuts makes no sense: the priorities are wrong. Education is the engine room of our economy, the backbone of our society.

I have a fundamental belief that a strong public education system is a pre-condition for a growing economy and a just and equal society, not a result of it. Where public education goes, so goes South Australia. As our public education system rises or falls in the second half of the 1990s, so will the South Australian economy next century. Learning is life long and Labor knows it. The Premier promised to create a world-class education system. Instead he is setting about to destroy all the good work done by parents, teachers and the community under Labor. South Australia cannot afford an education formula based on failure. To be a successful country economically and socially, we need to invest in our intellectual infrastructure. The Premier should have used his recent overseas tour to look at some of the successful economies and societies, because there is a direct link between the education and skills of a work force and the standard of living of a nation.

Enterprises go where the work force is the most highly skilled. It is not a matter of choice for them but a matter of being competitive. Little patriotism is involved. Third world skills command third world wages, and successful countries have known this for a long time. Only through education can we create true opportunities so that young people choose lives of promise over lives of personal and social destructiveness. Knowledge and work skills offer hope: they are the only source of economic mobility available to hundreds of thousands of South Australians. Lack of knowledge is economic impotence.

At the last election the Premier promised that there would be no cuts to education and that spending would increase in 1994-95. The Government then broke this promise by budgeting for an annual cut of \$40 million by 1997. Week after week, inside Parliament and in the community, Caroline Pickles has probed and highlighted the Government's assault on our education system. Let us look at its record.

Class sizes have been increased and the number of teachers and support staff has been slashed. The 1994-95 budget required a cut of 372 full-time teaching positions and a further reduction of 50 other teaching positions—a total of 422 staff. However, in just seven months to January 1995 the department approved 930 separation packages and the total number of staff fell by 1 066. In February, the Minister for Education announced that falling enrolments would result in cuts of up to another 200 jobs. In June, the Minister announced further cuts of 250 school services officers and another 100 teachers—a total of over 1 600 jobs in just one year.

I want today to refer particularly to the attack on SSOs—a cut to quality in education. The latest decision to cut the equivalent of 250 full-time school services officers at the start of 1996 has been imposed on the entire education community. It cannot be justified. The Minister says that South Australia has more school support officers than the Australian average. In fact, the South Australian level of one school support

officer for every 60 children is behind both Queensland (with one for every 55 students) and Tasmania (with one for every 54 students). After the cut of 250 staff, we will fall behind Western Australia and have the third worst level of school support in Australia. Because many of the staff work part-time, the cut of 250 full-time equivalents will mean up to 500 fewer staff in our schools. Every school in our State will be affected. School services officers are essential to the smooth running of our schools.

The tasks that SSOs perform are essential and include, to name just a few, school office management; the provision of reception and information services to parents; special education support; typing and collating student reports and letters; taking minutes; answering telephones; correspondence and filing; managing laboratories and resource centres; facilities and finance management, processing of school fees; the collection of statistics; accounting and bursar work; the preparation of curriculum materials; maintenance of School Card records; first-aid; sexual harassment counselling; the management of book rooms, stationery and second-hand uniform sales; assistance in preparation for parent and student interviews; the printing of materials; minor repairs; and the control of administrative computer networks, hardware and software, grounds and security. School councils throughout the State have written to the Opposition detailing the effect of these cuts on the quality of education they can provide.

For example, Adelaide High School expects to be cut by over 60 hours. This is the equivalent of almost two full-time staff, and I will quote what the school thinks of the decision:

The staff at the Adelaide High School are extremely concerned about the low priority being given to education in this State. SSOs are working longer hours than those for which they are employed and paid. They choose to do this because they take pride in their work and they care about children. This sense of dedication is readily exploited by the department, whose own estimates show that SSOs give 40 per cent of unpaid work. With fewer hours available next year, some programs will have to go.

Last Friday, I visited a school in my own electorate, the Parafield Gardens High School. It is a good school, with a dedicated teaching and support staff, but there are difficulties and pressures that will be made worse if these cuts go ahead.

