

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 October 1996

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

## LAFFER'S TRIANGLE

A petition signed by 403 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure the retention of the land known as Laffer's Triangle as open space was presented by Mr Caudell.

Petition received.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Premier (Hon. Dean Brown)—  
Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1995-96
- By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—  
Development Act—Regulations—Julia Farr Services  
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act—  
Regulations—Various
- Rules of Court—Magistrates Court—Magistrates Court  
Act—Forms
- South Australian Classification Council—Report, 1995-96
- By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—  
Friendly Societies Act—Rules—Pursuant to Section 10  
South Australian Asset Management Corporation and its  
Controlled Entities—Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing  
(Hon.G.A. Ingerson)—  
South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report,  
1995-96
- By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small  
Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—  
SAGRIC International Pty Ltd—Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—  
SA Water—Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—  
Medical Board of South Australia—Report, 1995-96  
Nurses Board of South Australia—Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for the Environment and Natural  
Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—  
Murray Darling Basin Commission—Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for the Ageing (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—  
Office for the Ageing—Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further  
Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—  
Construction Industry Training Board—Report, 1995-96  
The University of Adelaide—  
Report, 1995  
Statutes, 1995
- By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. R.G.  
Kerin)—  
South Australian Research and Development Institute—  
Report, 1995-96
- By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and  
Local Government Relations (Hon. E.S. Ashenden)—  
Department of Housing and Urban Development—Report,  
1995-96  
Development Act—Shack Land Division—Report, 1996  
District Council of Warooka—By-Laws— No. 2—  
Moveable Signs  
Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—  
Report, 1995-96  
Local Government Grants Commission—South  
Australia—Report, 1995-96

- Local Government Superannuation Board—Report,  
1995-96  
Urban Projects Authority—Report, 1995-96  
South Australian Housing Trust—Financial Statements,  
1995-96.

## WORKCOVER CORPORATION

The **Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.A. INGERSON**: WorkCover Corporation has achieved a \$69 million surplus for 1995-96 by fully covering the cost of all injuries incurred in 1995-96 with levies collected in that year. The corporation's annual report shows liabilities fell from \$940 million in June 1995 to \$832 million in June 1996, primarily as a result of redeeming over 1 500 long-term claims. As a result, assets also fell from \$664 million in June 1995 to \$625 million in June 1996. This is equivalent to a 75 per cent funding level as at June 1996, up from 71 per cent unfunded last year. Unfunded liabilities have been reduced from a huge level of \$276 million in June 1995 to a far too high level of \$207 million in June 1996. The corporation also holds surplus funds for \$29 million in other accounts.

The year 1995-96 saw a number of other improvements including:

- Claim numbers fell from 39 500 in 1994-95 to 36 920 in 1995-96.
- Fatalities fell from 24 in 1994-95 to 20 in 1995-96 (and down from 30 a year in the early 1990s).
- The average cost of a claim in 12 months development fell from \$2 046 in 1995 to \$1 850 in 1996.
- Outsourcing of claims management to private agents was successfully completed.
- The average levy rate was maintained at 2.86 per cent for the third year in a row.
- Levy collection at \$271 million exceeded the estimate cost by approximately \$10 million.
- Investment return for 1995-96 was 13.5 per cent up from 7.8 per cent in 1994-95.

The results are encouraging but there remains a major challenge to reduce the unfunded liability to zero. The scheme is now paying its way each year but liabilities from earlier years are not fully funded and a continued focus on return to work of these earlier injured workers is required. The South Australian scheme has become more competitive with other States in the past two years as it has held its rate while employers in New South Wales and Queensland have had rate increases of 40 to 50 per cent. Victorian employers, on the other hand, have had reductions.

There have been gradual improvements each year in South Australia as a result of the innovative programs on occupational health and safety, rehabilitation, claims management and medical services. The introduction of claims agents in 1995 resulted in some disruption to services during 1995-96, but these changes have now stabilised and significant improvements can be observed. The year 1996-97 provides the opportunity to harness the benefits of the changes over the past few years and to address the outstanding issue of the unfunded liability by achieving early and sustainable returns to work.

## QUESTION

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

### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr CLARKE** (2 October).

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The supply of timber from PISA Forestry to Carter Holt Harvey is the subject of seven agreements. The volumes and terms of these agreements effective from 1 July 1996, are:

1. Sawlog Supply Agreement. 440 000 m<sup>3</sup> sawlog per annum for 15 years with a right of renewal for a further 15 years.
2. Mount Burr Sawlog Supply Agreement. 60 000 m<sup>3</sup> sawlog per annum for nine years with a right of renewal for a further 10 years.
3. Expression of Interest Sawlog Supply Agreement. 42 000 m<sup>3</sup> sawlog per annum for four years—no renewal rights.
4. Timber Supply Agreement. 50 000 m<sup>3</sup> sawlog per annum for nine years—no renewal rights.
5. Private Forest Sawlog Supply Agreement. Up to 58 000 m<sup>3</sup> sawlog per annum for four years—no renewal rights. PISA to purchase log from private sources but will underwrite any shortfall in any year with log from PISA forests if required.
6. Pulpwood Supply Agreement. 100 000 m<sup>3</sup> pulpwood per annum for four years. Conditional renewal rights or right of first refusal for a further five years.
7. Preservation Supply Agreement. 14 000 m<sup>3</sup> log suitable for preservation treatment per annum for four years. Conditional renewal rights or right of first refusal for a further five years.

### MODBURY HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** In February 1995 Healthscope Limited was awarded a contract for the management and operation of services at Modbury Public Hospital. The contract is for 10 years with a further two five-year renewals. The contract is therefore an important one with respect to the provision of public hospital services to the residents of Adelaide, particularly those of the north-eastern suburbs. The Government was obliged to review retrospectively the performance of the contract and this has been done on the basis of a cost benefit analysis. Activity levels at Modbury Hospital during the 1995-96 financial year were used as the basis for the analysis and were applied to the 1995-96 case mix funding model for South Australian public hospitals. Lyell McEwin Hospital was used as a comparison for costs not quantified in the case mix funding model as the Lyell McEwin is the public hospital most similar to Modbury.

The cost benefit analysis concluded that the most likely estimate of the total benefit to the South Australian taxpayer of the outsourcing contract is \$7 million for the 1995-96 financial year within a range of plus or minus 5 per cent. The benefit consists of savings to the Government compared to the 'average' hospital of about \$3.7 million and savings resulting from the elimination of cost overruns at Modbury estimated at \$2.2 million to \$4.9 million. If Modbury Hospital had continued to be publicly funded, based on the casemix funding model and adjusted for accruals, it would have received funding of \$41.3 million. The actual cost of the Modbury Hospital, after adjusting contract values for payroll tax benefits and insurance costs, was \$37.6 million. The value therefore of the outsourcing arrangements compared to continued public funding is a benefit of \$3.7 million.

In 1993-94—Modbury's last full year prior to outsourcing—its costs were at least \$4.9 million higher than the Health Commission's funding model allowed in 1995-96 for the 'average' hospital. Although it is not possible to know exactly what the cost overrun would have been if outsourcing had not occurred, it is possible to estimate a range of possible outcomes. On the low side, Modbury's best financial performance relative to Lyell McEwin was an overrun of \$2.2 million. However, on the high side, its performance in 1993-94 relative to the pricing model set in 1995-96 shows a gap of \$4.9 million.

Adding these savings to the \$3.7 million resulting from the discount compared with the average cost of the funding model provides an estimated range of savings of between \$5.9 million and \$8.6 million. If the Modbury Hospital had remained in public sector management and continued to operate at the level of costs at the time of transfer, the outsourcing has achieved an economic benefit for 1995-96 of \$8.6 million. If the assumption is made that the Modbury Hospital would have improved its performance to achieve the standard efficiency gain set for public hospitals, the financial benefit would have been \$5.9 million. However, expecting a public saving of \$2.7 million in one year in a hospital of Modbury's size is beyond recent achievements in the hospital system. A more realistic estimate of achievable savings in 1995-96 is in the order of \$1.5 million. Therefore, the Health Commission has concluded that the best estimate of the benefit of the Modbury outsourcing contract for 1995-96 is \$7 million within a range of plus or minus 5 per cent.

This analysis shows that not only has this outstanding project lived up to expectations—it has actually exceeded them. The project was based on a payback by the end of the third year of the contract. At the current rate of progress, payback will be achieved earlier than planned. Coupled with the recent survey of Modbury patients, which showed that 97 per cent of patients were satisfied with the treatment they had received, this analysis shows that outsourcing is delivering real benefits to the State's taxpayers. A benefit of \$7 million savings for the 1995-96 financial year is tangible proof of just that.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I bring up the thirty-eighth report of the committee on the Kangaroo Island South Coast Road from Seal Bay to Rocky River, the upgrading and sealing, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

## QUESTION TIME

### EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Premier confirm that EDS will establish its Adelaide headquarters in the old News building at North Terrace instead of the Government's previously preferred location at Technology Park?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** No, I cannot confirm that as yet. EDS has not yet notified me of its exact final destination regarding where it will put its data management centre in South Australia. Under the contract, it is able to put it wherever it is willing to negotiate such a settlement with the Government.

## TRADE, EUROPE

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** Will the Premier advise the House of the important opportunities which have recently arisen for the promotion of strong trade links between South Australia and Europe and give details of the greater international recognition which has now been given to South Australia in overseas markets?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** South Australia has done particularly well with exports. We have only to look at the figures to see that this year we had a 17 per cent increase in exports. We are now up to \$4.4 billion, yet just five years ago the export figure was only \$3 billion out of South Australia. Each year we have been in government we have increased our exports. Most of the focus, particularly through the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, has been on Asia. We have had a number of very successful trade missions—one last week in fact—and there has been a range of other trade missions to Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Taiwan and Japan. However, the Government has also maintained a focus on Europe itself, and I believe that there are significant trade opportunities in Europe which this State and the companies here must be willing to embark upon.

I am delighted to say that tomorrow we welcome to South Australia the European Commission's trade mission to Australia. It is a very significant mission indeed which brings a range of people from various commercial backgrounds and people from the European Commission and which will highlight the opportunities for increased trade into the European area. There are 15 member States in what is the world's largest trading market, the European Union. It is an area that I have had a recent opportunity to visit—first Greece and then Italy—and to recognise the opportunity that exists in developing trade with that area. It is also a very important part of attracting new investment to this region of the world.

Europeans generally have the perspective that Australia is a long way away, and therefore they tend to be rather reluctant to come and invest in Australia. I pointed out to the Europeans that in fact Europe sends an enormous amount to Australia, particularly machinery and other goods, and there is a trading imbalance in favour of Europe and against Australia when it comes to international trade. However, there are opportunities there where, frankly, the distance should not be a barrier. As one example, Australia has been very successful indeed in getting wine exports from Australia and particularly South Australia into Europe. I point out to the House that it actually costs less to take a carton of wine from Adelaide to London than from southern France to London. Therefore, that distance should not be a barrier whatsoever in terms of developing increased trade. We as a Government will be putting a case tomorrow to the European Commission arguing very strongly that South Australia is open for investment as the most attractive Australian State in terms of efficiency, productivity and cost competitiveness for new investment.

Equally, I am now able to say to the House that, as a result of my trip to Greece and Italy a few months ago, two significant delegations will be visiting South Australia next year. In February of next year, the President of the Campania region, Dr Rastrelli, will be visiting South Australia and looking at developing new commercial and trade ties with the State as well as enhancing the already existing cultural ties. I am also able to say that our proposed new business council will be able to hold its first meeting while Dr Rastrelli is here

in Australia. Then in March next year we are expecting a significant delegation of Greek Government officials and companies to visit, again as a result of my visit and on my specific invitation to them to come to South Australia. They will be here as part of Glendi and we will be able to hold a further meeting of the South Australian Greek Business Council, which I established 12 or 18 months ago.

Significant opportunities are now starting to develop between South Australia and Europe. I would urge South Australian companies to continue to develop them and particularly to attend tomorrow to look at the opportunities that are outlined by the European Commission.

## EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Premier confirm that the Government is negotiating to provide substantial financial assistance to EDS to locate its head office on North Terrace, and will he tell the House the exact nature and extent of that financial assistance? The Opposition has been advised that the Government is negotiating a multi-million dollar assistance package for EDS to offset the high cost of CBD rental.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I can tell the honourable member that he is absolutely wrong: the Government is holding no negotiations to give any financial assistance whatsoever to EDS. It is a pity that the honourable member makes these sorts of assertions in the House without understanding the facts. The negotiations are between EDS and the developer, and I understand that EDS has been offered very competitive rates indeed. I assure the honourable member that the State Government is not offering EDS any financial assistance whatsoever.

## BULK HANDLING FACILITIES

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Treasurer inform the House of the progress that is being made to sell the Ports Corporation bulk handling facilities? The bulk handling facilities, which are extremely important to the export of South Australian grain crops, were originally listed for sale in 1993 by the former State Labor Government.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Today, I have given notice of amendments to the current Act to be able to advance this process one step further. We have made a number of statements over a period of time on the need to quit those assets which are not the normal responsibility as core assets of Government. It is interesting that in May 1993 the former Government said openly that it would sell the bulk handling facilities. However, when we came into Government in December 1993, the department was unaware of any instruction to do so.

The Asset Management Task Force has been working diligently on a number of issues, in particular, issues of access and of how the Government can divest itself of its asset. A conclusion has been reached, and basically that is that the conveyor belts and all the equipment shall be sold as chattels and there shall be a leasing arrangement over the land so that it will give long-term certainty to any operator. We believe that the sale can be negotiated with South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling.

The Asset Management Task Force has talked to the ACCC about such a transaction: first, the quitting of the asset and under what terms it should be sold; and, secondly, whether there is any difficulty on behalf of the ACCC in accepting that the Cooperative Bulk Handling organisation

would be a worthy buyer. Regarding the issue of the sale itself, the only contention is access. Under the competition principles, we have already certified that we will comply in respect of matters of competition. Therefore, there shall be third party access to those facilities. In terms of any residual thought that there may be lack of competition should the CBH be the successful buyer, the ACCC does not have a problem and does not think it will affect competition in any way. So, the homework is being done.

In terms of the bulk handling facilities that the Government intends to sell, there are Port Adelaide, Port Giles, Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and Thevenard, which are currently owned by the South Australian Ports Corporation. It has been a fairly lengthy exercise, simply because of some of the legal complications associated with the facilities. We have had a number of discussions with Cooperative Bulk Handling. It must be quite clear that, if there is not a resolution or a satisfactory outcome as far as the asset price is concerned, the Government will be forced to go to a competitive tender situation.

Whilst we do not envisage that happening, we must be mindful that that may well occur. In terms of the industry being able to have control of its own facilities, to determine its own future without a middleman or equipment in the middle, that will no longer be the case once we have advanced the Bill through both Houses of Parliament. I expect that there will not be any controversy about that Bill, and then we can go through the process of selling that asset for the benefit of South Australians and dedicate the proceeds to debt reduction. I thank all members, particularly my rural colleagues, for their contributions and their input into this process. I appreciate their strong feelings and their understanding concerning the need for coordinated integrated facilities for the movement of grain.

#### EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Can the Premier confirm that the Government is negotiating to collocate the Department of Information Industries with EDS in the old *News* building on North Terrace, and will he tell the House what this move will cost?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It appears that the honourable member is just throwing balls in the air at random and trying to make some sort of wild allegation. I point out to the honourable member that the first thing he should acknowledge is the fact that this Government has attracted EDS to put its data management centre for the whole of Asia in South Australia. That is my first point. Secondly, he should acknowledge that EDS now employs 460 people in South Australia, whereas a year ago it employed about 20 or 30 people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** He should also acknowledge the fact that EDS will take on another 100 employees by the end of this year if it can meet its target. Clearly, EDS will then employ about 560 people in South Australia, demonstrating that it is quickly attracting a significant new information technology industry to this State.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** There have been a number of Government transfers in that, but it is a minority compared to the number of people involved.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The net gain would be just under 400 people, and that is quite significant indeed. It involves about 460 people. The Opposition is embarrassed about having talked to EDS for five years and not even having been able to sign a memorandum of understanding. We know only too well that the then Minister, the now Leader of the Opposition, took in a submission and asked the Cabinet of which he was a member to sign a memorandum of understanding with EDS. And what happened? Cabinet turned it down. Members opposite could not even see an opportunity for an information technology industry to develop and expand in this State.

Since we have been in government over the past 2¾ years, we have created about 2 500 jobs in information technology, and that is very significant, indeed. These are jobs that previously would not have existed in this State but would have existed in other States of Australia or elsewhere in Asia. We have attracted them to Adelaide to the point where we now have such events as the Leader Conference, which clearly again reinforces our prominent position in information technology in the whole of the Asian area. The Department of Information Industries has been planning to shift for some time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Just wait for it! No negotiations are under way to relocate the Department for Information Industries. We are looking for opportunities and have talked to two or three different building owners. I think it is unfair—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Hart to order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** There is nothing unusual about that. I indicated to this Parliament 12 months ago that the Department of Information Industries was going to relocate. What is new about that? We have been negotiating with a number of building owners about possible sites and will continue to negotiate until we find one that is very satisfactory.

#### SA WATER

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Can the Minister for Infrastructure report to the House on the last 12 months of SA Water operating as a commercial and corporatised entity, and also report on some of the earlier results of the water contract? Just over 12 months ago SA Water was criticised for its outsourcing contract and doubts were expressed about the ability of the organisation to deliver benefits to South Australia and to South Australians.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, I am able to confirm the *Advertiser* report this morning about the very substantial turnaround from a \$47 million loss to a \$61 million dividend to the Government of South Australia—and by any standards for a Government trading enterprise in Australia, let alone overseas, that is a remarkable performance in the interests of all South Australians, in that that dividend flow is contributing to the provision of a whole range of other essential services to South Australia. However, the editorial raised a question as to the quality of the service and a number of other factors. Let me just pick up that point.

Not only do we get a better quality service at a lower cost; not only are we building an export market which is generating jobs in South Australia: we are also getting a better service

delivered to the consumers in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Let me state some of the statistics from the annual report. In areas such as connection to the water and waste water system mains, the normal time which is approximately three weeks is now down to seven days. The replacement of damaged meters, formerly six weeks, is now down to 14 days. As to telephone calls to the SA Water call centre, in the previous year, 28 per cent of calls were answered within the first 60 seconds; last year, 94 per cent were answered in the first 60 seconds. Correspondence has dropped from 15 working days to 10 working days, with a 90 per cent return. There has been a 10 per cent improvement in water quality at the customers' taps since United Water has been undertaking the task on behalf of SA Water. There has also been a 3 per cent improvement in faecal coliforms over that which was provided before.

The question posed was: how do we position ourselves in terms of cost of water with other States of Australia? Therein lies another significant advantage for this State. Not only are we getting better, cheaper water delivered through the tap, with jobs being created in a new export market focused industry, but the latest statistics released by the Commonwealth and Government Trading Enterprises, published in June 1996, indicate that the cost of Adelaide water and sewerage on average was \$674, compared to \$762 in Sydney, \$803 in Perth, \$829 in Melbourne, and \$874 in Brisbane. We are \$200 a year below that which applies on average in Brisbane for the provision of water and waste water services. We are below every other capital city in Australia. Not only are we delivering all these pluses, we are doing it at the same time as maintaining the cost competitive advantage in the water and waste water services to South Australian consumers. That is a good deal for everybody in this State.

### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Does the Premier support the \$850 million and 1 500 job Delphin Lend Lease smart city development planned around Technology Park by the MFP, and would a decision by EDS to locate its head office on North Terrace do damage to this planned development?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I indicated to the media on Sunday afternoon when it was revealed that the matter was before Cabinet, it was up to the MFP board to put a proposal to the Government on the MFP urban development. We have been waiting for that proposal for some time. It has now arrived, and the matter is now before Cabinet, which will make the final decision, taking into account—

**Mr Foley:** Do you support it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Hart for the first time. He has had a fair go.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The interesting thing about the member for Hart is that he was an adviser to the former Premier and he does not even understand or recognise the fact that one of the first things any Minister has to sign is a declaration that whatever goes on in Cabinet is in fact confidential. No wonder the former Government got itself into all sorts of trouble indeed, when members opposite do not even understand what Cabinet confidentiality is all about. The matter is before Cabinet, and it will make a decision.

### POLICE COMMISSIONER

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Can the Minister for Police inform the House of the Government's plans for the appointment of a

new Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner for Police? Last month Commissioner Hunt announced that he plans to retire after 13 years as Police Commissioner and a total of 42 years in the South Australian Police Force. Deputy Commissioner Hurley will also retire in December this year after four decades of service. Further, I note that the Minister has given notice today to introduce a new Bill concerning contract appointments in the Police Force.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The issues of retirement and contracts have come across my desk. As everybody would appreciate, some of the changes recommended as a review of the Police Department involved a contractual relationship rather than a promotional relationship under which officers serve until 65 years of age or retire or suffer some incapacity in the meantime.

The Government, in conjunction with the Police Department, has reviewed all the information provided as a result of the review report. One of the issues is the extent to which a serving police officer at the highest level should remain in that position to the age of 65. That issue, in conjunction with the retirement of the Commissioner and the deputy, has resulted in some recommendations that are now being pursued in a legislative sense, involving contracts to be issued for the positions of Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners. That has the full support and approval of the Police Department and the Police Association. I suspect that anybody looking at employment in contemporary terms would applaud the change, even though we could reflect on the fine service delivered by the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner.

I would like to take a few moments of the House to record the appreciation of I believe all members of Parliament for the service to South Australia provided by David Hunt, AO and Patrick Hurley, AM. David Hunt has served this State for some 42 years. He became a cadet in 1954. He was the youngest Inspector (at the age of 36) in 1970, and he was the youngest Police Commissioner when appointed in 1983, serving in that position for some 13 years. Most people would acknowledge that the fine image of the Police Department remains, whereas other jurisdictions have become somewhat tarnished in the process, and one would have to give credit to Commissioner Hunt's management in ensuring that the Police Force retains a very high respect level, some 82 per cent, within the wider community.

The Deputy Commissioner has served this State for 40 years. He became a cadet in 1956, having been dux of the school in that year. He became an inspector in 1972 and, again, that took place within a short time frame, inspectors having usually been much older before they rose to that rank back in the post Second World War era. The Deputy Commissioner was appointed in 1988 as deputy to David Hunt. There will be an opportunity to make further comments when we debate the Bills involving the change in promotional and appointment procedures, but I would like to say briefly to the House that I am delighted with the shape in which both David Hunt and Pat Hurley are leaving the Police Department.

The Commissioner has assured me that he will not be leaving until such time as the new Commissioner is appointed. Mr Hurley has already indicated that he will be retiring before Christmas. I think it will be a satisfactory transition process, and on behalf of the Parliament I thank both individuals for their service to South Australia.

### EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Premier. What is the nature of the dispute with EDS that has resulted in the information technology assets and staff of the Department of Housing and Urban Development not being transferred to EDS? In his annual report the Auditor-General says that assets of this department were not transferred because of an unresolved matter relating to the valuation and cost treatment of major assets. The Auditor-General said:

The amount subject to resolution in the Department of Housing and Urban Development is material. Its resolution is important to the achievement of the aims of the Government's contractual arrangements with EDS.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** There was a discrepancy of \$2 million within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The amount of data processing work in the department was overstated by \$2 million because in one year's assessment it included the capital cost of a computer rather than putting it down as a recurrent cost. When that was realised, the amount was changed for that department. I point out that EDS has gone ahead and honoured all the concessions and discounts to the Government. At present, negotiations are being finalised with the Government over a new baseline in terms of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is not a major problem.

Basically, data processing across to EDS has been implemented in all three waves of Government departments and it has gone extremely smoothly indeed. This matter—and it was a mistake by that department because it included a capital item in recurrent expenditure—is now being resolved.

### WOMEN IN SPORT

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Following the victory last weekend by South Australia's netball team at the Australian Championships, will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the House of other recent successes by South Australian women in sport?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I take this opportunity to congratulate the women's netball team. It was an absolutely fantastic effort to just beat New South Wales in the early rounds and then trounce both New South Wales and Victoria in the semifinal and the final. It was a magnificent effort by Julie Francou, the South Australian coach, to bring together a team that did not have traditionally all the experience that we have had previously in our netball team. They did a fantastic job in winning the national title. In congratulating Jenny Borlase, I suppose I also must congratulate Darryl Borlase for being part of the Port Adelaide football team. Jenny was captain of the netball team, and I congratulate her along with Julie Francou and the rest of the team.

As well as the netball title, which was a fantastic effort, Quit Lightning and the Hockey Suns also won Australian Championships; so, three teams have won national titles in women's sport. It is interesting that we have not had any men's teams winning national titles. It is a tremendous effort on behalf of women's sport in South Australia. As well as winning the Australian Championship, Quit Lightning members Rachel Sporn, Michelle Brogan and Karla Boyd also brought back bronze medals from the Olympic Games; Kate Slatter, Wendy Schaeffer and Gillian Rolton also brought back gold medals from the Olympic Games.

It has been a tremendous year for women's sport in South Australia, and one of the main reasons for that occurring has been the excellent coaching coming out of the South

Australian Sports Institute. Over the past 10 years, the South Australian Sports Institute has been able to put together excellent coaching methods which have helped our coaches in women's sport. It has been a fantastic effort.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I am reminded that one lonely male team did do reasonably well—the Sheffield Shield team.

**Mr Foley:** What about Port Adelaide?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** That is only a local competition. When the Crows or Port Adelaide win the real competition, then we can talk. A magnificent effort from women's sport and, in particular, a magnificent effort last week by the South Australian women's netball team.

### EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Why has the Premier blamed the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not think that the member for Hart needs any assistance.

**Mr FOLEY:** —mistake in overstating the baseline data of computer work by \$2.1 million when he has been advised that the error was with the Department of Information Industries and EDS? The Opposition has been provided with a leaked document which shows that the EDS—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections coming from the corner on my left.

**Mr FOLEY:** Thank you, Sir, for your protection. The Opposition has been provided with a leaked document which shows that the EDS contract requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development to pay EDS \$2.1 million more than the department should. The leaked document states that, although EDS was given information which clearly showed the contract figure to be wrong, both EDS and the Department of Information Industries accepted that incorrect baseline data. The document further states that EDS was also made privy to the 1994-95 budget estimates which reflected an appropriate reduction in lease commitment from the 1993-94 actual figures which had been provided during due diligence. Both EDS and the Department of Information Industries accepted the baseline cost figure in accordance with the contract. The figure, therefore, was overstated by \$2.1 million.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** It's in the document.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that, whether or not it is in the document, it is still deemed to be comment.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member has confirmed exactly what I said to the House a few minutes ago: the Department of Housing and Urban Development included a capital item—I said \$2 million; it may be \$2.1 million—in its total data processing costs as a capital item which was then incorrectly bulked in with recurrent costs. I point out to the honourable member that as far as we know it is the only area in which a mistake was made in terms of departments putting down their due diligence. As soon as it was identified, it was excluded. Ninety-eight per cent of all State Government data processing is now effectively with EDS and the process has gone smoothly indeed. Because of the mistake made by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that process was delayed. The mistake was

made by the Government and not by EDS, and it was made because of—

**Mr Foley:** The minute said it was an EDS mistake.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It did not. I suggest that the honourable member carefully reassess what the minute said. The minute states that the Department of Housing and Urban Development sent across some figures which were then accepted by the Department of Information Industries and EDS. That is what the minute states.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes, it was. I point out that the mistake was made by the Government and, therefore, the Government is moving to correct that mistake in negotiations with EDS. There is no problem whatsoever—no problem.

### TRAINING PROFILE

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide details of priorities for training in South Australia announced today which should lead to increased employment opportunities? I am advised that earlier today the Minister released the State Training Profile program at Magill Estate.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** This morning I launched the State Training Profile for 1997 and, whilst some members may not regard training as the most exciting area, it is fundamental to our future here in South Australia because it underpins every aspect of our life, and ultimately our survival and our well-being as a State depends on quality training. The profile highlights seven key areas for priority attention: the wine industry, computing and information technology, community services and health, tourism and hospitality, food processing and primary industry. In addition, other areas which will receive particular attention include building and construction, communications and printing, engineering and mining and various utilities which serve the IT area and also, importantly, developing increased linkages between high school and vocational education opportunities.

Within the profile, special recognition is made of the needs of our Aboriginal community, and that is an area of vital importance to the State because it ensures that every section of the community receives proper recognition and provision in respect of training. It was pleasing to see this morning that Sally Nunan, a self-employed graphic designer, was there to speak and provide further evidence of the excellent talent among our young people in this State. At the ripe old age of 19 she established her own graphic design business—Image and Substance—which is doing very well. This highlights to our young people the opportunities that exist to consider self employment as well as considering the alternative of working for someone else.

This country was built with entrepreneurship and people who were prepared to be risk takers. We should be encouraging our young people to look at self employment in areas such as tourism as well as the area taken up by Sally. One indication of the quality of training in this State was demonstrated in terms of the refreshments served today, particularly the Penfolds Bin 407, which reflects high quality in the wine industry. But, as I indicated before, training is where our future lies. Training means jobs, profitability, productivity and being world competitive. If we do those things, we will have a bright future here in South Australia.

### STATE ECONOMY

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

Does the Premier accept the view of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies that 'the overall state of the South Australian economy must still be described as generally weak'? The latest publication of the centre states that new home approvals remain weak, that vehicle sales have an underlying trend of zero growth, that the real value of our manufactured exports and private investment both fell during 1995-96, and the only factor stopping our unemployment reaching 10.5 per cent or more is the large number of people leaving South Australia for interstate?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The interesting thing is that, if we look at the broad South Australian economy, it is performing as one of the best of any State in Australia. We have only to look at the fact that for the past 12 months the growth rate has been 4.7 per cent, which is certainly in the top three States in Australia. I think Western Australia is ahead of that and Queensland is just ahead of South Australia, so South Australia is performing better than the other manufacturing States of Australia like New South Wales and Victoria. Certainly, there are sectors of the economy—and I indicated this to the House several weeks ago—which are weak.

If you like, we have two economies, and there was an interesting article in the *Financial Review* on this about a week ago. Indeed, I urge the Leader of the Opposition—seeing that he does not understand much about economics—to pick up a copy and read that article. If the Leader read the *Financial Review*, he would see that there are some sectors of the Australian economy—and we are talking about the Australian economy—that are doing extremely well, and there are other sectors of the Australian economy that are not doing so well. Certainly, any area focused on exporting in South Australia is tending to do very well. Earlier this afternoon I talked about the 17 per cent growth in exports from South Australia and the fact that our exports have grown over the past five years from about \$3 billion to \$4.4 billion, which is a very dramatic increase indeed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Look at where the job opportunities have been created. It is around—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition listen because obviously he just does not understand what is occurring in the South Australian economy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members have performed very well and I do not want them to spoil their record.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** To show the level of growth that has occurred, I point out that about 26 000 extra jobs are now in the South Australian economy compared to when we came to Government 2¾ years ago, in January 1994. We have reduced unemployment from the 12.3 per cent under Labor down to about 9.7 per cent at present. That is a dramatic drop compared to its level under the Labor Party of 12.3 per cent when the Leader of the Opposition was the then Minister responsible for employment. It was incredible. When the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister, we lost 34 jobs in South Australia every day. What a record. I invite the Leader to look at our employment record since January 1994 compared to the employment record when he was the Minister responsible.

I also point out that Morgan and Banks' latest survey indicates that only one State in Australia is showing a positive increase in job vacancies—South Australia—with a 20 per cent increase. We had a 20 per cent increase in South Australia, the only State in Australia to have an increase, and all the other States suffered a negative figure. I am the first to acknowledge that some sectors of the South Australian economy—housing and traditional retail sales—tend to be flat, but even the latest figures show that retail sales are starting to increase in South Australia. Therefore, if we take the State economy as a whole—and it is the only fair way in which to judge it—South Australia is in fact performing better than the average for the rest of Australia. Our growth rate and our increase in exports is faster than the rest of Australia and we have created about 26 000 extra jobs.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMALGAMATIONS

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** Mr Speaker—  
*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kaurna has the call and not the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mrs ROSENBERG:** Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations advise the House how many local council amalgamations have taken place to date and the total number of councils likely to exist at the end of the year?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I thank the honourable member for her question and her continuing interest in local government reform. I am delighted to be able to advise the House that the boundary reform program and process is proceeding very well indeed. To date eight amalgamations of entire councils have been proclaimed, which has reduced the total number of councils by nine from 118 to 109.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** Don't get impatient—that is just the start and the better news is yet to come. Councils which have already amalgamated are the City of Port Adelaide and Enfield, the District Council of Kapunda and Light, the Port Pirie City and District Council, the District Council of Grant, the Barossa Council, the District Council of Renmark Paringa, the District Council of Barmera Berri and the City of Holdfast Bay.

In addition, there has been one boundary adjustment of a parcel of land from the City of Noarlunga to the City of Marion proclaimed as part of the structure reform process. The Boundary Reform Board has recently received a proposal from the District Council of Kingscote and the District Council of Dudley to form a new Kangaroo Island council. A further 27 groups of councils are actively pursuing structural reform and are proposing to lodge proposals with the board before the end of this year. If all the proposals are submitted and accepted by the board and the Government, it is expected that the number of councils in this State at the elections next May will be 65, which is very close to the 50 per cent the Government indicated it would regard as a good result from this process.

The board is undertaking further investigations in several areas: in the Fleurieu Peninsula we have the Strathalbyn, Port Elliott and Goolwa, Victor Harbor, Yankalilla and Willunga or part thereof; we have the eastern and southern metropolitan areas of Marion, Mitcham, Unley, Burnside, Tea Tree Gully, Payneham and Campbelltown; we have the Adelaide Hills with Stirling, East Torrens, Onkaparinga and Gumeracha; and we have the Far North with Kanyaka-Quorn and Hawker.

Each of these investigations are at different stages and vary from a full scale analysis of options of the eastern and southern metropolitan area to finalisation of a proposal for the Adelaide Hills and a possible initiated submission in relation to Kanyaka-Quorn and Hawker.

At this stage, I advise the House that only 14 councils are not actively participating in the structural reform process because they are either geographically isolated or their neighbours are exploring alternative options and therefore they are not involved in discussions. All in all, members of the House would have to acknowledge that the process which is occurring is leading to a number of amalgamations and I believe that the results are outstanding.

### STATE ECONOMY

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Premier's comments about the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies' report, does he accept and is he concerned about the findings of the latest Access Economics report on the South Australian economy which projects the State as having an unemployment rate of 11.3 per cent by the year 2001?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It just shows the fantasy in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. I did not say anything about the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies' report.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** Yes, you did.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I did not. I only commented on the economy. I did not say a thing about the report. It just shows the absolute lack of substance in the Leader of the Opposition's question. He sits there—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked his question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—fabricates his question and then stands up—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will not invite interjections. I suggest that the Premier get on and answer the substance of the question.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is completely out of order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I was pointing out to members that there is absolutely no substance in the question whatsoever, because the question specifically referred to my comments about the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies' report.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I passed no such comment.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the House of any details concerning the appointment of a new chief executive officer for the Country Fire Service?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I thank the member for Chaffey for his question. I am well aware of the honourable member's strong support for the Country Fire Service in his district and I realise that the answer to this question is particularly important to them. A national search was conducted for a new chief executive officer following the

retirement of Mr Alan Ferris as CEO of the service. Mr Ferris served the Country Fire Service with a distinguished career spanning some 10 years. I am prepared to reveal today that Mr Ferris found it necessary to retire from the Country Fire Service earlier than he had planned due to his wife's illness. He wished to be able to care for his wife during her illness and, regrettably, Mrs Susan Ferris passed away some two weeks ago—and I am sure that the best wishes of all members of the House and their feelings are with Mr Ferris and his family during this time of sadness.

As a result of the endeavours of Mr Ferris, it was indeed a difficult task to fill his shoes and to find someone equally capable. After a national search—43 people applied for the position of chief executive of the Country Fire Service—a five person committee, including three members of the existing Country Fire Service Board, conducted interviews and put their recommendation to the Government, and it has now been accepted. I am pleased to advise the House that the new chief executive officer of the Country Fire Service will be Mr Stuart Ellis AM who will start in his new position in early December this year. Mr Ellis, who is 39, is currently a Lieutenant Colonel in the Australian Army, where he has achieved a distinguished 21 year military career, including an exchange posting with the British SAS for two years. He has a Bachelor of Arts (Military Studies) from the University of New South Wales, a Graduate Diploma in Management Studies and a Graduate Diploma in Strategic Studies.

Mr Ellis is currently the Commanding Officer and Chief Instructor at the Royal Military College, Duntroon, in the Australian Capital Territory, where all Australian Army officers are trained in leadership, management and command. In the 1995 Queen's Birthday Honours List, Mr Ellis was recognised as a Member of the Order of Australia for exceptional service to the Australian Army. He is South Australian born. Indeed, Mr Ellis spent his formative years in Yankalilla and completed his secondary education in South Australia prior to taking up his career with the army. In June 1996 he was placed on the board of inquiry for the Black Hawk helicopter investigation and it is for this reason that he is unable to commence his new position until early December. Undoubtedly, Mr Ellis will bring a wealth of experience and management ability to his new position. His credentials and qualifications speak highly of his ability and dedication to his career. I am confident he will bring a fresh and innovative approach to the Country Fire Service.

### TRAINING PROFILE

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Given the Minister's release today of the 1997 State training profile, will he advise the House what additional funds will be made available—as indicated in the Minister's press release—to fund the high priority areas identified in the profile and what will be the source of those additional funds?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I thank the member for Taylor for her interest in matters pertaining to training. The Government in its most recent budget increased its allocation for training in this State. The honourable member would know that many of the training funds come from the Commonwealth also and, in discussions with Commonwealth Ministers, there is agreement to provide funding for significant areas of training. As a result of maintaining effort in the TAFE sector in the past year, we will be receiving additional growth funds, as the honourable member would be well aware.

### TUNA INDUSTRY

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House of the outcomes of moves to obtain financial assistance for the tuna industry to assist with diver and boat operator training?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Flinders for the question but also for her obvious interest in the tuna industry and her assistance with this issue. The Tuna Boat Owners Association applied for funding for diver training in lieu of compensation resulting from the losses incurred in the storms of April 1996. Industry claimed that training was necessary to ensure that farm employees would remain in the Port Lincoln area throughout the period in which there would be little work because of the lack of stock. A proposal was put forward by the association to the Federal Government for funding to train 16 divers and seven people to master level 5 boat handling certificate level. Both my colleague the Minister for Industrial Affairs and I discussed the matter with the tuna boat operators and we lobbied the Federal Minister for Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs for her assistance.

I also point out that the member for Flinders led a delegation to the Federal Minister's office seeking her assistance. That lobbying has paid dividends and I inform the House that the Federal Government through the Federal Minister has approved a grant of \$80 000 under the training and skills program. This will provide diving and boat operating training for the Port Lincoln tuna boat work force. The grant has been awarded to the Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia, and the Port Lincoln manager of the CES is charged with coordinating the implementation of the training in conjunction with the operators of the tuna farms. The association is expected to submit detailed proposals for the allocation of the grant in the near future. It should be noted that a condition of the grant is that it be used for existing employees. Diver training is of vital importance to the tuna boat industry and its future development, and I am confident that the tuna industry on Eyre Peninsula can recover from the recent setback and will have a very viable future. It is an important part of employment in the region and this assistance to keep experienced people in the area and to increase their skill levels is an important boost for the industry and for Port Lincoln. Once again, I thank Federal Minister Vanstone for her assistance and acknowledge the important role that the member for Flinders played in obtaining this grant.

### SPEED CAMERAS

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister for Police act to prevent speed camera operators from concealing their cameras immediately in front of their Government plated vehicles and therefore hidden from the view of drivers of approaching vehicles? South Australian Police General Order 8910 with respect to the operation of speed cameras is used by the police Security Services Division's Speed Camera Unit. This general order outlines guidelines and instructions to be followed by the unit's operators. One of the instructions is that the speed camera is 'not to be hidden behind bushes, buildings or any other obstacle except when occupational health and safety dictates a location cannot be worked any other way'.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Quite clearly, the answer is 'Absolutely no'.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is particularly interested in the question.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am amazed that we should even have a question of this nature. We have just seen a deterioration in the road toll, with 20 more deaths than last year; we have seen a breakdown in that long-term reduction curve; and we have seen jurisdictions all across Australia saying we have to be tougher and more focused and that we do not make even half the effort. I have a particular view: I do not give a damn whether the speed camera is hidden, quite frankly. That is my personal opinion. It just so happens that there is a protocol in place.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I do, occasionally, and I will be driving at some time in the future. A protocol is in place, which is adhered to, except where there are black spots. The general orders are adhered to in respect of the hiding of cameras as well as at the bottom of hills, except where there have been reports of exceptional speed or a number of accidents. Each member writes to me and gives me all manner of excuses about why someone was speeding. Just about every member of this Parliament has given me a sob story, and none of them wash. Research has been undertaken, and the Vulcan report that has been put out states that we must be far more active and should fine far more people for speeding than we have done in the past. We must be more active.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am simply saying that there is a difference of opinion. Protocols are in place which are generally adhered to in the Police Department. Those protocols do not cover the issue of a car behind the camera. I will not change that rule at this stage. If I followed the Vulcan report, I would use everything available to the police in order to catch speeding and drink-driving motorists. There are no excuses.

#### ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL COMMISSIONERS

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Has the Premier seen the statement issued by the Leader of the Opposition today concerning the appointment of three commissioners to the City of Adelaide, and what response does the Premier have to the Leader of the Opposition's statement?

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** No, I am asking a question about your statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is of the view that the question is pre-empting a debate that may take place in the near future. Therefore, the question is out of order.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take it that the member for Goyder has a point of order.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, Mr Speaker. My point of order is that the Leader of the Opposition has put out a statement today concerning the appointment of three commissioners to the City of Adelaide; my question was about the statement that was made, not the Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder will resume his seat. From what the honourable member has indicated, the statement was made outside the House and therefore in no way reflects upon the decision the Chair has made. If the honourable member wants to ask the question,

he should rephrase it in a manner that is in accordance with Standing Orders.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And I sincerely hope that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows—

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Being an honest politician, I must confess that it was I.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! On this occasion I acknowledge that the offender was the member for Hart. We will let matters rest.

---

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

That the report of the committee be printed.

Motion carried.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Of late, the public of Australia has been very taken with remarks made in other Parliaments, and much of the defence of those remarks has referred to the fact that they reflect public opinion. Indeed, of late increasingly the catch-cry of citizens' initiated referenda seems to be taken up by various political groups.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much conversation. Members will not congregate in the centre: it is rude to the member for Unley. The member for Unley has the call.

**Mr BRINDAL:** There seems to be an increasing call among our community for citizens' initiated referenda, and I know that this matter has concerned a number of members of this House for some years. I must admit that some years ago I was attracted to the proposition that, if we live in a democracy, people who are capable of exercising a democratic right to elect members to this place should on occasion be consulted and should have their wishes taken into account when they take a point of view.

Unlike the member for Spence, who is inclined to shoot and dribble from the mouth rather than engage his brain, I consulted some of my senior colleagues and spoke to a number of political analysts on the matter of citizens' initiated referenda. The member for Spence is a great one for saying, when it suits him, that people should be consulted, but I remind the honourable member that his voting record in this place is anything but a reflection of the will of the people of South Australia. I can quote him several instances where quite clearly public opinion and any citizens' initiated referenda would result in Bills before this House that the member for Spence and others in this place would find abhorrent.

So, the honourable member seems to be caught on the classic horns of a dilemma. He supports citizens' initiated referenda when it suits him and his point of view but, when it is a conscience issue such as abortion, prostitution reform, capital punishment or a plethora of other issues where public support runs at about 70 per cent, the member for Spence says, 'That is all well and good, but we should ignore public opinion, because we know better.'

I inform the member for Spence that I have done a bit of work and spoken to a number of political analysts and noted academics on this subject, and I agree with the honourable member. Having thought this matter through, I quote Dean Jaensch who, in answer to my question about whether citizens' initiated referenda would be a good idea, said that it is a great idea in theory, provided the electorate takes the responsibility to inform itself on the issues.

He went on to explain that the very reason that we have a representative democracy is that members of this place are elected to the service of people. We are elected to full-time positions to study issues, to look at all aspects of those issues, and to make informed decisions. The argument is that we are elected to do a job, and because we are elected to do a full-time job we are more capable of making informed decisions than people who live a normal daily life.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith has been here for two minutes and is an expert on all things. In my case, it may well bring it into doubt, but I assure the member for Ross Smith that, if we look at the polling results in the honourable member's electorate, I am likely to be the member for Unley for much longer than he is likely to be the member for Ross Smith. Therefore, whilst I support the theory of citizens' initiated referenda—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley does not need any assistance.

**Mr BRINDAL:** —as a Parliament we must look at the educative process of our young people. If we seek to give the citizens of South Australia greater responsibility in the Government, we must educate them to exercise that responsibility. It is as easy as that: no education, no citizens' initiated referenda.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I agree with the member for Ridley: we should start with some of the members of this place.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Napier.

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I want to spend a little time today talking about one of the recommendations of the Government task force which was set up to investigate child abuse. Although I will refer in particular to only one of its recommendations, from a brief look at the report I believe that it has come up with a number of excellent recommendations. The recommendation in which I am interested in particular is that parents of newborn babies should be visited as part of a program to prevent child abuse and provide support that is required for families. This recommendation justifies what the Opposition has been saying since this Government came into office. In particular, I feel aggrieved because a couple of programs in my electorate that were beginning to operate for the whole of the northern suburbs were axed by this Government for short-term funding reasons.

