

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 July 1996

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

SHOOTING BANS

Petitions signed by 10 049 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the recreational shooting of ducks and quails were presented by the Messrs Leggett and Rann.

Petitions received.

FIREARMS

A petition signed by 359 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the proposed reform of gun laws was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 619 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reopen closed facilities at Mount Gambier Hospital, retain staff, and improve medical services to residents of the South-East was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

OBSTETRIC INDEMNITY INSURANCE

A petition signed by 782 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to resolve the issue of obstetric indemnity insurance for medical staff was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PLAYFORD, SIR THOMAS

The **SPEAKER**: I wish to advise all honourable members that, in commemoration of the centenary of his birth on 5 July 1896 and in recognition of his unparalleled contribution to South Australia, the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford by Sir Ivor Hele will from tomorrow hang in the House of Assembly to the right of the Chair and behind the Premier of the day. Sir Thomas Playford was Premier of South Australia for almost 27 years between 1938 and 1965. This term remains a record in the British Commonwealth, and it is appropriate that the centenary of his birth should be marked by the hanging of his portrait in the Chamber in which he served the people of South Australia with foresight, dedication and honour.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

In reply to **Mr FOLEY (Hart)** 26 March.

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: The request for proposal document was written to provide the maximum flexibility for the proponents to be innovative in their proposals.

BIRTH CERTIFICATES

In reply to **Mr ATKINSON (Spence)** 30 May.

The **Hon. S.J. BAKER**: The Minister for Consumer Affairs has provided the following response:

A birth certificate is not, and was never meant to be, a document of identity. The system of compulsory civil registration was introduced more than 150 years ago to establish a permanent social record and as a means of gathering vital statistics for a wide range of public health and community planning purposes. A birth certificate is a copy of an entry in the Register of Births, issued by the Registrar in a format which constitutes acceptable evidence of that particular event.

Citizens are entitled to expect that personal particulars entered in the register are treated with an appropriate degree of confidentiality. For that reason a birth certificate will only be issued to the subject or to a member of his/her immediate family, his/her solicitor or an agent authorised in writing. Further, the purpose for which a certificate is sought must be stated on the application and accepted by the Registrar as a proper reason.

The Registrar will query an application if some detail such as date or place of birth, or parents' full names, is not accurately given. Requiring the applicant to confirm his/her identity by production of specified documents would no doubt prevent some certificates initially getting into the hands of persons not entitled to have them, but it does nothing to prevent theft, forgery or other actions by which a determined criminal can acquire the basis of a false identity.

Other registries with identification requirements in place are having significant difficulties applying them to mail applications. In South Australia, some 42 per cent of certificate applications are received by post and this is the reason why the Registrar has not introduced formal identification requirements.

If the story run by *Today Tonight* is an accurate representation of the way in which other Government agencies create and accept so called documents of identity, in this case a student ID card incorporating a photograph, then there is an obvious need for them to radically rethink their procedures. The same might reasonably be said of the banks and other financial institutions which rely on a birth certificate and assorted cards to establish an identity for the purpose of opening an account.

It is interesting to note that the Australian Passport Office does not rely on an applicant's birth certificate to establish identity. This is done on the basis of a photograph endorsed by a person holding a position of responsibility stating that it is a photograph of the applicant whom he or she has known for a period of at least one year. The birth certificate is then used to establish eligibility for an Australian passport by reference to the country of birth of the applicant's parents.

Prior to this story being run by *Today Tonight*, a representative of Channel Seven contacted my press secretary saying that they did not wish to put it to air in South Australia without first discussing the situation in this State with me. A meeting was arranged, but was subsequently cancelled by Channel Seven, without explanation. That organisation then proceeded to take a hidden camera into the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Office in Adelaide and shoot some illicit footage which added nothing to the story which was put to air that evening. Channel Seven acted quite irresponsibly, if not illegally, by breaching privacy in this way and the whole episode reflected adversely on that organisation rather than on the Registrar and his staff.

TANCRED

In reply to **Ms WHITE (Taylor)** 30 May.

The **Hon. G.A. INGERSON**: I regret that I am unable to intervene in the current process of selling the tugboat *Tancred*. I am advised that the vessel was abandoned by the owner, and attempts to have it removed have been unsuccessful. Costs associated with securing the vessel and attending to it during inclement weather remained unpaid despite several approaches to the owner. Subsequently, the vessel has been declared a 'wreck' and proceedings have commenced to sell the vessel in accordance with the Harbours and Navigation Act, Division 2 'Clearance of Wrecks'.

I am advised that the Minister for Transport is under an obligation to sell the vessel for the best possible price and, after taking out any funds owed to the Government, to return any residual funds to the owner or hold the funds in trust if the owner cannot be located. A public tender for the sale of the *Tancred* has been called. Discussions have now commenced with the highest tenderer to clarify various aspects of the tender. To intervene in the sale process could lead to claims against the Government and to criticisms regarding the probity of the sale process.

The South Australian Tourism Commission considers that the *Tancred* would be an attractive diving opportunity off suburban Adelaide for local recreational purposes, but that the ability of the vessel to attract divers from interstate and overseas, to specifically undertake that dive, would be minimal.

GAMBLERS REHABILITATION FUND

In reply to **Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth)** 10 April.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I can categorically state that no unspent funds from the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund have been diverted into Consolidated Revenue. The fund operates on a rolling \$1.5 million per annum basis which is not tied to financial years for the purposes of expenditure. Funds have been allocated in line with the fund's policy, as service systems have been developed in the community.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Legal Practitioners—Trust Account Statements.
 - Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Coober Pedy.
 - Travel Agents—Deed of Trust and Fees.
- Rules of Court—
 - Juries Act—Principle.
 - Legal Practitioners Act—The Secretary.
 - Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—Pleadings.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

- Public Corporations Act—Regulations—Fire Equipment Services.

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

- Rules of Racing—
 - Racing Act—
 - Incompetent and Careless Driving.
 - Driving in Unacceptable Manner.
 - Australian Rules Not Applicable.

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

- Carclew Youth Arts Centre—Report, 1995.
- Harbors and Navigation Act—Regulations—Restricted Areas—Goolwa and Port Elliot.

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

- South Australian Water Corporation—Corporation Charter.
- Statutory Authorities Review Committee—Response by the Minister for Infrastructure—ETSA Corporation Energy Exploration and Research.

By the Minister for Emergency Services, for the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Public Corporations—South Australian Health Commission.
 - South Australian Health Commission—Variation of Schedule.

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

- Vocational Education, Employment and Training Board—Report, 1995.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. R.G. Kerin)—

- Fisheries Act—Regulations—
 - Abalone Fisheries—Licence Fees.
 - Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence Fees.
 - Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Licence Fees.
 - Miscellaneous Fishery—Licence Fees.
 - Prawn Fisheries—Licence Fees.
 - River Fishery—Licence Fees.
 - Rock Lobster Fisheries—Licence Fees.
 - General—Licence Fees.
 - Marine Scale Fisheries—Management.
 - Lakes and Coorong—Management.
 - Rock Lobster Fisheries—Management.
 - General—Fishing Activities.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. E.S. Ashenden)—

- Development Act 1993—Report on the Interim Operation of the City of Unley Local Heritage Places (Built Heritage) Plan Amendment Report.
- District Council of Victor Harbor—By-Law No. 2—Signs.

QUESTION TIME

GALLANTRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Did the Minister for Emergency Services issue orders that the fireboat *M.V. Gallantry* was not to be called upon for search and rescue operations and, if so, when was this order issued and why? The Opposition has been supplied with an audiotape of a conversation between a police communications sergeant and a fire service communications officer in which the police officer indicates that the *M.V. Gallantry* was not called out for a sea rescue because police had been instructed that, for political reasons, they were not to call upon the boat. The order was identified as coming from the former Police Minister's office, and your name was specifically mentioned. When the fireboat arrived in South Australia in April 1994 the Minister told the House:

... the MFS has been told loudly and clearly by me that I do not approve of this vessel being built, I do not want to take delivery of it.

The Minister has told the media on many occasions since then that the vessel is underused and that it is up for sale.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is quite obvious from the question that there is absolutely no coordination nor consultation whatsoever among members of the Labor Party. Just last week in the Budget Estimates Committee the member for Playford, in his role as shadow Minister for Emergency Services, asked me questions pertaining to the fireboat. For reasons probably best known within the Labor Party, the member for Playford has not had an opportunity to ask this question today, and I would be surprised if the member for Playford even knew if it was going to be asked. If he knew—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It could well be that he is in the wrong faction. If the member for Playford knew about this question I am sure he would have given advice to his Leader that there was no point asking the question, because it had already been explored in Budget Estimates. Of course, I issued no such instruction whatsoever, and it is quite clear under the separation of powers that no Police Minister has any authority whatsoever to direct the Police Commissioner. Therefore, it is not even possible to issue such an edict. Indeed, I outlined in the Budget Estimates that exactly—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the Leader listens he will get the full answer; I will repeat it again for him. In Budget Estimates last week I advised the Committee that, in fact, the reverse was the situation. I had given instructions to the Metropolitan Fire Service that it was to use absolutely every endeavour at its disposal to maximise the use of the *M.V. Gallantry*. As a consequence of that instruction, the *M.V. Gallantry* has been involved in call-outs that it would otherwise not have been involved in. Of particular interest is the fact that the *M.V. Gallantry* has been called out on a number of occasions to assist with the dispersal of oil after there have been minor spillages. Those are not the sort of roles the *M.V. Gallantry* was called out for before. The fact remains that to this day the fireboat has yet to pour water on a fire. The fireboat was purchased by the previous Government to assist in putting out fires, and to this day the fireboat has yet to pour water onto a fire.

What is worse is that that information, which was given to the previous Labor Cabinet and the GARG review committee (which was overseen by Treasurer Blevins in those days), indicated to the previous Government that there would be a \$150 000 stand-by charge per annum if the Government were to approach a private tugboat contractor instead of buying its own boat. On the basis of that information, the previous Labor Government said, 'In that case, we'll buy our own boat.' The problem is that this Government has been unable to find any tugboat operator in Adelaide who claimed to the Government that they would charge a fee. In fact, they have all indicated to this Government that their advice to the previous Government was that they would have a tugboat on stand-by at no cost. If we were to make a decision today about a fireboat in the light of the future needs of the State, this Government would not buy one. I have said on numerous occasions that there is no justification for owning a fireboat; however, there is justification to take the precaution—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—if the honourable member would listen—of having a boat with firefighting capacity. That has been achieved in other places in Australia, most notably in Sydney Harbour, Australia's largest waterfront, through the use of a contract. As the Deputy Leader would be well aware, the union movement lobbied the Labor Party particularly hard after the event because the tugboat operators wanted a contract with the Government so that they would be on call in the event that any fires needed to be put out. The fireboat is an unacceptable cost to the South Australian community at this time. As I reported to the Estimates Committee last week, final work is being undertaken to determine, in the light of the purchase by the previous Labor Government, whether it is more cost-effective for this Government to dispose of the boat now—and there is already more than one potential buyer—or to keep it for a few years and then dispose of it. Whatever the decision, there was no justification whatsoever for the original purchase.

PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Premier advise the House whether he will meet with the Prime Minister in Adelaide this week and, if so, what key issues on behalf of South Australia he intends to discuss? The Prime Minister is scheduled to be in Adelaide on Thursday and Friday this week as part of the centenary celebrations of the birth of Sir Thomas Playford. Issues relating to State development, the Adelaide to Darwin

rail link, and the environmental regeneration of the Murray River region are of importance not only to my constituents but all South Australians.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Prime Minister, John Howard, is coming to Adelaide for two specific purposes. First, he will give the inaugural Playford oration on Friday night. It will be open to the public, and I invite all members of the public to come along and hear it. It will take place in the Town Hall starting at about 7.15 p.m., with the formal speeches starting at 7.30 p.m. Some of the outstanding achievements of Sir Thomas Playford as the longest serving Premier of this State will be highlighted on this occasion together with the developments that he brought to this State. The other specific purpose of the Prime Minister's visit is to open an international art exhibition at the new Art Gallery. Until now, this type of exhibition would have bypassed Adelaide because our Art Gallery was far too small to house such a large international exhibition. We are now able to attract this important exhibition of modern landscape and portrait painters to this State, and I invite the South Australian public to visit the exhibition while it is on display over the next couple of weeks.

I will meet with the Prime Minister and raise with him a number of specific issues of interest to South Australia. I do not wish to go through them all, but I will highlight some, including the importance of the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link. I will be able to highlight to the Prime Minister some interest shown by Asian investors in the equity in that project, and that will be very important in terms of opening up our export markets into the Asian region.

I will also urge the Prime Minister to ensure that the legislation for the sale of one-third of Telstra goes through, and I will inform him that he has the support of South Australia in making sure that it goes through. I invite the Leader of the Opposition to join with me in a unified position to ensure that the Telstra legislation goes through because it is so important in respect of cleaning up the Murray River. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will indicate whether or not he will put forward the clean-up of the Murray River as the number one issue for South Australia and make sure that his own Federal colleagues therefore support this legislation when it comes to a vote.

I will also raise with the Prime Minister the South Australian Government's concerns over the future of Australian National. In particular, we want to make sure that an arrangement is in place to maintain rail services in South Australia, and certainly to retain as many jobs as possible, including those jobs in the workshop. I will be urging that the industrial relations legislation now before the Federal Parliament goes through as quickly as possible—

Mr Clarke: Unamended.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—unamended by the Labor Party—because that will provide a huge—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has had a fair go.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—benefit in terms of bringing about a great deal of uniformity to South Australian and Federal legislation and will, very importantly, free up the industrial relations system so that Australia can start to lift its productivity and therefore become world competitive. I will welcome the Prime Minister to South Australia later this week, and I inform the House that I will be hosting a dinner for him during the time he is in Adelaide.

GALLANTRY**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):**

Given that the Minister for Emergency Services stated today that he issued no order preventing the calling of the M.V. *Gallantry* for sea rescue operations, will the Minister for Police explain why senior police believe there is such a ban and did not call out the vessel because of that understanding? Will the Minister also tell the House how many sea rescues have taken place where the M.V. *Gallantry* has not been called out by the police?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I have had no discussions with the police about the use of M.V. *Gallantry* at all.

FIREARMS

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): Will the Minister for Police inform the House what progress is being made by the South Australian Government to develop uniform gun laws that will be accepted by the whole of the South Australian community? The Minister for Police attended a special Australian Police Ministers conference, called by the Prime Minister in May, where agreement was reached on the new laws. I understand that legislation will be put into Parliament in certain areas and jurisdictions reflecting the intent of the agreement.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: By now, every member should have a copy of the draft Bill sitting in their boxes for consultation—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:—with their constituency.

An honourable member interjecting:

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

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader to order if he was the offending person, and I apologise to the member for Hart.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The draft Bill accords with the Police Ministers' agreement, so that most of the provisions within that draft Bill reflect our own determination for a pairing on the Bill (which was looked at by a specialist group prior to the Port Arthur massacre) and, of course, the changes necessary to implement the agreement reached by the Police Ministers. A number of important changes are necessary to that Bill, including an increase in penalties and the responsible use of guns by persons who are not under the influence of drugs or alcohol. There is also the issue of gun clubs reporting members who are incompetent to operate a firearm.

The draft Bill covers the issue of photographic licences, and obviously it deals with prohibited guns (about which everyone is well aware)—the semiautomatic and pump action guns, except those in categories C and D. Many amendments have been made, either as a result of the agreement reached or as a result of the hard work of a number of members in this Parliament, and they have been brought together in this draft Bill. Police Ministers will be discussing a number of issues in Brisbane tomorrow in the hope of providing a package that will have the support of all those people who have an interest in guns.

The Bill to be introduced into the Parliament formally next week will be reflective of the final agreement, or close to final agreement, on firearms. We will be consulting with

those groups who have shown a desire to consult on issues that relate to the draft Bill and those who wish to see change in this State. I hope that by this time next week we will have a Bill that will be reflective of what I believe will be a workable new firearms system for Australia.

GALLANTRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Why was the fire boat M.V. *Gallantry* not called in by police to aid in the search and rescue of two men reported lost in Gulf St Vincent on 18 March this year? On that day a 29-year old Adelaide man died after a boat sank when it hit a reef in the gulf. As to a later incident, I have a transcript of taped phone calls between the Metropolitan Fire Service and the metropolitan police on 2 April referring to a search for two men in a fishing boat. The transcript states:

Fire officer: . . . wondering why they weren't called out before that was all.

Police officer: . . . at this stage the latest is that we got told that there is supposed to be a report floating around that er . . . we're not to use it. And that came from the Minister.

It goes on to say:

. . . we're still waiting to see this report and one of our night shift inspectors is . . . one that's trying to chase it up . . . till we find that. We reckon that it's supposed to be on the Minister's table back in November some time.

Fire officer: Very strange.

The transcript goes on to say:

. . . well. . . can't say too much about it—

etcetera, and it continues on the next page regarding the inspector's view—

. . . I don't think I'll handle it too much at this stage mate, it's all politics. I'll keep our hooter out of this one.

Reply: Exactly right. That's why I said I'm not commenting . . .

It goes on to say:

. . . there was supposed to be a report floating around somewhere with the Minister, with the old Minister . . .

Reply: The old Minister? . . .

Matthew? . . .

Reply: Yea . . . he'll flip his wig over this one again I suppose.

There is clearly a view in the Police Department that the M.V. *Gallantry* should not be used.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is clearly commenting.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: What an extraordinary performance before the House. It is almost like listening to a bar room conversation.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I do not know who it is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition has been on the Government benches and knows that, when a member asks a question, the member does not continue to carry on a conversation. I do not want to speak to the Leader of the Opposition again today. I advise members that the leniency the Chair has shown towards members has now been abused and that will not be tolerated. I draw attention to Standing Order 137. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Leader of the Opposition decided that he had a question and he was going to ask it. I have already replied that I have not discussed the M.V. *Gallantry*. The Leader's further question has been poorly

phrased. I had already discarded that as an issue. However, if the honourable member is saying, 'I have a tape; I rushed around and hid in a bar and this is what I heard,' that is fine, and he can use this Parliament for that purpose. However, if the honourable member is saying, 'There is an issue here as to why the M.V. *Gallantry* was not used on this occasion,' I am happy to receive a report back from the police. If that is what he wants, I am more than happy to receive a report. I have not talked to the police about the disposition of the M.V. *Gallantry*.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES BID

Mr BECKER (Peake): Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Peake has the call.

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister for Tourism and for Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the House of the estimated benefits to South Australia should Adelaide's bid to host the 2006 Commonwealth Games be successful and can the Minister outline the bid process and the degree of support for the bid among South Australians?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Peake for his special interest in this area: he was involved in the previous bid along with several others. On Friday the Premier announced Adelaide's bid for the 2006 games. We have had fantastic support from the media, the community, all sporting bodies and the Opposition. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the overall community support for the bid.

It was put in after a thorough economic analysis, which showed that there would be a benefit of about \$95 million to \$100 million (in 1996 dollars) for the State in 2006, that the revenue provided for the event would be about \$80 million and that the cost of putting on the event would be about the same. It also showed that infrastructure would be built within the State: for example, the swimming centre would be upgraded, a new portable track would be put down at Football Park and there would be the upgrading, in some 10 years, of some of the other new facilities such as soccer and the netball and athletics stadiums, which this Government is very proud to say it will achieve towards the end of next year.

The infrastructure cost is really the only cost to the Government and it will begin after 2002. It is estimated that at least 1 500 jobs will be created during the construction and operational stage of the benefit, and we expect to attract some 10 000 international visitors and 7 000 national visitors to South Australia. There has been a quip across the Chamber about a new rifle range. I would assume that that could be in place before the end of next year if discussions with the MFP continue at the present rate. Of course, that will add dramatically to the international bid that we intend to put forward.

The process is such that by October this year the decision needs to be made at a national level. There are 11 delegates, and we believe we have a 50-50 chance of winning the bid. It will be a very difficult bid because Melbourne, Darwin, Perth and Brisbane have all put up their hands to be competitors. It is our view that, having put together an excellent bid last time, we should be able to build on that and to have some support from the people who supported us on the last occasion. If we are fortunate enough to win the bid, there is a fairly long process of 2½ years to put together the bid internationally. It is at that stage we would expect a new committee to be put forward to work with the Government,

the Opposition and the community generally to make sure that we can virtually grow on the bid and get a better result in 2006.

As Minister, I have been pleasantly surprised at community support. Some 84 per cent of the community supported the bid, but the best part of it is that 86 per cent of people between the ages of 18 and 25 not only supported the bid but believed that the Government should make a significant investment in obtaining the opportunity.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. As the Premier and the Prime Minister reached agreement to reduce Commonwealth grants to South Australia by \$83 million at the recent Premiers' Conference but only after the State budget was handed down, and as the specific budgetary consequences of that agreement will obviously not be known before the Federal budget, will the Premier give a commitment to provide this Parliament with a full account of changes to the 1996-97 State budget as a result of the Federal budget; and what is the integrity of the State budget his Government has just handed down?