About 30 per cent of the students at the Parafield Gardens High School come from a non-English speaking background. Around 51 per cent of students, about 570 young people, are on schoolcard. We are not talking about highly paid personnel. That is why some of the attacks from Liberal members on SSOs is particularly disgusting. An SSO, grade 1, earns between \$13 068 and \$23 999. This is the grade from which the majority of SSOs of Parafield Gardens High School come, and over half are part-timers. These dedicated part-timers are not paid for 12 weeks of the year, nor are they paid for public holidays or annual recreation leave. These students require extra help and support with social problems and emotional traumas and other difficulties. Often the SSO is the only adult person available to assist with these problems. There are already pressures and, as a result, the workload of SSOs is prioritised. The cutbacks will be on the hours worked and not on the actual work performed. As a result, there will be intense pressure on SSOs to perform the same work in a shorter space of time.

Many people, including parents, do not understand the kind of work SSOs perform. First aid is one of those key duties. At Parafield Gardens High School, a number of students require assistance for conditions such as asthma, on a regular basis. They will still require that assistance despite

these cuts, so other important work will not be done. Practical classes performed in science will be fewer because, despite the requirements of SACE, fewer hours will be available for laboratory assistants to prepare for classes, and students will suffer. The faculties of technical studies, art and home economics at Parafield Gardens High School will also be affected in this way. SSOs' hours are used to prepare materials and even buy groceries, among other things. Teachers will have to prepare more of their materials themselves, and the quality of what they can do will decrease.

We have heard that Liberal MP, Joe Rossi, the member for Lee, wants to enlist unemployed parents to carry out SSO tasks on a voluntary basis. That statement—yet to be corrected by his Premier—is both grossly insulting and a delusion. In the past, schools such as Parafield Gardens High School have called for parent volunteers to help with the running of the canteens and learning assistance programs, working bees and special projects, but the number of parents available is limited. The majority of parents from Parafield Gardens High School work full time and are not available to work voluntarily at school.

Of course, there is another problem that neither the Premier nor Joe Rossi has thought about: having untrained volunteers doing SSO work in schools raises issues of confidentiality, consistency and competency. Much SSO work requires job-specific training and a lot of discretion when dealing with very sensitive personal health and family issues that arise. The real truth is that the Government's cuts to SSOs will generate more stress on remaining support staff and on teachers, and all our children will suffer. Students, teachers and parents will all pay the price of SSOs' not having the time to give the quality of attention they give at present. Our schools will be worse off, and the Premier and Rob Lucas cannot pretend otherwise. Again, it is a question of different priorities between the Liberal and the Labor Parties.

Given that the Government promised to increase spending on education, why has this decision been made? Because the Premier has reneged on all his major promises concerning education, and cut \$40 million from the budget to fund his other priorities. Millions of dollars have been spent on programs such as 'Going all the way', changing logos on buses, and Government public relations at the expense of our children's education. A radio station was established in the southern suburbs to promote the Premier's activities. South Australian schools are not overstuffed. They are not wasting taxpayers' money. They are educating our children. School support should not be cut to finance the other policies of this short-sighted Government.

Even worse has been the Government's total lack of vision in education and children's services. It has concentrated on cutting the system to the lowest common denominator, without considering the future. We are going backwards instead of protecting South Australia's position as a national leader in education. I particularly want to mention the need to accelerate the development of information technology programs in our schools. The Finn committee report, *Young People's Participation in Post-compulsory Education and Training*, concluded that there are certain essential things that all young people need to learn in their preparation for employment. These are the key competencies that we used to debate when I was Minister for Further Education and a member of the Australian Education Council. One of the competencies was a capacity to use technology.

A capacity to use information technology is now an essential skill and a prerequisite learning tool for students. Inequities are emerging as a result of different levels of access and availability of programs in our schools. Some private schools are ahead of public sector schools. There are now new divisions between students—new inequities. There are now those who have access to this technology and those who do not. There are those who are computer literate and those who are not. There is an urgent need for a comprehensive policy for information technology programs in South Australian schools.