The first program to go in my area was called Carelink. This program operated in the middle of my electorate and involved many agencies concerned with child care and the provision of support and assistance for families whose children were in danger of abuse. The Carelink program was a great model for other services. Families could go to one area and have all their requirements attended to. The program included staff of CAFHS, psychologists and family therapists as well as representatives from the Department for Family

and Community Services. This meant that families could go to one spot and get the help they required. It was a good program which was working very effectively in the area, but it was cut on funding grounds.

Carelink having gone, and at the same time the Para Districts counselling service having gone, people in my area were left with very few places to go, but we were reassured because a program called Healthy Start had been foreshadowed. This program had just begun, staffing had been set up, and the system had been organised. Healthy Start was designed to be a visiting program for parents of newborn babies, which is exactly what this report recommends. Money had already been spent on finding an office and appointing staff, the literature had been commenced and surveys done, but that program was cut by the Minister for Health, again for funding reasons. So, people in my area were left without any program whatsoever.

When the member for Elizabeth, as shadow Minister, and I protested bitterly about this, the Government replied that it was setting up a task force to investigate child abuse and see what needed to be done. What needed to be done was to set up an organisation such as Carelink and a program such as Healthy Start. In setting up this task force, the Government reinforced what everyone with any sensitivity for families in crisis knew already, and that is why the previous Labor Government had set up the Carelink program. Now, if the Government accepts this recommendation, which it should, it will have to reinvent and restaff programs that were already working effectively. I think it is a real indictment on this Government that it has had to go to the time and expense of setting up this task force which is now saying to the Government that we had it right in South Australia in the beginning. It seems that this Government is not satisfied until it has paid outside consultants to tell us these things when the community had already got it right and when these programs were already running properly.

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** The year 1995 will go down as the year in which more trees were planted in South Australia than were cleared. About 10 668 000 trees were planted in this State, and that is a great credit to this Government. It will go a long way towards solving the problem of erosion and the greenhouse effect. Today, I want to talk about trees in a different area, and that is trees and gardens in urban areas which I consider to be significant and unique and which deserve preservation. Recently in Norwood I received a petition from residents requesting the saving of a property at 115 George Street, Norwood. The house which was built on this large block in 1858 is architecturally significant, and the people who lived in the house have played an important role in the history of Norwood. There are significant gardens and trees on the property. In particular, there are Moreton Bay figs, two of which are well over 50 years old; old palms; huge pines; and a massive open space area.

Of significance is the fact that there is a creek which runs along the northern boundary of the property in a natural water plain. If members are familiar with my electorate of Norwood they will know that, unfortunately, the creek is a cement culvert, but on this property the creek is situated in a natural wetland with natural vegetation which has been there for as long as residents can remember.

Unfortunately for the people of Norwood, this property was recently bought by a developer, who I understand will be able to erect about 15 town houses on this property. The

Kensington and Norwood council had the chance to buy this property, but it was too tight with its money, so the developer bought the property for \$530 000. If the council had used its commonsense and bought the property, it could have subdivided the house and sold it for \$350 000, and got all this land for the price of a cottage in Norwood—\$180 000. We are now presented with a problem because the developer has its hands on the property. What will we do about it? I wrote to the council about this matter saying that it should lodge an amended development plan, but if we look at the Labor Party's development plan of May 1993 we will see that it does not contain any provision for the preservation of gardens or trees. When the Labor Party proposed this Bill, it did not bother to provide for the preservation of trees and gardens.

All that section 23 of the Development Act really talks about is buildings: it does not refer to trees or gardens. I wonder why the former Labor Government did not include a provision in the Development Act to ensure that gardens and trees are protected. I have spoken to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, who has told me that he has established a task force to look at the question of trees and gardens.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr CUMMINS:** It is obvious that the member for Ross Smith does not care about trees or the environment, as he constantly interferes when I try to talk in the House about this important issue. The Labor Opposition just sits there and screams. I really wonder about the honourable member's concern for the environment, but I will now go back to what I was saying. I suggest to the Minister that the Development Act 1993 be amended to ensure that significant unique gardens and trees in urban areas are protected. Unfortunately, in the case to which I refer, the amendments to this Act—because the Labor Party did nothing about it in its term of office—will be too late. I would urge the Kensington and Norwood council to acquire this property at valuation, which it can do. By simply subdividing the property—chopping off the house with a bit of land and chopping off another block—it could put some restrictive covenants on this property, register it at the Lands Title Office and thereby protect the garden and the trees so that the people of Norwood could have the benefit of that lovely property at 115 George Street Norwood.

I sincerely hope that this will be done by council. I urge our Minister and this Government to amend the Development Act to ensure that in future this does not happen, that trees and unique properties are protected so that developers cannot come in and savage the urban environment of South Australia which some of them are wont to do. I am not necessarily saying that this developer would do that, but it is imperative that we protect the environment for urban dwellers.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I wish to use this opportunity to commend publicly all foster carers in South Australia for the valuable, sensitive and caring service they provide for our community by becoming personally involved in the lives of young people and children over a period which could be anything from 24 hours to several years. I recently had the privilege of officially launching Foster Care Week 1996 on behalf of the Minister for Family and Community Services. A Family Fun Night was held at the Parks Community Centre on 7 September as part of the national Foster Care Week activities. Foster Care Week was initiated in an attempt to acknowledge the important role and commitment undertaken by foster families who take vulnerable children into their

lives and provide love, care and a stable and secure environment.

Foster care is the backbone of alternative care in this State. Carers who provide care for children all day, everyday, know a child in a way that professionals can never know a child. Foster parents must be regarded as partners in the provision of service to vulnerable families and children. In my own contact with children in care and with foster parents, I have seen first-hand the commitment of foster parents to the children in their care. I have talked to children and young people who have been given a stable and loving family environment by their foster families. It is not always an easy task to take a child or a young person into one's own family environment and to deal with the everyday situations that demand a great deal of understanding and tolerance in many cases to turn crisis into harmony. I have a great deal of admiration for those in our community who give so much of themselves to support and help others. I also acknowledge foster parents who can perform that most challenging of roles—to love and care for a child and then assist them to leave, in some cases assisting them to return to their birth families.

The nurturing and responsible role undertaken by foster families should also serve as a reminder to all adults in our society of the fundamental principle relating to protection and care of children which should be regarded as a natural and instinctive role of all responsible adults. It is important to ensure that the alternative care system is focused on the needs of children and their families, and to ensure also that carers are adequately supported to undertake this important role. Whether fostering is providing respite care to enable a vulnerable parent to manage, whether it is assisting a child to return home or to provide a child with a long-term home, it remains a vital part of our welfare system for children in need. It is also a vital part of our community structure, as the strength of a community lies in the number of people who are prepared to give to others.

I wish to thank Eveline Linker, Training and Assessment Coordinator for Emergency Foster Care and a member of the Foster Care Week Committee 1996, for her efforts and lively energy in organising the Family Fun Night for carers and their families who, from my own observations, utilised the facilities at The Parks with a great deal of enjoyment and certainly a lot of fun. I also wish to thank Joyce for the posters to advertise Foster Care Week which were displayed on various community notice boards. I want to say a special 'Thank you' to the committee, which was also responsible for library displays in over 20 metropolitan libraries. Carers may often feel that their efforts go unnoticed; I can only trust that this public acknowledgment will assure them that their special role in our community is indeed recognised and greatly appreciated.

I would also like to acknowledge recent changes to another area of child protection, and that is the area of child protection orders. Currently, there are no provisions for the transfer of child protection proceedings, and the majority of child protection orders are not transferable. However, at the recently held meeting of Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers, an agreement was reached to provide cross-border protection of children who are the subject of child protection orders. That agreement will put in place a workable, practical and effective means of resolving cross-border issues. I commend the Family and Community Services Ministers for their foresight in correcting what was an anomalous situation

which previously did not offer the best possible protection for our children.

The Minister has also agreed that child protection proceedings and orders should be administered by the State or Territory where a child resides. These cross-border issues, which in the past have resulted in child protection orders becoming unenforceable once a child moves interstate, are now resolved.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** This afternoon in Question Time I asked a question of the Police Minister about speed cameras always being used—and this has been my own experience—in a concealed position in front of Government plated vehicles and, therefore, being hidden from the view of approaching motorists. As I mentioned in my question, South Australian Police General Order 8910 applying to the operation of speed cameras is used by the Police Security Services Division, Speed Camera Unit, for the operation of speed cameras. I mentioned that one of the conditions is that these cameras not be hidden. Recently, an investigation in connection with speed cameras was undertaken by the Police Complaints Authority. When it interviewed speed camera operators, it found that all the operators were well aware of their obligations, requirements and responsibilities with respect to openness. The openness policy is in the guidelines and instructions for camera operators, and it was also adhered to by the South Australian Police Department when it manned these cameras. The general orders are utilised by the Speed Camera Unit, and the guidelines and instructions are well known to the unit's operators.

During the Police Complaints Authority's investigation, the openness policy was well known and recognised by the operators. One guideline and instruction contained in that openness policy is that cameras are not to be used within 200 metres of a change of speed zone sign. This happens in many situations where motorists are driving in an 80 kilometre zone and then a 60 kilometre sign comes up. Obviously, any responsible motorist would not jam on the brakes and cause embarrassment to following drivers. They just let their vehicle speed reduce until it gets down from 80 to 60 kilometres. This could take up to a couple of hundred metres. Quite often the speed cameras are set up within that 200 metre zone, and motorists travelling at 70 or 75km/h are pinged. That is very unfair. In this openness policy, there is an out—an exception where it is not physically possible—whereby, for example, at road works or in school zones a camera can be set up within that 200 metre distance. This is very unfair, and I feel that it occurs in places where that exception should not really be applied.

Further, a camera is not to be positioned at the bottom of a hill unless it is justified by collision data, and that is obviously an out for those concerned. This is a pretty common situation: quite often the road at the bottom of a hill can be seen clearly, and I cannot see such camera use being justified by collision data. Another policy states that cameras are not to be positioned on freeways, although we know that this quite often happens. Once again, they have the out 'unless justified by collision data'. Cameras—and this is the other point involved in the openness policy—are not to be hidden by bushes, buildings or any other obstacle (a Government car is certainly 'any other obstacle') except when occupational, health and safety dictates that a location cannot be worked by any other way. This pertains to the operator of the camera. If there is any occupational health and safety risk to that person, they can put the camera in that position.

However, as far as I have seen out on the roads, irrespective of the sites, they are placed in front of a vehicle where they cannot be seen by an approaching motorist.

It is interesting to note the Minister's answer. I cannot remember it exactly, but it is recorded in *Hansard*. He made the point that he would do whatever is necessary to ping these motorists. I accuse the Minister and the Government of indulging in a purely revenue raising exercise. I know there has to be a balance. We have to have road safety, and the speed cameras have been a very good deterrent.

**Mr BASS (Florey):** I am glad that the member for Price was not a member of Parliament when I was a speed cop, because I can remember hiding in the bushes on the Main North Road at Elizabeth on my police bike and catching people as they came through the town.

**Mr Clarke:** Why did you hide in the bushes, Sam?

**Mr BASS:** I would hide in the bushes for a long time, I can tell you! I would like to discuss the firearms buy back scheme which has been in operation since 9 September. Last week I went down to Thebarton Police Barracks and went through the system implemented by Superintendent Jim Lister and Senior Sergeant David Neil so that the banned firearms that are handed in can be destroyed. Notwithstanding that I do not agree with some of the legislation, I was most impressed with the way the police have set up a system which—notwithstanding early problems—makes it very safe for the people there.

People walk in with a firearm and it is checked to make sure it is unloaded. It then goes into a system which sees the firearm go through a series of checks, including a check on the computer, ending with the drawing up of a bank cheque in payment. The firearm is then put into a disposal rubbish bin, with a maximum of 20 per bin. The paperwork is attached to that bin. It then goes through into a large room where there are two machines which cut the firearms into two pieces. The firearms are returned to the same bin so the paperwork is still with those firearms in the bin. The bin is then placed in a store room and is finally loaded into a locked bin which takes the firearms off to be destroyed, either every day or every other day.

The Police Department has changed its method of destruction. The weapons are no longer taken to Whyalla for melting down. They are now taken to a scrap metal place at Enfield where they are crushed, put into a block and exported to Taiwan. No doubt in time they will come back to Australia as Daewoos. Perhaps these new Daewoos will have names like '12 gauge coupe', 'rapid fire 5 door' and the up market 'rifle barrel sports'. Notwithstanding that, I must congratulate the police on the job they have done. I notice that, as of 9 October, 22 000 firearms had been handed in, plus various parts and ammunition. I see from a later newspaper announcement that the Minister has said that figure is now up to 25 000. Up to that date, 9 October, which is only one month after commencement, \$10.5 million had been paid out in compensation.

It is believed that approximately 80 000 legally held firearms are on the banned list. I know that the firearms records are not up to date in as much as there could be up to 10 000 more banned firearms that are recorded as bolt action repeaters. Notwithstanding the inaccurate firearms records, the first month of the scheme indicates that the buy back scheme will cost the taxpayer in the vicinity of \$50 million, and this is without taking into account compensation to the dealers for loss of income.

It concerns me that in the first month only 25 per cent of the firearms have been collected. I urge all firearms owners to hand in their firearms sooner rather than later in order to avoid a last minute rush that would only create further problems. I remind firearms owners that it was not the police who made this law—it was the politicians. The police are there to do a job, and I would ask all people to treat the police as individuals who are just doing their job and, on my observations, an excellent job.

---

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 3 October. Page 119.)

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I rise to support the Address in Reply and, in so doing, extend my congratulations to His Excellency Sir Eric Neal on his appointment as Governor of this State. I commend him on his inaugural speech to this Parliament and trust that he and Lady Neal enjoy their time in Government House. South Australians are very fortunate to have a Governor with such a distinguished career in business. There is no doubt that His Excellency's business background and his longstanding commitment to this State will benefit South Australia as we position ourselves as a major trading force as we move into the twenty-first century. I also take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency on being awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of the University of South Australia at a ceremony which I had the pleasure to attend yesterday.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Dame Roma Mitchell for her contribution as Governor of South Australia during her term of office. We are all aware of her continuing commitment to serving this State and her involvement in the community. Her role and experience in affairs with which she is currently involved is very much appreciated. Thank you, Dame Roma. It is indeed my honour to have been elected to office during the terms of two very eminent and honourable people.

There is no question that the way this State is directed in the next few years will have long lasting effects for decades to come. It will affect future generations. We must therefore get it right if we are to have a solid future in this ever-changing world. I believe that, if we can put aside the political rhetoric, particularly from members opposite, and concentrate on policies instead of personalities, we will be heading in the right direction. We must also identify and separate those issues which are within the realm of Government and not be sidetracked as those opposite might have us do by raising matters which are beyond the realm of State Government. The average wage, the pension, is not given to be spent on gambling to the extent that some people do. It is our responsibility to educate and encourage the community to make responsible choices.

The recent unemployment statistics, particularly those relating to youth unemployment, are of major concern for all South Australians. As a father of three children, I am concerned with these statistics, as is every member on this side of the House. We are aware of the problem, and the Premier is aware of the problem, and we are determined to give it top priority to reduce the numbers, because it is of

prime importance to us all. The solution is not in short-term training schemes, although there is a great deal of merit in some of those schemes. The ultimate solution is the creation of long-term real jobs. Opportunities must be provided in this State for our talented young people who will play a crucial role in the future development of this State. Members opposite know there are no quick fixes because, if there were, we would not have inherited the problem of a 12 per cent general unemployment rate in 1993 as well as the present rate of youth unemployment.

Members opposite are acutely aware that we are faced with an ageing population; receiving a disproportionate amount of migrants in this State; and facing structural changes in the economy. The birth rate has not just declined in the past two years—these trends were evident when they were in Government. The Bannon and Arnold Governments had the opportunity to respond and to do something about the situation long before we came into office. The present Leader was the Minister. It is difficult to stimulate and sustain the housing industry when the population base is declining. The very age group of those who could stimulate the economy is not in the same proportion as it once was. These problems would have to be faced by any Government in power. It is not the fault of the Dean Brown Government. Other States are experiencing similar problems.

We must separate the rhetoric from the reality. Do members opposite quote figures which show that our exports have increased (as the Premier said during Question Time today) dramatically in the past 2½ years? There are positive signs that things are improving and that we are working towards finding lasting solutions. As we discovered in December 1993, budget deficits cannot be relied upon forever. Positive and sometimes drastic steps must be taken to accomplish those lasting positive changes. We cannot take the future for granted—it must be built on a sound and solid present, and it must be built on an economy that is viable, varied and sensible. It must provide an increase in gross State product as well as gross social product with an emphasis on environmental factors.

We are heading in the right direction. Look at the progress that has been made with our waterways. In the long term there is no sound economy without a sound environment. It costs us more to clean-up in the long term. We are doing it as we go. It has taken a Liberal Government to clean-up the Torrens River and the Patawalonga. We all are aware of the problems. The challenge is in identifying viable solutions—we are also doing that.

We are on track. The Opposition cannot deny that it was in power in this State for the best part of 25 years and that its Party missed opportunity after opportunity to position South Australia for the challenges ahead. Instead it burdened us with debt—the State Bank, SGIC, Myer Remm and so on. This State was on its knees in 1993 but members opposite held on until it was too late. They agreed to a royal commission and handed Lyn Arnold the poisoned chalice.

The financial disaster has made the task of restructuring difficult, but we are succeeding. The Dean Brown Government is on track. We are positioning this State to be part of the global economy. No household is able to pay off a mortgage in 2½ years—especially when it is a second or third mortgage. Similarly, as a Government we cannot undo the past and in 2½ years solve all the problems left to us. We need time and the confidence of all South Australians (including, hopefully, the Opposition) and then we will succeed.

This Government is preparing well for the future despite the difficult circumstances it inherited from members opposite. In the long term, our preparations will bear fruit. I agree with His Excellency's comments in relation to the State's finances and economic development. He said:

In delivering its three budgets, my Government has moved from a \$350 million underlying State budget deficit to a position where over the next year, and with further careful management and continuing commitment to debt and deficit reduction, we can forecast a real sustainable State surplus.

Our State finances are on track. The 1995-96 underlying deficit in the non-commercial sector is \$101 million. This is \$5 million less than forecast at budget time. My Government is ahead of its debt reduction targets. Asset sales play a significant role in this strategy and the Asset Management Task Force, established in March 1994, is continuing its comprehensive program of divesting non-core public sector assets to reduce State debt. The asset sales program has already achieved a total of \$1.75 billion in sale proceeds, dramatically exceeding the Government's original targets.

This is where our future lies. The Governor also said:

The Premier's recent trade mission to Europe and China has confirmed the competitiveness of South Australian industry on the international export market. My Government's commitment to developing the most competitive investment and business environment is now bearing fruit—from industry sectors traditional to our State to new and expanding industry sectors such as tourism, information technology, aquaculture, food and beverage processing, the arts, water management and export of technical services.

We must continue the momentum and maintain trust. We must promote confidence and explain more, if need be, about what we are doing. We must communicate our plans for the future and encourage everyone to participate and contribute. There is a positive future. I would encourage the Opposition and the Democrats to support the Roxby Downs indenture which will allow expansion of Olympic Dam and the mining of gold, copper and uranium. This \$1.25 billion expansion by the private sector will benefit all South Australians and create 6 700 jobs. Together with the success of our wine industry overseas, expansion of GMH and Mitsubishi, a further 1 450 jobs will be provided. We are exporting cars to the mothers of the car industry—the USA and Japan—and we are exporting pasta to Italy. I very much look forward to the day when our olive oil industry again plays a part as it once did in early settlement—we may then export olive oil to Spain.

We cannot be part of a world economy unless we can attract investment and business. This Government is creating an environment which will enable this to happen. EDS, Motorola and Silicon Graphics are becoming part of South Australia. South Australia remains a cost competitive location for business involvement based on rankings consistent with world competitiveness reports published by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies and Arthur Andersen Corporate Finance. Case studies were taken of 10 firms which were operating in Adelaide and which were representative of manufacturing services and communication sectors of the economy. Costs were then compared with the costs of operating the same companies in the eastern States. The comparison took into account the higher transport and communication costs faced by Adelaide firms selling in the eastern markets. Our per capita taxation is now 21 per cent less than Victoria and 23 per cent less than New South Wales.

Before the December 1993 election, we promised no new taxes and no increases in the rate of taxation. More than 2½ years later, the Liberal State Government has delivered. Since 1986, small to medium businesses have had a real reduction of more than 40 per cent in the cost of electricity. The 1996-97 State budget allows for a real reduction in commercial water rates of 3 per cent. Our labour costs are 4 per cent

below the national average. These are all very good reasons why businesses should choose South Australia as their base.

I now take this opportunity to briefly report on my recent visit to Italy, Greece and China. Trade missions and overseas study tours by members of Parliament are essential if we are to project ourselves into the world economy. Trade will not come to us by faxes and the Internet alone. Modern technology must be accompanied by human contact. The overseas business hand is rarely warm when you first shake it. We must make personal contacts and continue to maintain them if we are to succeed in establishing lasting relations with other countries. We must shake off the holiday myth associated with members travelling overseas.

I was honoured to play a part in the organisation of the Premier's visit to the Campania region. Campania, with its capital Naples, has a population of five million people and has very strong ties with South Australians from that area. In fact, 37 per cent of all South Australians of Italian background have ties with the Campania region. During his visit, the Premier met President Antonio Rastrelli as well as the presidents of the five provinces and many leaders of local government and industry and social and religious leaders. Tremendous opportunities are to be gained for both South Australia and Campania from maintaining relationships established by the Premier. We can assist Campania, for example, to facilitate trade in Asia by using South Australia as a base while they can assist us in facilitating trade in Europe by using Campania as a base. Delegations of trade, education and cultural groups are programmed to visit South Australia in early 1997.

A very proud and personal moment for me occurred on Thursday 5 September, when my dream of having a university link with Italy came closer to reality. The Premier met with the Rector of the University of Naples, Il Magnifico Rettore Fulvio Tessifore, and a memorandum of understanding was signed in the presence of Vice Chancellor, Ian Chubb, representing the three South Australian universities, Adelaide, Flinders and the University of South Australia. Professor Tessifore has agreed to send a group of academics and university officials to Adelaide next February. What is unique about this agreement is that it is the first time South Australia's three universities have joined together for such an alliance internationally. It is a historic agreement. The University of Naples has developed world class expertise in a wide variety of fields, including aquaculture. The University of Naples is Italy's second largest university and one of the oldest in the world.

At this point I would like to acknowledge the work of Dr Roberto Colamine, the Italian Consul, who met with Professor Ian Davey from the University of South Australia in Naples during his June vacation. Professor Davey was receptive to the idea when I first suggested it, and I refer to his work in involving Adelaide and Flinders Universities. Professor Harry Green is a friend who also played a part in putting the program together. This was a proud moment for me and I am sure benefits will flow for the State in many ways. My thanks go to all those involved and I am sure that I speak for both John Cummins and Joan Hall when I say that the organisation of the Campania region visit would not have been as successful as it was without the help of John Di Fede, President of the Campania Federation, and Renato Coscia, who represented the Adelaide Carnivale. I especially refer to the efforts involved during the week I spent in Italy prior to the Premier's arrival. Thanks should also be extended to all

those who were involved in the Premier's Department for the organisation of the visit.