On 18 June, the Premier told the House that cuts to Commonwealth grants will be \$83 million. The Minister for Health told the Estimates Committee that he had no idea what was to be cut and said, 'We do not know what the final budget position is until a number of weeks from now.' The Minister for Family and Community Services told the Estimates Committee that he could give no commitment that the State funding for the Home and Community Care Program would remain as stated in the State budget. The Minister for Education told the Estimates Committee that 'individual Ministers cannot give guarantees in relation to financial matters. The Premier and the Treasurer will do that. . . ' and ' . . . only time will tell in relation to that'. The Treasurer told the Estimates Committee that the budget cuts would be handled 'with difficulty' and that the Government was looking at all options.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, let me correct the claim made by the Leader of the Opposition: there was no agreement between the Prime Minister and me involving an \$88 million cut for South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has raised this matter, because here he was, running around before and immediately after the State budget was brought down, claiming that it was a phoney budget. The Leader has now ended up with egg on his face because all the fundamentals of the State budget are in place. The Ministers were specifically talking about federally funded programs—and I stress 'federally funded programs'. The fundamentals of the State budget are in place and remain in place.

If only the Leader had come into the Estimates Committee and listened to what was being said, because, as the member for Gordon, who was Chairman of the Committee, would testify, we went right through this (it is in *Hansard*): there will be a cut of about \$33 million in special purpose payments by the Federal Government—not by the State Government but by the Federal Government—which flows through to the State budget, and that will be for specific programs. The Ministers have been saying, 'We don't know where those

special purpose payments will be cut', because they will be cut in the Federal budget. We will only know that on 20 August. What the Prime Minister has indicated—and I indicated this to the Estimates Committee—is that the cuts in special purpose payments will be no more than 3 per cent across the board: that education—primary and secondary—will not be cut; and, secondly, that the cut in health will be less than the 3 per cent cut and will be relatively small.

Therefore, one can assume—although we do not know exactly what reductions in expenditure might take place within those special purpose payments, which, after all, involve federally funded programs—that the rest of the State-funded programs are intact. The budget is also intact, and no mini budget will be introduced in this Parliament. I can assure the honourable member that the general purpose payments the States requested they have obtained on an inflated basis, taking account of both inflation and population growth rate. Therefore, the Leader's claim is quite false.

WINE AUSTRALIA

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Can the Minister for Tourism inform the House of South Australia's involvement in the Wine Australia event recently held in Sydney, indicating the reaction to the South Australian promotion and details of how the event involved South Australia's tourism industry?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Last week when Wine Australia was held in Sydney I spent a very proud few days there because I had never seen before, at an exhibition level, the fantastic effort put in by South Australian companies promoting their own goods and also promoting South Australia. We had representations from the Riverland, the Barossa Valley, Clare, McLaren Vale, Langhorne Creek, Coonawarra and the Adelaide Hills—every region—

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—yes, the Minister is correct—and from TAFE.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I have mentioned Langhorne Creek, Mr Premier. The display by South Australian companies was fantastic, but what was even better was the fact that all the companies from all the regions had committed their senior staff and winemakers to go along and take part in this promotion. We had the opportunity to see, through the Tourism Commission and the Department for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, Government support for those industries. It was the best display that I have ever seen put on by a South Australian industry.

We also had the privilege of having the *One And All* in Sydney Harbor on its annual trip to Queensland where it does a lot of sail training. On Sunday afternoon we were able to take many representatives of the wine industry, particularly the international media, on the boat with the Premier as host. It was a very important excursion. We believe that we will get tremendous national and international promotion of that event for South Australia.

I put very strongly to the organisers that whilst it is in Sydney this year and in Melbourne in two years, it ought to be in South Australia as part of the exercise. My role and that of the Government will be to convince the organisers of Wine Australia that we ought to be part of that circuit. I repeat, it was a proud day to see our wine industry on show and all the wine makers putting their best foot forward and selling not

only the best wine but themselves as the best wine makers in Australia.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Premier agree with his Treasurer's statement that South Australia's teachers are 'maniacs' and that, if they achieve a pay rise significantly in excess of the Government's pre-budget offer, State taxes will have to be raised? In a 20 June media report the Treasurer was quoted as saying of the Institute of Teachers:

If they can't make the deal work without hitting the bottom line, there will be a tax increase.

When the Treasurer was asked whether that was consistent with the Premier's promise to resign if taxes were increased, he said:

When we make these undertakings we don't necessarily believe we are going to have maniacs like the teachers' union holding the State to ransom.

The Education Minister had already said that any increase in taxes would be designated a 'teacher-pay tax'.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I always find it interesting—*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will contain himself.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—that members opposite deliberately take a statement or issue and misquote it. We have a classic example by the shadow Treasurer, who says that the Deputy Premier had stated that teachers were maniacs. The Treasurer did not say that at all. He was referring to the teachers' union and its behaviour, in particular—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He was talking about the leadership of the teachers' union and, in particular, its behaviour in this industrial dispute.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for Tourism to order as well.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will outline the broad parameters of this dispute. The Government has provided over \$90 million in the budget for a salary increase for teachers. We have made a formal offer to the teachers of 12 per cent over two years. As a result of a direction by the State Industrial Commission, there have been further talks in connection with which the Government is in the process of upping that offer over 2½ years, but a demand has been put on the State Government by the teachers' union which would cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$230 million or \$240 million a year. That claim is absolutely outrageous, and the State cannot afford it.

All I ask is that common sense should prevail, that they willingly sit down as a union—and if the union is not willing to do so, then the teachers themselves might sit down—with the State Government and reach a common sense approach. Such common sense would minimise any adverse effects on the education of the children. I find it unacceptable that the teachers' union in its pay claim should want to interfere with the education of our children. I am sure that I am joined there by the vast majority of parents throughout South Australia. We have made a reasonable offer of 12 per cent, we are willing to up that to 15 per cent, perhaps over a longer period, but it is up to the union to sit down, be willing to compromise

and put aside its politics and dogmatic claim that this State should pay a \$230 million salary increase.

COMPUTER SYSTEMS

Mrs HALL (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. What action is the Government taking to plan for the impact, including the economic impact, on computer systems operated by or for the State Government as a result of the change of date at the commencement of the next millennium in the year 2000 and what is now called the Y2K problem? There has been considerable media speculation over several weeks concerning the potential cost impact of changes to computer systems at the year 2000. In this morning's *Australian* there is a significant and powerful feature article headed 'Date with digital disaster', which in two segments states:

As the automated world enters the twenty-first century, it's quite possible that many of its computers will register the first day of the millennium as January 1, 1900. The result, depending on whose analysis you believe, will be incalculable chaos.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member is right that changing from 1999 to the year 2000 will involve considerable potential cost across the entire world because of the ramifications involving the computer industry. However, South Australia has already planned for this. Although the cost is expected to be hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars internationally, in South Australia the cost will be minimal, because in our planning, particularly with our whole of Government approach, we have insisted—and we have been doing this for a number of years—that all new software must take account of the change of date that will occur going to the year 2000 and be able to handle that shift. Also, because we have mandated particular types of software, in choosing that software we will be able to say that we have allowed for that change in date.

There will be a lot of costs nationally, but in some areas where we are using much older software—and a classic example is the lands titling system (LOTS)—as part of our redevelopment we are insisting that it must account for the change in date in respect of the year 2000 and, therefore, have suitable software to handle it without additional expense.

Although it is recognised internationally as a big issue, we are already working through the problem. We have identified it and the Department of Information Industries has the problem well in hand. Although we acknowledge that there will be some additional expenditure, by the time we get to the year 2000 the impact will be minimal as most of the systems will have been changed across to it as we are doing currently.

STATE TAXATION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Premier. Following the Treasurer's advice that the Government is looking at all options to meet the \$83 million in Commonwealth grants that the State will lose under the deal brokered between the Prime Minister and the Premier, will he rule out the introduction of new taxes, any increase in existing taxes or any increases in charges by more than inflation?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can rule out the introduction of any new taxes or an increase in the rate of taxation. It was a promise that I made before the last election, and I will maintain that election promise. It was a very important election promise, particularly for South Australia, because the

previous Labor Government had increased taxes in the five years up to the last election by the biggest percentage of any State in the whole of Australia. The honourable member was a member of that Labor Government which imposed on South Australians that huge increase in taxation which meant that this State was no longer a competitive place in which to do business. This Government has given a commitment not to increase taxation and I am able to maintain—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, it is.

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I realise that the member for Hart was a senior adviser to the previous Government and that he is now hanging his head, having almost bankrupted this State.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Under the member for Hart's guidance the previous Government increased taxation by the highest percentage of any Government in Australia. I rule out any new tax or any increase in the rate of taxation as a result of the Premiers Conference in Canberra.

PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING ARRANGEMENTS

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Treasurer provide an explanation of what work is being done to improve accounting arrangements within Government following the Commission of Audit recommendation that all public sector agencies prepare general purpose financial reports using the accrual basis of accounting as this complies with Australian accounting standards?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is quite interesting to note that the Federal Government, which required the States to adopt the appropriate standard, refused to adopt the appropriate standard itself. When the former Government went out and the new Government came in there was fierce resistance to the adoption of accrual accounting, because it was all a bit too hard and it required too much work. I am pleased that the National Audit Commission has thoroughly endorsed accrual accounting and has told the Federal Government that, instead of telling the States to get to the mark, it should do so itself. I am pleased that the National Audit Commission has found that there is a huge deficiency in the account keeping methods of the Federal Government and that it has insisted the Federal Government adopt new methods. Accrual accounting brings to account all the costs of Government in a way that cash accounting does not.

We have advanced accrual accounting particularly in our Government trading enterprises, where significant changes have taken place. Of course, this financial year Government trading enterprises will operate on a full accrual accounting basis and, indeed, the rest of Government will do so by 1997-98. In particular, we have taken a number of steps with agencies that have never had any exposure to the rules under which accrual accounting is administered. As I said, under a financial management steering committee we have made considerable progress since 1995. We have visited all the agencies. They have taken on a number of modules in terms of the computer programs that are capable of delivering the basic information to meet that need. A total of 35 separate training courses have been developed. Topics ranged from management of the implementation of accrual accounting

through to technical uses, such as the measurement of assets and liabilities, and the implications for executives.

The first courses were run in May 1995 and, depending on demand, courses will be repeated through 1995-96 and 1996-97. To date, 700 people have attended the courses. We are getting our act together. We have brought together those people who have responsibility in Government for the delivery of the Government's financial returns and, indeed, there has been some tremendous movement in that area. We have a large number of people who are competent in accrual accounting. I am confident that by 1997-98 the Government will be fully equipped with staff who have knowledge of accrual accounting while, at the same time, the Federal Government will still be learning what it is all about.

SALISBURY CAMPUS

Ms WHITE (Taylor): What action has the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education taken to ensure that educational opportunities for people from the northern suburbs are not reduced from the end of this year as a result of the decision to close the Salisbury campus of the University of South Australia? Specifically, what discussions has the Minister had with the university regarding future educational uses for that site?

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that in asking her question she was very close to commenting. I hope that she will not comment when she explains her question.

Ms WHITE: The University of South Australia has changed its position on the future of the Salisbury campus several times, with the most recent decision being to close the campus at the end of this year. In 1994 the Government refused to support the Opposition's motion to keep the Salisbury campus open. The Minister issued a press statement—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting; leave is withdrawn. The honourable member has been told before about commenting.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the honourable member for this very important question. As the honourable member knows, universities in South Australia are autonomous. That is not to say that as a Government we are not interested in what they do: we certainly are. The university indicated to me in late 1993 or early 1994 that, in respect of the Salisbury campus, there was unlikely to be a total closure of that site but that there could be some relocation. In fact, it indicated at the time that relocation of some of the programs could extend well into next century. Obviously, the university has changed its stance, because it has indicated quite clearly that it intends to close that campus. The university argues that access is available to students at The Levels campus. That is partially correct in the sense that there are programs at The Levels, but they do not automatically replace the ones offered at the Salisbury campus.

As I understand it, the university intends to provide nursing training facilities at The Levels, but at this stage it does not have the capital funding to do that. Members would have seen in the newspapers recently that there is some concern about people entering nursing programs—because of the low cut-off score, many students were not completing their program. The university has had to revise its intake policy in relation to nursing. I am very concerned that people, wherever they live in South Australia, have access to a university education if they are qualified to enter a university.

I have already asked my officers to arrange a meeting with the Vice-Chancellor of the University of South Australia, Professor Robinson, to discuss this issue.

In prior correspondence and discussions the university has indicated from its statistics—and I have some that were provided yesterday to an honourable member—that people living in the northern suburbs are not disadvantaged. I want to explore that, because I would be concerned if people in the northern suburbs were in any way disadvantaged. I have heard rumours that there will be opportunities to bus students to different campuses. Once again, I would be concerned if that acted as a disincentive to people in the north. As a Government, we are very concerned that people, whether they live in the metropolitan area or in country areas, have access to a university education if they have the appropriate entrance requirements. It is a matter I will discuss in detail with the Vice-Chancellor of the University of South Australia very shortly.

NORTHERN TERRITORY EXPO

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report to the House on the outcomes of the trade mission and water seminar he attended last week in Darwin as part of the Northern Territory Expo?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to advise the House that South Australia had the single largest representation at NT Expo. NT Expo attracted some 800 delegates, principally from Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. NT Expo would clearly rival NITOC (National Investment Trade Outlook Conference) run by the Federal Government in Melbourne each year as a major international trade promotion. The 23 companies clearly made good contacts, and there will be a debriefing. For example, Vaughan Irrigators from Yankalilla has sold irrigation equipment to Brunei and also to Darwin. There is interest in Indonesia for its product.

Summers Country Bakery from Mount Barker, Brashes, Tymaroo Trading from Hallett Cove, UPAC Coatings from West Beach, Greeninformation from Nairne and MCI Environmental at Forestville represent a snap-shot of the different range of companies that attended the expo from South Australia. South Australia was the only State with, in effect, a shop front presenting South Australia to the BIMP-EAGA region in presenting trade and services opportunities in that region. The Northern Territory Government gave due recognition to South Australia, and a memorandum of understanding has been put in place between South Australia and the Northern Territory.

Incidentally, in Duvall this week, it is expected that the Northern Territory will be invited by BIMP-EAGA to have closer participation in that region. That will have flow-on effects and benefits for South Australia. In relation to the water seminar, up to 100 people from the Asia-Pacific region, including Ministers from Sabah, attended that briefing. Three acknowledged speakers participated. Mr Declan Duff, Head of the Transport and Utilities Division of the International Finance Corporation of the World Bank, who is involved in major infrastructure financing throughout the Asia-Pacific region, endorsed the approach that we have put in place in South Australia as having good potential for the future.

Dr Lazaro, Administrator, Metropolitan Water Works and Sewerage System, Manila, appointed personally by President Ramos of the Philippines to spearhead the development of

water and waste water systems in Manila, spoke at our seminar and, following our presentation, will now visit South Australia to talk further about our approach and involvement between the public and private sectors: the partnership that has been put in place between United Water and the South Australian Government. Dr Wanchai Ghooprasert, the Deputy Governor, Provincial Water Works Authority of Thailand, also made a presentation at that seminar and has accepted an invitation to visit South Australia.

This is starting to build on the linkages, the contract that was put in place for next year, to take the next quantum step towards creating investment and job opportunities for South Australian based companies in the Asia-Pacific region. To get endorsement from no less an authority than the Head of the Transport and Utilities Division of the International Finance Corporation of the World Bank underscores that the policy direction that we have put in place is right.

I would also like to refer to a letter that I have received from Professor Pincombe of the University of South Australia which refers to how these trade missions produce some good results at the end of the day. Some successes have been scored by the University of South Australia following the Australia Today 1994 Trade Mission in Jakarta, including teaching of the University of South Australia Bachelor of Nursing at Universitas IEU in Indonesia in January 1997. The program, which will be used to prepare Indonesian nurses for international nursing practice, has the endorsement of the Minister in Indonesia. That followed the Australia Today 1994 Trade Mission to Jakarta. In addition, there is the establishment of the early stages of a collaborative agreement with the University of Indonesia. The letter states:

Ten of our undergraduate nursing students will undertake a community health program at the university's Faculty of Medicine, School of Nursing, in Jakarta in June 1996. Again, this relationship developed following the South Australian dinner at Australia Today in Jakarta, 1994.

We are now some two years down the track, but from those initial contacts there has been a successful outcome. Professor Pincombe goes on to say that discussions are now continuing with contacts from the recent trade delegation to Brunei and Kuching and that there will be an opportunity to meet the Director of Health and Medical Services in Brunei. They are now looking at a wound management workshop to be conducted jointly by the faculty and Ashford Community Hospital in Kuching in June this year, and as a result of discussions with three Directors of Nursing in Kuching a proposal to teach the university's Bachelor of Nursing in Kuching has been requested and forwarded. The letter goes on to thank the South Australian Government for the trade mission, the networks and the linkages that can be put in place.

This is exactly what this Government has sought to establish: a rejuvenation of the economy through the development of an export culture. The Premier has often talked about the export culture and the need to go to the international marketplace. These trade missions and their success down the track demonstrate that our strategy and policy initiative are working.

COLLEX LIQUID WASTE TREATMENT PLANT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Given the decision of the Supreme Court on Friday 28 June to uphold the Port Adelaide Enfield council appeal against the Development Assessment Commission's go-ahead for the

proposed Collex liquid waste treatment plant in Kilburn, will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations now accept the decision of the Supreme Court and desist from supporting the establishment of the proposed plant? During Estimates on 21 June, the Minister said in relation to this issue:

We will await that decision [the Supreme Court] so that we can take it into account in terms of the action we will take further down the track.

On 28 June, the Supreme Court ruled in favour of the Port Adelaide Enfield council and said:

The evidence therefore unquestionably demonstrates the probability of odours which will be offensive to the residents.

It stated further:

This is not an industry which might produce offensive conditions on one or two isolated occasions over a period of several years. Instead it will subject residents in the vicinity to offensive odours on several occasions in each year and will continue to do so in ensuing years.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Once again, the Deputy Leader has not quoted in full. Had he quoted in full the answer that I gave during the Estimates Committee he would have been able to answer the question which he has asked me today. I made it quite clear then that a number of processes need to be completed regarding the Collex situation. One of those is the court decision.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: We made it quite clear that we would take into account the decision to be handed down by the court, and we will. I also made it quite clear during the Estimates Committee and have done so previously that the PAR process is under way—and that process will be completed. At the moment, the PAR is with the Port Adelaide Enfield council for comment, and that is due by the end of this week. After that, it will go out for public comment. So, there are many processes that are yet to occur before any final decision is made.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is warned.

PRISONS, INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Correctional Services provide details to the House of the number of occasions on which the former Labor Government utilised a system of providing prisoners with a remission on their sentence during times of industrial dispute within the South Australian prison system?

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

Mrs KOTZ: I am advised that last week when the Government found—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not be in the Chamber. He may be on the Bob Francis show, but he will not be in the Chamber.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you for your protection, Sir. I am advised that, last week when the Government found it necessary to use such a system for the first time in one prison, media outlets broadcast the views of the member for Playford, who claimed:

It seems to me to be the most bizarre thing I have ever heard.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I found the comments of the member for Playford quite bizarre when I heard them aired on the media. I am not sure whether the member for Playford has a selective memory, but I advise him and put firmly on the record in this place—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—that the previous Labor Government used this provision on 59 occasions from 22 December 1986 to 2 November 1993; and 26 of those occasions were during the time when the member for Playford was a member of the then Labor Government. Those occasions do not relate to just one prison but all prisons across the State. I point out again to the House that during 2½ years in Government it has been necessary for us to use this provision once in one prison. To refresh the memory of members opposite, I am prepared to put on the record some of those occasions when this provision was used by the former Labor Government. On 22 December 1986, it was used at Northfield, Yatala, Port Augusta and Cadell for one day; from 1 to 3 May 1987 at Adelaide Gaol for three days; from 4 to 10 June 1987 at Adelaide Gaol for six days; from 6 to 10 June 1987 at Adelaide Gaol for six days; from 31 May to 1 June 1988 at the Remand Centre, Yatala and Northfield for two days; from 28 May to 1 June 1988 at Mobilong—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Members opposite do not like this, but they can listen to it. The list continues: 1 June 1988 at the Port Lincoln and Port Augusta gaols for one day; from 17 October to 7 November at the Adelaide Remand Centre for 22 days; 12 to 14 October 1988 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for three days; 8 to 11 October 1988 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for four days; 15 October 1988 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for one day; 3, 7, 9 and 10 November at Yatala Labour Prison for four days; 10 and 15 November 1988 at Mobilong for two days. The list covers a couple of pages. In order to save the time of the Parliament, I seek leave to insert this information into *Hansard*; it is purely statistical.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order. I clearly heard the Minister say that the list covered two pages. My understanding is that one page of statistical information is the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no debate. Leave is not granted. The Minister can either read or table the list.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: That being the case, I am happy to read it all out, and here we go—

The SPEAKER: Order! So that there is no misunderstanding, I point out to members that it is unwise for the House to follow this course of action because, if one side withdraws leave, there is a likelihood others will also follow that course. I point that out so that members are under no misapprehension.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The list continues: 15 November 1988 at Port Augusta Gaol for one day; 15 November 1988 at Mount Gambier Prison for one day—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the second time.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: On 2 and 16 November 1988 at the Cadell Training Centre for two days; 16 November 1988—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—at Yatala Labour Prison, Mobilong, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, Northfield and Port Lincoln for one day.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence for the second time.

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, you did not warn me the first time.