While the Premier promises the development of technology-based industries, the Government has failed to address the development of information technology in our education system. In fact, last year, his Minister even withheld the allocation of \$360 000 to schools under the computer grants scheme. If our children are to be equipped to fill the new jobs in information technology related industries, the Government must act now and provide adequate funding and resources for the introduction of an information technology curriculum across the system.

There is also a crisis in the management of capital works expenditure on education facilities. In 1994-95, a lack of coordination between programming and construction resulted in the budget being underspent by \$22 million. Actual expenditure was down \$10 million on the previous year. At least seven major school projects slipped a budget. This included the construction of the Hewitt Primary School, the redevelopment of Inbarendi College and the Seaton High School, and the construction of Seacliff Primary School and the Seaford six to 12 school. The Minister's excuse was that these projects were delayed by planning and design considerations, but the fact remains that, if projects were not cleared for construction, the funds should have been used for other priorities. Projects should have been substituted by other urgent works with construction clearance, but instead the funds were returned to Treasury. It was a con, a sleight of hand, to make the Government's program look good—again, hype versus reality.

The capital works shortfall also included \$9 million allocated for minor works and maintenance, and there can be no excuse for not achieving this urgently needed expenditure. Of even greater concern is the decision to make the program for the construction of new schools and the redevelopment of existing facilities dependent on funds from the sale of school property.

The Minister says the capital budget is now conditional on revenue from the sale of assets, and the Minister's view is that his department is lucky to be able to keep these funds. That is simply unacceptable. Earlier I mentioned that school enrolments had fallen. At the beginning of 1995 enrolments fell by 4 000 and the Minister seized on that moment to announce that up to another 200 teachers could be cut from the system. This reduction in enrolments, coupled with a serious decline in retention rates, should have set the alarm bells ringing. Before gloating about how much money this would save, any Minister with a genuine commitment to the education of our kids would have wanted to know where they had gone. He would have wanted to know where our kids had gone and what was their future.

Our retention rates to year 12 fell from 93 per cent in 1993 under Labor to 76 per cent in 1994. Then another 4 000 students left the system in 1995. It is recognised that students who complete year 12 have a fundamental advantage in developing to their full potential through further full-time

education or employment based development. It should be a matter of grave concern when one in four of our kids opts out and denies himself or herself these opportunities. But the Government seems more interested in spending money on other things. Look at the last 20 years. The full-time youth labour market employing 15 to 19 year olds has fallen from 510 000 in 1975 to 260 000 this year. Full-time jobs for our young school leavers have been halved. There has been a revolution in our economy and our labour market.

The gap brought about by the halving of full-time jobs for young people over the last 20 years was filled by the conscious expansion of public education by Governments and Ministers who, over a decade ago, showed a better understanding of what the 1990s would be like than this Minister shows today. But let us look at TAFE, because what this Government is doing to TAFE is simply a tragedy. As Minister responsible for TAFE between 1989 and the end of 1992, I was proud of the progress made at that time in making TAFE an excellent choice for young people finishing their secondary education. TAFE was no longer second best. We made it industry driven but still responsive to the needs of the whole community and with the strongest commitment to access and equity and to equal opportunity.

Indeed, I brokered a deal with the Commonwealth to ensure that millions of dollars of extra Federal funds would flow to South Australia to fund thousands of extra places, to train thousands more young people, to enable TAFE to respond even better to the training requirements of industry and to supply the building blocks for economic and industrial growth. All of this is now in jeopardy: South Australia is now the only State in the Commonwealth yet to meet the criteria for Commonwealth growth funds to flow. South Australia brokered and won the deal, and now the other States are gaining from it but this State has sold our young people short. Instead, in what must be the most short-sighted move since the Liberals came to power, the Brown Government has cut funding to TAFE. According to its own Treasury estimates the Government has cut recurrent funding alone by \$5 million in dollar terms, and in real terms the figure is of course much higher.

The Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) has now issued an ultimatum to the South Australian Government to demonstrate why it deserves to be paid the millions of dollars of extra growth funds. Despite the figures being due at the end of July, the Brown Government is only now responding. Why has the Acting Chief Executive Officer of TAFE taken so long to sign off on the report to ANTA? Why has it taken so long to calculate the figures? By how much has this Government failed to maintain effort in TAFE? The tragedy is that our young people primarily will be the victims of the Brown Government's short sightedness and, unless the Liberals restore TAFE funding to its former level, they will doom to failure the vision we all share of South Australians taking giant steps forward economically, because the work force at the cutting edge in terms of skills will not be available.

Even if the Commonwealth eventually decided to pay the growth funds to South Australia our young people will still be victims because of the Brown Government's cuts to TAFE. The Opposition receives information regularly from the TAFE community that our institutes of TAFE are being bled dry, and it is the provision of a skilled work force that is being compromised. The effects of this Government's social neglect, its economic mismanagement and its decisions to sell off our basic utilities will be fully felt in the coming

years. The Government, far from being the protector of the welfare and prosperity of its citizens, will be seen as having provided new kinds and degrees of inequalities of which it is proud.

The policies of this Government in my view are tearing at the social fabric of South Australia, and few decisions highlight this more than the push to privatise the management of our water. Labor opposes this policy completely and is pledged to fight it. The Minister and the Government may delude themselves into believing that by preventing public and parliamentary scrutiny of this great water sell-off it can avoid political responsibility for so regressive and unpopular an initiative. They are wrong. However much the Government attempts to avoid letting the people have their say on the sell-off of their assets, the people will eventually have their say and this Liberal Government will be blamed.

In closing, let us just look at the events of last week when a Supreme Court judge of this State found that the Premier did not tell the truth under oath in court. This week another independent figure, the Auditor-General of this State, found that the Premier did not tell the truth in his budget papers and statements. In that case, when will the Premier finally tell the truth?

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I was not going to speak today because I thought it was not worth while but, after hearing the Leader of the Opposition carry on with his lies—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Lee has just used the word 'lies'. I understand that is an unparliamentary term and I insist on a retraction.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee cannot imply that a member has told lies. There are terms which are not in accordance with Standing Orders and I suggest that the honourable member withdraw the comment and use other terms if he wishes to continue in that direction. The member for Lee has to withdraw the inference that the Leader of the Opposition was telling lies.

Mr ROSSI: Does that mean that the Leader of the Opposition will withdraw—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will explain—

Mr ROSSI: Mr Speaker, I withdraw the comments that I made about the Leader of the Opposition because they were too good for him.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You asked the member for Lee to withdraw the term 'lies' and he just said he withdrew them on the basis that that term was too good for me. Surely that is compounding a felony.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the member for Lee that, when he or any member is requested to withdraw an unparliamentary remark, the withdrawal must be unconditional.

Mr ROSSI: Mr Speaker, I withdraw unconditionally. Only five or six minutes ago the Leader of the Opposition said that the Liberal Government had withheld the development of Seaton High School based on the Minister for Education and Children's Services's cashing in money and that that was not the fault of the previous planning and design work. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that only in the last half hour the Principal of Seaton High School and I met with the Minister for Education and Children's Services regarding the proposed new design. So when in his speech he accused the Minister for Education of not doing his job, of not looking after schools in my area, he was making a

misleading statement. That is what I am referring to when I say that the Leader makes misleading statements.

The Leader referred to what the Labor Party did while in Government. The Labor Government did not provide money for the maintenance of plumbing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or for upgrading catering and kitchen facilities or for repairing windows and brickwork. Nothing has been done to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for years. Ever since Labor came to Government, the upgrading of equipment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has not been done.

The member for Torrens said that Housing Trust dwellings have not been maintained by the Liberal Government. What did the Labor Government do when it was in power? Absolutely nothing! Today I rang Myer to inquire what REMM means. It stands for 'Relax, enjoy and make money.' That is what the BLF union used to do when the Myer site was being developed, yet the Opposition accuses us of not doing the right thing! It annoys me to hear so many untruths from the Opposition regarding what my Government has done in the past 18 months when for 14 years Labor did absolutely nothing.