I continued with the Premier's delegation to Thessaloniki, in Greece, and again the Premier had heavy schedules of appointments, and those contacts should bear fruit. The South Australian exhibitors should be commended and congratulated for putting South Australia on the trade route to the Balkans and Eastern Europe. Again, our Premier was able to get important commitments which should promote trade as well as cultural ties.

After Greece, I proceeded to China, where I was honoured to represent the Premier at the first graduation of the Yan Tai nursing project involving the first 14 graduates of the University of South Australia's offshore campus in China. This campus is the first of its kind in China and all those involved must be commended, particularly Professor Fran Sutton, who commenced the course in 1995. This development is another example of our standing overseas, especially in the field of education.

I take this opportunity to put the recent attacks on multiculturalism and migration into perspective. The comments of Graeme Campbell and Pauline Hanson are the desperate cries of a political has-been and the vociferous voice of a political never-be. We must have not only strong voices in opposition to them but also a responsible media that does not give disproportionate amplification to their divisive comments. Graeme Campbell and Pauline Hanson get much more airplay than their distorted comments deserve, as those comments represent only their individual views and those of a few supporters who are ignorant of the true contributions of multiculturalism and migration. The media has the responsibility to warn the community of the recurrences of racism but, in so doing, it must not fall victim and become the carrier of that same disease. Voltaire once said that nationalism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. It is also the first resort of the political desperado.

In conclusion, I believe that we are still going through difficult times. As a Government, we must communicate our achievements and believe in ourselves. It will not be easy to maintain trust, particularly at a time when unemployment is still at unacceptably high levels. The Opposition also has a role to play in a democracy. True, the Opposition must question the Government of the day, but it must not continually do so by comparing with the unattainable ideal, confusing State issues with Federal issues and blaming this Government for what is clearly beyond its realm of responsibility.

There is a difference between outsourcing and privatisation. We have not sold SA Water and we have no plans to sell ETSA. The days of class war politics are over. The Berlin Wall has now been down for a long time. Capital and labour must be partners, working together for the good of the State. It is also a pity that the leadership of SAIT has not learned this lesson, and I say that as a member of SAIT, as someone who is proud of being a teacher and who acknowledges the difficult job that teachers have in the demanding classrooms of the 1990s. I agree it is important that we find a solution to the present dispute, but solutions do not lie in creating conflict between the private and public sectors. We must uphold the profession. Neither do solutions lie in making unrealistic demands in the present economic environment. I agree that teachers deserve more and I look forward to the day when we can justly reward the teaching profession as well as other workers who have also shown great restraint in difficult times.

In my maiden speech after I was privileged to be elected to this Parliament, I said that Governments are like teachers: if we do not establish trust in the classroom, no matter how qualified a teacher is, no learning takes place. Similarly, if we do not establish trust as a Government and a Parliament, our ability to deliver is diminished. The public expects more from us as members of Parliament. As I was in 1993, I am still honoured to be part of a Liberal Government under the leadership of Dean Brown and working towards a better future for all South Australians.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I support the Address in Reply and I join with my colleagues in congratulating our new Governor, Sir Eric Neal, on opening his first session of Parliament and delivering the opening address. Sir Eric has large shoes to fill in following Dame Roma, and we remember her stewardship with fondness at this time. Sir Eric has started well and I note his extremely busy schedule, including a trip to Port Lincoln with us a couple of weeks ago and also presenting the trophies in the wet for the Bay to Birdwood vintage car run. I see that there are many other activities that Sir Eric and Lady Neal are involving themselves in. They have certainly hit the track running and I wish them all the best. I was pleased to be invited to Government House two weeks ago for the launch of the Barossa Music Festival when Sir Eric and Lady Neal were great hosts.

We are now commencing probably the last long session of this Parliament, a Parliament in which we have seen a new Government on the Treasury benches in South Australia encompassing a difficult period involving a huge debt and other problems left by the previous Labor Government. The Liberal Government has made some difficult decisions causing hardship to many sectors of the community and, to the credit of the Government, the people of South Australia have accepted the decisions well. The South Australian electorate overwhelmingly still supports the Brown Liberal Government. People know the problems we faced and they voted for a Party to solve their problems and make the tough decisions, and now the runs are appearing on the board.

We heard what the Auditor-General had to say and that does not concern me greatly at all. I was a businessman for 25 years before coming into this place. I had experience in cash management and I know that, when things are low, it is common to chance one's arm, that is, to get out and hit one's problems hard and create one's own demand and lift the State's confidence. The Auditor-General highlights many successes in the three huge volumes which make up his report and it is a pity that the Opposition chooses to talk only about those few areas one could identify as being involved in taking a risk. It is inappropriate to talk about the Government's risk management: it is a pity that all players involved seem to have temporarily taken their eyes off the big picture, that is, South Australia's perilous financial and employment position obtaining when we came into office.

I know the position of a cash-strapped business with a huge debt, with low public and business confidence, and how difficult it is to get it up and running, especially in a four-year period. I believe that we have done a remarkable job, risks and all. Time will show that we have achieved our goal: debt reduction, job creation and a return to business and public confidence in our State. We are on the way and, yes, much still needs to be done and, in the months remaining, this Government will continue to lift the State out of the abyss it has been in.

While I was away I made a trip to Israel. Even with the security problems that were beginning then, I saw it as part of my duty to visit Israel to learn specifically about irrigation, particularly because it is seen as the most technologically advanced country in the world in the area of water technology. In my electorate in the Barossa Valley, water (or the taste of it) is the only problem standing in the way of its future, so I chose to visit Israel. I was supposed to take this trip in March this year, but I did not take it then because of a preselection in which I was involved, being my own. I studied many areas, as I will submit in my report, but most important was the area of irrigation. As I said, as the member representing the Barossa Valley, I felt it was my duty and certainly I was very interested in what I could learn, particularly with the Barossa Valley being the world's premier wine growing district—and I intend to keep it that way. We have to manage our water better to get more value and to allow the Barossa Valley to continue to progress.

I was a guest of two of the largest and most successful irrigation manufacturers in the world, namely Naan and Netifim. Both companies have expressed a strong interest in a presence in Australia and we aim to have at least one in South Australia. All other details are confidential but I am confident of good news for South Australia. I also was privileged to be briefed on and shown the most efficient water systems in the world. So many of Israel's problems are Australia's problems, that is, acute shortage of rain, little surface water and salinity problems. I was also privileged to visit Eilat. It is very interesting to note that more than 80 per cent of the water used in the large community of Eilat is desalinated water from the sea. I was very interested to attend the water science centre in Eilat and to meet the chief scientist, who happened to be a South Australian. I know he is coming to South Australia in a few weeks on long service leave and I have ensured that the gentleman will see our new development at West Beach, particularly our marine science centre. I would encourage him one day, if he returns home, to become part of that development, because certainly the work he has been doing in Israel is nothing short of fantastic.

I was pleased with the cooperation I received from Israeli businessmen and their associations. Some businessmen visited South Australia last week and have now moved onto other States. Two or more businessmen will be coming to South Australia next week and have expressed interest in joint ventures in South Australia in many areas. I know that, as the member for Hartley just said, olive production is one area in which the Israeli people are very interested. We can look forward to continuing to work with and receive cooperation from the Israeli people, particularly the business people, and I hope that my visit to Israel has encouraged that process.

While I was away we saw the release by the Federal Minister for Transport of the Brew report as a result of the so-called problems we are having with Australian National Rail. The findings are no surprise to me or to many other members of this House. As was stated by Mr Sharp, the Federal Minister, the Brew report highlights that the seeds of destruction of AN were sown by the former Federal Labor Government in the manner in which it established the National Rail Corporation. In the process of establishing the corporation, Labor took the best routes from AN and gave them to National Rail. It also took locomotives and rolling stock from AN and provided them to National Rail without adequate compensation, leaving Australian National with a smaller revenue base but the same debt and commitments to meet. It was a ridiculous situation—unjust and unfair.

Few people would disagree with the assessment that AN's problems result mainly from the formation of National Rail. The claim that Labor is to blame entirely for AN's problems is backed up by the significant gains made by AN during the 1980s and longstanding practices of building interstate highways and effectively subsidising their use by heavy trucks whilst expecting interstate rail mainline track to pay its own way.

AN was established in the mid-1970s—and most members would recall that—from the former Commonwealth Railways and two run down State systems in South Australia and Tasmania. Under the guidance of former Chairman Mr Lou Marks from Brambles, it was increasingly run like a trucking company—lean, mean and hungry. During the 1980s, and with the reform legislation of 1983 receiving bipartisan support, AN was a pacesetter in rail reform. It was the first rail system in Australia to introduce the five pack wagon for containers and to run long, heavy, general freight trains. AN was also the first rail system in Australia to double stack containers.

To make its freight services more competitive, track upgrading was carried out. The first major project was the completion—with bipartisan support—in 1980 of the new line to Alice Springs from Tarcoola. I have been a passenger on the train on that track, and certainly it is a marvellous improvement. The cost of the new track was fully charged to AN and remained as a debt until converted to equity following the formation of National Rail in 1991, National Rail now being the sole user of this track.

The next major upgrade, with loan funds raised by AN, was the Adelaide to Port Pirie gauge standardisation in 1983 and it put AN on the path to efficient standard gauge interstate freight operations. That operation is well documented in *Hansard* because our family was involved with that in not a very nice way: the new rail dissected our property north to south. That is all history to recall whether the decision—

**Mr Clarke:** Did you sell the land?

**Mr VENNING:** We sold the land and we were well compensated, but certainly there is no suitable compensation for cutting one's land in half. That is what happened in 1983. The third major upgrade, which took the best part of 20 years and \$500 million, was the concrete re-sleepering of the Adelaide to Kalgoorlie line. That involved more efficiency but more debt. The debt has been building all the time, but AN was trading very well and could handle it. How much of AN's debt is due to these projects—the Adelaide to Wolesley gauge standardisation and the associated work, such as insertion of gauge convertible sleepers—is a very good question. All these below rail and above rail innovations led the Federal Bureau of Industry Economics (BIE) as recently as late as 1995 to conclude that of all the Government railways in Australia 'AN was the most efficient Australian railway' and that AN had made the most progress towards meeting world best practice—and have we not heard so much of that?

So now we have a paradoxical situation of the most efficient Australian railway being on the chopping block. As the Brew report pointed out, the start of AN's big problems was the transferring of its core functions to National Rail. But this was done as a result of a Federal agreement in 1991. The then Labor Premier, Mr Bannon, is the man most to blame. He should never have signed that agreement—never. Even at the time, we were in a fantastic bargaining position because we are in the middle of the operations of the new National Rail. If the Premier of the day had refused to sign the deal

and not granted access to the track, the whole thing could not have happened. What sort of bargaining power was that? He immediately signed away our rights, and at the same time he signed away the profitability of Australian National.

As I said at the time and I say again, Premier Bannon shares the blame with Premier Dunstan, when Premier Dunstan sold the South Australian Railways. What sort of deal was that? It was a poor deal then and it is an even poorer deal now, with no guarantees at all for South Australia. We have jeopardised all our rail infrastructure in this State. We did it once with the sale of SA Railways and Bannon did it again when he signed the deal to bring in National Rail—yet another bad rail decision by Labor's team in Government. It bites hard on the heart when one realises what has happened to rail systems here in our State. AN's problems, as highlighted by Mr Sharp, hide the progress made in reducing overall rail deficits. I note from the Bureau of Transport and Communications Economics that rail deficits fell to \$1.4 billion for 1993-94 as compared with \$2.1 billion for 1989-90, when the rail freight deficit was about \$550 million. Those figures are from the Industry Commission estimates.

The BIE noted in late 1995 that 'there has been a substantial reduction in the extent of freight operating deficits in the past two years, possibly to less than \$20 million in 1993-94'. Prior to the election, the Federal Coalition stated that it was committed 'to providing Australian National with a future, through such means as the inter-State passenger initiative, which will increase Australian National's business base and promote job security for its employees through policies designed to increase the use of rail, and utilising an under-utilised resource'.

I expect Governments of the same persuasion as mine to be responsible and to consider the work force, the people of Port Augusta and the rail workshops there. What happens if AN is allowed to go down? What happens to the people of Port Augusta at the rail workshops? I appreciate the work done by the current Speaker (the member for Eyre, the Hon. Graham Gunn), and I also want to pay tribute to the Mayor of Port Augusta, Mrs Joy Baluch, and acknowledge her responsible input in this respect. We know that Mrs Baluch can certainly say how she feels, but in this instance she has been conservative. I am sure she has refrained from saying things she felt like saying. The situation at Port Augusta is not good. In fact, I was speaking only last weekend to a business friend who is finding it very difficult to operate in Port Augusta; nobody is buying motor cars and he is very concerned indeed.

Mr Brew's report appears to provide AN with no future. The summary of his report also fails to acknowledge the importance of competitive neutrality between road and rail freight operations. Possibly this is raised in the main report, which I have not seen. With present road cost recovery from heavy trucks leading to effective 'highway subsidisation' of line haul interstate trucking, one would not expect to see any private investment in 'below rail' mainline interstate track. Certainly, there has not been very much at all. With regard to the 'above rail' private interest in interstate freight trains, only two companies are operating to date: SCT as at the end of 1995, now joined by TNT this year. Both companies have opted for the east-west track with its better alignment and not the north-south track serving Australia's three largest cities of Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. As Professor Hilmer stated when he delivered the William Fraser Commemorative Address to the Chartered Institute of Transport in Sydney on 29 September 1995 about the road freight industry:

The road sector does not fully pay for the road damage and externality costs (Inter-State Commission 1990) and this may affect potential intermodal competition with rail especially.

I agree that a levy should be imposed on fuel that trucks and cars use to help pay for our roads—and it is—but why should trains using diesel pay fuel tax? This is our last chance to save much of our rail infrastructure, utilise private enterprise and engage world's best practice. AN's largest customer is here in South Australia, in South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling, which is our grain handler. I am concerned that it has not made any public comment about its desired position in relation to AN. Again I declare my interest as a grower member of South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling; I do not wish to have any conflict of interest. I know that SACBH has other things on its mind, as the Minister told us today when the Treasurer moved the Bill to sell the Government's and the Ports Corporation's delivery belts and gantries to South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling.

I know that the company is deeply involved in negotiations with the Government to agree on the price. Again I declare my interest in that, although I have no part in the debate or the vote. The sooner the negotiations are completed the better, so that CBH can focus on this new problem. I know that the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board have had talks about their position in relation to AN's future. I am very curious to know whether Cooperative Bulk Handling has had such discussions; I very much doubt it, and that concerns me greatly. As the State's sole handler and storer of our grain, Cooperative Bulk Handling has many questions to address. I note that Cooperative Bulk Handling has other problems, which it hopes to address in a review of its operations and structure, and I will do what I can to help with that.

A very damaging rumour has been circulating around the industry for the past two or three years. No-one seems to want to ask the question, but last week the new Chairman, Mr O'Driscoll, did comment on it in an oblique way. I will ask questions now and hope for an industry response. Did South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling incur huge losses with its computer network two to three years ago? If so, how much money did it lose and are the rumours that it was \$3 million to \$12 million unfounded? How did it happen, who was responsible, and can these losses be recovered by using or selling off the equipment? SACBH's record was the best in Australia until the mid-1980s, but it seemed to have lost the plot a little and gone off the rails. I fervently hope that the company can bounce back and address these problems, and I am confident that it can and will. If ever South Australia needed its grain storer and handler to be performing well and be world efficient it is now.

I am confident that the current board will address these problems and get CBH back as a top performing company. We need CBH to be taking a very active part in relation to what happens to AN, particularly in relation to the rolling stock and the plant that CBH uses. Whether Cooperative Bulk Handling should purchase and operate trains is a debate that we will have further down the track—if you will pardon the pun, Sir. Certainly, Cooperative Bulk Handling needs to be in there floating the options so that, when they make their final plans, the industry, farmers and Government can know what will happen to AN in the future. This is a very trying time, and I hope that CBH can get over this temporary hiccup and be there in the final debate. I wish it well in its negotiations and workplace agreements with its employees and the enterprise bargaining process which it is undertaking right

now. Hopefully, South Australia will have a large harvest. It looks very good out there, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you would be aware, driving down to the South-East as you do; and I know that the Speaker would certainly be very much aware of our fantastic potential for bringing in a record harvest this year. We do not want industrial problems during harvest; I cannot stress that enough.

Some work practices that are in place are not acceptable in these days of greater efficiencies and best practice, and I am sure that the member for Ross Smith would agree. I hope that the employees will agree to cooperate, because the harvesting of grain is unpredictable. On rainy and very hot days harvest hours differ widely. We need flexible operating hours in our silos: long hours on hot days and shorter hours or even closing on rainy days. Also, I hope that morning and afternoon tea breaks can be taken without closing the silos. Nothing is more frustrating on a good reaping day than waiting for the workers to finish their smoko. Tempers become frayed when this happens. I look forward to an eventful harvest, one which, with the multiplier effect, could add \$3 billion to the economy of South Australia. Yields and tonnages could be one of our highest depending on the weather over the next three or four weeks. Hopefully, we will not have too many hot days such as today but mild winds with a little bit of moisture. The position looks good not only for our grain growers but also for the continuing success of our wine industry.

I was interested to see the results of the New Zealand election. I know that that election has nothing to do with this House, but when I visited New Zealand two years ago I was involved in discussions on the new electoral process. I said that if that system ever worked it would bring about absolute chaos, and that is exactly what has happened. The New Zealand economy has been booming and its successes have been great. Many Australians have used New Zealand as a benchmark. I say to you, Sir, or anyone who is interested in history: watch the New Zealand economy turn around and go the other way now that New Zealand has this ridiculous electoral system in place. We do not know who has won the election in New Zealand, whether Labour will be able to govern with a minority of seats, whether the ruling National Party will continue, or whether we will see the New Zealand First Party swing in and change the whole thing with deals either way. New Zealanders are in for a very difficult time. I hope that Governments in Australia, either Federal or State, never take on a system such as that. It is total chaos, and I feel sorry for the New Zealanders. They were getting their act together, the runs were on the board, the economy was booming, and the GST was working extremely well, but I now fear that we will see a complete reversal and the wasting of all the good work they have been able to achieve.

For the first time in South Australia we have now seen the introduction of tractor registrations. This issue has been before this Parliament for 30 years. For 30 years it has been too hard to handle, but at long last—and I give credit to the Minister—after hours and hours of work we have now addressed the problem. Farmers can now drive their tractor on the road with unlimited cover against liability for personal injury. Many farmers have said that they already had that cover, but they did not have unlimited cover in respect of litigation. They now have the compulsory third party cover at a very cheap price. I apologise to all those farmers who were anxious about the process. We had to sort out a few things including some of our bureaucrats, but in the end I am

pleased with the result. I hope the farmers are pleased also and that they will realise how lucky we have been.

We now have in place a system which gives farmers total protection against legal liability for bodily injury when they drive their tractors or farm machines on the road, and at the cheapest rate in Australia. I pay full credit to Minister Laidlaw for her forbearance and patience. I feel we have achieved a very good deal. This issue began when we were in Opposition. When my private member's measure passed the first reading to the amazement of the then Labor Government but failed at the third reading, the then Speaker (Hon. N. Petersen) said that I should take up this matter with the then Minister (Hon. Frank Blevins) to have the problem addressed equitably and fairly. It has taken this long, but I am pleased with what has been done eventually, as I am sure everyone else will be.

I also want to comment on my other favourite subject in this place: the Morgan to Burra Road, half of which in actual kilometres has been completed. I spoke to one of the residents of that area on Sunday, and I was informed that the people who live there are over the moon. The second half of that road is yet to be completed because of the greater expense of the extra roadworks involved on the outskirts of Burra. I am sure that the project will be completed in 1998. I will ride my bicycle as many times as is needed to make sure that that job is completed, because it will make a great deal of difference to development in the Mid North of South Australia. Not only the Riverland but the Mid North and the Barossa and Clare Valleys will benefit hugely from the opening of that corridor.

Water in the Barossa and the Mid North at present is absolutely shocking. I have never seen it worse: it is not water, it is mud. The filtration plant at Swan Reach is under way and should be completed early in 1998, and I look forward to that. I am pleased with the progress that this Government has made in many areas and to be a member of this Government, because when I retire from this place I can look back on these years and say that we were able to achieve many things which many Governments before us were not able to achieve, particularly and most important of all repairing the economy of our State.

**Mr BASS (Florey):** I rise to support the motion. I congratulate His Excellency the Governor Sir Eric Neal on his inaugural speech in opening the fourth session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament. In doing so, I acknowledge the retiring Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. Dame Roma's achievements as Governor are well documented and have been mentioned by previous speakers. I concur with the statements that have already been made. Without doubt, she is a remarkable lady, and I wish her well in her retirement, although I suspect that her retirement will be in name only.

Whilst supporting this motion, I must raise the matter of having an opening for every session of the same Parliament. After a general election, the opening of Parliament is appropriate, but to open each session when the members of Parliament remain the same is a little like having an opening ceremony at the start of each quarter at a football grand final. The speech read by the Governor is an overview of the direction which the Government of the day is taking and which it intends to achieve. This could be introduced as a Premier's statement at the beginning of each new session of Parliament, and the Houses could get straight on with the business of the day. I do not for one minute wish to denigrate the role of the Governor, but in this day and age we as politicians should be looking at ways to streamline the

process of Government. In my opinion, there are times when pomp and ceremony must take a back seat to efficiency.

I do not intend to discuss all the areas in which the Government has mentioned it will be involved in this session, but I will first address the matter of the State's finances. To be in our current financial position after only two years and 10 months in office is a credit to the Treasurer and the Ministers of this Government. One must remember that this Government is attempting to reverse the mismanagement that occurred over a decade. It is quite easy for the Leader of the Opposition and Labor members of the previous Government to criticise what the Government is doing in an attempt to put us in the black financially instead of in debt. I wonder where they were from 1989 to 1993 as the Labor Government plunged this State into a financial nightmare. It is a pity they did not raise their voice then. It is a fact of life that no budget can be returned to the black over a short period especially when the economy has been mismanaged for years. However, the economy is slowly improving and, whilst some areas of business such as information technology are benefiting significantly, the Brown Government's initiatives will, over time, see many other areas increase their profits as the economy continues to improve.

While agreeing with the Government's push into Asia, we must broaden our horizons into the north and look at India. In India, with millions in population and with many now no longer living in what we consider third world conditions, the opportunity for investment and exports is even greater than or equal to that of other parts of Asia.

I would now like to discuss employment in South Australia, which will always be an issue in any country as information technology takes over and reduces the number of employees needed to perform tasks that previously required high numbers of employees. Notwithstanding these problems, the Government's push to train and provide opportunities for our youth is vital and must continue, both at State and Federal levels. The youth of today are no different from the youth of yesterday: give them an opportunity and they will seize it.