The SPEAKER: I will name the honourable member if he again rises on a frivolous point of order.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I continue: 3 November 1988 at the Cadell Training Centre, Mobilong, Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier and Northfield for one day; 3 and 7 July 1988 at Yatala Labour Prison for two days; 8 to 25 July 1988 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for 15 days; 25 July 1988 at Yatala Labour Prison for one day; 5 to 7 November 1988 at Port Augusta Gaol for three days; 27 July 1988 to 11 August 1988 at Port Augusta Gaol for 16 days; 12 to 19 August 1988 at Port Augusta Gaol for eight days; 22 and 29 August 1988 at Port Augusta Gaol for eight days; 30 August to 2 September 1988 for four days; 25 January 1989 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for one day; 31 January 1989 at Port Augusta Gaol for one day; 9 and 10 February 1989 at Port Augusta Gaol for two days; 10 and 11 May 1989 at Port Augusta Gaol for two days; 22 May 1989 at Yatala Labour Prison for one day; 25 and 26 October 1989 at Port Augusta Gaol for two days; 21 October 1989 at Yatala Labour Prison, the Adelaide Remand Centre and Mobilong for one day; 26 and 27 January 1990 at Port Augusta Gaol for two days; 10 to 15 October 1990 at Port Augusta Gaol for six days; 16 to 19 October 1990 at Port Augusta Gaol for four days; 25 October 1990 at Port Augusta Gaol for one day; 28 November at Northfield, Mobilong and Yatala Labour Prison for one day; 3 to 5 June 1991 at Yatala Labour Prison for three days; 23 June 1991 at Yatala Labour Prison for one day; 16 June 1992 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for one day; 3 and 9 June 1992 at Northfield for two days; 22 October 1992 at Yatala Labour Prison, the Adelaide Remand Centre, Northfield, Port Lincoln, Cadell Training Centre, Mobilong and Mount Gambier for one day; 3 November 1992 at Yatala Labour Prison for one day; 10 November 1992 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for one day; 11 and 12 November 1992 at Mount Gambier Prison for two days; 20 February to 4 March 1993 at Yatala Labour Prison for 13 days; 14 to 18 February 1993 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for five days—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—19 to 23 February 1993 at the Adelaide Remand Centre for five days; 13 to 19 February 1993 at Northfield for seven days; 21 to 23 February 1993 at Northfield for three days; 2 and 3 March 1993 at Northfield for two days; 14 March at Northfield for one day; 14 to 20 February at Mobilong for seven days; 21 to 23 February 1993 at Mobilong for three days; 3 March at Mobilong for one day; 12 March at Mobilong, Northfield and the Adelaide Remand Centre for one day; 13 May 1993 at Yatala Labour Prison for one day; and, finally, 2 November 1993 at Mount Gambier Prison for one day. Last week, the Deputy Leader had the gall to say to the media that this Government has bungled the handling of the dispute at Yatala Labour Prison because we found it necessary to invoke this procedure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: What does it say about the previous Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—with 59 occasions since 1986? That is bizarre. I personally find it absolutely repugnant to have to give prisoners four days off for each day they spend in their cells, but we have given four days; how many days did the previous Labor Government give? Not four, not five, but six days off for every day those prisoners served in their cells after a particular period of time, and who authorised that? It was the entire Cabinet of the previous Labor Government. Prisons are difficult places to manage but, in 2½ years, we have had to invoke that procedure once in one prison, and not 59 times across every prison in the State. That is what is bizarre.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMALGAMATIONS

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations provide the House with an update of what is happening with local government boundary reform?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am delighted to do that. The local government boundary reform process is proceeding extremely well, and I know how disappointed members opposite will be to hear that. The local government boundary reform board is now meeting frequently. It last met in the Murraylands and the Riverland; it has also had meetings with South-East councils; and, shortly, it will be meeting in the Mid North. For the benefit of members opposite, I advise that, since March, proclamations have been made for the creation of six new councils. These new councils include the City of Port Adelaide-Enfield, an amalgamation of two councils; the District Council of Kapunda and Light, an amalgamation of two councils; the Port Pirie City and District Council, an amalgamation of two councils; the District Council of Grant, an amalgamation of the district councils of Mount Gambier and Port MacDonnell; the Barossa Council, an amalgamation of the district councils of Angaston, Barossa and Tanunda; and the District Council of Renmark-Paringa, an amalgamation of two councils.

At the moment, the overall status of structural reform is as follows: there have been six amalgamations involving 13 councils; 31 council groups are exploring or developing council initiated proposals, which comprises 82 more councils; and 17 councils are not involved at the moment, due either to geographic isolation, the inability to find a partner or, in some instances, an unwillingness to participate and, of those, six councils have been sent questionnaires, which is the start of the board initiated proposal. Members can see that we have certainly had a very good result in relation to the voluntary process.

The way in which things are progressing, there will be no trouble meeting the 50 per cent target that the Government set, and we are expecting the majority of council initiated proposals to be lodged with the board during August, September and October. I repeat that the process is going extremely well; we have more amalgamations at this stage than we had expected; and we will certainly achieve the goal we set not very long ago.

BUSINESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. Is the Premier concerned at the impact on South Australian business from any reduction in business assistance programs currently being considered by the Howard Government, and will the Premier argue against these proposed cuts when he meets the Prime Minister later this week? With your leave, Sir, and that of the House, I would like briefly to explain.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister.

Mr Foley: I had a good explanation.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The South Australian Government has taken up with the Federal Government a whole range of support programs, particularly with respect to export markets. The DIFF scheme is one that the South Australian Government argued to the Federal Government ought to be retained. The DIFF scheme supported SAGRIC International in going into a number of major contracts in the Asian region. Several major contracts were pending but, unfortunately, because of the Federal Government's decision not to continue with DIFF, those contracts have now slipped.

At the Trade Ministers' meeting in Darwin last Friday a number of concessions were given. As to the export market development grant scheme, which is currently being considered by the Expenditure Review Committee, the Trade Minister, Tim Fischer, indicated that he would report that it was a unanimous view of all State Ministers that that scheme ought to be retained, and that will be referred to the Expenditure Review Committee.

In addition, in relation to the abolition of DIFF, the Trade Ministers' meeting acknowledged that the decision had been made. The decision having been made, there was the question of how we correct and put in place a scheme of relevance to go into the market place for infrastructure and commercialising infrastructure opportunities out of Australia, in particular South Australia. Tim Fischer has given a commitment that a review will be undertaken for a soft loan replacement scheme to DIFF to be considered by the Federal Government after consultation with the States.

That was a real concession by the Commonwealth to the States, which had a unanimous view that these schemes are supportive of Australian industry, commercialising many research and development technologies and commercialising into the international market place. These are important seeds for those companies getting contracts, particularly in the Asian region. I hope that the negotiations that take place with the Commonwealth Government in the next three to six months will see a replacement scheme to DIFF.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT RATE CONCESSIONS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Is the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations aware that some pensioners are denied concessions on council rates because the system in place does not retrospectively account for pensions? Will the Minister act to ensure that pensioners are not discriminated against when applying for council rate concessions? One of my constituents received a carer's pension for 11 months and nine days, yet no concession on council rates was allowed because the rates fell due after the pension ceased. On the other hand, a person

is entitled to a concession if they are on a pension for a couple of days and the rates fall at that time.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Obviously, there is a lot of detail in the question that the honourable member has asked. If she would like to see me afterwards and provide me with the full details, I will make sure that a full answer is provided for her.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I table a ministerial statement on the Adelaide Festival made today in another place by the Minister for the Arts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr CLARKE: During Question Time the Minister for Correctional Services said that I had been holding him responsible or blaming the Government with respect to the issue of remissions in gaols, the issue that was raised last week in the Estimates Committees. In fact, the only issue I raised last week with respect to Correctional Services concerned the shambles in industrial relations and I was blaming the Minister for Industrial Affairs—

The SPEAKER: Leave is withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My purpose today is to talk about a specific instance of racial vilification. This example is of a white supremacist at the Woolworths Warehouse at Salisbury and of his attempt to use the labour movement to promote his ideas. Mr Richard Kalemba of Para Hills is a casual storeman at Woolworths Warehouse. He is angry at what he calls the Asianisation of Australia. Mr Kalemba told me that we have too many Asians in Australia. He tells me that so many are still coming to Australia that it is lowering the standard of living of Australians in general and wage earners in particular. His policy is that we should look after our own backyard first and should repatriate Asian-Australians to their country of origin. Mr Kalemba promotes these views among his workmates and is renowned for taunting the Asian employees of Woolworths Warehouse.

Mr Kalemba has approached the secretary of the principal union covering Woolworths Warehouse to invite him to a National Action rally on the steps of Parliament House and he spoke about the rally to the same person after he had attended it. In fairness to Mr Kalemba, I should point out that he denies any association with National Action and criticises the methods of its chief, Mr Michael Brander. To his work mates, Mr Kalemba is nicknamed 'Klu Klux', as in Ku Klux Klan. Mr Kalemba has sought to convert his work mates to

his point of view. He has sought full-time employment with one union at the warehouse and, when this was refused, he joined a rival union with a view to full-time employment with it as an organiser. To prove his worth to that union, he has used his racial ideas as a rallying point for recruiting members to that union.

Woolworths Warehouse has the potential to be a physically dangerous place, with fork lift drivers lifting heavy loads to great heights on the shelves. But that is not the only resemblance it has to the film *On the Waterfront*. In October 1995 Woolworths storeman Mr Van Lam Nguyen resolved to leave his Woolworths employment after anti-Asian taunts by Mr Kalemba and his followers in the warehouse. In February this year a Kalemba follower assaulted a fellow worker who would not join Mr Kalemba's preferred trade union. In June this year the only remaining Vietnamese Australian in the warehouse, Mr Quoc Phuc Vo, was knocked unconscious in a fight at the warehouse. It is not clear, however, that this assault was caused by the climate that Mr Kalemba had fostered in the warehouse. On 19 June another Kalemba supporter threatened to smash the face of an employee who refused to join the union of Mr Kalemba's preference.

One of the two unions had as an organiser Mr Sang Nguyen, who has recently become the first Vietnamese-Australian to be elected to an Australian Parliament. The other union has as an organiser Mr Tung Ngo, who was the first Vietnamese-Australian to be elected as a councillor in South Australian local government. I feel strongly about this matter, partly because Mr Sang and Mr Tung are friends of mine. Alas, neither of the unions could send an Asian-Australian organiser to Woolworths Warehouse because of the risk of a confrontation with Mr Kalemba, the Johnny Friendly of the South Australian labour movement. It is an indication of Mr Kalemba's success that not only would the union fear for its organiser's safety but it would also fear that Mr Kalemba would use the visit of an Asian-Australian organiser to rally the men against the union that employed him.

I appeal to Woolworths and both unions involved in poaching members from each other at Woolworths Warehouse. We may not yet have racial vilification legislation in South Australia, but what Mr Kalemba is doing is something with which no employer or union should be associated, even if they may see a temporary advantage in it for themselves. Woolworths may calculate that Mr Kalemba keeps the workers divided and the unions may see him as a rallying point for or against membership of their organisation, but all of them should get together to put an end to this sordid episode.

Mr Kalemba is free to hold the views he does about Asians, free to preach for his opinions and free to run for elected office in a registered trade union. Communists, the Green Party, Catholic Action, the Australian Labor Party and a variety of other political ideas have used the labour movement as a vehicle for promoting themselves. However, some ideas are better than others and Mr Kalemba's are demeaning and, in my opinion, at the bottom of the scale of merit. We should not have to wait for the passage of the Racial Vilification Bill for public organisations, such as a major retailer and two trade unions, to use their discretion to prevent Mr Kalemba vilifying Asians, inciting fellow workers against Asians and using the racial card as a method of switching workers between two competing unions. I call on

any organisation that might use Mr Kalemba to advance its interests to reconsider.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise with a great deal of pleasure this afternoon to talk about a company in my electorate which has been so successful. The company in question, Krix Loud Speaker Systems, was recently successful in obtaining a \$1 million export contract to China. It has 95 per cent of all the theatre speaker system work in Australia, and only two weeks ago I was delighted when our Premier agreed to come down and open a \$1 million expansion to Krix Loud Speaker Systems at Hackham. Krix is the brainchild of Scott Krix, who about 20 years ago decided that there was a niche market for developing sophisticated speaker systems for theatres and other places, and he got on with the job quickly. From there, it has grown to be an extremely successful organisation now employing a considerable number of people, including five brothers and his mother and father who have recently bought shares in the company.

I congratulate Krix on the way that it has gone about its work and the way it is committed to South Australia and even more particularly to the southern region of our metropolitan area. This is just one of the many success stories that are occurring in our southern region virtually on a daily basis. In the Messenger Press, for example, a recent report from the Noarlunga City Council referred to record numbers of applications it had received for commercial and industrial developments in Lonsdale. One only has to drive through the Hackham industrial area to see the growth taking place there and to appreciate the number of jobs being created. I would like to commend to the Parliament all the companies in the Hackham area. Those small businesses now jointly employ over 800 people in that one area, and that is important for a region such as the southern region.

I do not for one minute deny that it is still difficult from time to time for small businesses in South Australia and Australia to operate, due not only to national and international trends but also to the debacle we had to encounter, both State and federally, from Labor Governments that were not supportive of business. The reason why small businesses are successful is that they are getting on with the job. They are committed to developing their business further, and they realise that the South Australian Government is committed to making sure that we support and enhance their businesses, whether it is keeping taxes and charges down to just a CPI level of increase or building urgent infrastructure such as the Southern Expressway, which has created 600 new jobs in the southern region—and that is only just a start. Once the first stage of that Southern Expressway is open to Panalatinga Road, on the northern end of my electorate, by about September or October 1997—which is only next year—we will start to see many more jobs emerging.

The other area in which we have seen a lot of growth is tourism, and I have already reported to the House on what our Government and the community, together with industry, are doing to build up those tourism links throughout the southern area. It just goes to prove that the Government is on the right track. We have to create a framework that will not only encourage new businesses to establish but also support, strengthen and further the development of existing businesses. Our Government is absolutely committed to creating the right climate for existing businesses, as well as for new business development. As a member of this Government, I stress the importance of the job that existing businesses are doing. Clearly, of course, we still have to encourage new

business to come in and, if we can achieve that and thereby create additional jobs, that will mean more dollars for our region and our State, and people will have more disposable income to spend as a result.

Recently, we have seen other businesses either establish or develop. We have seen major expansions of Mitsubishi, and Sealy International, which I know is on a growth curve, has recently established operations here. Whilst the retail sector generally in Australia has seen some decline this year, I am pleased to say that since Harris Scarfe has come into the Woodcroft Shopping Centre—in which I was pleased to have some input—I have had good reports from virtually all the retailers about much more activity and increased spending in that shopping complex. That shopping complex, which is now completed, has seen the creation of hundreds of jobs immediately, and I know that that involves a value add-on with other jobs such as cleaning and delivery services throughout the region.

To that end, I would like to also congratulate Mr Joe Hani, the developer of that complex, who has been absolutely committed to South Australia and in particular to the southern region. This is now the second shopping complex he has completed in our region.

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In Question Time today, I raised the matter of the imminent closure of the University of South Australia, Salisbury Campus. Yesterday, I attended a rally of students on the steps outside the Brooklyn building of the City East Campus, where the University Council was meeting to ratify that decision. It is a decision that will add to the social disadvantage of and mean less opportunity for residents in the north. It will be another barrier to people in the north pursuing careers in chosen fields, and it will add to a number of things that have recently happened to make life that much more difficult in the north. One of the reasons given for the announcement of the closure of the campus at the end of this year is the Howard Government's Federal funding cuts to the university. That comes on top of cuts, already announced, to a whole range of social and community services in the north which are hurting people in the northern region (the region I live in), and now access to our university at the Salisbury campus is being limited.

The existence of that campus in the north is probably not understood by many members of this Chamber. I am a student of the University of South Australia, and I have benefited greatly from the good education that has enabled me to have a fulfilling career. I take that message of the importance of education with me when I talk to school students in the northern suburbs, and I tell them that, even though I came from a family that was not rich, I was able to get an education and have a good career. Yet what they say to me is, 'People like us don't go to universities', and for the past year or so they have been pointing to the University of South Australia's Salisbury campus closure saying, 'They've taken our university away from us.' People in the north are already disadvantaged by the fact that, in addition to living in an area that is among those areas experiencing the highest rate of unemployment, they have definitely the lowest participation rate in higher education in this State. This is one of the largest council areas in the State.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms WHITE: The member for Ridley criticises the abilities of the people in the north, and I am one of those

people. I can guarantee him that I have more qualifications than he is ever likely to get.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Ridley to order. The member for Taylor has the floor.

Ms WHITE: The Liberals seem to be testy. I was prevented from reminding members present that in 1994 the Liberal Government refused to support the motion of the Opposition to keep the Salisbury campus open; they voted against that motion. Indeed, the Minister released a press statement to say that the university should not be criticised for its decision, that he had been assured that there would be no programs and that the university would remain open—that is, a university with no courses. There seems to be some doubt that this decision will harm people of the north, but it will. We have found that the promises that have been made to educate nurses and teachers in the north have not been kept. Those courses have been moved right away from the northern region; they will go to Magill, Underdale and to City East. Many students have said that they can afford to live in the Salisbury area near the Salisbury campus, which I remind members has had the highest number of local participants of any metropolitan university.

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

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I bring to the attention of the House a matter which I believe is a grave injustice to the students of Eyre Peninsula, that is, a reduction in music teaching positions. Just as there can be no music without learning, no education is complete without music. We must destroy once and for all the myth that music is somehow optional, a sort of icing on the curriculum cake. Since music was introduced as a subject into the school curriculum in the early 1970s, about 50 Port Lincoln High School students have gone on to make careers in music, while students from other schools on the Eyre Peninsula add to this number.

Vocations include the Air Force Band, South Australian Police Band, Navy Band, teachers in the Education Departments of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, private music teachers, professional musicians and bands. Mrs Judy Pearce, one of the first music teachers at Port Lincoln High School, mentioned a dyslexic boy who was a problem student and for whom music was his only success. He now earns a living through his career in music and has thanked Mrs Pearce for believing in him when no-one else did. But for music, this young man would probably have been on the scrap heap, unemployed and unemployable.

Music is basic not only to education but to humanity. This former student is a clear example that we must not concentrate on technology at the expense of things that define our humanity. Eyre Peninsula has a long history of producing local musicians of high standard. The isolation of the region means that visits by the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra or groups and individuals of this standard are few. In fact, visits can be counted in years per visit rather than visits per year.

For many years we were privileged to have the husband and wife team of Sally and Ian Drummond at Yeelanna. This talented couple taught piano and singing and, even though, because of their age, they stopped teaching in 1973, their influence is still being appreciated. One of their most outstanding students was Geraldine Hackett-Jones, a soprano, who achieved worldwide recognition as a professional singer. Eyre Peninsula Music Teachers Association members funded the Drummond Prize in honour of Mr and Mrs Drummond.

This annual competition, with sections for keyboard, instruments, group and vocals, has become a showcase for student talent.

The introduction of music as a curriculum subject in State schools brought to Eyre Peninsula residents the feeling that they were at last receiving some of the opportunities that had always been available to urban children in one form or another but had been denied them. Port Lincoln High School quickly gained a reputation for its music department, while the extension of music to area and primary schools brought renewed hope to many. For the first time, students in Central Eyre Peninsula were assured not only of music teaching but also of continuity of teaching.

Options for performance at the Port Lincoln High School include orchestra, concert band, jazz ensemble, choir, brass ensemble and the Nunga Band. The Port Lincoln High School band has entered the National Band Championships in Adelaide, has worked with the Elder Conservatorium Wind Ensemble, toured Victoria and has performed across South Australia, including many isolated schools and communities in its itinerary.

The Port Lincoln Jazz Ensemble has toured the State as well as performing in Perth and Sydney. Both groups have performed with Don Burrows and James Morrison. In March this year Don Burrows made this comment about the combined primary school band on Lower Eyre Peninsula:

I believe that you will be engagingly surprised by the repertoire of these 10 to 12 year old musicians. They are most worthy of recognition beyond their local community.

The Port Lincoln cooperative hub model involving all DECS schools in Port Lincoln and nearby country districts, including Cummins and Tumby Bay, was recognised as 'best practice model' in a DECS overview of all State schools in October 1994. Music is something that lasts a lifetime, whatever else people do with their learning.

The community of Eyre Peninsula is incensed at the cuts to music in their schools. I presented to the Minister for Education, the Hon. Rob Lucas, a petition bearing 2 168 signatures when he visited Port Lincoln on 31 May, and this gives some idea of the level of support for music. I ask for the restoration of the allocation of music teachers on Eyre Peninsula to the level that was applying in 1995, not only as a matter for social justice but also to honour a commitment that was made by the Premier. Music taught viaduct is, in my view, not an adequate substitute.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter that was raised by one of my constituents, Ms Wright, who wrote to me because she was extremely concerned about the cuts in funding to the Skillshare organisation, which is an issue of concern to her and many others for various reasons, some of which I will outline to the House. She wrote:

As a former Skillshare attendant, I am full of praise for the efforts of the people who run these courses and also for the people like myself who attended these courses with an attitude that I had not witnessed in many unemployed people before I commenced the course.

She had been unemployed for nine months and had no work skills and very little motivation to look for work as she really did not know how to go about it. It was then that Ms Wright began a Skillshare course. During the three month course she learnt to type and understand computers. In addition, the

course provided an active Job Search lesson thereby enabling her to apply for at least 10 jobs each week. Skillshare provided Ms Wright with the skills that she did not have before, and this enabled her eventually to gain full-time employment. Further in her letter she said:

I think that if the funding is cut it is stopping the transition from many unskilled, unmotivated, unemployed people to people with skills, focus and a desire to achieve. It will hurt a lot of people and hinder a lot of people's attempts to join these programs to get new skills as it will affect the placements more than anything else.

I was quite moved when I read her letter but I was also angered because of the way the Brown Government and Minister Such are dealing with the funding cuts. In fact, Minister Such said on 5AN on 25 June:

The people affected should direct their complaints to the Federal Minister. We cannot, as a State Government, always be there to protect the Federal Government.