The Opposition mentioned the poor people of the western and northern suburbs. The amount of money that the Labor Government (both Federal and State) chucked at these people is phenomenal, yet the poor of the State and this country are ever increasing. I think that 4 or 5 per cent of poor people is unavoidable, but it is increasing to 10 or 11 per cent. More and more money is being spent in this area. What do these poor people do? They spend the money that the welfare system gives them on alcohol and drugs and gambling on races and poker machines, and they refuse to feed and clothe their own children.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: Some, yes, but the number is growing, and that is what worries me. A certain percentage of the population say that these things happen and nothing can be reduced to zero, but when the trend increases the Government should be worried. Under Labor, family break-ups, family poverty, graffiti and crime were always on the increase. What did the Labor Party do? Absolutely nothing! I am pleased that the Liberal Government is getting tough with regard to graffiti and crime, and it is getting tough on welfare handouts with justification.

Since becoming a member of this House, I have been accused of attacking single mothers. On the first New Year's Eve after the election was won, I was called out to Semaphore Park by a group of about 24 people who complained about a single mother and her two children who were causing havoc in the area. They said that they had approached the previous member but that he had done nothing for the previous four or five years. What could I do? Should I have ignored them? Of course not. Everyone in the electorate that I represent has the right to the peaceful enjoyment of their life. If someone interferes with someone else's rights and privileges, they should not have any rights and privileges.

So, I approached the manager of the Housing Trust to see whether the behaviour of these people could be curbed. The answer was: 'There's nothing we can do.' I then rang the police and they said: 'There's nothing we can do. The Labor Government's legislation prevents us from disciplining them.' What choice did I have? I went to the media, my last choice, and what did I get but abuse from the do-gooders. Even my predecessor's secretary rang me and gave me a mouthful. I learnt a few more words which I had never learnt in the army. That was such a nice experience.

I turn now to school councils and SSOs, but, of course, I do not know what I am talking about because I did not attend school in South Australia; I have never had children to know what SSOs do; and, of course, I have never been a member of a primary school or high school council. Like fun! I have been to school in South Australia—I even went to kindergarten in South Australia. Kindergartens, primary schools and high schools have always asked parents for help with playground equipment, to repair water sprinklers on the ovals and gardens, to plant trees, to cover school books, and to listen to the children read and to watch them write or draw and give them a bit of encouragement.

The intelligent SSOs rang me up and taught me a few more words that I had not heard in the army. Is that right? I have visited schools to observe what SSOs do and I have great respect for them. Parents can do some basic things, but, when I observed some children at these schools and was told they could not cope, that they could not do the simple tasks that the SSO asked them to do, I asked about their parents and how much time they spend with their children. The SSOs told me they spend only two or three hours a week on a one-to-one basis with these children. How much influence can that two or three hours a week have on a child compared with a mother and father spending 56 hours a week with their children?

Of course, the parents are too busy enjoying themselves getting drunk, going to the races, going to the pub and playing the pokies. They do not worry about their kids and believe that they can look after themselves, or that the State Government and the Education Department can look after them. What a cop out! However, the Labor Leader (Mr Mike Rann) called me an idiot and said that I do not know what I am talking about. The corruption of the family unit has been brought about by the Labor Party, not by the Liberal Government, and certainly not by Joe Rossi, the member for Lee. In only two years, how could I do as much damage as the Labor Party did in 14 years?

I must also mention our marvellous Prime Minister (Mr Paul Keating). He was the best Treasurer this country has ever had! The only thing he did was copy Don Dunstan, who was the first Premier to sell his State's railways to the Commonwealth to get rid of his debts. The corruption followed on to New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia, and finally to Paul Keating himself, who has his snout in the trough. Where is the economy of Australia and where was this State going—to overseas banks and overseas industries. In the electorate that I represent, there used to be Philips, GMH, Kelvinator, and Simpson Pope Limited. Where are they now? Don Dunstan scared them interstate or overseas. Philips, which was at Hendon Common, as it is now, shifted out of this State at that time. He even threatened Santos because it did not sell some of its shares in the gasfield at Moomba. Don Dunstan wanted to bring his heavy-handed laws against them. Of course, it is the member for Lee who has corrupted this State, who has caused all these breakdowns and who does not have any feelings. I have more feelings for these children than do their parents who do not love them.