My Government trainee, who worked in my office from August 1995 to August 1996, while having no experience in the work requirements of a busy electorate office, worked tirelessly to learn the tasks needed to equip her for employment when her traineeship ended. She was successful in finding full-time employment at the end of her term. I thank my personal assistant Vicki Pegram for the extra work she put in to train my Government trainee, and my thanks go to the member for Playford's personal assistant, Clare, for her efforts. The member for Playford and I exchanged our trainees for a week so that they could gain experience in a different political office. This exchange was beneficial to both trainees and indicates that politicians from both Parties believe that employment for youth should be above politics.

I turn now to the health area. Modbury Hospital continues to provide excellent service to the public, with ear, nose and throat operations under Healthscope management increasing by 200 per cent, and other operational procedures by 20 per cent, notwithstanding an occasional problem—problems experienced by all hospitals, whether they are managed by the Public Service or by a private company such as Healthscope. The savings announced today of some \$7 million by the Minister for Health is another indication that Modbury Hospital is a success. I congratulate all concerned at Modbury Hospital—the board, Healthscope's management, the doctors,

nurses, ancillary staff and volunteers. It is a job well done by all.

In relation to community safety, new laws relevant to confiscation of profits from criminal activities and laws to tighten controls on second-hand shops and the pawnbroking industry have been passed. It is a known fact that, if there is nowhere to sell stolen goods, the number of breaking and entering offences will be reduced. Without a receiver, there is no thief. In other areas of community safety, my attitude is well known, so I will now move on to the environment.

The Government's programs for industry and economic development are based upon a fundamental respect for and recognition of our unique environment. There is no doubt that, over the past 30 years, I have taken note of matters involving the environment. We in South Australia and Australia have neglected the environment. One needs only to drive towards the South-East on the way to Meningie to see the large areas that have salt that has come up through the ground, and only saltbush grows in those areas. I know that in the South-East there is a problem with salt coming to the surface. If one looks at the Murray River, where I grew up, one sees areas that have been damaged by people who had no thought for the environment. The environment is important, and I congratulate the Government on the steps it has taken over the past 2½ years and the steps it intends to take in the next 12 months.

I refer to my trip to Europe in January this year, where I spent time with Thames Water and North West Water. Both companies—notwithstanding that they are private companies; they are not Government companies—spend a great deal on the environment. Testament to the work that Thames Water has done is the fact that there is now salmon in the Thames River, and it is over two decades since there has been any salmon there.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BASS:** Yes, very small, but they are getting bigger. North West Water has an even better environment plan in place and, while I was with these people, they took me to the East Pennines, where employees of North West Water, notwithstanding that they have no contractual arrangement that they have to do this but because they work in this area, are rebuilding much of the old dry walls that have been neglected over the years. There are buildings that have also been neglected, but employees of North West Water spend some of their time rebuilding them. They rent these buildings to voluntary groups, such as the scouts and Rotary. They are charged a fee, but it is not paid, and the club puts that money back into other environmental issues in the area. The Brown Government is addressing matters concerning the environment not only in Adelaide but in the Murray River and Cooper Creek Basin areas and all other natural watercourses, and I congratulate it for this. I turn now to education. In his speech, the Governor said:

Support for the educational needs of gifted and talented students will be enhanced as our education system strives for best practice outcomes and excellence in teaching and learning.

On 15 September, the Minister for Education and Children's Services released a press statement about the great interest in a new school for gifted students. In this media release, the Minister said:

Over 300 students have expressed interest in the 30 places in the State's first special interest secondary school for students with high intellectual potential.

The acronym is SHIP secondary schools. On 15 September, some 20 secondary schools expressed interest in becoming the State's first special interest secondary school for students

with high intellectual potential. Most members would know that this morning it was announced that the Heights School at Modbury Heights, one of the high schools in my electorate, has been selected to be the first SHIP secondary school. Next year, 30 year eight places will be available at the school and another 30 each year following. It is anticipated that a total of 150 students will participate in this special program. As I said, over 300 students have already expressed interest in the first 30 places. They will be put through a selection process, and a final selection will be made before the beginning of the first term in 1997. The Heights School was chosen from the 20 secondary schools that had expressed interest by an independent panel of Department of Children's Services officers, parents and academics with expertise in the field.

The Heights is uniquely placed to offer this special program. The school has a long history of successful teaching and learning programs for gifted students. I can attest to the talent that has been at that school, because my two youngest children both started school at the Heights in reception, and they both completed year 13 without going to another school. In 1984, I saw that the school made special provisions for gifted students, including grade and subject acceleration and curriculum compaction.

In 1987 the school published its first 'Gifted and Talented Policy', and a special education senior was appointed the following year. Since that time other staff have been trained and appointed to specially manage and develop gifted children. The school has been identifying gifted students and, where possible, offering individualised timetables. The reception to year 12 structure at the school also allows for greater flexibility in student placements. It does not apply only to the senior school because there are three subschools within the school—senior, middle and junior—and I have seen students as young as five years old receive special attention because they have shown the ability to proceed more quickly than other students. The choice of The Heights school as a special interest secondary school for these students and the undertaking to provide further special interest schools is another example of the Government's commitment to ensure that all children receive high quality education.

While I am speaking about this school, I must comment on some of the people who have taken this special project through from 1984 to today, where The Heights has been selected as the first SHIP school. I refer to the Principal, Terry Woolley, who has been enthusiastic about this project from the time he came to the school some six or seven years ago; the Assistant Principal and Student Services Officer, Greg Cox; the Coordinator, David Roberts; and the three Principals of the three subschools—Jay Strudwick, Gabby Proc and Stephen Measday; and Judy Hill, the Assistant Principal and Student Services Manageress of the Gifted Education area.

The submission to have The Heights nominated as the first SHIP school not only had teachers and administrators involved, but parents with an interest in this area had an input, and Julie Blackman, Sandy Horn, Corinne Neary, Michelle Glauche and Chris Lartrow all assisted the school in ensuring that the submission to the Department for Education and Children's Services was excellent. I congratulate all of them for playing a part in having The Heights selected as the first SHIP school. The Government must proceed in the next 12 months exactly as it has in the past. It must have new initiatives, and it must continue the fight to

reduce the debt. I congratulate the Governor on his inaugural speech and support the motion.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** It is with great pleasure that I take part in the Address in Reply debate this afternoon. In opening my remarks, and on behalf of my constituents, I welcome Sir Eric Neal to the Governorship of South Australia and say how much we in Morphett look forward to his visits to our district. There is much to show him around the district in the western suburbs, and I am sure that it will be only a matter of time before we see him there.

Some of the successes of this Government are reflected in the western suburbs. I think it has been demonstrated now, after 2½ years, that this is a Government of achievement, a Government that has got out there and done something. The context in which we took over the reins of Government 2½ years ago was such that the former State Government had gone through the debacle of the State Bank. If we cast our minds back a year or so before the debacle hit the decks, the Government of the day was not achieving much. We have achieved a lot even with the ball and chain around our neck, so to speak, of the great State debt that we inherited. This is quite significant when one compares the projects and the type of Government we had in South Australia three or four years before the change of Government with what we have achieved now with a massive debt on our hands.

The Governor's speech makes fascinating reading to anyone who looks at it with a mind open enough to recognise and acknowledge that this Government has been a Government of achievement. The Government came in with a specific role to create a foundation for economic and financial reform. No-one can say that that has not happened. The State debt which we inherited is now certainly on the way down. We have delivered a dramatic turnaround in respect of the State's finances. The Governor said:

... my Government has moved from a \$350 million underlying State budget deficit to a position where, over the next year, and with further careful management and a continuing commitment to debt and deficit reduction, we can forecast a real and sustainable State surplus.

The Treasurer has to be congratulated. No-one thought that we could do it with such speed, and here we are ahead of schedule. The effect will be that the credit rating for this State will rise, which will make it a lot easier to go out and sell South Australia as a place to do business.

I was interested to read in 'The State of Business,' a pamphlet that came out on 27 September this year, a very interesting article headed 'South Australia: A Cost Competitive State'. Regardless of the knockers, particularly the criticism from our political opponents, the fact remains that South Australia is a cost competitive State and a cost competitive location. The leaflet refers to case studies of 10 firms operating in Adelaide as conducted by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies and Arthur Andersen. The 10 firms are representative of manufacturing services and communication sectors of the economy. The study compared the costs with the same companies operating in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. The idea was to compare the costs so that, in promoting South Australia, we had some benchmarks.

The comparisons took into account the higher transport and communication costs faced by Adelaide firms selling to the eastern markets. The report states:

The studies concluded that Adelaide has a cost advantage compared with Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane in the following areas—

It then lists several dot points, including industrial and CBD office rentals, industrial and commercial property values, interface costs, professional services, labour costs, and energy and water. They are pluses which have been achieved by the South Australian Liberal Government, something of which we can be proud, and something which becomes a very useful tool for those who have to go out and sell the State both interstate and overseas.

I now refer to the Governor's speech and some of the other highlights that have come to light. In the area of economic development, he stated:

My Government will continue to build upon the foundations of a stronger and more diverse economy which is creating more jobs for South Australians.

The Premier has embarked on a program to bring information technology to this State. He has been successful and already, as a result of EDS and other allied companies coming in, we are seeing smaller companies wanting to be involved in South Australia. The other area of economic development is the creation of an export focus through export competitive companies that will come in here and challenge the international market. I had the privilege of attending the Convention Centre several weeks ago when the Minister for Infrastructure put on a presentation of the achievements of his department and the new growth overseas in the water industry as far as it affects this State.

Those members who were not there obviously missed a very stimulating and exhilarating presentation—to see the huge potential of this State and what can be achieved by a small group of men and women dedicated to promoting this State both here and overseas. The growth potential is there and the number of opportunities, both in employment and for the future of our children in this State, I believe are unlimited and it certainly came through in that presentation. I believe that the Chairman of SA Water, down through the ministerial staff, to those in the department who put the whole program together are to be congratulated, and I say that on behalf of all South Australians. It was a magnificent presentation which gave many people in the audience a lot of hope that this State has a future and is going somewhere, and going somewhere very fast.

The Governor also noted that the economic and development priorities include building an attractive business environment for the highly skilled work force. At last we are starting to see that happen; at last in the technological areas we are seeing new companies opening up and employment being created. It is all very well for the Opposition to knock and selectively quote the employment and unemployment figures, but the reality is that new companies are coming here and a new culture is being set up in the employment fields from which we will benefit.

An area of expansion which is very exciting and which was referred to in the Governor's presentation is mining. We are only on the threshold of the mining industry. We have Roxby Downs and we have the \$1.25 billion expansion which will indirectly create 6 700 new jobs and which has been announced by the Government. It is very exciting and will create a huge future for the State, particularly when we receive the flow-on effect of the royalties, let alone for the people who are investing in the company.

There are also the untapped resources in the Gawler craton. There are opportunities for those involved in the exploration field and for those who are prepared to put risk money into mining ventures, and I am sure they will reap the rewards. The cost of mineral exploration is estimated to reach

\$35 million over the next year. That is a lot of money—a lot of money to be invested in what was, until three or four years ago, a sparse arid area of South Australia. That is a 300 per cent increase in five years. Once again, it is very exciting; it is happening here in South Australia and should be trumpeted.

I also believe that the Government has a very exciting program for revitalising rural Eyre Peninsula. I am a metropolitan member but I recognise that all the energies of this Government will not go into the metropolitan area. They will go into the country and, in particular, an \$11 million State-Commonwealth project will assist farming enterprises on the Eyre Peninsula and be a tremendous boost to those farmers who have struggled through drought, who have always been there at the end of the day, who have been great survivors but who need assistance to revitalise the area. This Government has gone ahead and done it.

I mentioned earlier the water overseas projects. I will not detail them other than to note that this area of export focusing of the water industry will lead to our becoming internationally competitive. It will mean that three or four of the leading global water companies will be operating in Adelaide and exporting world competitive South Australian products and expertise to Asia in the near future. I believe that is exciting and something of which South Australians in the future will be very proud.

In the area of infrastructure, this Government, despite the burden of debt, has been able to ensure that we continue our program of infrastructure. As Chairman of the Public Works Committee, I have become very conscious of the numbers of references that are being put through. In fact, recently it was running at one every 2½ weeks. Today I tabled the thirty-eighth report of the Public Works Committee on the south road on Kangaroo Island. One of the benchmarks of our references is that each project must involve at least \$4 million. I did a quick calculation before I rose to speak: if you multiply 38 projects at just a bare minimum of \$4 million—and many of them go well over \$4 million—you find that \$152 million worth of capital works programs have been put through the Public Works Committee during the life of this Government.

Despite the constraints on the Government, it has been able to maintain a comparatively large public works program, one which has been very carefully thought through so that all sectors of the community benefit and one which in the next 18 months to three years (when most of these projects are completed) South Australians will be able to identify with the South Australian Liberal Government.

I will mention just a few examples, the first being the airport extension. The Labor Government was in power for 11 or 12 years. It had many opportunities to extend the airport but never made an attempt to do so. It had many opportunities to talk about the need for the upgrade of the airport terminals. I recall sitting in Opposition in this House hearing criticism that all that the Liberal Government could do was to put in a small international terminal which, members will recall, David Tonkin as Premier was able to achieve in the dying days of the Tonkin Administration before the election, but at least he got an international terminal. It might have been modelled on the Townsville airport or one of the provincial international airports of Queensland, but at least he got cooperation from Prime Minister Fraser: at least he got an international airport and international flights coming into Adelaide Airport.

Then for 10 years we had criticism from the ALP and Labor members because it was all that we had achieved, but they did not do anything about it. I find it very encouraging to see in the Governor's speech a reference to the need to upgrade the passenger terminal facilities at Adelaide Airport. It is exciting to have the domestic and international terminals tying in with this Government's program for tourism and to see, over the past 2½ years, how the priority of tourism has increased quite dramatically since we came to power.

I fully acknowledge that Commonwealth money has been invested in two infrastructure projects, one being the Patawalonga: \$9 million of Commonwealth money was put in, but it has become a catalyst for further works. The State has announced only in the past few days \$7 million for the harbor at the end of the lake, and \$4 million was spent on the clean-up of the Patawalonga and also the works upstream. There is also the tunnel from Eagle on the Hill, and that too is very exciting for this State. The Government is still talking about the promotion of the Darwin to Alice Springs rail project. All of us hope that that will come to fruition very quickly. Those members who have been to Darwin and seen the work and the plans for the development of the Port of Darwin and who have noted the distance to Indonesia, Singapore and other points to the north know that, if we had flat tops travelling between Adelaide and Darwin, it would be a huge boost to this State.

There is excitement in the Riverland because this Government has gone ahead and put in the Berri Bridge, in which the former Government was not interested. The flow on in getting vehicles and road freight through the Riverland and to Sydney is something that I would have thought the former Government would have considered. In looking back over the 10 years of the former Labor Government it is hard to see what it did. It is interesting to reflect on how the then Opposition put enormous pressure on the former Labor Government from the back benches.

I refer to my own bailiwick of Glenelg and the Patawalonga. We suggested that the former Government do something about the trash going into the Patawalonga. The former Labor Government put a floating boom into the Patawalonga. The boom went out about 20 metres into the lake and lasted about three days. It was washed against the side and that was the sum total of the former Labor Government's investment in cleaning up the Patawalonga.

The new Government came in and not only cleaned up the Patawalonga but started the biggest environmental clean-up that South Australia has ever seen, including those waterways going back into the plains of Adelaide. Members know that the Patawalonga catchment and Sturt Creek cover one-third of the metropolitan area. People claimed that we would never tackle the Torrens catchment problems. They claimed it was too difficult because of the various drains and creeks involved. However, the Brown Liberal Government created a board and is now tackling the River Torrens problems successfully.

*Mrs Kotz interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** As the member for Newland says, the Liberal Government did not just talk about action: it went ahead and acted in the face of enormous criticism, including statements that we would not achieve a clean-up, but we have done that. Another point I wish to pick up in the Governor's speech—and there are many—involves jetties. I refer to the criticism from many sources when the marine Minister announced that the Liberal Government would get on with resolving the problems involving jetties. I thought that

criticism was amazing. Local government screamed that it would not take over the responsibility for jetties until the Government acted. The Liberal Government knew it faced tight financial constraints but still it came out and committed \$12.8 million over three years to save our jetties. As a member representing an area on the coast, and like all other members representing areas on the coast, I welcomed that commitment, and I am not talking just of the metropolitan coast, because jetties are a fantastic tourism attraction throughout South Australia. Not only are they a tourist attraction but they are part of the life of many local communities. People like to walk along jetties as well as along waterways.

The Governor's opening speech was an excellent presentation of the Government's achievements over a short period, but a time involving enormous financial constraints. The Government has demonstrated that it will get out and bite the bullet in terms of taking hard decisions and making things happen.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr OSWALD:** The honourable member should read the Governor's speech. The member for Hart has been in here for only a minute and he is already here knocking, carping and criticising the achievements of this Government which are there for everyone to see. I wish to conclude by congratulating the Governor and welcoming him and his wife to South Australia. I would like to say how much people in the District of Morphett are looking forward to their visit. I know the Governor and his wife will be visiting us for Commemoration Day and the Old Gum Tree ceremonies and I am sure that the Governor will be taken in hand by the various dignitaries around Glenelg and shown the district. From discussions I have already had in the district I know that my constituents are looking forward to giving the Governor good old-fashioned Morphett hospitality.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech opening the fourth session of the Forty-eighth Parliament and I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the outstanding service given to our State by our previous Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. I extend to her every good wish, good fortune and good health in the future. I am pleased to welcome His Excellency Sir Eric Neal into the important role of Governor of South Australia and offer my congratulations on his appointment. I wish both His Excellency and Lady Neal every success in their respective roles.

His Excellency's opening speech outlined this Government's achievements over the short period of just 2½ years and outlined its projections and objectives for the future. The budget brought down in June this year identified our dramatic success in reducing debt and maintaining quality services to all South Australians. Our commitment to debt and deficit reduction has been restated. Responsible and sustainable financial management has set the guidelines for the path to financial stability of this State's finances. It was interesting to hear the Labor Leader's interpretation of the state of the State, remembering the honourable member's dire predictions after last year's budget, when his financial and economic mastery elicited the incredible statement that the Liberal budget had a \$1 billion hole. We all know that the Labor Leader got it wrong again.

The Opposition Leader's Address in Reply contribution contained a diatribe of abuse, imputations against the character of members of the House and against people not in

this House, a tirade of drivel that continued against the Federal Government, its current policies, and he continued in an almost insensible manner across a range of Federal issues which, to my mind, was a clear statement that the Labor Leader was admitting that the Brown Liberal Government's handling of the South Australian economy left the Labor Leader without a genuine sustainable gripe to put to the South Australian public about Liberal management of this State.

In fact, the Labor Leader has incorporated the Federal issues theme into Labor campaigning strategies for Labor candidates. Electioneering pamphlets being distributed by State Labor Party candidates into marginal seats talk about a range of Federal issues. This again suggests that Labor candidates know nothing about State issues and it does nothing for the credibility of Labor candidates. Or, is it purely that the Brown Liberal Government has got it right and for the first time the Labor Leader has run out of his normal puerile fabrications? He has earned the nickname 'the Fabricator' for his fast and loose manner in dealing with the truth. Has the Fabricator run out of ideas to further misinform the people of South Australia?

**Mr FOLEY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During Question Time the Speaker ruled that 'Fabricator' was an inappropriate term in referring to the Leader of the Opposition. I ask that the same ruling be applied to the member for Newland for her comments.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member's criticisms are verging on the edge of a substantive motion and I urge her to reconsider.

**Mrs KOTZ:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will not refer to the Opposition Leader as the Fabricator, but I am sure that members will read that into the comments and criticisms that I am about to make.

**Mr FOLEY:** Again, Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the comments of the member for Newland, who is clearly ignoring your ruling, and that is quite inappropriate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is acting in some defiance of the Chair, which does not need any clarification of its rulings.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, the member for Hart.

**Mrs KOTZ:** I do apologise, Sir, if you think I was working against your ruling. That is certainly not the case and I do apologise. The Opposition Leader loudly proclaimed untruthfully that SA Water has been privatised, yet he knows as we all do that the people still own that State asset—

**Mr FOLEY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Newland is now using the word 'untruthful', which is exactly in the same vein as 'Fabricator'. That is clearly a reflection on the Leader of the Opposition.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair was reflecting on what might be the member for Hart's next point of order but anticipated wrongly and, in doing so, I must admit that I missed the word in question. It is improper to attribute untruthfulness to any member and I am sure that all members are aware of that. The member for Newland.

**Mrs KOTZ:** The Leader of the Opposition loudly proclaims that Modbury Hospital has been privatised when he knows, as we all know, that the people still own Modbury Hospital. The Leader of the Opposition was part of the Ministry of the previous Labor Government which brought this State to the brink of bankruptcy, the only inheritance from that Government for the people of this State being an

\$8 billion debt. Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition has never had the good grace to admit when he is wrong; to do so would alter the persona of negativity under which the Labor Leader thrives. The people of South Australia have more intelligence than the Leader of the Opposition dares to give them credit for. They have had enough of the sleight of hand performed by the previous Labor Government, enough of the pea and thimble tricks which presented so-called substance but which proved to be pure illusion. They want the reality of substance, and that is what they are getting from the Liberal Government. We have not hidden from the reality of making the hard decisions, realities forced upon a new Government by a previous one whose financial mismanagement and total incompetence will be the talk of Australians for a long time to come.

One of the many areas on which the Brown Liberal Government has focused to improve economic development is information technology and telecommunications (IT&T). The Government is actively working on the development of a strong, viable and internationally competitive IT&T industry in South Australia. This industry is a key focus for the State's long-term economic development strategy. The Government has taken the lead by setting the example of putting its own information and services on-line through electronic business services. It could be as soon as next year that you could expect to be able to purchase tickets or pay your motor vehicle registration and insurance from your home computer, your business premises or as unlikely a venue as a public kiosk. There are obviously a range of locations, including some local libraries, which will facilitate these processes through new technologies.

As part of the IT2000 vision, the South Australian Government is aggregating the IT&T activities of the entire public sector into a small number of business segments and outsourcing these activities to multinational companies to achieve both efficiencies and a major step-up in IT&T investment in South Australia. The aggregation of the public sector includes over 150 independent agencies, statutory authorities, health units and Government owned companies. In return, these selective multinational companies are required to make a significant investment in South Australia as part of their corporate global strategies and to provide substantial support to the local IT&T industry. The IT&T and the systems technology, which accompanies this new leap into the future and into the twenty-first century, are certainly the most exciting and challenging means of doing business not only locally but globally. Governments can set certain infrastructures in place and lead by example, but business and industry through their own initiatives must make the move to grasp the opportunities that now abound through international trade or remain in a time warp of the past which will see some of those opportunities pass them by.

The second major change that will impact on all businesses will be the development of increasingly sophisticated intranets within companies. Intranets are based on Internet standards and will lead to significant productivity gains and competitive advantage. It would be fair to say that intranets are now the fastest growing part of the web. For those who are still catching up with new technologies the question has been asked: what are the advantages of intranets and how will these new information systems affect the way we do business? One of the answers was given by Mr Ed McCracken, Chief Executive Officer of Silicon Graphics, when he was in Adelaide for the opening of the Silicon Graphics Works Centre.