No doubt the remaining Government members are also telling their constituents to go and tell the Federal Minister, and I think that that is outrageous. I cannot understand how this Government, on the one hand, can acknowledge that these programs help the unemployed and, on the other hand, fail to take this matter to the Federal Government and argue for the continuation of existing funds.

It appears that the Brown Government will not stand up for South Australia's unemployed if it means tackling its Federal Liberal mates in Canberra. I think, once again, that this demonstrates that Liberal Governments are not truly concerned about the people of this State. As for my constituent, Ms Wright understands the importance of this funding and the impact on our unemployed if it is cut. I say, as she has said to me, that it is about time the Brown Government got stuck into the Federal Government on behalf of all of those in this State who are unemployed.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): On 4 May 1994 in a speech in this place I made allegations about members of the Karidis family, in particular Mr Gerry Karidis and Mr Don Karidis and their relationship with the ALP. I have since been informed that Mr Gerry Karidis and Mr Don Karidis are not and have not been members of the Labor Party, and I accept that. I withdraw my allegation about their membership of the Labor Party and apologise to Mr Gerry Karidis and Mr Don Karidis and their family members.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF TRIBUNALS) BILL

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 7.30 p.m., at which it would be represented by Messrs Atkinson, S.J. Baker, De Laine, Lewis and Wade.

APPROPRIATION BILL

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

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

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

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

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

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

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): It was my good fortune to be involved in the Estimates Committee questioning of the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. Today I want to outline further to members some of the points made by the Minister in relation to establishing business in South Australia.

The Minister's response to a question about the competitiveness of the South Australian economy is worth quoting, especially for the benefit of the member for Ross Smith, who attended very late in the day, was extremely negative and, I assume, cannot have heard the many positives that we have going for us in this State. The Minister said:

In manufacturing and communication Adelaide, as a location, provides a 20 per cent cost advantage compared to Melbourne and Sydney. In the services sector, Adelaide offers a cost advantage of 30 per cent over Melbourne and 49 per cent over Sydney, with escalating costs of operation, rents and so on.

A recent survey on the level of rents showed that those renting in Sydney paid about half the average weekly earnings in New South Wales for average priced accommodation in Sydney. That means that it takes half of one's salary to put a roof over one's head in Sydney. The Minister also stated:

In connection with the escalating costs on the eastern seaboard, late last year Fortune 500 clearly identified that the growth cities in the United States are the lifestyle cities, not New York, Chicago and similar cities.

Clearly, people are looking for quality of life, freedom to get around the city, open roads and streets. Herein lies South Australia's greatest opportunity for success.

The continual negative carping of the Opposition is very tiresome. Through extremely hard work, the Brown Government has turned the tide. To illustrate best how industry perceives this progress, I wish to quote from the *Advertiser* of 1 July. I refer to page 31 for those who have not read what Mr Anthony Toop had to say about 'Accentuating the Positives.' Last year, Mr Toop's company, Toop and Toop Real Estate, won acclaim as the winner of the National Award for Small Business from the Australian Customer Service Association. To understand how to maintain a successful business, Mr Toop recently toured California. Arriving back in Adelaide, Mr Toop said:

We are often so engrossed in our work we lose sight of the enormous success around us. The problem in SA is that success is treated like a disease by so many.

We have success stories all around us—we have the cheapest business manufacturing environment, the cleanest air, the prettiest city, nationally we are strategically located in the most central position, we have the best lifestyle, a comparatively low cost of living (even the wine is cheap), attractive homes and it's easy to get about. . . Just watch the wheel as it turns. I've seen it all before.

Adelaide is the lifestyle city. It's Australia's best kept secret, waiting to be rediscovered.

My electorate is in a rural area, and it may be of note to members that generally there is a greater consistency of work ethic and less turnover of staff in country areas than in the metropolitan area. The lifestyles available on both Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula are often of the kind that most people can only dream about, with pristine beaches, clean air, pure water and abundant fish. The cost of operating in country areas in many instances is lower than in the metropolitan area.

The huge quantity and value of our primary industries are often not appreciated. Eyre Peninsula alone, according to the last census, produces per annum 33 per cent of South Australia's grain harvest, 65 per cent of its seafood harvest and 12 per cent of its livestock harvest. That is a value of \$198 million for wheat, \$76 million for barley and oats, \$75 million for wool and lamb and \$13 million for livestock. Some 90 per cent of cereal grain is exported. In seafood it produces \$70 million for tuna, \$20 million for prawns, \$24 million for abalone, \$20 million for cultivated abalone, \$21 million for rock lobster and \$4 million for oysters. About 80 per cent of seafood production is exported. In addition, Eyre Peninsula has 75 per cent of Australia's production of gypsum and 90 per cent of the world supply of black jade. The total value for agriculture is \$362 million and for seafood it is \$155 million.

I want to comment on the development of the aquaculture industry. I will not highlight any specific area or development funding, except to mention one important project which will provide new entrants to the local aquaculture industry with a range of handbooks fully explaining all the operations of the industry that they are interested in or intend to develop.

As mentioned earlier, recent improvements in the business climate now make South Australia one of the more cost-competitive locations in which to carry out business. This has been achieved by a rigorous approach to public sector reform and the corporatisation of major Government trading enterprises such as ETSA and SA Water. The sale of commercial business assets, including the State Bank, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, SGIC and others, has resulted in asset sales bringing in \$1.6 billion.

The Government has sought to not only maximise the financial benefits for the State from the asset sales but to achieve economic development benefits. This Government is all about providing real benefits to the State's 64 000 small businesses. Over the past 17 months about 140 South Australian companies were involved in trade delegations. In line with the Government's focus on promoting regional development, a further \$750 000 will be provided to support the State's 15 regional development boards. In addition, funding will be used to continue the employment of business advisers. A mechanism has been put in place so that a business adviser is available for every regional board in South Australia.

Before I continue, I will comment on the performance of United Water, especially in respect of the range of health related aesthetic water quality targets specified in the agreement. I was delighted to hear the Minister report that United Water has equalled or exceeded South Australia's

performance for those subject areas over the 12-month period of the outsourcing contract. United Water has undertaken prompt and remedial action in respect of any water quality problem. It has also introduced several new initiatives to improve the quality of the water supply to customers. If we are to remain competitive in the world, research and development are critical areas. I was delighted to learn that Thames and CGE have each committed \$500 000 to research and development. They have met a commitment to spend \$1 million on research and development in the first year. United Water's Research and Development Manager arrived in Adelaide in January to work full-time in the research and development effort.

I also refer to the improvements in waste water treatment. In responding to questions, the Minister outlined how he went diving in the Gulf prior to the 1989 election to demonstrate how the former Labor Government did nothing to clean up the marine environment. Unfortunately, in 1989 the neglect continued with another four years of inaction. The Brown Government was elected in 1993 and within two years had announced a \$150 million project to clean up a problem which the Minister identified in 1989. We are ahead of every other State in Australia in meeting the requirements of the EPA in terms of waste water quality.

As a result of the Government's commitment to clean up the waste water being released into the ocean, 80 per cent of the phosphorus and 80 per cent of nitrates will be removed from our waste water. When we sell our aquaculture products we will be able to say to the Asian market place that South Australia is the only State in Australia that has a clean, green, friendly environment for aquaculture products.

Mr BECKER (Peake): Again, I must report to the House my disappointment at the Opposition's use of the Estimates Committees.

An honourable member: Misuse!

Mr BECKER: In some respects, yes, but I do not think it took full advantage of the opportunity presented. When I first entered this place many years ago, we dealt with the budget line by line for several days well into the early hours of the morning. The Budget Estimates is the best system I am aware of anywhere in the Commonwealth parliamentary system.

I recently had the opportunity to attend a conference in Hong Kong, and one of the issues was accountability to Parliament and the systems and methods used by the various Parliaments. I undertook to draft a paper setting out what I consider to be the best system. I honestly believe that our system is the best. I am not aware of another system where one has the opportunity to debate the budget and then have seven days for Budget Estimates A and six days for Budget Estimates B: a total of 13 sitting days to examine the 13 ministerial portfolios. In effect, one has from 11 a.m., excluding meal times, to 10 p.m. to scrutinise the operations of each Minister and his or her various portfolios. The Opposition—particularly a depleted Opposition such as we have—should take every opportunity to ascertain exactly what the Government is doing and what it proposes to do.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Morphett interjects, it is depleted because no-one is there. As far as the operations of government in this State are concerned, no-one may as well be there, because the Opposition is totally ineffective, totally unprepared and totally bereft of any ability and/or enthusiasm to do its homework. I found the performance of

the shadow Ministers wanting. Very few shadow Ministers in the Opposition did any work preparing questions and briefing their House of Assembly colleagues so that the Ministers could be examined effectively.

I noted in the *Advertiser* on Saturday that the political journalist, Greg Kelton, suggested that members of another place, as well as House of Assembly members, should have the opportunity to attend Budget Estimates. I would not like to see that. The other place is commonly referred to as a House of review. Some prefer it to be known as a committee House. Therefore, it must have and should have a different system of examining the budget. At the same time, its members may well have to justify the expenditure of their House. If it is to be a House of obstruction to this Government's or any other Government's carrying out its elected promises, the Government of the day and the major political Parties should review the operation and the necessity of the House of review.

Fortunately, under our constitutional system, another place cannot amend the budget. That is probably the greatest plus we have under our system in that the budget, once it is introduced, cannot be amended by another House of the Parliament which may take an obstructionist or political point of view. We do not have the situation which exists in Canberra or in other Parliaments whereby a very small minority can turn the budget right around and deny the Government the opportunity to introduce economic policy which it believes provides a better alternative.

However, this Government has to live with that situation and do the best it can to improve South Australia's economy. I believe the Government is doing a very good job. There is about \$5 billion of new works, new opportunities and new businesses looking to establish themselves in South Australia. Some businesses are starting to establish in South Australia. For the first time, about \$19 million in Government capital works will be spent in my electorate, the reasonably new electorate of Peake. My old electorate of Hanson was never given very much money, if any, to improve anything at all. But on this occasion, as in previous years, several million dollars will be spent in the electorate of Peake. Alterations and improvements to the city end of Henley Beach Road are beginning. I can only add to the comments I made the other day with respect to the Thebarton Main Street Association in that Henley Beach Road is starting to come alive. It is starting to look as though it is an important thoroughfare into the city and into the suburbs of Mile End, Thebarton and Torrensville. Work will continue on road widening and the undergrounding of electricity cables, and streetscaping arranged by the Main Street Association will enhance the outlook and create a much greater impact of a cosmopolitan city.

In line with the development that has been undertaken already and the encouragement given to the local Thebarton council and the West Torrens council and, more importantly, the general encouragement given to the business community by my Government, several new business ventures have commenced, several new restaurants have been opened, and several specialist shops are coming into the area. This is changing the whole face of Henley Beach Road in that location from a trading point of view. We do not want to copy The Parade at Norwood or Unley or any of the eastern suburbs, because we in the western suburbs have a much better and more pleasant lifestyle. We believe that we can establish our own identity while supporting what has been done in the past, maintaining the historical impact of the area, giving it a modern facelift, and generally improving oppor-

tunities for those who wish to establish or increase business and those who want to make the best of the opportunities that are now available.

The Government is to be commended for what it has done and is doing with little publicity or support from the media. We on our side of town do not expect that support. We believe that the *Advertiser* and the Messenger Press are quite parochial in their own little areas of reporting ability and general editorial interest. If it were not for the Crows football team I do not know what the sporting pages in the *Advertiser* would be like. As I have said on many occasions and as I said 12 months ago, I am getting a little tired of reading about the Crows football team. Had the media left it alone and let the new coach and the players establish their own game and style, the team would be a lot more successful than it is at present. I think the media has a case to answer for its treatment of the State's only football team in the national football league at present. It was a wonderful move for South Australia and Australian football, but the media must learn that it is possible to overdo things. We can create tall poppies, but the media loves to chop them down: it is a great Australian pastime. I think it is a shame.

The addition next season of the Port Adelaide football team to the national league is also a wonderful venture and a great plus for South Australia and Australian Rules football. When you look at where it is domiciled—again, in the western suburbs, in an area that traditionally involves having to get up and do it and battle for yourself—it will be an extremely successful team. We wish it all the best and much success.

It is not just sport or the effort of a few individual football teams that makes a State. We need the media to encourage development. Our educational institutions, particularly the Thebarton campus of the University of Adelaide, are achieving much without fanfare or hullabaloo. The opportunity is being given to many graduates to establish themselves in business at minimal cost to the taxpayer. They are doing some wonderful things: let us hear about the good news stories, and they will continue to be the quiet achievers within that campus. The University of South Australia's Underdale campus is also achieving wonderful results without fanfare or publicity.

My Government is not the type of Government that we have seen in this State in the past during the glorious Dunstan years when, every time \$1 000 was spent, we had fanfare, tea and biscuits, huge openings, and brass plaques all over the State. This Government has been getting on with the job. It really annoys me when retired politicians, former Premiers of this State, once they lose government, quit. Most of them have left the State political scene altogether. But there is one who hangs on, and that is dear old Don Dunstan. I have said it before and I will say it again: I wish DD would give it away. He has a restaurant at North Adelaide, and he ought to concentrate on that. He is being used all over the place to jump up and down, criticise and berate the very person who, as he said in his own words during the mid-1970s, was the only person who had any potential for being a future leader of South Australia—and he named the present Premier.

Dunstan was full of praise for the ability of Dean Brown and the potential he showed for politics in South Australia. Yet, that very person, a retired Premier of this State, is now running around creating mischief whether it be writing for the *Adelaide Review* or attending a populist platform. I have yet to see him take a stand on something that is not seen as a great populist issue. We must refer to him now as an old man

who is creating mischief by trying to sabotage the operations of this Government. My personal advice to Don Dunstan is: slide away quietly and leave the politics to the younger generation. That is exactly what I intend to do. There comes a time in life when you must face the fact that you have reached a certain stage when it is far better to let the younger or new generations have a go and give them the opportunity to make a worthwhile and positive contribution to the State. And they will do it.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I must agree with the comment of the member for Morphett: the Opposition, having to trot out dear old DD to back and support them and come up with ideas and criticise the Government, shows how bereft it is of talent. As the member for Morphett knows, one of our colleagues made the statement the other day that the future Labor Premier of South Australia has not yet been born. That is good news from my point of view, because it means there will never be another Labor Premier during my lifetime. I hope that is what will happen as far as the Liberal Party is concerned.

Returning to the budget estimates, as I said, the Opposition missed a wonderful opportunity, and the people of South Australia were let down badly, because there was a lot of good news and many good stories in the budget about which the Ministers have not yet had the opportunity to advise the public and let the people of South Australia know what the Government plans to do. One of those stories which concerns me personally is the announcement last Friday that Adelaide will bid for the 2006 Commonwealth Games. The biggest hurdle is overcoming the bids from Melbourne, Darwin, Perth and Brisbane.

I am surprised that Perth has bid again, because I was involved in the previous bid when I represented the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Dale Baker). Carmen Lawrence put on one of the worst performances by a defeated Premier that I have seen in my life. It is no wonder that she has been tangled up in all the controversies of late, but South Australia won the right to bid for the 1998 Commonwealth Games by defeating Western Australia 18 votes to 2. We knew those two votes would go to Perth because Bowls Australia had indicated that, whichever city was awarded the World Lawn Bowls Championships (either Perth or Adelaide), it would support the other city in its Commonwealth Games bid. Adelaide was awarded the World Lawn Bowls Championships which, in my opinion, was a superb event. Cost wise, the event was economical and I believe it made a very small profit. Perth had no chance.

Why Melbourne would want to bid for a Commonwealth Games in 2006, at the same time as it holds the Australian Grand Prix and its festival, is beyond me. To say that, weather wise, it is the best time of the year in Melbourne is a little questionable, whereas we know that Adelaide does not have the air pollution or any of Melbourne's problems. From an athletics point of view, Adelaide is an ideal city: it is clean and clear and provides the best opportunities for Commonwealth athletes. Darwin is a new city bidding. I can understand why, because the Oceania area is extremely important not only to Australia but also to Darwin. In some respects, the Oceania people look to Darwin as the first important point of entry to Australia, and one can understand why Darwin would want to be involved.

Brisbane has already hosted the games and has done little since, so I see no reason why it should again be given that opportunity. I believe that Brisbane's bid is more of a mischief bid than anything else, but it is interesting that

another Liberal Government is involved. All the Liberal Governments of Australia are competing against each other for the right to represent Australia in a bid for the Commonwealth Games. I hope Adelaide wins the bid, and I believe we should give Adelaide every support.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Both the honourable member and Kym Mayes did a very good job with the last bid.

Mr BECKER: We put a lot of work into it, doing a lot of work on the side to extend and create a friendship in Africa. I hope we can continue to do that by offering sporting scholarships to the African countries and other developing countries and that we continue to collect used books or anything else of need to these countries. It should have been something that was occurring on an ongoing basis.

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): This budget is what I said it was a few weeks ago: this budget is a phoney and the claim of an extra \$150 million for schools and hospitals is a sham. Not only does the budget not restore the cuts previously made to these critical areas but it delivers yet more cuts to the police, to correctional services and to TAFE. This budget has been a hoax. The claims of extra money for schools and hospitals have not survived the COAG meeting and will not survive the first Howard-Costello budget.

The Premier initially claimed that he had a deal with John Howard that would see this State right: the Commonwealth would cut its own cloth and not harm payment to the States. In fact, Dean Brown, the Premier, was in there urging the sort of savage expenditure cuts he has carried out in South Australia. The Premier claimed to have a special arrangement with John Howard to maintain general purpose payments: he had one with Paul Keating for the two years he spent complaining about the fact that Labor would not slash and burn. The Premier brought down a budget that was fraudulent, knowing that there would be large cuts to State grants, and knowing, by his own foolish sooling on of these cuts, that he could not complain about them when they occurred. South Australia has been treated to a remarkable pantomime, starring the Premier.

While everyone was yelling out to the Premier that John Howard was standing behind him with a very big stick, our Premier responded by saying, 'Oh, no, he is not.' He refused to see the train coming, as we have said, and the train is starting to roll all over him. But the outcome of the Premier's advocacy on behalf of this State at the COAG is that the general payments to the States are to be cut by over \$1.5 billion over the next three years with specific purpose payments cut by \$320 million this year alone. Basic services—health and education—despite claims of some quarantining, will all suffer. The Premier is prepared to admit that this means a cut to revenues to this State of \$83 million this year.

We in the Opposition believe the real figure could be substantially higher. We have been subjected to this farcical budget and this farcical session of budget estimates in which time and again senior Ministers have been unable to answer basic and major questions about their own portfolio areas. When asked about the effect of the Federal cuts on hospitals, the Minister for Health said, 'I am unable to give an answer and will not bother. The information is unavailable.' The Minister for Family and Community Services told the Estimates Committee that he could give 'no commitment'

that State funding for the Home and Community Care program would remain as claimed in the budget.

Our erudite Treasurer told the Estimates Committee that the Government would handle the cuts with difficulty and that the Government was looking at all options. Finally, our Education Minister, Rob Lucas, told us what he knew about the effect of the cuts on education. He said:

I am not sure how that will affect general purpose grants. I am not in a position to guarantee anything. As the Minister, I am not in a position to guarantee that until the Commonwealth budget comes down.

The Parliament is being expected to vote appropriation for a budget that is already dead in the water. Senior Ministers cannot answer the most basic and fundamental questions about their own budgets. Most of all, when the Government drew up its budget, it knew that this was exactly the farcical situation into which this Government would be putting the Parliament and the people of South Australia. It has been a copy-book performance in cynicism.

The claim of an extra \$150 million in spending on health and education is utterly false: it is a complete fraud. Not content with having engineered one debacle for this State with John Howard and Peter Costello, the Premier went about doing what he does best—organising another debacle. On 21 June, the day of release of the National Commission of Audit, the Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as hailing the report. The Premier stated:

Billions of dollars will be saved by adopting its recommendations and cutting duplication of the State and Federal services.

The Premier further stated that the report's recommendations provide 'the best opportunity to achieve fundamental reform of Commonwealth-State relations since Federation in 1901'. Where is this Premier? Is he in dreamland? One wonders whether the Premier had read any of the report at all before he hailed it. I am told that he got the press release about the Audit Commission report and then went on radio and was interviewed before he had even read the report.

Precisely what recommendations of the Audit Commission report does the Premier hail? Does he hail the promise to hand over health to the States, provided they cop a 10 per cent cut? Does he hail the delineation of the State's education role to primary, pre-school and secondary education, once again presumably with a 10 per cent cut for all functions transferred? Does he hail moving post secondary education funding to a scholarships basis? Does he hail the withdrawal of subsidies from publicly funded child-care centres? Does the Premier hail the movement of family services to the States, again with a 10 per cent cut built in? Does the Premier hail the abolition of the regional development program? Does he hail the reduction of the value of specific purpose payments? Does he hail the introduction of means tested entry fees for aged care accommodation?

Does the Premier hail the abolition or cutting of the export market development grant scheme, or cuts to or abolition of the taxation concession for industrial research and development? Does he hail means tested co-payments for Medicare and the pharmaceutical benefits scheme? Does he support the cuts to pensions? If not, just what in the Audit Commission report does the Premier support? What does he hail? When this Premier speaks on State-Commonwealth relations and how South Australia is benefiting from a Commonwealth Liberal Government, he has no credibility whatsoever. He has no credibility, because he has no clout with John Howard. That was shown in the statements he made before the Federal election when he said he had this special deal with John

Howard—no cuts. We saw the special deal repeated again after the Federal election. When the Premier speaks of having brought down a caring budget, he is not to be believed and, increasingly, South Australians are disbelieving.