With respect to the crime rate, I believe that people are not born violent but that they are not shown love. The only thing they are shown by drunken parents is violence. At 8 o'clock this morning I was asked to observe people in a *de facto* relationship with two children bashing down a Housing Trust property, getting drunk at night and preventing their neighbours from sleeping. The neighbours were upset because they

have to go to work at 7.30 in the morning. Those people do not care a damn, but what does the Leader of the Opposition expect me to do? Does he want me to be quiet, to go around kissing babies or something like that so I can be re-elected next time? I will not kiss babies.

I shall defend the people who need defending, but I shall knock down those people who have no respect for other people because that is all they deserve. I shall not change my habits. I shall stick to the truth as much as I can and I shall fight for my electors as much as I can. I do not give a damn what the Leader of the Labor Party and the member for Torrens say. It is about time they looked at themselves in the mirror. They should remember what happened when they were in power. What has the member for Torrens done since she was elected as a Labor politician? What did she do in the trade union movement? Absolutely nothing.

The Public Service is in disarray because some people employed by the Public Service who were caught stealing were not disciplined. It was alleged that one person was caught stealing \$125 000. He was then given another \$125 000 provided he resigned of his own accord. What a beautiful pay-out he received: he was given \$250 000, while an honest person gets a kick in the butt. That is what the unions stand for: if you are in the right, you get kicked; if you are in the wrong, you get rewarded. A person who is honest has to pay a fee to go to TAFE, but a person who is sent to prison is given free education and can become a lawyer, or they can undertake TAFE studies and become a car repairer, and so on. What reward is there for doing good?

The more people do good in this State under Labor the more they get kicked. We got rid of the State Labor Party and what have we got? The Federal Labor Party, which is more corrupt than ever. It tells more lies than the State Labor Party because its teachings come from Don Dunstan. Poor old Don Dunstan. He attends all these public meetings because he wants to support the Leader of the Opposition who has no charisma, no intelligence and who cannot look after himself. What a beautiful Leader members on the other side have got. They want equality in respect of members of Parliament, and they say that more women should be selected for safe seats.

There is no such thing as a safe seat in South Australia. The member who works the hardest and is the most honest is re-elected over and over, and I hope that that will be me. What happened at the preselection at the weekend? The Labor Party promised the seat to one person but, when that did not suit, it changed its mind, under union thuggery, and preselected Michael Wright. Of course, he can play the dirty game because of his father's experience, but I will not go into that. I do not like the Leader of the Opposition attacking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, or any other Minister who has bent over backwards to help me in my electorate.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services, for example, has provided West Lakes Shore Primary School with funding of \$50 000; Hendon Primary School with \$27 843; and Semaphore Park Primary School with \$24 657. He has also offered Seaton High School \$1.3 million following the sale of the Seaton Park Primary School oval, which is now part of the Seaton High School. He has given Seaton High School \$88 470. He has also made amounts available to disadvantaged students: Hendon Primary School, another \$40 459; and Semaphore Park Primary School, \$80 818. How can the Leader of the Opposition say that the Minister for Education and Children's Services is not treating the electorate of Lee properly?

The Minister for Education and Children's Services granted some further money to the Seaton South Primary School, which is located in the electorate of the member for Spence. The Minister does not bring politics into it; he gives money to those schools in need, not schools that want. Of course, most Labor supporters who are unemployed and with whom I have problems in my electorate do not need help but they always ask. They want, want, want. The 'want' people are now finished. The Liberal Government, I am pleased to say, will give money and help to those people who are in need. People must be given the incentive to look after themselves.