The example given by Mr McCracken showed how business will move faster than we can often now contemplate. He described what happens on the Silicon Graphics global intranet when a competitor's new product is released. Within six hours of the release, documents begin to appear on their intranet which analyse the capabilities of the new product. Within two to three weeks, Silicon Graphics has its responses on the intranet drawing boards. That is the speed with which business will have to keep up: that is the potential that can be achieved using information technology in business today.

This Liberal Government has advanced into the information technology field, as I said earlier, by leading by example. In education we will spend \$4 million this year as part of a \$15 million five-year program to give school students access to computers and to set up computer networks within schools, to provide on-line access to schools from homes and to teach teachers how to teach with computers. In the health area we are using information technology to provide better health care to South Australians right throughout the State and we have budgeted for \$19 million expenditure on IT alone in the 1996-97 health budget. We are putting doctors into hospitals and community centres on-line, and South Australia is a leader in Australia in the use of telemedicine. A doctor in Adelaide at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for example, can now deliver specialist services to a patient in Whyalla.

A further example is the South Australian Land Ownership and Tenure System (LOTS), which is now one of the most advanced land title information systems in the world, attracting over 4 000 inquiries a year. The Government has budgeted to technically upgrade and redevelop the LOTS system including spatial information. It has the potential to be one of the most integrated spatial information systems in the world. Additional budget funds for IT right across Government means real opportunities for local information technology companies. Now, whether it is the supply of expertise, equipment and services or software development, the State Government is committed to ensuring that the focus of Government work is directed at a fast growing local industry. The benefits to South Australians are immense, and the economic potential increases the quality of employment growth for the future.

We have moved on a long way from Labor's record level of joblessness which sat at the unacceptable level of 12.3 per cent. Under a Liberal Government unemployment has fallen to 9.4 per cent. This is still an area where we all recognise that greater inroads are required to reduce that percentage even further. This is where the private sector will generate employment growth through the new environment created by the Liberal Government. New and sustainable private sector jobs mean that young South Australians increasingly will have a choice to build their life in their home State. Labor policies in latter years saw our young people leave their home State to gain employment elsewhere and they were only following industry and business enterprises which closed their doors in this State, taking their resources, their finances and therefore jobs for South Australians to other States in Australia. They could not prosper under Labor. Just as industry could not prosper under Labor neither could small business, and with increasing bankruptcies in that area more jobs have been lost.

A Liberal Government has set in place a cost competitive climate to attract business and investment capital back into South Australia. Adelaide has a cost advantage compared with Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane in areas such as

industrial and CBD office rentals, industrial and commercial property values, port interface costs, professional services, labour costs, and energy and water. Our per capita taxation is now 21 per cent less than Victoria and 23 per cent less than New South Wales. During the 1993 election the Liberals promised no new taxes and no increase in the rate of taxation. More than two years later the State Liberal Government has delivered. Small to medium businesses have had a real reduction of more than 30 per cent in the cost of electricity. This year's budget allows for a further reduction in commercial water rates of 3 per cent.

The creation of jobs is the mainstay of Government policy, and the recent announcement by Western Mining of its \$1.25 billion expansion of Olympic Dam will achieve approximately 6 700 jobs. Also Westfield Shopping Town building extensions will add 1 650 jobs; SA Water, contracting out of metropolitan and waste water services, over 1 100 jobs; Westpac's mortgage loan centre, 800 jobs; Mitsubishi, 750 jobs; and Holden's, 700 jobs.

A further industry area of great importance to the State's development which very rarely receives the recognition it deserves is our defence industry. I recently delivered an address on behalf of the Premier to a gathering of defence and electronic industry representatives. The reception was initiated by the Mayor of Salisbury, Mr David Plumridge. Other speakers included the Hon. Ian McLachlan, Minister for Defence, and Mr Peter Smith, Managing Director, British Aerospace Australia.

The northern Adelaide area is recognised as an Australian centre for defence and electronic industries. There is a very strong grouping or clustering of electronic industries in Salisbury, focused in the area between DSTO and Technology Park. Over 100 companies are involved in defence in some way in South Australia, with total defence employment in South Australia standing at 4 400 in Federal Government activities and over 3 700 in industry. The importance of the defence industry can be put into focus when it is considered that it accounts for 3 per cent of the gross State product and for around 19 000 direct and indirect jobs, making it equivalent to the household appliance and beverage manufacturing industries—and that includes the wine industry. South Australia is currently winning up to 40 per cent of total defence capital equipment expenditure going to Australian companies. With the Australian Submarine Corporation based at Port Adelaide, well advanced with sea trials of the first state-of-the-art Collins class submarines, South Australia's defence future is bright indeed.

South Australia's strength in this sector originated from the location in Adelaide of what is now the Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) Salisbury complex, which is still a major element in our competitive edge in this State. DSTO has its own budget and has a policy that supports development of its ideas by external industry. South Australian industry is supported by this very process. Many of the smaller companies in niche areas were started as a result of ex-DSTO staff initiatives, and continuing this process is a South Australian Government objective. South Australia's prime defence capabilities involve systems engineering, advanced electronics, electro-optics, surveillance and command, control, communications and intelligence. Of the five areas identified in the defence White Paper of 1984, seen as being imperative to give Australia decisive strategic advantage and therefore the need to be developed and enhanced, four currently exist in South Australia, namely,

surveillance and reconnaissance, command and control, key weapons and sensors, and electronic warfare.

South Australia is a centre for systems engineering and surveillance, key skills and competencies which have been built up in the South Australian defence sector and which stem to a large degree from the research activities at DSTO. All this means that South Australian companies are well positioned to share substantially in forthcoming major projects such as airborne early warning and control capability, aerial surveillance, reconnaissance and fire support for the Army, frigate upgrade and offshore patrol vessels. South Australia's policy for developing the defence industry is to support the maximisation of local industry involvement in these projects, building on these key competencies which have been developed here and capitalising on the potential for dual use technologies, that is, both civilian and defence applications.

Through its acquisition of AWA Defence Industries, British Aerospace Australia has emerged as the largest defence electronics company in Australia. The company is clearly a major force in the South Australian defence sector, placing the State in a commanding position to become the prime supplier of goods and services for the \$5 billion to \$30 billion of defence procurement expected to be called on by the Federal Government before the year 2005. British Aerospace Australia now has annual sales of \$260 million, an order book approaching \$400 million and a work force of 1 700 people.

Obviously, opportunities also exist for smaller players in the defence industry, but it is recognised that these firms may lack the financial strength or infrastructure to capitalise on major opportunities; therefore, the South Australian Government is assisting to establish the Defence Teaming Centre, which was opened recently by the Minister for Infrastructure, the Hon. John Olsen. This is an industry-led initiative aimed at developing a defence industry cluster network to help the smaller business sector win more business. The centre will provide access to market intelligence and will lower transaction costs in establishing those teaming agreements. It will help companies with domestic and international marketing through collaboration with other member companies. The centre will serve as a window on the local industry for outside firms and agencies searching for business connections and opportunities in South Australia.

South Australia's concentration of major defence industry players, research and development, infrastructure, skilled work force, cost competitive operating environment and a State Government committed to the industry offers a very attractive environment in which to locate defence, advanced electronics and space related businesses. With the collaboration of all the players in these industries, it is this message that will attract further economic development for South Australia.

In the short time left to me I will also cover other positive moves that have occurred in this State since the Liberal Government took over 2½ years ago. I will refer specifically to areas that come under my responsibility as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Infrastructure and Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. The Adelaide water contract initiated by the Government in December 1995 is continuing to result in substantial savings in the cost of providing water services in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The contract is also providing the basis for the development of a competitive, export focused, private sector water industry in South Australia and,

since the commencement of the contract, South Australian companies have already received orders totalling \$10 million in relation to export business. The Government has recently announced its strategy for the development of the South Australian water industry, which will result in South Australia becoming the centre of a world competitive and sustainable water industry. Over the next 10 years it is expected that the water industry will generate exports of the order of \$1 billion to interstate and overseas markets.

The Government will also proceed to implement a long-term contract with the private sector for the provision and operation of 10 water treatment plants to filter the water supplies for 100 000 people living and working in households, businesses and communities in the Adelaide Hills, Barossa Valley, Mid North, Upper South-East and larger towns along the Murray River. The total value of the project is approximately \$110 million, and the first of the 10 plants to be constructed serving the Adelaide Hills is expected to be commissioned in January 1998, with others to follow through 1998 and 1999.

Also, construction will soon commence on a privately owned and operated waste water treatment plant at Aldinga under a \$7 million contract finalised by the Government to upgrade services for urban development on Adelaide's southern fringes. In addition, recycled water from the plant will be used for irrigation in the Willunga Basin. This will contribute to economic development through expanded opportunities for local horticulture and at the same time provide greater protection for the environment by eliminating discharges either to the sea or to local water courses.

Under the environmental improvement program the Government recognises the need to ensure the continuing satisfactory environmental performance of the State's waste water treatment systems. A comprehensive environmental improvement program for SA Water's waste water treatment plants is under way in line with the licence requirements of the Environment Protection Authority. In metropolitan Adelaide, the Government has endorsed a process of community consultation in advance of improvement works over the next five years, at an estimated cost of \$152 million. Similar initiatives are under way in country South Australia, which initiatives include environmental monitoring programs, process upgrades and investigations into land based re-use options for recycled water. This will ensure that regional waste water treatment plants continue to provide high levels of protection to both public health and the environment.

As part of the continuing program to upgrade and improve the management and efficiency of water delivery in Government irrigation districts, the Government is planning the commencement of rehabilitation works for the Myponga Highland Irrigation District. The Government irrigation districts rehabilitation program for Moorook, Cobdogla, Myponga and Cadell is well ahead of schedule due to rigorous review of route selection, efficient project management and competitive tender prices. In the area of capital works, through SA Water the Government has committed a total of \$74.1 million for expenditure in 1996-97 on a range of products to improve the State's water supply, wastewater and irrigation systems. Significant projects proposed in the program include: \$6.5 million for ancillary works and development costs in relation to the regional water treatment program; \$4.65 million to replace water meters as part of an ongoing program to ensure the accuracy and reliability of SA Water's metering; \$4 million for renewal and upgrading works at Adelaide's four major wastewater

treatment plants; \$1.6 million for renewal and upgrading works on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline; and \$1.24 million to extend water supplies in the Angle Vale, Willaston and Morphett Vale areas.

In the area of the Department of Manufacturing Industry, Small Business and Regional Development, the manufacturing sector continues to be the largest contributor to the GSP, accounting for 17.5 per cent of South Australian GSP for 1994-95. Comparing 1994-95 to the previous year, manufacturing GSP at factor cost increased by 3.7 per cent. South Australian exports have risen significantly over the year to May 1996—16.5 per cent compared with the previous year. In comparison, total national exports have increased by 12.9 per cent. This growth in exports can be attributed to favourable seasonal conditions which led to cereal and cereal preparations exports rising by over 130 per cent. Exports of manufactured goods have also increased over the year to May 1996 by 2.9 per cent. Food and beverages, metal products and machinery and equipment manufacturing all contributed to the growth in total exports over the year to May 1996.

In line with MISBARD's increased focus on manufacturing, program funding support to SACFM has increased significantly from \$1.6 million in 1995-96 to \$5.1 million in 1996-97. Expenditure on tooling and foundry programs will rise to a total of \$900 000 in 1996-97, which is up from \$565 000 in 1995-96. The 1996-97 budget also provides \$2 million for the establishment of a cast metals precinct on a 40 hectare site at Wingfield which is expected to accommodate much of Adelaide's foundry operations in an environment conducive to providing world best practice operations. Major productivity improvement programs delivering significant returns to South Australian manufacturers will be delivered through SACFM to 15 targeted manufacturing enterprises generating on average a 20 per cent reduction on manufacturing costs. Twenty-four companies will participate in a machine changeover competition operated by SACFM to inculcate the tools and techniques capable of achieving average reductions of 50 per cent on die changeover times, which will assist manufacturers to become internationally competitive. The advanced manufacturing facility at SACFM will continue to provide leading edge services and deliver about 140 rapid prototyping and CAD modelling services to manufacturers.

The Let's Get South Australia Really Working program, which was launched in January 1994, has recently been restructured, including the introduction of many of the programs already in place which include Focus on the Future and IT Skills Advantage. It continues the following existing schemes: payroll tax rebate, business development plans, and the Young Farmers' Incentive Scheme. All this shows a litany of the improvements that have been made to economic growth in this State in the 2½ years that the Liberal Government has had at least the good fortune to be in Government to be able to make changes to the great liabilities that have been inflicted on the State of South Australia under the Labor Party. I am happy to support the Address in Reply.

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** I should like to give my support to His Excellency the Governor Sir Eric Neal upon his appointment as Governor of South Australia and for his first address at the opening of Parliament. There is no doubt that Dame Roma Mitchell is someone whom I have admired and respected over a long period. She certainly won the admiration of all South Australians during her five years in

office, but now we can look toward Sir Eric Neal in the position of Governor. I know that his contribution will be a great addition to the State of South Australia. His business background will give him the opportunity to sell the great pluses which this State has but which have not been exploited fully. Through meetings at Government House, overseas visitors with a similar corporate background will be sold a very strong message as to why their companies and countries should invest in this State. He is the first true corporate director to be appointed to the position of Governor. I believe that South Australia will be well served over the next five years in having a person in Government House who has not only been selected to represent Her Majesty but who will also play a dual role in promoting growth in the new areas of technology, mining, horticulture, agriculture and the wine industry and in the general promotion of this State.

The past three years have been difficult for South Australia, but the Government had no alternative. It took over a State which was near bankruptcy, one which had been working for the past 11 years with huge budget deficits, with Government run organisations such as the State Bank, SGIC and others carrying huge losses which plummeted the State into deep financial debt. I have not always agreed with the strategy taken by the Government, but I have supported it strongly, because I know that without these measures the State would have collapsed and would have been hard to revive. The Government has set itself on a program to restore the financial position of the State, to cut State debt, to remove the underlying budget deficit, and to undertake asset sales. Its role was to restore confidence in the community, to create jobs, introduce competitive tendering and to contract out services. South Australia has the second fastest rate of improvement for productivity of infrastructure in Australia and has the second lowest index of charges across the broad range of infrastructure such as ports, electricity, gas and aviation. South Australia has the cheapest port charges per container and fastest ship turn around times.

Since the Government was elected, there has been steady industrial expansion: for example, GMH has initiated a \$1.4 million expansion at Elizabeth to produce a new mid-sized vehicle with major investment for the Commodore model for release in both right and left-hand drive versions; the \$500 million Mitsubishi expansion to meet the demands of the production of a car in Adelaide for world markets; the \$200 million SANTOS investment doubling petroleum exploration in the Cooper Basin; and Western Mining Corporation's expansion at the Olympic Dam site where there will be investment of \$1.2 billion over the next five years. This expansion will create 1 000 jobs during construction and 200 permanent jobs on completion, and there will be an increase in Western Mining Corporation's exports out of our State from \$270 million per year to \$600 million per year. This Government has laid down the foundations for future expansion. It has had to weather the tough times to get the State into a position where there can be growth and expansion in the future.

I refer now to a few local issues that affect the seat of Colton. I have made it quite clear to Parliament on a number of occasions that I will always oppose any move to create an open channel diversion of the Sturt Creek and Patawalonga catchment to flow directly out to sea. For many years, the Patawalonga has acted as a ponding and settlement basin, and the only way the water could be diverted was through the creation of four or five wetlands to purify the water. There is only one long-term solution to cleaning the Patawalonga

basin, that is, to recreate wetlands from the foothills through to the beach. That would emulate the role of the wetlands which were built at the MFP site at Salisbury and which are not only functioning effectively but have received world recognition as some of the finest—if not the finest—man-made wetlands ever produced.

I must admit that I was impressed to see that my representation to the Premier on behalf of the electorate met with a quick response. The first wetlands of four hectares are now being created in low-lying paddocks at the Urrbrae Agricultural High School. These will lead the way in the catchment and natural decreasing of polluted water flowing downstream to the Patawalonga and into Gulf St Vincent. The \$1.3 million initiative was instigated by the State Government as a joint venture with the Mitcham Council, the Urrbrae Agricultural High School and the Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board.

The Premier has agreed with me on two issues: first, that this is the first of a chain of wetlands to be established in the 235 square kilometre Patawalonga catchment; and, secondly, that the next one should be built in the south parklands of the city. My personal opinion is that the one built in the south parklands should be the largest and most significant of its type ever to be created in any capital city of the world. The rapid progress the Government is making in delivering its promise that the Patawalonga and Sturt Creek catchment should deliver clean water to the people of the western suburbs is reflected in the minutes of the meeting of the Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board of 19 September. It was carried by the board that a project officer position be advertised for the south parklands wetlands project, and applications for that position closed on 20 September 1996.

The Urrbrae wetlands will filter much of the nitrogen, phosphorus, suspended solids, heavy metals and bacteria from stormwater which runs off the foothills and suburban streets. They will produce water of a quality fit for irrigation and recharging the underground aquifer. What is equally important is that this new wetlands area will provide hands-on experience for students of Urrbrae Agricultural High School in the newly developed Certificate of Environmental Studies and an assurance that the young people of tomorrow will be trained to be more aware, more responsible and better qualified to handle the environmental disasters of the past. The project will result in an innovative solution to improve water quality, reduce pollution and provide a state of the art education resource for the children of South Australia, while at the same time delivering clean water to the western suburbs. It will give the students an extensive teaching experience in environmental management at secondary level and, therefore, they will be able to combine a magnificent facility with a theory on agriculture and environmental education, resulting in being able to reuse some of the water in the underground waste management system on the school farms.

Today we have to acknowledge that, during this term of Government, in the first three years, the Premier has gone out and done three very significant things. He has given a commitment to clean up and put in place a water management board for the Torrens River, which has been an absolute disgrace for the past 25 years. Only some 10 days ago, I stood on the bridge on Seaview Road, at the outlet of the Torrens River, and watched literally thousands of tonnes of soil and silt go out to the beach at Henley South and West Beach, and that entire part of the coast was absolutely brown in colour.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CONDOUS:** He has put that catchment board in place. With respect to the environment, he has established the Patawalonga Catchment Management Board. A series of some 14 trash and silt traps has been installed. The first wetlands are being created, and again the Patawalonga has been cleaned up ready for tourism development and for future generations to be able to enjoy it. Over the past 20 years, we have destroyed our seagrasses which were the breeding ground for aquaculture and fish for South Australia. Yet the previous Government, which was in power for some 20 of the past 23 years, never addressed that area, because it knew it would be difficult.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CONDOUS:** The Labor Government should hang its head in shame. Twenty-four years prior to the election, it did absolutely nothing to address this problem. It was too difficult a problem to address and, in not addressing the problem, it destroyed the beaches of the western suburbs.

Debate adjourned.

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

**YATES, Mr B.**

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services):** I lay on the table a ministerial statement, made in another place earlier today by the Attorney-General, relating to Mr Bruce Yates.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Mr CONDOUS:** Education was also neglected in the western suburbs. After I was elected in December 1993, early in 1994 the Minister and I spent two days visiting the schools in the electorate. By far the worst was Seaton Park Primary School and during the inspection I was appalled at the run down state of the general classrooms, the playing areas, the asphalt surfaces and the building that was used as a lunch room where the students could buy their morning and afternoon lunches. The floor of one prefabricated block of classrooms was dangerous to walk on because the floorboards were just about worn through. I could not understand how any primary school educational institution would be allowed to operate in such poor condition, providing such appalling conditions for the students.

I find it extremely difficult to comprehend the Labor Party's stance on education when it neglected the schools in the western suburbs so badly. But, when I started to analyse it, I found out that it had done one of the major things that you do not do in politics—to take your electorate for granted. Because it knew that the Seaton area strongly voted for Labor, it simply did not put money into that area. In fact, the area needed turning around, and the Minister and I decided to look closely at the situation with the school principals. I am proud to say that in this year's budget the Grange Primary School received \$208 000 for an upgrade and Seaton Park Primary School, which probably has not had any money spent on it for 20-odd years—the forgotten school in the western suburbs—is receiving \$750 000 for redevelopment with an assurance by the Minister that we will both inspect the school when the money has been spent to see what additional funds

are needed so that the children in my electorate of Seaton can enjoy decent primary school facilities.

I believe that the Government has been through the tough part and that we are about to see moneys injected back into education and health in the western suburbs. It is important that funds be injected into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the western suburbs, especially in my electorate, because it is changing dramatically. We find that, as the older population passes away, young people with families and children move into the western suburbs because of the great advantages it presents. Of course, part of the electorate of Colton is a beautiful seaside resort. It is close to the West Lakes shopping centre and Football Park. It is only 15 minutes drive from the city and is in close proximity to Glenelg. I believe that the Government will act responsibly and that we will see those changes take place. It gives me pleasure to be part of a Government that has guided South Australia back on track, and we will see the benefits of that in the future.

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** It gives me great pleasure to support the motion for the Address in Reply. I congratulate Sir Eric Neal on his first opening speech as the new Governor of South Australia, and I commend his address to this very important parliamentary session. I also take this opportunity to congratulate him on the honorary doctorate recently awarded to him. It sends a positive message to the people of this State that business is important when we have a man who understands the importance of business holding the State's highest office. I wish Sir Eric an enjoyable time during his term as Governor.

An article in the *Advertiser* of 12 October stated that the biggest firms in the world have bigger economies than those of most nations. This amazed me. Of the 100 biggest economies, 49 are countries and 51 are corporations. This presents a new era for business and for Governments who no longer have the control over the labour market that once existed. Fortunately, South Australia has a Government with flexibility that can respond positively to these global changes. Dean Brown's Liberal Government will have been in power for three years in December. Therefore, it is an excellent time to take stock of where we have come from and where we are going.

My electorate of Flinders is a microcosm of the whole State. In its 34 000 square kilometres covering most of Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island we have huge potential, particularly in the growth areas of aquaculture, tourism and mining, along with the value-adding and expansion of our primary industries. However, to really start to fulfil this potential we needed a Government that provided a sound economic base from which to work and an environment conducive to the survival and expansion of the small to medium-sized businesses that make up the economic engine of the region. Despite the annual \$350 million deficit underlying the State budget that we started with, we are now on track for a State surplus. It is from this position, where we can afford it, that the Government will gradually ease the reins on the State's finances.

It was not nice to know that as a State we could not even pay all the interest on the massive debt that Labor had accumulated. The necessary sound economic base is being put in place, from which we can all take heart without fear that taxes will have to be imposed on ordinary working people, as would have had to happen as a measure of desperation to pay the State's debts that were rapidly becoming unmanageable. With business confidence will

come the jobs that an electorate such as Flinders so badly needs to hold and improve our infrastructure. I point out that Eyre Peninsula, with only 2.3 per cent of the State's population, provides 33 per cent of the State's grain and about 65 per cent of the State's fishing income, mostly from exports. However, we still need to broaden our economic base as quickly as we can. The more efficient we become in our major industries, the fewer people we need to run them.