I also want to talk about our very strong support—which I know you have, Mr Acting Speaker—for the police in this State. We have an outstanding Police Force in South Australia. We have had one for many years, and it must be preserved at all costs. We cannot continue to see the erosion of resources and personnel in the Police Force in South Australia. Last year or the year before I was pleased to hear the Police Commissioner, David Hunt, announce that in fact Operation Titan was being launched to combat criminal gangs operating here in South Australia. Today, in supporting David Hunt in his work, I want to criticise a court decision by the Federal Court of Australia to scrap a special investigation and to water down that investigation by the NCA into organised crime involving bikie gangs around the nation.

Last Wednesday, a Federal Court judge ruled against the NCA and dealt that probe into organised crime through bikie gangs a mortal blow. The judge found that the terms of reference for the NCA's gang probe gave the NCA excessive powers. I remind the House that in May last year the NCA launched a major investigation into suspected activities involving motor cycle gangs, including 'murder, drug trafficking, arms deals, extortion, fraud and tax evasion'. The NCA probe had special powers greater than those available to the police, and the investigation was due to report by June 1997. Those special powers, in addition to normal police powers, have now been nobbled and completely stripped away by a Federal Court judge.

Across the Tasman it is quite clear from looking at evidence released in the last two weeks that the axing of the NCA probe in Australia is a complete disaster for the fight against organised crime in Australia. Just a few weeks ago the New Zealand Police Commissioner told a special parliamentary inquiry that, unless concerted action is taken against gangs with Australian links, they would become so powerful as to be 'untouchable'. When we talk about gangs, too often we think about hoons on motor bikes. Instead, it is quite clear that many gangs in Australia, as well as New Zealand, have become crime syndicates. Gangs are involved in drug manufacture, particularly the manufacture of amphetamines, and drug dealing, drug distribution, prostitution, extortion and the intimidation of witnesses. Drugs are a huge business in both Australia and New Zealand, and apparently drug supermarkets flourish as gang headquarters.

The latest New Zealand evidence shows that gangs with links to Australian cities, including Adelaide and Mount Gambier, provide a disciplined local management structure for organised crime. These gangs build up loyalty and discipline to the extent that members even welcome imprisonment and they organise their gangs in prison. It is part of the initiation and promotion process—an initiation process that also includes rape. Some gangs are based in fortified houses. Many gang members provide the necessary muscle for the drug enforcement business. They are also the distributors for organised criminals. These gangs have to be broken up, and the NCA needs wider powers and extra resources to do the job and to assist the South Australian police in what they are doing.

Certainly, the last thing that the campaign against organised crime and drug dealing by motor bike gangs needs is a Federal Court decision that hobbles and nobbles the power of the NCA in its probe. Many of the gangs are

multinational in character. Some originate in the US and have chapters in Australia and South Australia. Adelaide links were mentioned in a New Zealand police report into crime gangs released last week, and I will quote from that in a minute.

Violence, drug dealing and prostitution are being franchised like any other multinational business, and we have to ensure that our laws and law enforcement agencies in Australia keep pace with the changing nature of gang-based organised crime, much of which is linked to similar activities in the United States, which is head office to these organisations based in Australia, including Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide, as well as various New Zealand cities. South Australia has been hit twice. Not only has the NCA gang probe been effectively and substantially weakened by having these special powers stripped away, but in South Australia the NCA staff has been cut by the Federal Howard Government from 33 to 10, and NCA police officers and investigative accountants and lawyers have been cut from the Adelaide office, even though it was the scene of a terrible bombing that took the life of Detective Sergeant Bowen. Certainly, the Federal Court's decision to cut NCA powers is a disaster in the fight against gangs, organised crime and the fight against drug dealing in South Australia and beyond.

I now want to read some excerpts affecting South Australia from the restricted document 'A Preliminary Report on the Bandidos Motor Cycle Club Merging with the New Zealand Highway 61 Motor Cycle Club' leaked last week in New Zealand and prepared by Detective McGhie of the Organised Crime Unit of the New Zealand Police. Interestingly, in the introduction it states:

During '93 there was a move in the international motor cycle gang world to consolidate national and international gang empires and to drastically reduce the number of outlaw motor gangs proliferating world-wide.

It states:

This [move] began in America where most motor cycle initiatives appear to begin, and through the reaches of the empire of the strong gangs, such as the Hell's Angels and Outlaws, spread to Europe through their associated chapters and affiliated groups, and then to other countries of the world.

It continues:

The reasoning behind the activity was to limit and control the amount of competition for the shrinking dollar in the illicit trading arena such as the drugs market, and to strengthen the financial position of the major corporation players.

It states, referring to competition:

... where minor gang entities exist, they were either to be chartered—

taken over—

or absorbed by takeover, or eliminated completely, often through extreme violence, [including] homicide through shootings and bombings.

In terms of the Australian trend it goes on:

In early 1994, following the world trend, there was a meeting in Sydney, Australia, between the major gangs where it was decided informally that the gangs in that country would adopt a similar stance to that already being set up by the rest of the [multinational] gang business world-wide.

It was agreed in principle:

There would be a maximum of six gangs controlling Australia by the year 2000, hence the name of the project being dubbed 'the Australia 2000 Pact' by law enforcement and the gangs alike.

The six gangs were agreed to be the Hell's Angels, Outlaws, Bandidos, Rebels, Black Uhlans and Nomads motor cycle gangs. The report goes on to say:

In Adelaide city early this year, there were major confrontations and shootings in the crowded city centre itself. By way of reaction the South Australian police has formed a task force, Operation Titan, in an attempt to resolve the issues and to try to eliminate the organised crime and violence that has manifested in that region as a consequence of the struggle between the new organisations.

I am quoting directly from this New Zealand police report, which also states:

In late '94 the Highway 61 New Zealand [group] had chapters in Whangarei, Auckland, Rotorua, Hastings, Wellington, Christchurch, Sydney and Adelaide and had close affiliations to the Tribesmen and Huhus and other motor cycle clubs.

Again, it talks about the Australian and New Zealand links. It seems quite clear that the evidence before the New Zealand parliamentary inquiry is terrifying for Australia. It shows that the problem has evolved into sinister organised crime, where overseas gangs are seeking a share of the lucrative New Zealand market for drugs and prostitution. The Police Commissioner has told the inquiry that New Zealand has only five years to win the battle against gangs or they will become untouchable. This is some of the evidence that they have heard in New Zealand. Triads have let contracts out to assassinate New Zealand police members. Triads are in New Zealand prisons and employ New Zealand gangs to protect them. The report that I mention, from the Police Intelligence Unit, confirms the potential for further gang warfare as this American-Australian gang seeks to extend its power and drugs market in New Zealand, and this proves just how much of the market the gangs already control in that country.

The report goes on to say that gangs have been involved in extortion and protection rackets, as well as illegal debt collecting. It states that 40 per cent of non-domestic murders in New Zealand are gang related and that New Zealand gangs have been caught with and are trading in illegal weapons and that they have ties to Australian gangs involved in trading with and selling illegal weapons. Further, it states that there have been drive-by shootings in New Zealand cities involving gangs and that the gangs there have been involved in producing counterfeit cash and credit cards. It states that 80 per cent of drugs in New Zealand are retailed by gang members, and school children have been involved. According to the report, police in New Zealand say that up to 10 000 individuals are gang members or associates and that gangs have become stronger despite taxpayer handouts through the various Government agencies over the years.

The report states that gangs have been involved in the production of illegal chemical drugs, that New Zealand is used as a transshipment statement for drugs because of its clean image to places such as Australia, and that large sums of cash have been found at gang headquarters raided by the police. It states that the provincial police strategy of containment is no longer sufficient, and that the arrogance and influence of the gangs is such that last week the gangs refused a police summons to attend a select committee hearing and even wrote to the chairperson of the select committee demanding the dismissal of a committee member for bias—this is a gang leader, writing and calling for the sacking of a parliamentary committee member. The gangs are trying with some success in New Zealand to dictate who serves on a parliamentary select committee.

Ministers in the New Zealand Parliament have confessed that no records are kept of how much taxpayers pay out to

gangs, and so on. Information from Government departments such as inland revenue and customs and immigration prove that there is little coordination and sharing of information. Indeed, the police told the committee how they raided a farmhouse where gangs were processing drugs using a wool press and found a tonne of marijuana. Also, documents were found showing that Inland Revenue was investigating the same group.

The report then goes on to say that the international drug business is estimated at over \$1 000 billion annually—\$1 000 billion, which is equal to the world trade in oil. From the New Zealand evidence, it is quite clear that the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States and New Zealand cannot just rely on normal policing methods. They are not effective in a world where crime has become organised and globalised, and where gangs have become the expendable foot soldiers who manage the drug franchise.

I have been talking about New Zealand evidence, but this frightening New Zealand inquiry about drug dealing and manufacture is constantly talking about those organisations being affiliates of gangs in Australia and in Adelaide. That is why we need an effective NCA with extra powers to break up gangs that are being mentioned in an overseas inquiry as having clear links in Adelaide and Mount Gambier. We have to be vigilant, because they are carving up the territory, carving it up among themselves, to manufacture drugs for sale to children and others.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Leader's time has expired. The member for Lee.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I support the Appropriation Bill. It never ceases to amaze me that the Leader of the Opposition's contributions to a debate frequently involve crime. During the years the Labor Party was in power, it was slack in the policing of criminals in this State and in passing laws to control crime in South Australia. I firmly believe that crime starts during a person's childhood and develops as the person gets older, if that person happens to have grown up in a bad environment. The previous Labor Government did nothing to control these tendencies among children in primary schools, high schools and then, of course, through the criminal justice system. The Labor Party has always given discounts to prisoners for the time they have to spend in gaol, and it has always enticed judges to give bonds instead of imposing harsher penalties. I am lost for words as to how the Leader of the Opposition can criticise the Brown Liberal Government with regard to what it is doing and has tried to do over the past 2½ years.

I enjoyed attending the Estimates Committee. I refer to *Hansard* of 21 June 1996 (page 134). The *City Messenger*, in an Alex Kennedy article, said that I was criticising the previous Liberal Minister (Mr John Oswald) for my comments. However, in my time in Estimates Committee A, the performance of that Minister was never mentioned. However, what was mentioned was the performance of a previous Labor Minister (Mr Crafter) in connection with the East End project, which was the subject of one of my previous questions. I used to go along North Terrace and Payneham Road out to Marden nearly every day and recall when the East End Market debate was in progress. Having closely observed what went on under both Labor and Liberal Governments, I point out that it was not until the Liberal Government came to power, under Minister Oswald, that progress started on upgrading the facade of the East End Market.

I refer members to an article of 24 June 1995, stating that the blame for the blow-out of two deals hurriedly signed just before the last State election lay between the Labor Government and two private developers. The newspaper article states:

Mr Oswald told the budget Estimates Committee his predecessor Mr Greg Crafter ignored the advice of Treasury and the Crown Law Office not to sign the deals. He said Mr Crafter signed the deals with private development companies Mancorp and the Liberman group, despite being told that the deals were not in the best interests of taxpayers and required further negotiations.

I know about the matter to which that article refers, and I also know, from personal experience working for the EWS, how the Labor Ministers did not do their homework or investigate situations properly, and that they were thoroughly incompetent. As a typical example, the article states:

As a result, the State Government has spent more than a year trying to find a solution, and the only option was to inject \$6.4 million into the area.

At that time Mr Oswald also said that it was likely that the Government would also have to spend \$4 million on a new car park at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to solve the parking problem in the area. At that time my wife was working in the IMVS section at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and she regularly told me about the problems that were occurring at the East End Market. I stress that I never referred to a Liberal Government Minister as being incompetent. I have been on the local government committee and I never had a cross word with the then Minister, Mr Oswald; nor have I ever had a cross word with the present Minister, Mr Scott Ashenden. I am happy to clear up that matter.

The progress that the Local Government Minister has made with respect to council amalgamations and encouraging councils to talk to each other for the benefit of ratepayers and the cheaper service provided to the community in the long term is to be commended. The member for Ross Smith came into that Estimates Committee and took away the responsibility of the acting shadow Minister, the member for Napier, when he asked questions of the Minister, because, in my opinion, he felt that the shadow Minister was not doing a good enough job.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: The member for Ross Smith can comment on my observation if he wishes. I also noticed that Labor members did not ask intelligent questions of the Minister, and I felt that some of them were simply keeping the seat warm—

Mr Clarke: Coming from you, Joe, that's pretty rich.

Mr ROSSI: Well, I ask the Deputy Leader to tell me how many members opposite participated in asking questions. Some were there simply to make up the numbers and did not ask any questions. I do not think that it is good enough for an Opposition to keep—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROSSI: I am pleased about the way the Liberal Government has looked after the seat of Lee with respect to current and intended works. A lot of work is being done to upgrade the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is just across the road from my electorate—and this work was not carried out during the 14 years of the Labor Government. Seaton High School is being upgraded; funds have been given to local communities for senior citizens, and that is greatly appreciated; money is being spent on the Seaton Railway Station platform, which was in a very dangerous condition with sagging and rotten wood supporting the platform. Now

it is in A1 condition after having had concrete poured to create an extremely good surface.

I praise the Minister for Transport who has cooperated with me in looking after the electorate I represent. She has been cooperative in respect of traffic lights and every other request I have made of her. Of course, there is one continuing problem which the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is handling, that is, the sand replenishment program for the Tennyson and Semaphore Park foreshores. However, I believe that during the next 12 months this problem will be solved or a plan will be drawn up to manage sand replenishment along the foreshores in my electorate. I support the Bill.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In so far as the Estimates Committees are concerned, I want to concentrate on the industrial affairs line of the budget, in particular what we found out and, more particularly, what we did not find out from the Minister as to this Government's position with respect to the most fundamental of changes to Australia's industrial relations system since 1904. On a number of occasions during the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister what this Government's position was with respect to maintaining in our State industrial relations system the role of the Industrial Relations Commission and its oversighting of all enterprise agreements before they became legally enforceable, the retention of the 'no disadvantage' test and, in particular, the maintenance of paid rates awards. Those matters are a few of a whole host of many important issues surrounding industrial relations not only at State level but also at national level.

Much to my shock, last Wednesday the Minister had the gall to say, in so far as the South Australian Government's position was known at that time as regards the Federal Howard Government's proposals on industrial relations, that a submission to the Senate inquiry was being formulated by his department but that he did not know what it was, he had not read it and that it would not be on his desk until Thursday (the next day), when in fact submissions closed for the Senate on Friday 28 June. I found that somewhat appalling because, obviously, the Minister's department was operating in a policy vacuum where the Minister was not in charge of his department and the Chief Executive Officer, formerly of the Employers Federation of South Australia, was drafting the Government's instructions in this area.

However, today the Premier inadvertently gave the game away in so far as the Liberal Government's position is concerned: he said that he supported, in totality, the Howard Government's industrial legislation—and we can deduce from that and expect, given the Minister's and the Premier's statements about wanting to harmonise industrial relations at State and Federal level, that legislation will be introduced in this State along the lines of that introduced by Mr Reith. In other words, the Government will take away from the Industrial Relations Commission in this State the right to oversight enterprise agreements, delete any reference to the 'no disadvantage' test and outlaw paid rates awards which affects tens of thousands of State public servants, from teachers and nurses to white collar workers, who presently enjoy paid rates awards.

We also heard from the Minister that his department had spent close to \$140 000 on a road show promoting enterprise bargaining agreements throughout South Australia. We learnt that last year it had given \$100 000 to the Employers Chamber to promote enterprise agreements in the private

sector. We heard that the Minister has a special policy unit in his department, staffed obviously at taxpayers' expense, to promote enterprise agreements in the private sector, and that that has been the case for the past 12 months at the very least.

The Minister also said in Estimates that he was extremely disappointed with the outcome of the spread of enterprise agreements in the private sector and that more had to be done both by the trade union movement and the Employers Chamber to promote enterprise agreements. If we were to look at the expenditure that the Minister has talked about and weigh it up against the so-called successes that have been achieved in the two years since enterprise agreements under their current guise were legislated for in August 1994, we would find that it has been a howling failure by the Minister's own yardstick.

You may recall, Mr Acting Speaker, as you participated in the debate when the new industrial relations legislation was introduced early in this Government's life in about March 1994, that the Minister and many speakers on the Government side said that there were not more enterprise agreements in the private sector in South Australia because of the intrusion of a third force. It was claimed that the trade union movement prevented enterprise agreements from flourishing, particularly amongst small and medium size businesses with employees who were largely non-unionised, and that the legislation of the previous Labor Government inhibited their growth in the non-union sector because of the requirement under the then Act that at least one trade union had to be a party to industrial agreements applying at that time.

The facts are very simple. I have taken the trouble to go to the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia and get out the statistics it keeps with respect to the registration of enterprise agreements, whether the Employee Ombudsman represented any of the workers or whether any trade union was involved as a party, and I dissected that information amongst Government agencies and the private sector.

As at 17 June this year, nearly two years after the legislation was proclaimed on 8 August 1994, 150 enterprise agreements had been approved or were awaiting approval, of which 108 were made between employers and employees with no trade union acting as a party to the agreement. I then counted the number of employees involved in those 108 non-union agreements, because they are also listed in the statistics. The agreements that were made covered 6 525 employees out of a total of 33 085 who were bound by enterprise agreements. If we deduct the number of employees covered by Government agencies from those 6 500 non-union employees who were parties to agreements, we take 10 out of those 108 agreements. Those 10 Government agencies, where there was no union party to enterprise agreements, cover 2 639 employees, leaving 3 886 non-union employees in the private sector.

In South Australia, 300 000 workers are covered by State awards and/or agreements. Just over 1 per cent of those in the private sector are covered by pure non-union agreements. We have spent a fortune in relative terms on promoting enterprise agreements in the private sector where overwhelmingly employers and employees have demonstrated their wish to remain under an award system. We find that of the 33 085 employees covered by enterprise agreements as at 17 June, 60 per cent (or 19 739) are employed by State Government agencies or bodies. Only 3 886 employees in the private sector are covered by union-free enterprise agreements, and

2 156 of those employees are employed under just 10 agreements.

One of those agreements involves South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling, which covers approximately 480 employees. They are casual employees who work at silos in rural areas for about eight weeks of the year. Farmers or farmers' sons or daughters can get eight weeks' work each year during the grain season not at the bulk terminals at the various ports, but at the rural silos inland. About 500 employees were covered by three agreements involving a major company in the private sector, Hills Industries.

At the end of nearly two years of this industrial legislation, all the huff and puff that conservative Governments have put before the public and Parliament to the effect that the only thing holding back the private sector in making enterprise agreements directly with employees has been the intrusion of a third party, the trade union movement, is an absolute fallacy. The same is true at Federal level as well.

When I asked the Employee Ombudsman about the types of inquiries that he gets from employers and employees regarding enterprise agreements where no unions are involved, he said that he had received a number of calls from employers who were keen on getting enterprise agreements and getting rid of the 17.5 per cent leave loading and penalty rates and overtime. However, when he explained that they could do all those things—annualised salaries, and so on—but at the end of the day they must pass a no disadvantage test so that workers were no worse off than if they had remained under their relevant award, the employers lost interest in pursuing an enterprise agreement.

The whole crux of the industrial relations system in this State is the maintenance of an independent Industrial Relations Commission with oversight of any enterprise agreement and which can test any such agreement against the no disadvantage test of the same Act. Those were the provisions that the Opposition had to ram down the Government's throat in 1994 because it did not want those protective devices in the legislation. We forced it upon this Government, and it is just as well that we did. Although employers and employees are perfectly free to enter into enterprise agreements without involving trade unions, they cannot disadvantage workers as against their existing award, and the direct result is that just over 1 per cent of the private sector work force has chosen to go into enterprise bargaining.

I should also report on a survey conducted by the Employee Ombudsman titled 'Enterprise bargaining in South Australia: the first six months.' It was carried out on behalf of the Employee Ombudsman by the Learning and Resource Centre of South Australia and signed off on 29 February 1996. It is quite a long report and I will not go into all of it. However, on pages 10 and 11 the roles of the Employee Ombudsman and of the Enterprise Bargaining Commissioner were looked at. The researcher, on page 10 of the report, found:

The role of the Employee Ombudsman and the Enterprise Bargaining Commissioner were regarded by most people interviewed as being crucial to the success of enterprise bargaining.

The report later states:

The Enterprise Bargaining Commissioner was also seen as a significant contributor to the success of enterprise bargaining. . . and his rigorous application of the 'no disadvantage' test to all proposed agreements brought before him. This latter feature was also important in developing confidence in the system. The impression that appears to have been given is that the Commissioner does not just preside over the process, rather he works with all parties involved to obtain the best agreement possible.

This shows quite conclusively that in any industrial relations system, either in this State or at a Federal level, the supervising role of the Independent Industrial Relations Commission and, in particular, the no disadvantage test must be retained, because that is the only way we can prevent the charlatans of this world—those employers who would seek to use their stronger bargaining position with their employees—from exploiting.

I draw members' attention to a case that received publicity in South Australia at the time involving the Phoenix Society. The Phoenix Society, which employs predominantly intellectually disabled workers, sought an enterprise agreement with its work force and negotiated through the Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The Employee Ombudsman did not represent the employees; no-one represented the employees. As a result, a whole raft of changes to the enterprise agreement under which they had formerly worked were put forward by the management of the Phoenix Society, causing a great deal of consternation to the parents of the intellectually disabled workers. As a result of their representations to individual members of Parliament on this side of the House and to trade unions, when the matter came before the Enterprise Bargaining Commissioner it was pointed out to the Commissioner that the agreement breached the no disadvantage test in so far as those workers were concerned.