You can give a person a fish and he eats it, but teach that person how to fish and he eats fish for the rest of his life. That is the difference between Labor and Liberal, as far as I am concerned. Labor just chucks things out but does not teach people how to look after themselves. That is why the economy and the family unit in this State are going backwards instead of forwards.

Some people say that I have come into politics because I wanted politics. I did not go into politics for enjoyment. I went into politics because I was worried about the crime rate, as well as the future of my children and the work opportunities available to them. If I help my children, I help other people's children at the same time. What do the Labor people do when the pressure gets tough? They just break up. They send their kids to school to look after themselves or allow them on the streets without supervision, and that annoys me even more. If I had my way I would get rid of financial handouts and give out ration tickets. By doing so, we would ensure that the parents obtained food and clothing for their children and did not spend the money selfishly on themselves.

I find that a lot of the children who are on the streets are unhappy. The only thing they have in their hearts is the idea of vengeance on the community and their neighbours. Some even threaten police with screwdrivers or attack them. Even 80 year old women are attacked by some of these young kids. I do not think anyone is born violent: they become violent only because they are shown violence. What does the Labor Party do? Absolutely nothing! The Labor Party sends the person to gaol where they are taught a trade and then lets them out three or four years later. As far as I am concerned those times are finished, and I hope the Liberal Government will make sure that that is the case.

When the Messenger Press rings up for a story, one tells them the truth, and the editor then puts a slant on the headlines. I find that this has happened too many times. I refer, for example, to the article on the sterilisation of single women. The aim and the argument was that seven or eight single mothers in the electorate of Lee were causing trouble to about 60 or 70 families. What happened? They mentioned my name, and suddenly I am seen to be attacking all single mothers. I can assure members that seven single mothers are not all the single mothers in Lee.

Then there was the article on the school services officers (SSOs). I mentioned something which parents used to do when I was a child and thereafter. Because parents have not volunteered to do the work the SSOs have taken their place. I just said that this involved the same duties that were performed when I was a child, for example, gardening, repairing the books and helping in canteens.

Fewer parents attend to these functions now. I was categorising only three people, yet the Messenger Press said that I was replacing all SSOs. What a lot of rubbish! Then members expect me to be cool, calm and collected in this

House when members opposite misrepresent everything that we on this side of the House are trying to achieve. They are a group of knockers and are not constructive. If I had my way I would lock them up and throw away the key. That would be against democracy, so I will protect their rights, as I hope they would protect mine if I were in need.

On a more sober note, I am concerned about the legislation that the Labor Government introduced in the 1970s relating to West Lakes Shore and the West Lakes Development Act. It allowed the building of homes right up to the waterfront. Any Government should pass legislation to prevent the construction of homes within 200 metres of any coastline. By so doing, it would prevent the costly repairs of constructing rock walls, sand replenishment and other structures to prevent homes being claimed by the sea. Why should there be construction along the waterfront? Why cannot that land be used for basketball, cricket, football, tennis or other activities?

If the sea does climb a sandhill here or there, no great damage will be done. Only a couple of acres of grass will be claimed. Also, it will be far cheaper for the Government in the long term. Yet, the Port Adelaide Council is refusing to give to the Hindmarsh Woodville Council sand which has

travelled there from south to north. If I had my way and the council still insisted on sand not being trucked south, I would put a groyne at Bower Road. In that way, the sand that belongs to Hindmarsh Woodville would stay there. Of course, I know what would happen to sand in the Semaphore area: it would be reclaimed by the sea and there would be nothing.

It is about time that the councils stopped fighting amongst themselves. They should bring commonsense to bear and allow sand replenishment further south. They will get it back eventually. Not having experienced the problem at Semaphore Park, they even allow building south of the North Haven boat ramp. How ridiculous can people be? They should learn by experience. Yet, the Port Adelaide council has not learnt a damn thing from the Hindmarsh Woodville council. I will not mention the flower farm, which has been raised by a member in another place. Mr Speaker, I thank you for your patience and time.

Mr CONDOUS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 October at 2 p.m.