With a coastline larger than Tasmania's, it is no surprise that the electorate of Flinders has huge potential in aquaculture, both on shore and in the sea. Visitors are already coming from around the world to see what is being done in Flinders. On shore abalone farms are just coming into production and oyster farms are gradually producing top quality oysters, potentially for the world markets. Experimental farms for fin fish are in production. In addition, we have unique hybrid farms that take the wild product and hold it, ready to sell live into the world markets. The most successful of these are the tuna farms with product valued at around \$80 million and growing.

More recently, the industry rock lobster cages are being trialled. Rock lobsters, with a market value of \$23 per kilogram when put into the cages, have recently been sold for \$53 per kilogram. The lobsters are already being held in land tanks while awaiting shipment. The Government has been active in helping to ensure that these industries are properly placed for the long term. Aquaculture plans have been undertaken for all of South Australia's suitable waters, and the South Australian Research and Development Institute is continuing to undertake research relevant to their development and long term survival.

Existing fisheries have not been neglected, with research being done into fish stock. The Government has given a significant donation for research into breeding whiting fingerlings to restock the wild. The project is being financed by the Playford Trust which commemorates the 100th anniversary of Premier Tom Playford's birth. A major development to affect the Eyre Peninsula region has been the involvement of the Flinders University and SARDI in the new Marine Science Centre at Port Lincoln.

Tourism has been a sleeping giant in Flinders. On Kangaroo Island, this giant is awakening and the Government has contributed to significant roadworks and information centres, while advertising has been targeted. On Eyre Peninsula, this is just beginning to take place, with tourism and road funding going into Elliston and Streaky Bay areas among others, and plans being developed for the Lincoln and Coffin Bay national parks, with others such as Lake Newland to happen in the near future. These plans should pave the way for ecotourism opportunities within the parks to be brought to fruition.

The second stage of the Lincoln Cove Marina development will soon be released for sale. Waterfront homes of high quality in the vicinity of \$200 000 and marina berths will ensure continued investment by retirees, investors and others in this outstanding project. The 10 year program to seal all rural arterial roads is bringing hope of a better deal for communities in Kimba, Cleve, Lock and Elliston, with councils in these centres now starting on sealing work. Watching the grey snake of bitumen lengthening is a constant reminder that our Liberal Government not only cares about our rural regions but also actively supports them.

Mining has had a significant impact on Eyre Peninsula, mainly through Roxby Downs which, although not within the electorate, provides many jobs for people from the region.

Significant funds are being repatriated back through links with farms and businesses and the holidays of people who work there. The recent \$1.25 billion expansion in Roxby, with an expected 6 700 jobs, will be of great benefit to the region. However, the potential of Tarcoola's gold mine and of the possible mine in the Yumbarra National Park are also of great significance, and I would be distressed if either of those projects was held up for any reason. Mineral deposits actually on the Eyre Peninsula are also being investigated through the electromagnetic aerial survey and other work being done by Mines and Energy South Australia, work which is instrumental to their success.

Fishing and farming will probably always be the major sources of income for Flinders. However, continued diversification and value adding of these products is necessary to ensure that jobs are maintained within the region. The expansion of the canola crop within the electorate has added a valuable commodity to the existing ones, and if a crushing plant is found to be viable, it will be an added bonus to process the product in the electorate as well. The \$4 million expansion of the SACBH facilities at Arno Bay I believe is a good omen and a vote of confidence in the region. The \$11 million rural strategy for upper Eyre Peninsula and the Government support and the expansion of the Minnipa research station are both major projects that have occurred in the last three years, and augur well for the future of business and farming in the region.

The new industry development boards for rural industry sectors should help to focus on the management of the rural industries, particularly in relation to export markets for wool and aquaculture products and their infrastructure requirements such as airports. The full potential of the regions of South Australia will not be able to be fulfilled without good communications. The Government has recognised the importance of information technology which, I believe, is even more important for we who live in the bush than it is for those who live in the city. If we are to reap the benefits of being able to video conference between our professional people and our students to keep them up-to-date with the best in the world, we must have improved infrastructure provided as a matter of urgency. It can be a matter of life and death whether an operation can be directed by experts miles away to deal with a crisis in a small country hospital. It can have a similar effect on the future of a student who is unable to attend a city school but who can access the information and opportunities via the Internet. The possibilities for expanding the available knowledge and ability in remote locations are endless.

An article on the world economy in the 28 September 1996 issue of the *Economist* explains some of the global changes which IT is bringing. While there will be a change in the nature of the work and therefore jobs, as happened in the industrial revolution and transport revolution of the last two centuries, there will be advantages for governments that adapt to change. The article stated that gains will be hard to measure because conventional economics statistics designed for the industrial age are out of their depth in the information age, and I quote:

That does not mean that governments should just sit back and watch. There is plenty they can do to help their economies adjust to change and to lend a hand to those who lose their jobs. In periods of technological change it is the economies with the most flexible product and labour markets that perform best.

The Liberal Government has the flexibility to respond to the new era which has been born with the microchip. We are not

tied to outdated ideology that taken in context with the world situation disadvantages our workers.

There are many other positive topics that could be explored such as the effects of the local government amalgamation proposals and the Government's environment, education and health policies for the bush, but these I will cover in speeches throughout the next year. I am honoured to be a member of the Government which is playing such an important role in the development of the State. I again commend the Governor on his speech and wish him and his wife the best in their new roles. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I support the motion. I congratulate Sir Eric Neal on his recent appointment as Governor of South Australia and also on the more recent announcement of the honorary doctorate conferred on him by the University of South Australia. I am well aware of the very deserved honour that confers on him though I sometimes wonder about the motives of the universities for conferring honorary doctorates on people, whether they be prominent dignitaries or other figures of a more political nature with which it appears elements within a university wish to identify. I do not find that all that edifying. In this instance, I am delighted that Sir Eric has been so honoured.

He drew attention—as have the Treasurer and the Premier over the past few months—to the fact that in the three budgets which this Government has had the honour and responsibility of delivering for South Australia, we have come from the parlous state of a deficit of over \$350 million to a point where in the next 12 months we will have a very real and sustainable surplus in the State's budget. That to my mind deserves commendation.

It deserves commendation because it sends a signal to the wider community outside South Australia that the economy here is sound: the risk of taxes needing to escalate is low and the environment for capital investment is therefore good—short run, medium run, and long run. That means that we will be achieving what we set out to achieve and what we said we would achieve when we were first elected just a short time ago, that is, that we would produce jobs—real jobs, more jobs, jobs for people who want to work and who want the benefits that come from the income derived from work, and the dignity they get in consequence of being able to support themselves and their families.

Without those sound economic bases, these investments will not be made. Without these investments being made there will not be an expansion in the number of jobs in the State. Without an expansion in the number of jobs in the State young people—indeed, people of any ages but predominantly young school leavers more mobile and unattached—will look elsewhere in increasing numbers, as they have been doing during the past decade, for a start in their careers. The better brains among them will not return; they will stay where they put down new roots, and we will be the poorer for it since we, as a community in South Australia, have invested in their education not only in primary and secondary schools but also, in many instances, at post-secondary and tertiary levels.

We have made the investment. We have forgone the expenditure in other areas of our economy in order to provide them with the education and training, only to find that they then fly the coop and contribute to the economic development and expansion not here but elsewhere, and we lose as a consequence of that. It is a pity that the former Government never grasped that point; never focused its attention upon the

underlying problem that was illustrated by that symptom, namely, the symptom of young people leaving the State. We have stopped that trend, and the 15 to 24-year age group is, in increasing numbers, staying in South Australia to the point where we have a slight population growth again.

We, as the Governor quite properly pointed out in his speech, will develop an export focus on where those jobs will be developed—jobs that come from simply competing with service providers to the State's population and, indeed, to other Australians—and merely take those jobs from somewhere else and establish them in South Australia. That of itself may be good for us, but it is at the expense of our neighbours. It will always be a part of competitive Federalism, and desirably so, since it ensures that the States each compete with one another to provide the best environment in which business can flourish, and people can vote with their feet accordingly.

There will always be this healthy tension and competition between the separate constituent States in the Federation trying to outdo one another at being the best place in which to establish particular types of enterprises which they believe can best serve the national interest. It is appropriate at this point to illustrate that by referring to the Premier's vision, shared by all members of the Government, that South Australia should become a centre of excellence in information technology and telecommunications, and that is to be commended. It is a sunrise industry; it is growing. The percentage of the world's work force and economy, which will be dedicated to it because it is a more efficient way of decision making and communication, will increase.

It is much more efficient than chopping down trees and printing on the paper produced from the trees the word that needs to be communicated to other parties, and then carrying that piece of paper to those other parties. It is smarter to do it through the information technology and telecommunications media since that does not take as much energy in the processing of the paper that is made redundant, and it does not take as much energy as carrying those pieces of paper from wherever it is that people write their messages to wherever it is that the messages must be delivered.

It is not only less expense and trouble but quicker to utilise IT&T. So, we have established a sound basic economic framework to build new business confidence here in order that in a sound way we can diversify our economy and particularly our regional economies: we need to focus our attention upon that. It will do us not one jot of good as a State if our efforts ignore the benefits that can come from spreading that investment outside the metropolitan area into the provincial centres and regional economies of South Australia. Indeed, as the member for Flinders has already pointed out, there are enormous investment opportunities by virtue of the natural resources to which she has referred in the electorate she represents. In addition to what she has mentioned, in the electorate I represent there are also natural advantages, including being at least two to 2½ hours closer to major Australian markets on the eastern seaboard and, in real terms, so far as cost assessment goes, being no more expensively located than the metropolitan area to supply to that area the local needs for any of those specialist products which could be manufactured in the towns in my region.

For instance, I have said there is a service industry which ought to be transferred to Murray Bridge to make the South-Eastern Freeway a much safer road along which people can travel. It involves removing a large number of semi-trailers by establishing transport depots for road and even rail

transport. Semi-trailers coming from the Eastern States to supply South Australia could easily unload in Murray Bridge in the transport depots and have their cargo despatched to wherever the client's ultimate address is—north of Adelaide in the Elizabeth/Salisbury area, the western suburbs or to the area south around Lonsdale or even closer in than Lonsdale—and the time taken to travel radially across the hills from Murray Bridge to any one of those locations is no greater than the time taken for a truck once unloaded in a depot, say, in the western suburbs, to carry its cargo either to Salisbury or to the southern suburbs around Lonsdale.

It saves the cost of hauling the cargo on a semi-trailer over the hills to one location and then despatching the cargo. There are real savings to the extent that trucking companies should be encouraged to do that. However, whether or not they will acknowledge that benefit is not certain in my mind and there is no particular policy in place to draw their attention to the benefits that could obtain by doing as I have suggested.

In addition, we as a Government have been expanding mining exploration here in South Australia. Let me illustrate that point by referring to the fact that in the next 12 months we are likely to be spending \$35 million on mineral exploration. That is a 300 per cent increase in over five years and is a policy which is bipartisan in this Chamber, although I do not know that the Democrats really understand what exploration is all about. Probably taking a look at their navel from a different angle would be as much exploration as I would expect of some members of that Party.

Some of the rantings I have heard from Democrats in both the Federal and State Parliaments in recent times and other madcap fringe elements from the left of politics lead me to believe that my assessment is probably correct in that regard. I mean them no ill will. I think them pleasant enough people. They seem to wash daily and so on, and in social terms they can be good company; but in political terms they really are in the wilderness and it is difficult to find them. It is even difficult for them to find themselves, on analysis of some of the things that they come out with.

I know that they are opposed to the notion of developing Roxby Downs, with an expenditure of an additional \$1.25 billion. I wonder where they would make the cuts to expenditure that would be necessary had Roxby Downs never been established. It would be interesting to invite the members representing that Party in the other place to put down where they think we could afford to slash expenditure and close down the mine at Roxby Downs in keeping with what was their bent then. I guess that, within another five to 10 years, they will still be prating their hypocrisy by saying 'No more mines', yet quite happily and gratuitously handing out advice to the Government of the day as to how it ought to expend the revenue it obtains from royalties and other sources which is generated by the mining sector.

I know that some weirdos, who have similar inconsistent views, populate even the Labor Party and other political Parties, but none are more destructive, none are more insular and none are more self-righteous than our friends the Democrats. Let me move on from my observations about the political ineptitude of those people and the fact that they will always be in the position they are in now, never having the responsibility on their shoulders of implementing any of their policies because they will never impress a sufficient number of people that they understand what the world is all about.

Let me move along from that to illustrate what the Premier and many members of the Government have done in recent times in promoting South Australia's expanding production

base in overseas markets. That is where it is. If we do not expand exports from this State, we will not expand job numbers in anything like the same way as is possible through export income. There is a multiplier effect on export income from the types of industries that we have, that is, by value adding in the food and beverage industries on the raw material that we produce and selling those goods, as the member for Flinders has said. The Governor drew attention to this matter in his address to us.

I have already mentioned the mining industry, but we should be selling our education, be it at the secondary, technical and further education or university level, to the markets to our near north. We have international excellence in our universities and in our TAFE colleges and secondary schools, whether in the private or public sector, to offer those people, and we have sold ourselves short in the past. We have not been nearly aggressive enough in entering the fray, either as a nation or as a State of that nation. We do less well compared with the States to our east and west, because that is where the international jets first touch down and that is where people have tended to stop, hire their accommodation and enrol their children.

The Premier drew attention to that in the course of his visit to Europe and China just prior to the commencement of this session of the Parliament. In addition to drawing attention to food and beverages, to mining products and value adding on them, and to education, he has also drawn attention to the processing technologies in the service industries that are developing here, such as in our water business. In addition, we represent the ideal destination for tourists. We are a pleasant, placid, peaceful and enjoyable destination for anyone who wants to ice out from the stress of running business at high level in east Asia and just to take it easy. There is plenty of space in South Australia, plenty of fresh air, no smog, a very pleasant climate by comparison with many other places, and a very low crime rate.

Tourism is a vital element in the strategy to expand this State's economy—and so it should be—and it is a vital element in the expansion of the economy in the region I represent. It is not necessary for us to simply focus on selling wine and wine alone as the image in the east Asia market. In some places where we are having a very dramatic expansion in the number of tourists seeking holidays outside their countries they simply do not drink alcohol of any kind, leave alone wine and, if they have a penchant for drinking alcoholic beverages at all, it is most commonly beer or their local spirits. They are not in the least interested in or attracted by the thought of being able to enjoy, as we would see it, a wide range of very high quality wine; indeed much of that is lost on them.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** As the member for Unley points out, we do produce amongst the best malting barley in the world to make their beer but we do not yet sell them on that idea in our tourism imagery. We do not yet focus adequately and accurately on what will interest the east Asian holiday maker. Take them to one winery and they will be happy: take them to any more and they will be bored. Put them on a houseboat on the Murray River or put them in a host farm setting with an Australian couple who are sympathetic to their interests and needs and who will show them how farming is undertaken and they will be enthralled. Take them to a fruit block and let them pick their own oranges, watch the birds and enjoy the sunshine and they will be so rapt they will stay longer and,

what is more, they will bring their friends the next time they come.

I pay tribute to the support which was given to the Premier by other members in this House in the course of the trade mission which he led from South Australia. The member for Norwood, the member for Coles, as I recall, and the member for Hartley all in their special way deserve commendation. I know personally, because of the conversations I have had with him as a colleague sitting next to me, the enormous amount of work that the member for Hartley did in establishing connections in Italy. That is to be commended because in the short term and the long term it will mean many more people will come here. I am attempting the same thing myself in another quarter, that is, in the east Asian market in the Korean area not only because of my belief that it is the most exciting market in that region—it is rapidly expanding and it already has approximately \$A15 000 GDP per capita per year—but also it is a clean slate. The Government of that country is opening its markets to suppliers from anywhere and over the next three or four years it is crucial that we get in there as suppliers to get them to put orders on the blank slate. If we do not, we will miss out to the Eastern States and to Western Australia as we already have, for instance, in the supply of food and beverage.

I intend to do something about that and make no secret of the fact that my wife by birth is a Korean which enables me to make a special contribution in that area. If members of Parliament do not examine those opportunities and the framework through which they can be made available for the benefit of the South Australian economy, then who will? If members of Parliament do not understand them and then through discussion determine a policy direction for the expansion of our production to supply those markets, then it is unlikely that anyone else will, either. What is more, there needs to be backup provided by Government instrumentalities in Australia, and in South Australia in particular, to ensure that those forays are successful. For that reason I believe it is vital for members of Parliament to continue to travel as the current arrangements for travel make it possible to do so.

Contrary to what the *Advertiser* has said, as most members in this place know, travel arrangements overseas—or anywhere, for that matter—for members of Parliament in this State are not excessive or generous when compared with those in other States; nor are they inappropriate in the way in which they are accounted for. In New South Wales, the travel allowance is buried amongst the electorate allowance, and the way in which it is spent is not accounted for at all. It is, nonetheless, permissible to spend money from the electorate allowance for this purpose—travel overseas—and the electorate allowance, by and large, is much larger than it is in South Australia and reflects that fact.

However, that seems to be lost on the editorial staff of the *Advertiser*, who are more concerned about a good headline and sensationalism than they are about facts and the public interest. It is easy to beat up interest in a cockfight. It seems to excite the baser instincts, even in journalists. When members of the general public are told or shown only a portion of the truth, they are inclined to agree with the drivel that is trotted out in that editorial attitude rather than seek and understand the benefits that accrue from it.

I am delighted that in the course of his remarks the Governor drew attention to the fact that a small business advisory council and a regulation reform advisory council will now be established. Both have been needed for a very long time. It is a credit to the member for Kavel, as the

Minister responsible, that he has taken up that course of action, in keeping with his predecessor in the Tonkin Government, the current Premier, who was determined to see a rationalisation of the numbers of licences required, for instance, in the enormous amount of regulation imposed on small business. His vision was to provide a one—stop shop for small business to obtain the various licences that might be required to operate.

There are many other aspects of the way in which the State's economy has, not so much subtly, but very deliberately and very sensibly and acceptably, been redirected by this Government under the leadership of the current Premier since coming to office that have produced great benefits for South Australians who do not realise what risk we were subject to at the time we came to office. This State's economy was on a knife edge and it would not have taken much to destroy the State's economy completely; and, with that loss of investor confidence, our population would have been driven down. It would have caused an enormous problem. Goodness knows, we have a big enough problem now with a preponderance of older people in our population by virtue of the fact that our younger folk have been leaving for so long that we have, if you like, an hourglass figure in respect of the analysis of our aged in the population at large. We have to hold the line and in fact reverse it—and I believe that we have done that.

I now wish to draw attention to a matter about which I have been speaking in recent times in this place, and that is men's health. It is well known that in the past 12 to 15 years increasing expenditure has been directed at diseases which are specific to the female gender. However, it is now known, but not widely acknowledged, that the life expectancy of men is more severely reduced by a failure to develop appropriate diagnostic and treatment techniques for diseases which are specific to men.

We spend more than 100 times as much on breast cancer, on cervical cancer and other gender-specific diseases of women than we do on men, even though the consequences for the population at large are worse for men. Altogether, I think it is time that we addressed those problems such as prostate cancer and the fact that men have a lower life expectancy. They certainly have a lower disability-free life expectancy. There is a six year disparity between men and women—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Whether there is any gender-specific retardation in consequence of mental development I do not know, but I can tell the member for Unley that mental health problems in men are deeper and wider than they are in women, and men in our culture are disinclined to talk about their problems. Whether that is true across the board is beside the point. It is a fact in our culture and it needs to be addressed. It is worse in the lower socioeconomic groups. I do not accept that the causes of behaviour are attributable to socialisation. I believe that it is more basic and primitive than that. Even though the culture and the manner in which people are socialised into our society does have an effect, it is not the most significant of effects. We need to reverse that trend. We need now to start spending money on the problems that males have related to their health, physiological as well as psychological or psychiatric. It is not good enough for us simply to say that it will go away.

In this State the suicide rate is many times higher amongst young men than it is amongst young women, and throughout age groups by gender. At a later time I will make a fuller exposition of the facts supporting my assertions in this respect, because they are easily supported by a careful

analysis of the data available to us from the records. But it is time for us to begin reversing the trend of increasing concern for women's health and not much concern for men's health. I look forward to seeing that included in the policy manifesto developed by the Liberal Party and put to the public over the next couple of years.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I should like to begin by offering my congratulations to the Governor Sir Eric Neal on his first speech to open Parliament, and I wish him and his wife Lady Neal success—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A rather bad habit has been creeping into speeches whereby members have tended to read far too much. I suggest to members that this is not a good practice.

**Ms STEVENS:** As I was saying, I should like to congratulate the Governor and wish him well at the beginning of his term. I will start my Address in Reply contribution by quoting a couple of sentences from the speech with which the Governor opened Parliament, and I will use those sentences to address the points raised in them. The Governor said:

My Government has created a foundation of economic and financial reforms to public administration from which South Australians are now poised to reap the benefits. These benefits have been targeted to meet the economic and the social priorities of my Government.

The first thing I should like to talk about is the economic state of South Australia. Contrary to what we hear time and again in this House and in the media, things are not good in South Australia. We all know that from the people we come across in our electorate, and yet we hear a very different story time and again.

I will mention a few matters that are evidence that things are not working so well in South Australia. Since the election of Dean Brown our job growth rates have trailed those around the nation. The South Australian employed work force has grown by just 2.7 per cent, compared with more than 7.1 per cent nationally. In Australia over this time, the employed work force grew by more than 558 000. Here in South Australia, despite a substantial rise in the last month, employment has risen by only 17 100 since December 1993. If South Australia had just kept pace with the national growth rate there would have been 45 390 extra jobs over this time.

Since April the total number of people employed has fallen by 5 700. Of particular concern also is the fact that, whatever the growth we have had in the number of jobs, it has been in part-time work only. There are now fewer full-time jobs in South Australia than there were in early 1991. Moreover, between Dean Brown's coming to office and September the number of full-time jobs fell by 1 800. Reflecting this under-performance, the gap between South Australia's labour force participation rate—that is, the number of people actively seeking work—and that of the nation has widened over the past two years, illustrating the greater discouragement felt by job seekers in South Australia.

Currently, the national seasonally adjusted participation rate stands at 63.5 per cent, while in South Australia it is 61.7 per cent. South Australia has the highest rate of youth unemployment of any State, at 38.9 per cent in July this year. As a result of poor job prospects in South Australia, more and more people are leaving our State. Indeed, the number of people leaving the State for other parts of Australia each year now exceeds by about 7 000 the number of people coming from other States to South Australia.

The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates of private new capital investment for the year to June 1996 show

that South Australia had the largest fall of any State. New private investment for the year actually fell by 15.3 per cent. We have all heard other statistics. Housing approvals are at their lowest levels for over 30 years. There has been an increase in retail sales in recent months, but this has largely been restricted to food retailing and hospitality; the other sectors are flat.