Ultimately, the hearing was adjourned and the parties were sent away for further conferences. An agreement was finally entered into only once the intellectually disabled workers and their parents were satisfied that, at the end of the day, the agreement did not disadvantage them compared with their previous agreement. The agreement was then duly certified. If it had not been for the enterprise agreement's being subjected to independent scrutiny in public by an Enterprise Agreement Commissioner and then being subjected to a no disadvantage test as being the critical test which it had to satisfy before it could be certified, those intellectually disabled workers would have been considerably disadvantaged in their employment, and their intellectual disabilities would have been taken advantage of by their employer—a disgraceful situation that had been allowed to develop. The only saving grace was the State legislation amendments to which the Labor Party and the Democrats forced this Government to accept when it introduced the legislation in 1994, hence the very reason why at a Federal level we must insist on the maintenance of the no disadvantage test and the rights of an independent Industrial Relations Commission to scrutinise the legislation.

The Premier's answer today, by way of interjection in many respects in Parliament, is a very interesting insight into the thinking of this Government. At the State level the Government wants to get rid of the no disadvantage test and the oversight of the Industrial Relations Commission so that it can allow agreements, such as the one the Phoenix Society's management wanted to foist on its intellectually disabled work force, to become the norm. The statistics from the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia that I have read into the record show that, overwhelmingly in the private sector, employers, small and large, prefer to retain their award structure. If they wish to pay over the award they will do so, but they know that here is an award structure which suits them and their industry and which affects their competitors equally as well. They are all on a level playing field. They do not have to worry about an unscrupulous employer in the same industry competing against them by

unfairly taking advantage of superior bargaining strength with a group of workers and reducing pay rates considerably.

I urge upon the House its ever vigilance with respect to legislation that this Government will propose in the State Parliament if federally the Government gets away with removing the no disadvantage test and the oversight role of an Independent Industrial Relations Commission.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): A number of portfolio areas examined in the Estimates Committees affect my electorate. First, I refer to the environment and to the Minister's statement on litter. As you are aware, Mr Acting Speaker, in February the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources released a paper entitled 'Litter. It's Your Choice'. As a result of that paper I circularised throughout my electorate a questionnaire, which drew a considerable response. The issues that drew the most response were as follows. First, there was unanimous support for increasing the fine for the offence of littering to \$200, with a maximum of \$4 000 for dumping. However, most of the replies expressed some concern about our ability to enforce such fines.

There was total support for the maintenance of the existing legislation on container deposits. In the area of exemptions with a two-year moratorium, without question, every reply returned to my office indicated that there should not be any exemptions. In respect of products such as Two Dogs lemonade and other mineral waters with an alcohol content that are presently subject to an exemption, every single reply I received expressed the belief that those products should no longer be exempt. Accordingly, I sent a copy of the reply to the Minister.

The issue of plastic shopping bags drew the widest and most varied responses. At this stage I commend the efforts of the Marion Foodland store in my electorate, because it has instigated a recycling program with respect to plastic shopping bags. It issues trading stamps for people who recycle their shopping bags. Every time they use their plastic shopping bags, they get a stamp on a card which gives them a discount off their purchases.

Most respondents to the circular I distributed believe that litter bins outside Government and public buildings are insufficient in size and in quantity and that a need exists for council planners to ensure that any new developments take into account the need for receptacles for rubbish and other litter. In the other issues section, the majority response dealt with smokers. Most respondents believe that there should be a special provision dealing with people who drop cigarette butts in public places and that there should be a minor fine associated with that. However, people who throw cigarette butts out of car windows should face a major fine. The results of that survey have been forwarded to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources.

With respect to education, issues affecting the Marion Road-South Road Corridor School Project were addressed. The issue of middle schooling was dealt with, and I have written to the Minister about a number of these areas. In relation to middle schooling, it is anticipated that in 1997 Daws Park High School will take year 7 pupils and that Hamilton Secondary College in 1998 will take year 7 pupils. The Marion and Clovelly Park primary schools will become R to 6 schools at the conclusion of 1997. At its present stage, this project is being handled quite capably by officers of the Education Department, local principals and school councils.

This is a pilot project, and it will be looked at by other schools in the area. Included in the budget are funds for the

expansion of Hamilton Secondary College to take new students from Clovelly and Marion as well as an expected influx of students associated with the closure of Marion High School. At present, it is estimated that \$1.2 million will be spent on the expansion of Hamilton Secondary College for that purpose. The Special Education Unit, which is located at Minda School, will close in 1997 and transfer to a new facility at the Hamilton Secondary College: \$650 000 has been allocated for that purpose. A further \$600 000 has been allocated for the upgrade of Clovelly Park Primary School, the result of the amalgamation of Mitchell Park Primary School and Tonsley Park Primary School that occurred at the beginning of 1996.

An amount of \$15 million has been allocated for the next financial year for the DECSTech 2001 project, which was announced in the education budget, for a technology and communications upgrade in schools in South Australia with a view to having one computer for every five students in the State system. The remaining schools in the Marion Road and South Road corridor have been guaranteed to be the first on the list for the upgrade. It is understood that the work will be completed in the remaining schools within 18 months. That work is associated with an assistance package for hardware systems and establishing networking between school buildings. I have had a tour through Hamilton Secondary College in the last couple of days regarding the proposal at that facility for the communications and technology upgrade. The remaining schools in my electorate—Marion Primary School, Clovelly Primary School and Hamilton Secondary College—are looking forward to the work that is proposed under the communications upgrade.

The issue of the Southern Expressway was raised during the Estimates Committees. It is encouraging to see that 600 new jobs have already been established in the southern area associated with preparation for the construction of the Southern Expressway. The head of the Southern Development Board, in a publicity sheet that went out recently, expressed the virtues of the new Southern Expressway and stated that industries have already established themselves in the industrial regions around Lonsdale in anticipation of its completion. Of course, this does not include the jobs that will be created during the construction stage. The Public Works Standing Committee, of which I am a member, has already approved the stages of the Southern Expressway from Marion Road to Panalatinga Road and we are awaiting further representation regarding the area from Marion Road to South Road.

The Southern Expressway is one of many projects occurring in the south-western suburbs in or around the electorate of Mitchell. There is \$72.3 million worth of capital works projects under the 1996-97 budget, which goes hand in hand with the \$400 million worth of private and Government capital works projects that have already commenced or are about to commence in this area.

With regard to the Passenger Transport Board, during the Estimates Committees the Minister for Transport advised that contracts have been won by Serco in the north and TransAdelaide at the Lonsdale depot. In September 1995, the Passenger Transport Board entered into two negotiated service contracts for the Adelaide Hills. Not only did these contracts deliver savings to the taxpayers but also services were improved in each area. With respect to passenger transport in the electorate of Mitchell, included in the budget papers is the fact that the Morphettville depot will undergo a tender process in March next year. We have already

commenced a survey amongst residents in the electorate of Mitchell. I wrote to all community groups in my electorate recently, and round table discussions were held with TransAdelaide and community groups to ascertain the transport needs of the area so that they could be covered in the tender process. What was found to be most in demand was the need for inter-suburban transport, away from the main roads—Marion, South, Daws and Sturt Roads—and services between the suburbs connecting with Marion. This issue is being looked at by TransAdelaide in its provision of services.

We are also looking at expanding the Marion access route, providing special buses to collect handicapped people throughout the area. We are considering the size of those buses and the times they run in order to cater better for the local community as well as assisting with transport requirements for those who travel to local schools. That project, which I started last month, is ongoing, and it is anticipated that the consultation process will involve the entire community.

The Minister for Local Government reported to the Estimates Committee on local government amalgamations. I have written to every Minister of the Cabinet, the Premier and the three local councils involved—Brighton, Glenelg and Marion—advising them of my support for a report which has been prepared and which shows the benefits for the economic development of the south-western suburbs by the amalgamation of those three councils. That survey highlights that there will be \$5 million savings per annum for the local community, which will reflect an individual saving for each and every ratepayer of \$100 per annum. It also highlights that economic development activity in that area following the amalgamation of the three councils will have a budget of \$50 million with savings in the number of elected officials, which I have emphasised to the Ministers concerned.

During the Estimates Committees, the Minister for Health referred to the private hospital development of the Flinders Medical Centre to the value of \$60 million. I look forward to the commencement of that facility, because it will provide better health facilities in the south-western suburbs with extra hospital beds and a reduction in waiting times.

As I said, the budget and the Estimates Committees delivered some good news to the people in the south-western suburbs. The budget allocated \$72.3 million for new capital works projects in addition to the already announced \$400 million in private and Government works, and this will provide up to an extra 3 000 job opportunities for South Australians in the coming year. As I said, the budget and the Estimates Committees process were good news for the south-western suburbs.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I will not take up unduly the time of the House on this matter this afternoon. The Estimates Committee procedure over the preceding two weeks has covered most of the finer details of the budget for 1996-97, but I believe that a couple of issues of a general nature need to be raised. I mention first the very unsatisfactory arrangements in respect of the Auditor-General and his report. All members are well aware of the fact that the Auditor-General is a parliamentary officer: he signs off a report on the expenditures of the preceding financial year concluding on 30 June, and usually reports to this place around September of the following financial year.

It is a fact that the Auditor-General, by an Act of Parliament, reports on the preceding financial year: I understand

that. When in Opposition—particularly at the time when I first entered Parliament, from late 1989 and into 1990—members of the present Government made much of the State Bank, the SGIC and other financial disasters, and it amazes me how they can allow a situation to continue whereby the Auditor-General reports several months after the Estimates Committee hearings. I am told the logic is inescapable. I am told that the Estimate Committees must coincide with the budget. The Deputy Premier told me that one of the penalties for bringing consideration of the budget forward was not having available the Auditor-General's Report to investigate lines of expenditure. That is what we were told.

I want to tell the Deputy Premier that no-one asked me about that. No-one asked any member of the Labor Party about that, and I do not believe that too many members on the other side were consulted because, at the end of the day, that is the issue here. This place has 47 members and 22 others occupy the Chamber further up the corridor. Not all members are Ministers. Members in this place are elected in their separate districts, and the 22 members up the corridor are elected in two cohorts to represent the State at large. One of the major tools required for financial and good prudential management has been denied every member of this House who is not a Minister and who does not have access to information around the Cabinet table, and it is denied to those members elected at large at the other end of the corridor.

We raised this issue last year, we have raised it again this year, and we have got nowhere. No alternative arrangements have been put in place and, in fact, last year the debate on the Auditor-General's Report—a rather interesting report on the first full year of this Government—commenced at 7.30 one evening in a three hour set piece debate with only one Minister in the Chamber at any given time. I return to the central point, that an Opposition has become a Government and it has learnt nothing—not a thing. It has not learnt that proper scrutiny is necessary. It has not learnt that the Opposition and, for that matter, its own backbench members can play an important role.

Quite frankly, that role was not played here in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Unfortunately, we are hamstrung now and we cannot play out that role because the Auditor-General's Report—and the Auditor-General has enormous resources to inquire into the estimates of payments and receipts—is denied to us. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

OMBUDSMAN (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRUSTEE (VARIATION OF CHARITABLE TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (TRADE PLATES)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**TRUSTEE (VARIATION OF CHARITABLE
TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the place appointed by the House of Assembly, but intimating that it had appointed Tuesday 9 July 1996 at 5.30 p.m. as the date and time for holding the conference in lieu of 7.30 p.m. this day.

Consideration of the Legislative Council's message.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I move:

That the date and time appointed by the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1791.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Auditor-General—the chief parliamentary officer, the chief inquirer, the person with the resources to inquire into the budget, with resources well beyond those available to me or to members on both sides of this Chamber—brings down a report which is examined in the dead of night three months after the Estimates Committee process. I believe that if the Government is serious and wants to be taken seriously on this matter it must do something about this matter and put in place, at the very least, a proper parliamentary debate on the Auditor-General's Report, and it must be done a lot earlier in the day than at 7.30 p.m.

As to other issues that have come out in this year's budget, I note with interest the structure of the budget where in health, education and a number of other areas we find theoretical extensions of greater resources during 1996-97. But on further examination we find that, if we factor in the underlying rate of inflation, which is roughly 3 per cent, those increases are largely a mirage and, in most respects, it is a steady as she goes situation from 1995-96 to 1996-97. However, it has to be remembered that the underlying rate of inflation is not the rate currently being used or contemplated. At the end of last year the official rate was closer to 5 per cent than 3 per cent and that makes these increases in payments much less than the current rate of inflation, as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics that we follow here. Therefore, it makes the payments less than the 1995-96 budget figures.

Another point that needs to be made is that in health and education there were significant cuts in the 1994-95 and 1995-96 budgets. In fact, what we are seeing is only the *status quo*. This budget was constructed and crafted in such a way that specific Federal payments were anticipated over the next 12 months. In health, education and other areas specific increases in Commonwealth grants were factored in. It does not take much of an IQ to realise that, when the Federal budget comes down in late August this year and those

increased payments to the States do not materialise, the Commonwealth will be blamed for the contraction in these projected estimates. Let me go through that again, because it works out like this: we know the Howard Government is going to cut grants to the States and if members do not know that, I do not know what planet they have been on, because every television station, media outlet and newspaper in this country is not speculating on whether there will be cuts of grants to States but by how much the cuts will be.

There is not a skerrick of evidence to suggest that this Federal Government will increase payments to anyone, let alone the States, yet we still have the Premier factoring into his budget increases in grant moneys across the board. Clearly, this is the Brown Government getting ready for a horror Howard budget and preparing to distance itself from decisions made in Canberra. The Brown Government will be blaming Canberra rather than itself. The Opposition said that the budget—and we went into the Estimates saying this—is an illusion, a mirage and a phoney. We stand by those remarks. In late August, when the Federal budget comes down, the State budget will be shown for the sham that it is. Real expenditures will be considerably lower in this financial year unless the Howard Government comes to the party and gives this State a lot more money. However, I have seen no evidence whatsoever that that procedure is going to take place; I have seen no evidence about that at all.

I now refer to some of the procedures in the Estimate Committees over the past two weeks. We saw the thorough examination not only of the budget but of a number of other issues that were explored and commented on by Ministers and their staff, and by various members of both sides of the House. The Estimates procedures are important and necessary, but the sort of system that I prefer is the one used in Federal Parliament in the Senate, where Ministers and their staff are required to remain until all lines have been thoroughly exhausted.

Under our procedures we have just one day for each Minister in each Committee and that is not adequate. That is because the workload of some Ministers is considerable. If we look at other Ministers, obviously the Premier does not trust some of them with too much. So some days we have the situation where it is really just the politics of exhaustion. Some Ministers, though, carry two or three major portfolio areas. The Deputy Premier is a clear example of this. I am sure that his workload has been increased by almost 30 to 40 per cent by having the police attached to his portfolio. Indeed, I understand that he has thousands of letters to sign to firearms owners as well. In my view the Deputy Premier and Treasurer has been overloaded.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Acting Speaker, will you tell the member for Fawley that I will be even longer if I keep getting interrupted?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): It is the member for Mitchell, and I would appreciate it if he would desist from interjecting.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member will be outside if he does not obey Standing Orders.

Mr QUIRKE: The way we structure the Estimates Committees is much better than the system that pre-dated them, but there are ways by which we can do it a whole lot better. There is no doubt that to go straight into the Estimates

with only a week's break from Parliament is not adequate. Further, I do not believe it is fair to go straight out of the Estimates procedure into two weeks of Parliamentary sittings, particularly when we have important legislative matters to attend to over these next two weeks. I hope that the Government takes on board my remarks so that next year we will have more time in which we can thoroughly prepare ourselves for the Estimates Committees. As to the specific issues raised in the Estimates Committees, it is not necessary for me to go through them now. Some of my colleagues have done that, and certainly we got plenty of airplay last week.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Like the member for Playford, I will not detain the House for long in noting the Estimates. The point I wish to make is that all members on the Government benches had opportunities to ask relevant and pertinent questions about their electorates, and the Estimates, which I believe were introduced in your time, Sir, under the Tonkin Government, continue to be successful. I would draw the House's attention to the situation which arose in the education Estimates, when the member for Custance pointed out the amount of money and resources going into Aboriginal education, and other members pointed to the money and resources going into isolated education and the education of the disadvantaged. The Minister's answer gives me great heart for the future of the Government. When asked about the expenditure the Minister answered that, whilst he was not afraid to spend money on educational areas which needed support and was prepared to spend extra money on those people who are disadvantaged and who need that support, he would be very much looking to the future and would be worried to come into the Parliament as a Minister in four or five years and say that nothing had been achieved for the extra money spent. In the area of Aboriginal education, disadvantaged schools and isolated education, millions of dollars have been spent over the past 20 years.

Often there is very little to show for it. If members read the budget papers this year, they will note that the rhetoric for the disadvantaged, for those whose education occurs in isolated areas, is much the same as it was 20 years ago, despite the amount of money that has been poured in. It is heartening to see that, through the use of basic skills testing, the Minister is determined to see that Government money is well spent.

I am sure that we could detain the House for hours going through chapter and verse of what did and did not happen in the Estimates Committees. I think they were a good innovation. I note what the member for Playford said about the Auditor-General and I concur with him that it is a problem, but I am not quite so sure, if we are to have early budgets, what can be done about the problem. I support his efforts to have something done because it is an important adjunct to the Estimates. I commend the Bill to the House.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I will not detain the House very long. The House has heard much from various members about the integrity of the budget that was brought down by the Liberal Government and about the fact that, in each of the portfolio areas, the budget was predicated on significant funding increases from the Federal Government which, of course, will not eventuate. In the health budget, in the education budget, and in my shadow portfolio of employment, training and further education, the budget was predicated upon increases in Federal funding to the States. We know now, as we knew during the Estimates Committees, that those

funding increases will not come about; in fact, there will be significant cuts.

Since the budget Estimates Committees process, there has been another significant announcement, this time by the Federal Education Minister (Senator Amanda Vanstone) and, for the benefit of the House, I should like to read from her press release of last Friday which points to some of the programs that will be cut further in the job training market. The Minister's press release is an interesting document because it lists a number of labour market programs, indicates how effective and useful they are and, then, in the very next line, states that they will be cut.

The Minister states that SkillShare, together with JobClub, is among the most cost effective labour market programs. The Minister has cut those programs by at least a third and will not guarantee their funding after the August budget. In her statement, the Minister went on to state, 'The New Enterprise Incentive Scheme is one of the most successful programs.' The next line of the press release states, 'Its funding will be reduced by one third.' The press statement also states, 'Brokered programs such as LEAP, JobSkill and New Work Opportunities are expensive programs.' In the next line, it is stated that 'they will face an 80 per cent cut to funding and activity.' There are no prizes to those members who guess which programs will not continue after August.

The Minister's press release went on to say, 'Other training programs, for example, JobTrain and the Special Intervention Program will be restricted in funding and activity levels by 50 per cent.' However, it does not stop there. The Minister goes on to say in the very next paragraph, 'The Minister understands the need to provide language training for non-English speaking migrants and special assistance for people with disabilities.' In the next line, it states that 'activity levels will be reduced.'

The Minister ends her happy press release by stating that she noted 'the reduction in staff and CES offices announced [on Friday] by the Secretary of the Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.' For the information of members present, I point out that that refers to 'a response to funding reductions by which several CES offices around the country will be closed'. In South Australia, the CES offices to be closed are Payneham, Mile End and Munno Para. So, on Friday, there was additional news from the Minister. Virtually every labour market program that is currently in place has been cut: SkillShare, the New Enterprise Incentive Scheme, the LEAP programs, the JobSkill programs, the New Work Opportunities programs, JobTrain, special intervention programs and assistance for people with disabilities and non-English speaking migrants. So the list goes on.

To cap it all off, the press release from the Minister on Friday indicated quite clearly that market programs which, by her own admission, have been very effective and mostly cost effective will be scrapped in the August budget. At least a dozen market programs have been scrapped or reduced severely. In addition, three CES offices in South Australia are to go, and we have not got to the August budget. Over the next three months, funding has been reduced severely and, after August, it is not guaranteed at all. In fact, the indications are that these programs are to be scrapped. The budgets, right across every portfolio into the health, education, training and further education budget, are all severely reduced and predicated upon increases to Federal allocations.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I found the experience of Estimates this year most unusual, because the Government got away with murder. Effectively, the Opposition did not put up any fight at all. In one Estimates Committee, I served with the Treasurer, and we were on our way home at 5.20 p.m. At 5.20 the Treasurer was on his way home, and we could have been here until 10 o'clock at night. What does that tell us about the Opposition? When we were in opposition, what a great opportunity it was for us to get stuck into the Government—

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If this man carries on like this and on this line, he will be here until 10 o'clock on every Estimates Committee. He is casting doubt on deals that were done in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I note the point of order taken by the member for Playford, but it is more an objection than a point of order. I suggest to the member for Custance that he relate his remarks to the budget as it came out of the budget Estimates Committee.

Mr VENNING: I certainly hear your words, Mr Speaker. If I caused the honourable member any duress, I apologise for that. I will reflect on the general questioning of the Opposition. It did not use the opportunity that this Parliament gives it during the Estimates Committees. I want to comment on the speech that the Leader of the Opposition made this afternoon about the budget. He called it a phoney budget, referred to the extra \$150 million being spent on education and health, and called that a phoney. I am a great believer that anybody can say anything and that talk is cheap.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr VENNING: I am a great believer of hearing a lot of rhetoric and talk—particularly in this place—but seeing is believing. One has only to look to see the success of this Government. When the Government says that it will increase expenditure on health and education by \$150 million, I believe it, because I can see it happening. I can see it in my electorate. Right through my electorate maintenance has been going on in schools, and \$3.5 million has been spent on new schools in my electorate at Tanunda. It is all there. If you add up all small figures, it does add up.

However, the Leader has said that it is a phoney budget. I merely ask that people check the record, because the record says that that honourable member was a member of the previous Government. The previous Government will go down in history as having one of the poorest records we have ever seen or we will ever see in this State. I took great umbrage at the Leader's saying that the budget was phoney, because it certainly is not.

He went on to say that it was all subject to Federal Government funding or maintaining the current levels. So it is. All States are reliant on funding from Federal Governments. The Leader said that the budget, therefore, is dead in the water. I find this line completely extraordinary, because there is nothing new in a State Government putting down its budget, because it is dependent upon funding from the Federal Government.

I am fully aware that there is a strong tip we will receive cuts in the Federal arena, but we have to put down a respon-

sible position and then fight to have that funded, and that is what we have been doing. Already Premier Brown has won the battle on the sales tax on Government vehicles. It could have cost South Australia hundreds of millions of dollars of lost sales, particularly for Holden's and Mitsubishi.

I congratulate the Premier because I, as did most other members, watched him on television and saw him put up a strong case. In fact, he led the other State Premiers to a great victory, because that issue would have cost this State a lot more proportionately than any other State. So, to say that the budget is dead in the water was quite irresponsible. We know the Federal Government will cut, because it must do so. Like us, that Government follows a long-term Labor Administration and, as we all know, it has an \$8 million black hole. So, it will cut waste and duplication. We will support that but we will also fight to have our budgetary line protected. We put down a position for which we will fight. We have, first, established our budgetary priorities in the area of the budget, and now we will fight to keep them there.

I am pleased with the budget and how it affected me and the electorate of Custance. As I have told my constituents in recent days, since this Government has been in power my electorate has benefited to the tune of \$41 million in various aspects of Government funding, particularly capital works. I am very pleased about that, and I am delighted that this budget, which was handed down on 30 May, addresses the important areas of health, education and roads.

The overall picture is that the Government has now been able to fund some of the difficult areas—with education receiving an extra \$60 million and health an extra \$90 million. These areas have been very touchy for all members in the past 18 months. This situation is due mainly to the success of the previous two Brown Liberal Government budgets, particularly the cuts in efficiencies which have not always been popular. There has been a lot of hurt out there and all members, including me, have received telephone calls from anxious constituents telling of their loved ones in hospitals which have had their services cut: the same with teachers in the schools. Many people have not been happy.

The general constituents—and that is 90 per cent of my constituents—have taken the pain; they have said, 'We will take the pain as long as it is worthwhile.' We now see that it has been worthwhile because the budget which has just been delivered is a responsible document which is now easing the pressure in many of these areas. We still have a long way to go in relation to the debt that we inherited from the previous Labor Government, but we are well on track particularly in relation to job creation and debt reduction.

The people of South Australia are well satisfied with the Government. If members want proof of that, they should go out and ask the people or look at what the opinion polls are saying. If a State election was held tomorrow, we would be returned with a similar majority. That tells me that the community is expecting us to make the tough decisions and, as long as we are fair and consistent, they will respect us for it—and I am satisfied that we have been fair and consistent. In my electorate at present the Barossa Festival Centre is being built; the walls are erected and the roof will be going on either this week or next week.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The Government is providing \$1.5 million towards the total cost of \$5 million; the balance of the funds will be raised by the constituents, although I give credit to the Federal Government which this week has provided \$450 000 as part of a Federal grant to assist the

centre. The Barossa Valley should have been the first area in South Australia to have a festival complex or performing arts hall: the community is very musical. However, centres were built at Port Pirie, Whyalla and in the Riverland but not in the Barossa Valley, and I am curious to know why.

A world-class complex is being built in the Barossa and the Government is getting it on the cheap; the community of the Barossa, particularly the community of Faith Secondary School are footing the lion's share of the bill. I look forward to opening night—and I am sure many members will attend—to see the magnificent facility which will be equal to, and in many areas better than, the State Festival Centre. I say that with courage: I have seen the complex and the plans and no stone has been left unturned. I am pleased that the Government has made it happen: its grant of \$300 000 multiplied by five (\$1.5 million) made it possible to break the ice to enable that sort of development to proceed.

I also welcome the \$4.5 million that the Minister for Transport has allocated to upgrade the Barossa Valley road system. In the Barossa Valley we have two problems, and we already know about the problem with the water. I thank the Minister (because he is in the House) for his promises and in relation to the filtration plant which is being built and which should be completed by this time next year. For the past 25 years, governments have promised the Barossa Valley, and the region generally, the provision of clean water, but to date it has not been delivered. The previous Labor Government indicated that as soon as it finished Myponga filtration plant it would build one in the Barossa. That project finished over five years ago, yet nothing happened. It is in *Hansard* for those who want to read about it—yet nothing was delivered. I thank Minister Olsen for making it happen: we will see clean water in the Barossa late next year.

The other problem is the Barossa's roads: the infrastructure is absolutely terrible. Wine is a boom industry, but when you get trucking companies that cannot get their large vehicles into five of the key wineries because of road restrictions there is something wrong. When companies have to break B-doubles in half and take them in in sections because of the road restrictions, it is about time that South Australia said, 'This is our boom industry. We cannot have this impost. We have to do something about it.' I congratulate Minister Laidlaw for putting aside this money for the initial stages and the complete planning of the whole road infrastructure in the Barossa region. I could go on for a long time. The budget is very positive for the State, very positive for my electorate and very positive for me as a member. I appreciate that, as do the people of South Australia.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I was going to speak about the Estimates Committees and the timing of the Auditor-General's Report, to support my colleague the member for Playford, but I will not because of the time. I want to speak briefly about Estimates Committee B on 18 June, when the Minister for Education and Children's Services was the Minister under questioning. I refer particularly to my questioning of the Minister on the proposed closure of The Parks High School. I have said repeatedly that there was no consultation with the local school community on the closure, but the Minister maintains that there was. It is a matter of definition in terms of the word 'consultation'. The Minister's interpretation was that consultation took place in respect of the review of the school's activities. I disagree with that, because the review and the guidelines drawn up in that review

were a report on what the school has done and is doing, irrespective of any other consideration.

Consultation, in my view and that of the whole school community, is about the Minister's coming up and saying, 'The Government is considering closing the school, let us consult with the community and see what can be done about saving the school, or what options are available'. That is trying to have full consultation. The Minister says that he does not share that view. I say to the Minister that the review was a complete waste of taxpayers' money, because it came out very strongly in support of the school and recommended strongly that it stay open as an excellent teaching facility in the area, yet the Minister chose to completely ignore the review and close the school. Irrespective of what the Minister said, as far as I am concerned it was a waste of taxpayers' money.

The Minister criticised the involvement of former Premier Don Dunstan in the public meeting held at The Parks High School in relation to the closure. The Hon. Don Dunstan has been criticised by the Premier and also by the member for Peake today in the debate. I would like to remind the Minister, the Premier, the member for Peake and other members of Government that we do live in a democracy. The Hon. Don Dunstan or anyone else is quite at liberty to come out and attend any public meeting he wishes and speak if he wishes. That is the tenet of our democracy, and I support that view.

The member for Peake says that the ALP trots out Dunstan when he is needed. I would say to the honourable member that, if there is a person of such outstanding ability as the Hon. Don Dunstan, you welcome his involvement in any sort of issue. He is retired and getting on in years, but he has still got it, and that is something that many members of the Government just cannot handle. The Minister claimed that Don Dunstan was a 'rent-a-protector' and the Premier said that the public meeting at the school was a Labor Party stunt. I refute those views. The meeting was arranged by the school and Don Dunstan asked to speak at it as I and other members of the community did.

Don Dunstan was Premier at the time of the concept of The Parks High School when the Whitlam Government decided to build The Parks Community Centre, which incorporated the high school. As Premier he was interested and he is still interested. That is his right: not like some members who retire, sit back and do nothing. He has an ongoing interest and concern in the State and people whom he loves, and he should not be criticised and put down for that interest and concern.

The decision to close the school ignores the needs of the community, of wheelchair students and of adult re-entry students. I have asked questions in this place and of the Minister in the Estimates Committee about the future for wheelchair and adult re-entry students. The answer is almost, 'Trust us. They will be looked after and sent somewhere else.' But where? We are in July, there are about six months before school starts next year, and no announcement has been made as to where these students with special needs will go. What has also been overlooked are the inflated rental charges to the school. That matter could be negotiated with the Port Adelaide Enfield Council, which the Government is keen should take over the community centre, including the high school. The Minister and the department have not thought through the implications of the closure and are steadfastly sticking with their decision to close the school.

I should like to make a couple of comments about the argument regarding the numbers of local people who do not send their children to The Parks High School. First, people can choose to send their kids to The Parks High School, Croydon, Kilkenny, Woodville High, or wherever. Secondly, there is the perception that it is a rough school. I admit that in the early days that perception was realistic: it was a rough school. The people in the area had not had anything as good as The Parks Community Centre or The Parks High School before and the place was vandalised and graffitied somewhat. However, those days are long gone. The usual problems of unruliness, vandalism, graffiti and, unfortunately, drugs are ever present in most schools in our State as they are in the whole of the western world. However, The Parks High School is one of the better schools in all these areas. It has a very good reputation internally, but the community still has a great deal of misinformation about it. One argument is that if there had been genuine consultation about the possible closure of The Parks High School, a strategy could have been developed to change the perception of the school to reflect what it really is like.

The Parks High School contains probably the best computer facilities in this State. It has three separate computer facilities and it is years ahead of other schools in the western suburbs in computer technology and teaching. The Premier always claims that computer technology is important, yet he wants to close this school with its excellent computer facilities. The Premier and the Minister were formally invited to the school about two weeks ago, but there has been no response to that double invitation. The Minister said that he has never been invited to the school. I can assure him that he is now invited and we are awaiting his response. In answer to my question in the Estimates Committee, he said that he cannot get around to all 650 schools under his jurisdiction. I agree that is not realistic, but I suggest that he should certainly visit the schools that he is proposing to close. Irrespective of the numbers and the dollars, which the Minister and this Government think is the be all and end all, the bottom line is that there is a desperate need for The Parks High School to remain open as the excellent teaching institution that it is now. Some things are more important than money.

The Parks High School very adequately caters for the needs of many students and families in the local Parks area in a very unique way. Some students will fit in at other schools, but many will not. Many of these kids will not go to other schools in the area because they just do not have the confidence and know they will be harassed and stigmatised. They will drop out of the system, and I refer especially to the adult re-entry students who are involved in a very successful program run at the school. It is the second most successful in the State, involving in excess of 250 students.

If the Minister goes ahead and closes the school, he will be condemning many of these people to the scrap heap, and that will affect them not only for now but for the rest of their lives. As far as the Labor Opposition is concerned, this is totally unacceptable and completely ignores the principles of equity and social justice. The Minister is a bully and his attitude flies in the face of the current policy of his department, obviously approved by the Minister himself, and in the State schools, against harassment and schoolyard bullies. He is nothing but a hypocrite, and he is the biggest bully of them all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is normally one of the very best behaved members in this

House. He is not supposed to cast improper motives or reflect on a member in another House, and I ask that he just temper his language slightly.

Mr De LAINE: Maybe so; you are quite right, Mr Speaker, but I am particularly angry about this issue. I think the Minister is being a bully—and I will leave it at that. The Minister has repeatedly said his decision to close the school is irreversible. However, I appeal to him once again, after doing so many times, to reconsider his decision for the sake of social justice in the Parks area.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My remarks will be as concise as possible, given the wish of the House to not adjourn for the dinner break and return after, but to conclude the debate before going to dinner. Let me point out that, at the time we came to office, the overriding consideration for this Government, a strategy that has to be pursued through this budget, has been to rein in the debt which was created by our predecessors in their years of office between 1982 and 1993, and the indifference they had to the responsibilities entrusted to them by the people of South Australia through this Parliament.

Our job is also, at the same time, to do almost the impossible, to build the economy's base and expand the number of jobs, so that young people in South Australia—especially those with high skill training and training in the professions—do not continue leaving in droves, to go interstate or overseas to further their careers or, indeed, to get them started. A look at the demographic statistics of those people living in South Australia per 10 000 between the ages of 18 and 30 will show that, in those first 12 years of adulthood, we are smaller in numbers per capita than any other mainland State, and not much different from Tasmania. That is a direct consequence and legacy of the incompetence, indifference and arrogance of the previous Government. Those jobs come to us either by transfer payments—that means the Government creates pretend jobs that depend on taxing other enterprises and the efforts of other individuals—or as real jobs—jobs which are there because there are people willing to pay an agreed price in the market place for the goods and services which are produced through their efforts.

The kinds of jobs to which this Government and the Minister at the bench right now—*par excellence* amongst Ministers—are jobs which will be enduring and which will supply export markets—jobs which will therefore be at the leading edge of T and T and the technology available to us in manufacturing and at the leading edge, too, of the development of other types of products that are in demand in those rapidly growing economies of East Asia, which are our export markets. They are rapidly growing and, as they grow, the prosperity levels of their populations increase. With that increasing disposable income comes the demand which we are best suited and best fitted to supply from South Australia. There are jobs not only in T and T and ETMs but in primary industry—primary industries of those types which we already have and industries which we are as yet only just establishing or, perhaps, have not even yet begun to establish. I am talking about, in the first instance, things such as meat production, be it pork, beef or any other meat, or grain for processing, whether into beer or bread—it does not matter. But they are certainly industries which this State has had a reputation internationally for excellence and competence in producing.

We also sell our technology overseas. That became evident in the course of the examination of the votes in the Estimates Committees—if it was not evident before that. We

also have a number of jobs being created here which are, in category, export jobs but which are in fact located here because they supply services to visitors who bring their money from overseas to spend here rather than overseas. They are the jobs in tourism which were spoken of by the Minister in respect of that portfolio, and we hear examples of how the Government is addressing those matters from week to week in this place. It is increasing our employment opportunities. We are providing the training necessary to ensure that we do have the skilled people who can take up the challenge and provide those markets with the kinds of products they seek.

That, to my mind, is illustrated by the fact that an enterprise such as PDL Industries in Murray Bridge, formally known as Nilsens, has been taken over by a New Zealand based company that operates mainly in New Zealand and Asia with an annual turnover of \$270 million and a net after profit tax in New Zealand of \$13.6 million. PDL Australia Pty Ltd is its subsidiary, and it purchased the switch gear division of Nilsens wholesale products. One of those plants was in Victoria, the other at Murray Bridge. In Murray Bridge we employ 78 people. It was considered sensible to locate all that production, which was part of the deal in the takeover by PDL, in the Murray Bridge site. That has been undertaken in consequence of an offer made by the State Government to provide for the cost of relocating plant and equipment from Heidelberg to Murray Bridge.

I was honoured to represent the Minister in presenting a cheque for \$50 000 earlier this week. That will mean an expansion of jobs, in the first instance, of more than 20 and provide for further expansion as that company grows given its new products and supplies to the markets which it already has with those products. I was, indeed, pleased to see the way in which a new management style in that company has clearly lifted production output as well as enabled the employees—the people who work there—to obtain a wage agreement as an enterprise arrangement with the company that puts them in exactly the right place, namely, being rewarded for their efforts and their productivity.

We have another industry which is contributing to the expansion of that market and our access to it, that is, SA Ships, in the fast ferry market. South Australian Ships is in the process of kick-starting a long standing plan that will add another valuable tier to the transport link between Australia and Asia. The Chairman is Mr Don Williams, who has set up another company called Australasian Transport Systems (AATS), which is looking to attract finance to operate that service on a high speed sea-land transport link between Adelaide and Asia, taking the route across the continent through Alice Springs to Darwin, where the new Darwin harbour facilities will provide rapid turn-around for these very fast vessels, such as (as they are called) the Incat Cargo Express, carrying several thousand tonnes.

This high speed freight service will entice shippers of those goods from conventional shipping and the airlines by offering a massive time advantage over the conventional sea transport and its freight rates, where they are more than competitive with air freight rates. While the sea freight rates on Incat will be a little dearer than the conference rates, they will be very much cheaper indeed than air freight. That is to be commended, because it makes it possible for us to get our perishables out of South Australia across the continent to Darwin much faster than they can otherwise go through Bass Strait, around the Tasman Sea and up the eastern seaboard or, alternatively, across the Great Australian Bight, around Cape

Leeuwin and up the western seaboard into the Arafura Sea, to Singapore and ports beyond.

For that reason, we will be able to rapidly and cheaply access the markets of east Asia with our perishables from primary industries and our highly manufactured goods that are more valuable per kilogram than the bulk stuff that we have been exporting to some of those markets in the past. That is important to us, because it provides us with the opportunity to add value here and, in the process of doing so, to provide jobs. I point out that some of the types of products that can go there will be things such as fruit, flowers and fish.

I hope that the Department of Primary Industries, now well established in its approach to aquaculture, will issue its first onshore freshwater aquaculture licence in the Murray Valley in the near future. There has been some unfortunate delay in that licence, and I am sure that Mr Mick White will tell anybody about the distress that has caused him. Given the commitments and assurances that he is willing to provide, there is absolutely no reason now why that licence cannot be granted, and I will be very disappointed if I find myself at the end of the week still not able to provide for Mr White the opportunity that he seeks to establish that enterprise in Murray Bridge as an example of what other fish farmers can then do.

I also refer to the work that the Premier has done to expand the opportunities for well skilled people in our community. Almost half—indeed, more than half—the community are women, and yesterday the Telstra awards for Businesswoman of the Year were made. I am sure all members here join with me in congratulating Pauline Rooney of the Riverlands First National real estate company in winning that award yesterday and in congratulating the other sector winners, including Pamela Lee from SGIC. She is a business analyst and strategic planning facilitator in a company which was formerly Government owned and which is now a private sector corporation employing more than 100 employees. Also awarded were Mrs Rosemary Brooks, who is the principal at St Anne's and who is also a member of other finance company boards and so on; and Virginia Battye, the Para Institute of TAFE Director, who is an outstanding administrator in her own right. Obviously, she would not have won her award were that not the case. That illustrates to the House the point that I am making that we need to recognise the skills we have and get on with the job in hand.

I now wish to draw attention to the way in which comments have been made over the years that Estimates Committees have been in existence by referring to last Saturday's *Advertiser* and an article written by Greg Kelton in his column 'The State of Affairs'. He said that in the opinion of some people 'it's the most boring, unproductive two weeks in the parliamentary calendar'. He was referring to the Estimates Committees. Whilst Mr Kelton has views which are in common with mine, he has some views which are different. Allow me to illustrate the point. He states:

... both sides have become... adept at using the Committees as little more than political point-scoring exercises.

He makes that point well, and I agree. Equally, he states further:

For all their faults, the Committees are absolutely necessary for proper scrutiny of Government—

and the appropriation of revenue and its expenditure. However, I disagree with the view that he holds that:

Another necessary change is the provision for members of the Legislative Council to sit on the Committees. Under the present system, only members of Parliament from the Assembly can attend.

He does not understand that the Assembly is the House which generates the money Bills and which must pass those money Bills for the Government. It is a constitutional as well as a conventional practice, and it is therefore not possible for members of the Upper House to sit on the Estimates Committees nor would I approve of any move to make it possible. I

think the Upper House has its job of review of legislation. It may well do other things better that we can otherwise do in the Assembly, but one of the things that it cannot and should not do is tamper with the raising and expenditure of revenue. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which sets out the dates and times at which Estimates Committee sittings commenced and concluded for each of the portfolios.

Leave granted.

COMMITTEE A

Tuesday, 18 June	11 a.m. to 9.57 p.m.	Premier and Legislative Council
Wednesday, 19 June	11 a.m. to 5.38 p.m.	Treasurer
Thursday, 20 June	11 a.m. to 5.40 p.m.	Primary Industries
Friday, 21 June	9.30 a.m. to 3.42 p.m.	Housing and Urban Development and Local Government
Tuesday, 25 June	11 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.	Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development
Wednesday, 26 June	11 a.m. to 9.58 p.m.	Tourism, Recreation and Sport; Industrial Affairs
Thursday, 27 June	11 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.	Health; Aboriginal Affairs

COMMITTEE B

Tuesday, 18 June	11 a.m. to 10.00 p.m.	Education
Wednesday, 19 June	11 a.m. to 10.01 p.m.	Transport
Thursday, 20 June	11 a.m. to 8.30 p.m.	Attorney-General
Tuesday, 25 June	11 a.m. to 5.40 p.m.	Employment, Training and TAFE
Wednesday, 26 June	11 a.m. to 10.02 p.m.	Environment and Natural Resources; F.A.C.S.
Thursday, 27 June	11 a.m. to 6.12 p.m.	Correctional Services, Emergency and State Government Services

Mr LEWIS: This table illustrates the point that there were six occasions of the 13 on which the Opposition for whatever reason best known to itself chose not to use the time available to it to scrutinise the budget or Ministers and public servants in the process. To some extent, that disappoints me, especially when I look at such opening statements as that which came from the member for Taylor who, when examining the TAFE budget at the outset of the day, said, 'Given the constraints of time', yet she concluded that examination at 5.40 p.m. The same thing occurred in the Committees of which I was a member, and I was disappointed with that.

I was also disappointed with the way in which the established practice of this House and the Estimates Committees in previous years has deteriorated. There have been some departures from it. Mr Speaker, to refer to Ministers or indeed any member of the Parliament as 'you' is simply not permitted under Standing Orders. All remarks on a Bill must be addressed to you, Sir, or the Chairman of Committees when we are examining the clauses—and the budget Estimates Committees are the equivalent of examining the clauses of any other Bill. For members of those Committees to engage in that kind of activity of directing questions in the second person pronoun using the word 'you' in an accusative context, to my mind causes them to deteriorate somewhat. That was well illustrated to me and other members of the Committee who might have cared to take an interest in it on 27 June when we were examining Correctional Services and Emergency Services and State Government Services. I also draw attention to the fact that I do not believe that it is legitimate in any sense to refer to members of a Committee as a monkey or, for that matter, to other members of a Committee as being objectionable. The member for Playford accused me of being both those things early in the day. (Pages 208 and 209 of Estimates Committee B.)

I tried to draw the attention of the Chairman of the Committee at the time to the fact that the practice of three

questions on any given matter at one time was not being observed, nor was the practice of referring all remarks and questions through the Chair. The evidence of that fact can be found on page 205 (the third page of the proceedings of that Committee) and on page 206. Yet later on in the day, when I sought to obtain further information about the CFS, which is the Country Fire Service and the SES, which are emergency services located in country areas, I was roundly abused by the member for Playford. I know there are no votes for the ALP in the CFS, or in the SES and that, obviously, it did not suit his purposes, motives, or his strategy to spend any time on that at all. If the honourable member had had his way, he would have spent only 10 or 15 minutes on it.

When I sought to spend time on it I was disappointed that, for some reason or other unknown to me—and not provided to me, even though I was the only member who was a member of the Committee for the whole day—I was told that there was some other arrangement made for the hour that we had agreed would be allocated to the examination of those lines. The member for Playford needs to know that his own colleagues refer to him as 'a bully'—and a bellicose bully at that—and I do not like him when he badmouths me. I had no wish on that occasion to do anything more—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already said to another member earlier that that particular term of reference to another member is unwise, and I suggest to the member for Ridley that he not refer to members in those terms. The member for Ridley.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I have no intention or wish to draw any more attention to his behaviour than you or any other member has, but it is about time he learned some manners. And for me to then, after having mentioned that fact, be required to apologise to him struck me as quaint. On that note then, may I say that I trust that the capacity of the Chair to control the debate and the behaviour will be more balanced and fair in future.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the view of the Chair that it is not appropriate for the member for Ridley to reflect upon one of the Chairpersons of the Estimates Committees, and I suggest to him that he should withdraw any reflection upon those people because, if he is unhappy, there is a mechanism available to him. Therefore, the Chair must request that he withdraw any reflection upon the Chairperson. The member for Ridley.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Speaker, I only wish that the same rules that applied to me were applied to the member for Playford and, accordingly, in future I trust that the matter will be resolved—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS:—and I therefore unconditionally withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Ridley, if he was unhappy with the ruling of the Chair, he could have taken a point of order during the Committee stages of the examination of that particular line. The Chair has asked the member for Ridley in a very quiet and reasoned way to withdraw any reflection on the Chair of those Committees. The member for Ridley.

Mr LEWIS: Then let the record show that I have done so, Mr Speaker.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 May, Page 1624.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): This Bill increases the criminal injuries compensation levy in line with the consumer price index. As I understand it, the levy has not been increased in the past three years, and so this Bill will catch up those past three years. The levy will increase for expiated offences from \$6 to \$7; summary offences from \$25 to \$28; for indictable offences from \$40 to \$44; and for offences by children, from \$13 to \$14. The Opposition has no difficulties with these increases: we think they are warranted and we agree with them. We will, therefore, be supporting the Bill. However, I want to make some other remarks about criminal injuries compensation before I finish because there is much more to it than the levy.

The total amount of criminal injuries compensation paid in 1994-95 was \$13.6 million. This figure comprised \$3.1 million supplied by the criminal injuries compensation levy, \$2.1 million provided by a specified percentage of total fines paid, and only \$.2 million, that is, \$200 000 from the offenders themselves. All those contributions together are nowhere near as much as the contribution coming from general revenue, and that, in 1994-95, was \$8.4 million. The first thing to understand about criminal injuries compensation is that most of it comes from consolidated revenue: it is paid for by the taxpayer.

If we are going to be more generous with criminal injuries compensation, it is not going to come from those who commit the crimes: it is going to come from consolidated revenue, or it is going to be cut out of some other Government program or come from the taxpayer. In February 1995 the Legislative Review Committee issued a report on criminal injuries

compensation. In what follows I want to emphasise that the Government has a majority on that committee. It is, in effect, a Government report. That committee came up with a number of suggestions as to how the criminal injuries compensation scheme could be improved.

That committee proposed that the minimum award payable under criminal injuries compensation be reduced from \$1 000 to \$500. It did this because it thought that \$1 000 as a minimum claim excluded far too many small claims. It was the opinion of the committee that many claims for criminal injuries compensation would come in well under \$1 000 but were nevertheless meritorious claims. The Legislative Review Committee also recommended that the standard of proof required for someone claiming criminal injuries compensation be changed.

South Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth where one must prove the commission of a criminal offence beyond reasonable doubt in order to claim criminal injuries compensation. In other States a claimant, in order to succeed on his or her claim, has only to prove that a crime was committed on the balance of probabilities, which is the civil standard of proof. To convict an accused of a crime requires proof beyond reasonable doubt, but the committee argued that, because a criminal injuries compensation claim is a civil claim for compensation, it should be on the balance of probabilities. The committee went on to a third proposal for change, namely, that the compensation for non-financial loss, that is, pain and suffering, ought to be indexed to the consumer price index in the same way that compensation claims under the Wrongs Act are indexed.

The fourth recommendation of the committee is its request that the Attorney-General issue an annual report about the operation of the criminal injuries compensation scheme. These four recommendations have one thing in common: they all require legislative change. That report—essentially a Government report, although it emanates from the Parliament—was handed down in February 1995. I do not see that the Government has done anything to implement it and I challenge the Deputy Premier to inform the House why a report that was signed by a Liberal Party member of Parliament has not had any of its recommendations attended to in the past 15 months or so. Why not?

We have the Criminal Injuries Compensation (Levy) Amendment Bill before us now so that we can increase the levy. I have no quarrel with that, but why is not the opportunity being taken by the Government, now that the Bill is before the House, to implement the report of the Parliament? That is my challenge to the Government. A committee that included, among others, the Hon. Robert Lawson and the member for Norwood, is not the sort of committee that is unmindful of the Government's budgetary difficulties. Some suggestions were put to the Legislative Review Committee that could have had the effect of blowing out the total sum paid under criminal injuries compensation in a way that could have hurt the budget. The Legislative Review Committee was careful to reject those recommendations.

So, we have remaining the four recommendations for legislative change that I have mentioned to the House but which the Government has not implemented. It seems that there is no compelling financial reason for the Government's resisting these suggestions. I refer, for instance, to an annual report: what is wrong with the Government's issuing, 90 days after the end of the financial year, an annual report about the criminal injuries compensation scheme? I do not think that would be a tremendous burden on consolidated revenue.

In relation to the reduction of the minimum award, members of the committee were mindful that that would lead to an increase in the total number of claims. They made the point that they were quite willing to see claims at the upper end of the scale reduced in order to accommodate claims at the lower end of the scale. In fact, they said that the cake should be spread more evenly. Again, I do not see the potential for a budget blow-out unless the Deputy Premier can explain otherwise. Again, with the standard of proof, the committee took the view that a criminal injuries compensation claim is essentially a civil claim and why should it not be decided on the balance of probabilities? In the vast majority of criminal injuries compensation cases a conviction has been obtained and the accused has been convicted beyond reasonable doubt and, therefore, we have proof of a crime being committed beyond reasonable doubt and compensation is payable. It is easy for the victim to establish the basis for criminal injuries compensation.

The problem here is that in a minority of cases an accused has not been convicted: perhaps the accused has not been found and, therefore, has not been charged; that the accused has been located but has not been charged owing to a technicality; or that the accused has been charged and has been tried but the case has failed for reasons that do not derogate from the fact that a crime has been committed. For instance, in the case of rape it may be that the accused is not convicted because he did not have the requisite *mens rea* or mental element for the Crown to be able to obtain a conviction. Nevertheless, it is clear that from the victim's point of view a rape has still been committed and there is a claim for criminal injuries compensation which, by any measure, ought to be fulfilled.

Every other State gets by on a criminal injuries compensation scheme where the claims are sustainable on the civil standard of proof, that is, the balance of probabilities. Will the Deputy Premier explain to the House why these recommendations of the committee have not been implemented and why, when we have the criminal injuries compensation legislation before us, the Government has not taken the opportunity to implement a report signed by a Government member which is now 16 months old? With those remarks the Opposition supports the Bill before the House but reserves the right in another place to move amendments in line with the Legislative Review Committee's recommendations.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I thank the honourable member for his contribution. I was a little nonplussed by the honourable member's contribution. Normally, if a Bill is quite technical, I hear about the history of English law and most of the House gets entertained. On this occasion we were dealing with more contemporary issues such as, when someone has been the victim of an assault, how the system works in terms of compensation. I was somewhat nonplussed by the honourable member's contribution because I was not sure whether he wants the whole fund to blow through the roof or whether he believes that there needs to be some major adjustment to the scheme because it is not working fairly. If I judged the quality of his remarks, I would probably come down on the side of saying that the member for Spence believes that there are some strengths to the system but many people are missing out because they have not had the necessary proof to enable them to succeed in the system; therefore, the system should be more open; the compensation should be greater; and there should be a greater bleed on the budget as a result.

I can have some sympathy with the honourable member about what is fair and reasonable because people coming through my door in my constituency have raised the same question. On one or two occasions there has been a *nolle prosequi* that has never been taken to the court for good reasons yet, in the mind of the victim, the assault has occurred.

The member for Spence should recognise that in 1989 the maximum compensation sum was \$10 000. It is now \$50 000. When the changes were made to that amount—and the honourable member may well recall because he was a member of the House at the time—the Attorney-General gave an assurance that the scheme would pay for itself: that the levies paid by those who committed offences would make the scheme self-funding to the point that it would not be a drag on the Consolidated Account. That was quite untrue, and it was unfair for the then Attorney-General to suggest that the levy on the fines and the penalties would in any way reimburse the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund.

I admit that there are a number of anomalies in the way in which this fund is administered. I know, for example, of people who, but for want of opportunity, would have been the offender rather than the victim, and they have qualified for victim status, and some of them have been subjected to some fairly significant injuries. As I said, it was only a matter of timing so that it would have been their mate who was the victim if they had their way. There is always this dilemma about whether people with criminal convictions should even qualify for compensation as victims. There are all these inevitable dilemmas and, as the member for Spence has pointed out, there are occasions when sufficient evidence suggests that a crime has been committed, that someone has been a victim, yet there is no way under the law as it stands today that they can be compensated.

I am not happy that this is in a halfway house situation and that we need \$8 million from Consolidated Account to pay the bills. It was never envisaged that this would be other than self-funding, and the Government must look at this scheme and work out ways in which it can more ably accommodate change than it can today and to ensure that it is more self-funding than it presently is. With those few words, I thank the member for Spence for his contribution.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to speak about the proposed Collex waste treatment plant on the former British Tubemills site at Kilburn. This issue is quite important although complex. I will not touch on the debate that will take place tomorrow on amendments to the Development Act, but in this matter, for reasons which are totally unknown to me and which are beyond logic, the Government has stated that it is intent on setting up a waste treatment plant within metres of residences, a nursing home and a primary school in Kilburn.

This matter has been fought for the past three years by the former Enfield City Council, now the Port Adelaide-Enfield council. It has fought two or, if memory serves me correctly, three times in the Supreme Court of South Australia, and last Friday the court ruled that the application by Collex to

establish a waste treatment plant, which application was supported by this Government and by the Development Assessment Commission, involves a special industry and, as such, requires the concurrence of the local council. That concurrence will not be forthcoming from the council. It has made its position absolutely clear that it will not permit, within its powers, the establishment of a waste treatment plant so close to residential land, nursing homes and schools.

I do not know how many members have been in Kilburn when there is no wind, when the odours from Geoffrey's Garden Centre, the Master Butchers Limited plant in Wingfield and Inghams chicken factory are in full force and there is an air inversion. The stench in the Kilburn area, because of its low-lying geographical location, is appalling. Schools have actually had to be emptied out in the middle of the day because of the stench. Residents have had to close their windows and lock their doors, even on the hottest of days, to try to prevent the stench from those industries invading their property, yet we have this Government intent on supporting the establishment of a waste treatment plant in Kilburn.

During the Estimates Committee the Minister, like his predecessor, claimed that basically what the Government wants to do is say that Collex is a state-of-the-art waste treatment plant, that it is a waste treatment plant that has the latest in technology that will cause no offensive odours to be emitted from its production processes. As the Supreme Court itself said on Friday—and I quoted from that decision briefly in Question Time today—notwithstanding all this technology, there will be many occasions during the year when the offensive odours will get loose amongst the residents—and not just for one year but for every ongoing year that that waste treatment plant is established in Kilburn.

If this plant is so hygienically clean, if it is so non-offensive in so far as the odours it omits, I suggest to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development that that is a magnificent industry to establish in the middle of Golden Grove—in the heart of his electorate. If it is such a wonderful new industry, that is the ideal place for it to go, because it is a hilly location and, indeed, the winds from the sea are more pronounced than in Kilburn and any odour will be far more quickly removed from the lofty heights of the seat of Waite. That is where those industries should be established; they should not be established in my electorate.

This Government has a fetish for establishing this type of industry in the heart of my electorate. It says, 'We are a pro-business, pro-development Government and this will prove our credentials.' I have already warned the Minister for Industry privately on this matter that it will be an enormous embarrassment to the Government because, quite frankly, we will have community picket lines if the Government insists on establishing this industry. There will be women and children lying in front of bulldozers trying to establish this plant.

The citizens and residents of Kilburn will not roll over on this issue. It will be the worst advertisement this Government could have about this State being open for business. One of the industries that occupies the immediate area is Trio Hinging, a plant which was recently opened (and I was at the opening, with the Premier who opened that plant) and which is exporting hinges overseas. It is export oriented and grew from small beginnings to one which we hope by 2000, if its plans are met, will employ some 300 people. It would have liked them in Kilburn and it would have liked more land later where the Collex waste treatment plant is proposed to be

established. It is now worried about the establishment of the waste treatment plant-recycling centre. It has a modern office and factory and a number of employees working there; and it has a number of interstate and overseas visitors to its office and workshop areas to sign contracts, and it does not want these overseas visitors to attend on a particular day when there is a foul stench from next door.

As I said previously, this is an industry which is export orientated. It is the type of industry that this Government says it is committed to winning and promoting within South Australia. What do we propose in its stead? In an area surrounded by residential homes, schools, nursing homes and the like, we propose a stinking industry. As I said earlier, the Minister will not accept the advice of the Supreme Court; he refuses to accept the views of the Port Adelaide Enfield council; and he proposes to ramrod this development through under the existing powers of section 24 of the Act. Despite that, the Government expects the Labor Party—the Opposition—to support its Bill tomorrow on changes to the Development Act to make it easier for developers to ram down our throats noxious industries like this.

We will not do it. The actions of this Government with respect to the Collex waste treatment plant is the reason why members of Parliament such as I will not support any legislation which will give further powers to the Government to override the wishes of local residents. It is not any of the 13 Cabinet Ministers who live in Kilburn; it is not they or their families who have to submit themselves, particularly during the summer season, to an absolutely appalling stench from existing industries in Wingfield. We will not have any more of it; we refuse to further inflict on our own residents those types of offensive industries in a residential area.

The SAMCOR saleyards have already been moved from Gepps Cross to Mallala; at a future stage the abattoirs will be moved further north away from residential areas because residential areas have encroached on what was once broadacre land well removed from residents. If it is so important to have another waste treatment plant in South Australia to compete with the existing waste treatment plants of Cleanaway—and I do not oppose that—it should be placed in an area that suits that type of industry and the type of work it carries out.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to put on record some details regarding the very successful, positive and constructive consultation process which is continuing with respect to water resources issues in this State and particularly involving the Murray River. The two areas of interest with respect to Murray River irrigators specifically include the proposed Water Resources Bill, which the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources will introduce later this year, and the water resource levy which the same Minister announced in terms of a specific amount a couple of weeks ago.

During the past two weeks, while the Budget Estimates Committees have been in progress, as chairman of the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources Backbench Committee working through this proposed Water Resources Bill I organised and chaired two public meetings in relation to these issues—one at Barmera and the other at Murray Bridge. The meetings were particularly directed towards irrigators in the upper reaches of the Murray River and in the lower end of the Murray River in South Australia. Both meetings were attended and addressed by Minister Wotton and the Director of Water Resources for the

Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Peter Hoey, and they spoke in detail. The aim of the meetings was to discuss, consult and update the irrigators on a range of issues affecting irrigators and the influence of those issues with respect to the Bill and the current declaration of the water resources levy.

I want to put on the record a number of factors that have influenced these two issues. The first is the Catchment Management Act, which is currently operating and working well in the metropolitan area, in relation to the Patawalonga and the Torrens Valley. I am pleased to say that it is operating successfully, since this Act will be incorporated in the new Bill. The second is the Premier's and South Australian Government's leadership and great success in promoting the Murray-Darling 2001 project in terms of the benefits it will bring to this State in additional revenue, both federally and from interstate. Thirdly, there is the influence of national competition policy and the influence of the Council of Australian Governments agreements with respect to resource management over the past couple of years. And, fourthly, there is the issue of interstate water capping and trading.

At that meeting we also summarised the consultation process to date, which has included some issues papers last year and a discussion paper early this year. The discussion paper is a *pro forma* to the draft Bill that was released about a month ago. Prior to that there had been tremendous consultation over the previous couple of years by RMWRAC, the River Murray Water Resources Advisory Committee, in terms of its assessment of issues that needed to be addressed to improve the Murray River. Earlier in the same week as the meeting was held in the Riverland, one of the groups that believes that it is representing irrigators on the Murray River, the Murray Catchment Consultative Group, held its own public meeting. To some extent it was on the premise that it wanted to get a representative view to put to the Minister at the Minister's public meeting.

I believe there was a bit of grandstanding in this, to get publicity as much as a real feel for the issue, because much of the submission with respect to irrigator concern on the levy had been well recorded over the past few weeks. At the meeting I attended, I spent something like three-quarters of an hour both speaking and defending the current position with respect to the levy. There were some 80 people there, 20 of whom had come from an earlier meeting in the same hotel. It was put to a vote and there was overwhelming acceptance by the majority. I would have thought that about 40 or 50 hands went up, with only five or 10 against, publicly supporting the .3¢ a kilolitre levy for irrigators up and down the river.

In terms of my presence at that meeting, I did recognise the concerns that continue with respect to the levy. First, there was concern at that and the other public meetings that the levy should not be eaten up in terms of administration component and, secondly, that there should not be an unfettered process that would allow in future for the levy to increase unabated without good reason or without appropriate recommendation or assessment. It was very reassuring that irrigators at large appreciated and accepted the principle of the need for the levy to clean up the Murray River and accepted the specific amount that was declared by the Minister in the last couple of weeks. This River Murray Consultative Group had previously submitted a 10 point submission with respect to the levy issue in the Bill but, with

the announcement of the actual levy and with the process of the public meeting that went on, it was obvious that the majority of those points had been resolved either wholly or partly.

Time does not permit me to go through each of them, but I wish to give examples of how they have been satisfied or resolved. The first issue in this 10-point submission is:

A levy on irrigators should not be introduced until the proposed catchment board has prepared and presented a costed report on the issues facing the river basin.

Without new legislation that requirement is for the Minister to deal with. He is in the process of doing that and it is being advertised publicly. The second point is:

A South Australian levy must be equitable with that in other States.

I can assure irrigators that if they were in Victoria, in particular, they would be paying more than they pay in this State. The third point is:

The levy should not distort the basic structure of horticulture industries away from the current broad horticultural base within South Australia.

That has been satisfied. The fourth point is:

Other South Australian river users should contribute equally to the total catchment levy fund.

That is partly satisfied because of the contribution that will be made by domestic and industrial users through SA Water accounts. The fifth point is:

If the levy on irrigators is introduced, it should be based on water used, not on water allocations.

That was a major concern and, because of the lack of meters for a number of irrigators, that is not possible at this stage. However, that arrangement will be available and we expect it to be progressed by the board as a part component charged on usage in future. Another issue is:

Irrigators must receive rebates for irrigation management improvements undertaken in the past.

The legislation intends to allow for discounts. The next concern related to penalties to foster responsible water use, for which the legislation will allow.

The main concern was how the catchment management board should be constituted and who should be represented on it. A specific proposal was put forward at the public meeting in the Riverland and further espoused at Murray Bridge for a selection panel to advise the Minister as to who should be on the board, and there was a requirement that a number of irrigators should be represented. Importantly, Minister Wotton was clear in his offer to consider further options in this regard, because he reiterated the importance of the board as a major cornerstone in getting this right for the future of the river.

The Minister made it clear that he was working on the strong principle that the board should be selected primarily on the basis of expertise and ability and, secondly, on the basis of interest groups or organisations. I reinforce my thanks to the Minister for his willingness to continue the consultation and to my fellow backbenchers on the backbench committee. Although we were in Estimates, we had good representation at both meetings.

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

Motion carried.

At 7.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 July at 2 p.m.