A vitally important sector of the South Australian economy is manufacturing. The real value of manufactured exports fell in 1995-96, whereas the real rate of growth in manufactured exports in the five years to 1993-94 was 13 per cent per annum. A survey of manufacturing employment notes a fall of 4 per cent over the year to June. This is the grim reality of what is happening here in South Australia under this Government. It is interesting to note that in the speech that was given that day the Government again spoke of its privatisation strategy, one of its major policies. We know that in his report the Auditor-General picked out major flaws in this strategy and raised issues in relation to private sector funding of public works, particularly hospitals at Mount Gambier and Port Augusta, where the private sector option actually cost more. The Government's privatisation strategy has been shown up for what it really is: an ideological push.

We are saying not that privatisation or outsourcing is necessarily wrong in all cases but that we need to take each case on its merits and that we need to be sure that the benefits are there. Clearly, that has not happened here. There is some good news on the horizon, and other members have noted this. I, too, am pleased with the development at Roxby Downs and with the developments in the rural sector. We have been lucky to have good seasons recently which have bailed us out. It has been good to see the advancement in the TAFE sector where our work force has been able to produce world class materials for export.

So, the news is not all bad, but overall the situation in South Australia is grim. It is a challenge, and it requires vision, commitment and honesty to make a change. But what do we have, what do we see, and what do we hear from the Premier? What we hear are fanfares, announcements and hype. We hear much talk and see little action. We hear and see a lot of dishonesty which leads to disillusionment in the community. This is something that I hear throughout the community. People are not stupid; they know that things are not going well.

**Mr Lewis:** Who caused it?

**Ms STEVENS:** The member for Ridley calls out, 'Who caused it?' This is not about pointing the finger and blaming. It is about time that we lifted ourselves out of that mentality and started to focus on the future with a bit of vision, planning, honesty and guts in order to address the issues and come up with some of the new solutions that we will need to get South Australia going and to provide a future for our State, our people and our children. We are not seeing this from this Government. We are seeing dishonesty, make-believe and a whole lot of superficial hype which everyone knows is not what is really going on.

I would like to focus in particular on youth unemployment. In my area, youth unemployment has been an issue for some time, but never more than now. As other members of this House have mentioned, nothing is more demoralising for a community than to have its young people without hope. This issue of all issues is something that we as leaders need to address straightaway.

I will quote briefly from the report of the Premier's task force on youth unemployment and mention a couple of the strategies that it contains: develop secondary schools within regions dedicated to vocational training with significant industry content; ensure that school-to-work transition programs are well structured, logical and easy to administer; review career advice in secondary schools to ensure that young people are assisted to form realistic expectations; further develop special early intervention initiatives for students at risk of leaving school prematurely (13 to 15-year age group) or not making a successful school to work transition.

Let us think about those recommendations. The Government's own task force on youth unemployment has suggested these changes to our education system. On the one hand, the task force is making these lofty recommendations; on the other hand, the State Government is ripping out money from the State system and pulling out resources so that there is absolutely no way in which our State schools will be able to do what this task force recommends.

We have a Government superficially making these recommendations but not being prepared to bite the bullet and say, 'Yes, we think addressing youth unemployment is important; yes, we will use these strategies in our schools; and, yes, we are prepared to fund those things so that they are successful.' It is all hype; it is all rhetoric. Over the past weekend, during the Labor Party's phone in on education, many young people said that they were leaving school early—

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** We received more than 370 phone calls, or thereabouts, during that weekend. Those young people said that they were leaving school—and the retention rate has fallen in our schools over the past year or two—because there is no hope. Their attitude is, 'Why bother? Why be at school?' We are facing a terrible situation, and we need to do something about it. It is not something that will be easy but, if we do not address it, it is something for which we will bear the consequences for years to come. It will mean that the fabric of our community—the hope of the future—will not be there. Youth unemployment must be addressed, and it must not just be addressed with rhetoric but backed up properly with the resources and the will to make it happen.

I note, too, that one objective mentioned in the Governor's speech is that this Government will promote labour market programs. I find it interesting that this was mentioned, completely ignoring the fact that the Federal Government has just cut labour market programs savagely across our whole country. It was as though this speech was given in complete isolation from what was happening nationally. In other words, the attitude was, 'We know that this is happening nationally but we will ignore it; we will make out that South Australia is by itself. The speech will bear no resemblance to reality in relation to what the Federal Government has just done.' Again, the reality does not match the rhetoric—a consistent theme that came out of that speech the whole way through.

I refer now to social priorities. On behalf of the Government, the Governor said that the benefits that were supposed to flow from this Government have been targeted to meet the economic and social priorities of the Government. Let us just think about the social priorities and, perhaps before we think about them in detail, we should also think about the importance of balancing economic and social priorities and about how important it is to get that balance right. Good governance means striking the balance so that you make changes in one

area without throwing the other into chaos. Let us look at social priorities.

I have already mentioned education in terms of school to work and the upper end of the education system, but the cuts in the public education system have hit from preschools through to years 12 and 13. Early intervention strategies fall way short of providing the basic literacy and numeracy developmental programs for young children. This is a huge gap, and it involves speech pathology and programs for students with special needs. There are glaring gaps, and again the Government superficially is saying that it is doing the right thing. We are having basic skills testing so that we can improve what we are doing. However, are we putting in resources to fix up the issues when we find them? No, we are interested not in that. There is a skills test, but we have no interest in actually addressing the problems that come through in those tests. Let us see a Government prepared to measure outcomes and being prepared to put its money where its mouth is and doing something about the results. I was interested to hear today that The Heights R-12 school is the new high school for gifted and talented children.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** I agree that it is not new, as the member for Unley interjected. That is good. We need to do things for students with high intellectual potential, but it is not good enough simply for one school to be doing it. It has to be integrated into the system. Rather than just pinpointing, let us see a Government tackling the issue and bringing it in right through the system.

**Mr Buckby:** It costs money.

**Ms STEVENS:** Yes, it does, but you have to balance out long-term benefits against short-term costs, and that involves the balance between economic and social priorities—a smarter Australia, a clever country and hope for the future for our young people. I refer to another area of social priority, namely, health. As we know, the health system over the past two years has staggered under the cuts inflicted upon it by the Government. I will not spend a lot of time going through that issue as I have done it on many occasions, but I will mention two things. I will refer briefly to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the big about face of the Minister in relation to the privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We know about the massive outsourcing, amounting to about \$2.2 billion total, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Enormous stress was placed on that hospital when it was outsourcing, redeveloping and amalgamating. It was an incredible decision by this Government to put this institution in the position of doing those three massive tasks simultaneously.

As a result of the decline in services and complaints by patients, the Minister was forced to back down and say that he had got it wrong; he had to pull back from that ill-conceived massive privatisation. It will be interesting to see how the privatisation of part of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—the surgical side—plus collocation with a private hospital proceeds. Judging from the Health Commission's ability to manage privatisation in terms of public works, as we saw with Mount Gambier and Port Augusta, and its ability to manage Modbury Hospital, I do not hold out a lot of hope. As a community we need to watch this carefully indeed. Members of the community with concerns about our health system will also be watching.

I noted the interesting exposition with which the Minister presented us today in relation to the cost benefit analysis regarding the Modbury Hospital. If one can plough their way through the jargon and circular arguments, one will see that

the Minister is preparing us for a renegotiation of the Modbury contract, because Healthscope has not been able to hold up its end of the bargain. The Minister is preparing to put more money into the pocket of Healthscope to continue that arrangement, because he knows that if it fails, as is likely if things do not change immediately, he will lose so much face that his position will become untenable—even more untenable than it has been in the face of other issues that we have raised.

In relation to community services I refer to the fact that over the past two years services were downgraded when a greater need in our community existed. FACS workers and front-line social workers' numbers were cut back from district centres. Again, the social priorities of this Government are sadly lacking. The focus has been in one direction only; the balance has been lost.

I also refer to the comments on the ageing which were made in the Governor's speech. He made overall statements about our commitment to the older people and their position in our society. These statements were made without any reference to what had just happened as a result of the Federal budget. This year's Federal budget was a huge kick in the guts to older people in our community. The Commonwealth Dental Program, which serves many older people, was scrapped.

**Mr Caudell:** Why? What was it brought in for?

**Ms STEVENS:** The member for Mitchell asks me why the Commonwealth Dental Program was scrapped. In the words of the Minister for Health, the Commonwealth Dental Health program was scrapped because it was working. Now that is a great reason to cut a program: when it works, cut it! First, the Commonwealth Dental Program was scrapped; and, secondly, there were cuts and reductions in the Home and Community Care Program. When the Howard Liberal Government came into office it talked about the importance of the HACC Program and then cut it. This will have a significant effect on services to older people, to the frail and aged and to those people who are least able to cope with this treatment. The trifecta in the Commonwealth attack on older people in Australia was to charge older people when they go into a nursing home. This has caused incredible concern, worry and grief amongst older people in our community.

What did the Brown Government say about these things? Nothing at all. The Government went on as though these things had never happened. It ignored it. It tried to make out that it was not there. It put its head in the sand and made not one comment about this situation. It did not even bleat that there was something wrong with this. The Minister for Health, the Minister for the Ageing and the Premier have not fought for older people in this community. Not one of them has said that this was outrageous or that they would go to Canberra and try to do something about this. No, they accepted this.

When they gave their speech at the opening of Parliament, they conveniently ignored this situation and delivered a speech that went on with the same old stuff that they have been going on with over the past few months. That is not good enough; that is dishonest. That is not what we need in South Australia. All in all, what we heard on that day in the other House was very disillusioning. Sitting there listening to that speech one would have thought that we were in a different country. It bore no relation to what is actually happening to people in our community. It was a superficial attempt to skim across the surface of very important issues to our State.

South Australia faces very challenging times. South Australia needs leadership, vision, strategic planning and the will of good operators working with the community to put these things into practice. I am saying that what we have seen over the past two years and what we heard on that day of what was to follow in the coming year gives us nothing to lead us to hope that any of those things will be achieved by this Government.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** It is always a great pleasure to follow the member for Elizabeth, high priestess as she is of the cargo cult mentality. She talks about this Government not bleating about this, that or something else. We should always remember what the previous Government and Governments like it inflicted on this State. When you and I were much younger, Sir, there was a spirit of self-reliance in this State and in Australia generally. What has been created by a succession of Governments, some I am not pleased to say Liberal Governments, is an almost implicit belief that from the womb to the tomb you were owed something by the Government. Unfortunately, that has not been helpful, as you know, Sir, to the development of this country. It is one of the things that has come very close to bringing this country low, yet we have an obscure and out of date Opposition opposite who continue to preach the cargo type cult mentality, that the Government is an everlasting pear tree from which fruit can continually be plucked for the benefit of its people, never increasing taxes, charges or doing anything that will offend the people. However, at the same time, you increase welfare benefits, education and every popular cause and go on expanding this never ending pipe.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Elizabeth asked whether education is a popular cause. Education is not a popular cause but her Party turned it into little more than a showpiece. It was a three-ringed circus under her Party. For 20 years, every single time there was an ill in society this Parliament told the teachers to fix it. It did not matter what it was, this Parliament pontificated and said, 'There is a problem here; we should teach in our schools,' and how much of it worked?

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I was not one who advocated it. I for one have long believed that the education profession is an important profession with much more to do than social engineering for an incompetent Government.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Elizabeth gets very bold in her old age. She actually dares to heckle. That is very encouraging. I support the Address in Reply.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member interjects that she should be a brain surgeon. For some of her colleagues, I would say first you must find the brain before you can operate on it. The Address in Reply is always an interesting time, because it is a time when each of us in this Parliament should reflect on the purpose of government and what we are actually doing here. It is not confined to either side of the House, but the Executive Government makes most of the decisions, and they are brought in here as a *fait accompli* having been discussed in the Government Party, so we should consider seriously the contribution that we make.

As the member for Elizabeth actually pointed out, the Address in Reply is a time to reflect on such things, because in the address of the Governor, the program of the Executive Government is laid out before the Parliament. Therefore, all

members of the Parliament—both the Opposition acting as an Opposition which is its right and duty, and members of the Government benches—must consider what their individual approach will be to the Government's legislative program. As members opposite will know, often the first anyone hears of the Government's legislative program is in the Governor's speech because we are not all privy to the considerations of Cabinet. It is a good time to reflect—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart says, 'And you never will be': I can assure him that for the next decade, at least, I will remain much closer to a ministry than he is ever likely to.

**Mr Foley:** I bet I get there before you.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart is remiss in turning this into a gambling chamber. It is not the place where we should make bets, but if he would like to talk to me outside I will certainly cover his wagers.

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Mitchell used to be a friend of mine. As I have said, the Governor's address provides an opportunity for all members to consider the purpose of Government and, indeed, the purpose of the body politic. The Governor made some important remarks, in many ways encapsulating the purpose for which we are here and of which some members in the hurly-burly of daily parliamentary life sometimes lose sight—as they certainly sometimes lose sight of common courtesy.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Peake may have heard that comment before but he is capable of making his own rather pointed remarks, and so he can have a few in return. The Governor's speech got to the nitty-gritty of our purpose here. He said that the main purpose of this Government—his Government—was to improve the quality of life and the living standards of all South Australians. I would contend that behind the economic reform that has been so much a part of this Government's program has been the desire to improve the quality of life and the living standards of all South Australians.

It is true that the overwhelming effort of the Government in the past three years has been directed towards implementing an economic reform agenda but that is explained, again in the Governor's speech, by saying that the position ahead of the debt reduction strategy at this time is for the purpose of achieving job creation through private sector industry development. So, there is a coherent theme. I do not care how much the Opposition attacks this Government: one thing it must concede is that there has been a consistent approach. That consistent approach has been reform—reform aimed at achieving and shifting emphasis towards the private sector and hopefully, in creating a greater flexibility, providing a more competitive environment within the private sector of generating jobs and, by the generation of new jobs, establishing a better quality of life and improving the living standards for all South Australians.

The Opposition has argued, and I presume will argue in the future, that the Government has not achieved that or is falling short in certain areas, but I believe that the Opposition can and should concede that the Government's approach in this matter has been consistent, unified and well aimed. The Governor's speech continues, and I think this is the most telling quote:

Self-confidence is itself a most valuable resource and we should nurture it.

One of the things that this Government and this Parliament cannot compel is self-confidence in the people of South Australia. As I move around my electorate I find a lack of confidence, a lack of belief that South Australia is up and running or back on its feet.

The Governor having said that self-confidence is a most valuable resource and that we should nurture it, I believe that we are not quite getting the message across, and I would constructively say to the Opposition that it might be part of that process. In seeking to criticise the actions of Government, if we assist—any of us—in destroying that fragile confidence in the rebuilding of this State, then we may achieve some short-term political gain but, in the end, we may achieve long-term economic damage to South Australia. The Opposition must criticise: that is its job. Members of the Government backbench, if they see something wrong, must question; but if our questions and our criticisms go to the point of destroying public confidence in South Australia, we are not doing our job: rather, we are failing in our job, and that is a matter we should all consider. I know that members opposite do not treat the job lightly or take it other than seriously.

South Australia has problems and none of us would deny this, but the Government is to be commended because it started with an unenviable task. It started with a huge debt that had to be brought under control, with section after section of a Public Service that really needed reform, and this Government had the courage to reform it. So it is that the Governor can come in and announce that, after three years, the Government is ahead of its debt reduction strategy and that we may now use the foundation laid by this Government, the cleared area created by this Government, as you pointed out in your speech, Sir, to revitalise the State.

But, in many ways, this Government is now at a cross-road because, having done the hard work, having clear-felled the land, it now remains to plant and reap a worthwhile crop, and that is the challenge ahead of this Government. As the member for Elizabeth said, this Government, or any Government, must be about leadership, vision and strategic planning, and they are the critical three points confronting this Government. Pleasingly, one element of that requirement, vision for the future, was embodied in the Governor's speech. I note with interest the various components of rural sector revitalisation that were embodied in the Governor's speech, and this is perhaps a solid area from which to embark in our future efforts.

You would know better than most, Sir, as would other members such as the member for Light, that one of the great strengths of this country over more than two centuries has been the innovative capacity of our rural sector to triumph and survive against the odds. One of the few failings of the rural sector, I believe, was to have spawned the member for Mitchell and to inflict him on this House. I believe that he comes from rural Queensland, and he is a constant source of irritation when people are trying to make speeches. Nevertheless, generally speaking, the rural sector is an outstanding part of Australia's achievement.

In seeking first to revitalise that sector, to set it in a new direction and to encourage in it innovation is commendable, and if any group in our society is capable of picking up the ball, of seeing new opportunities and running with them, I am quite sure that it is the rural sector of South Australia. It has been a leader in the past, and I am sure it will continue to remain a leader and a pillar of economic development in this State.

The other purposes of the Governor's address dealt with a number of issues, one of which related to community safety. I draw to the attention of the House these words in paragraph 62 of the Governor's speech:

My Government will continue its program of crime prevention, community protection and personal and public safety.

The Governor did not say that this Government would continue to protect the public morality, and in that sense I have a few concerns with some current practices operating in this State. I note with some concern that there will be amendments to the criminal assets confiscation laws.

I was placed in the unpleasant situation of finding out that one law under which assets can be confiscated is section 21 of the Summary Offences Act involving the offence of keeping a brothel. I know that at least one person in South Australia is currently being prosecuted for that offence—Sir, you will have to correct me if I go too far—and is liable to have an application made for the confiscation of profits. Certainly, I make no apology for standing in this House and saying that I find that abhorrent. A great number of South Australians believe that the law in that area is archaic and should be reformed. The fine inflicted on the last several people charged was about \$100 yet, because it is allowable under the laws passed by this Parliament, the police are going to seek to confiscate assets. I believe that that is not on and is not in keeping with what our Police Force should be doing.

Similarly, last Friday an establishment was raided which it is alleged is a house of ill repute—a brothel. The police arrived with a furniture van and removed everything from the premises. I spoke with one of my colleagues about it and was told, 'You know full well that under the confiscation of profits legislation they are allowed to do that.' They are not allowed to do that. Someone must first be found guilty. Once found guilty an application may be made to a court, as I understand it, for confiscation of profits. What the police have done has been to seize every skerrick out of the building on the grounds that it may be material to the case and may be evidence. Basically, the police have stripped the entire building and seized everything from it on the grounds that it may be a brothel and they may need everything out of that building for evidence. If that is good policing in South Australia, I honestly question it.

If we have nothing better for our police to do than to run around in furniture vans seizing beds out of places that may or may not be a brothel, then I suggest we have a few too many police resources. I have to tell the House that in Ningana Avenue, which is the street in which I live, there have been some break-ins and the police have not solved those cases. My property at one stage was stolen and never returned and the police never found the culprits. They seemed to have plenty of resources for pursuing moral crimes all around South Australia but never enough resources to solve crimes that involve community safety and things with which our community is most concerned. I believe that the police should apply their resources to all areas of the law. I believe they should most apply their resources to areas of law which really do impinge on community and public safety.

If I want my morality policed, I will go to a priest and the priest can police my morality. Also, I will answer to a higher authority than the Commissioner of Police. I suggest to the House that it is about time that the South Australian Police Force concentrated on serious crime and stop playing around with people's morals. Again, I note that the Governor did not say that one of the priorities of this Government was to police

the morals of the community. It is to police community safety.

The member for Elizabeth spoke about this Government's education policy and claimed it had an interest in testing basic skills and no interest at all in using the results of the basic skills testing for an improvement in education. That is arrant and palpable nonsense. The idea of testing the level of literacy and numeracy, of asking the education system to be accountable for its product, is exactly that. It is only after we can quantify the results of the education system that we can look to redressing those areas in which there is a deficiency. This Government came to office on a policy of enhancing basic literacy and numeracy skills. In a climate in which many education resources have been cut, as much as we might all regret it, two areas have been quarantined against cutting: the junior primary area, where basic numeracy and literacy is first taught, and the area involving people with special needs. Sure, there might not be enough resources, but we have quarantined those areas and the Government is actively pursuing education as one of its major planks and major priorities.

For Opposition members to stand in this place and say that this Government is not interested in doing anything other than tests, that it is not interested in applying the results of those tests, is basic nonsense and shows an element of hypocrisy, since they were the very people who claimed that basic skills testing was everything that was wrong, evil and would bring down the system. To think that we should have a Government that expends billions of dollars on education and expects the providers of education to be accountable to the voters, to the people who pay the taxes in this State, was anathema to them. They believe that the money spent on education—over \$1 billion—should be paid out willy-nilly, that there should be no accounting.

Parliament compels children to go to school between the ages of five and 15 and, in compelling them to go to school, Parliament guarantees them whatever it is that constitutes an education. If we are going to compel kids to go to school and guarantee them an education, during the process and at the end of the process, those children and their parents have an absolute right to say, 'You contracted with us. You took from us the ability to do what we wanted. You promised to provide us with an education. Did you deliver it?' They should be able to measure the extent to which this Government has achieved what it promised, and that is to give its young people an education.

This Government has courageously embarked on a process whereby parents can have confidence that their children are being educated at school. They are not asking any more from the teachers than to do the job that they have always done. What they are asking, which is additional and important, is that not only do the teachers do their job as well as they have always done it but the parents have the means of knowing that the teachers are achieving what I am sure they have always achieved. No good teacher needs to fear basic skills testing of their pupils. The only people who have any quarrel with basic skills testing are those who are better suited to farming or other professions, but they are certainly not suited to teaching our young people.

The address by the Governor is a time to reflect on the purpose of this institution. As members know, I had the privilege of being elected by Parliament to represent the State at the CPA conference in Malaysia. I addressed the House briefly in a grievance debate to say what a privilege it was and to commend such trips to all members, as they get the

opportunity, as a great learning experience. I think that you have been on one, Sir, and that you know exactly of the benefits that can be derived from the CPA and from working and talking to people from all types of democracy.

It was a very enlightening experience to go away with members from all those countries, all of whom believe they have a parliamentary democracy and all of whom have a Westminster tradition, and to see the diversity within the Commonwealth of what we call parliamentary democracy. The parliamentary democracy practised in this House is not the same as the parliamentary democracy practised in many African nations. In each place where parliamentary democracy is transposed, it gets its own essential characteristics, its own flavour and its own inherent biases. Together with other Australians, I came away very proud of the way that the Westminster tradition has developed and flourished in Australia.

From my contact with parliamentarians from other places in the Commonwealth, I heard nothing to suggest that our system was not at least as good and, in many cases, demonstrably better than the way the system operates elsewhere. However, as good as that system is, it is constantly in need of refinement and scrutiny so that we can improve it. The danger of parliamentary democracy in its 1990s form is the power of two groups: the bureaucracy and the media.

I believe Jeffrey Archer summed up the media in the foreword of his latest book *The Fourth Estate* where he talked about one of the Prime Ministers of England. One of the kings of France had called a conference of the three estates—the estate of the commons, the estate of the clergy and the estate of the nobility—and the Prime Minister in commenting on this looked to the press gallery and said, 'There, Sir, sits the fourth estate and they, Sir, are the most powerful of all.'

One of the problems with our system of democracy at present is that we are very much exposed to the media. That is very good and very right. Parliament should never be—and I do not believe ever has been—afraid of public glare and scrutiny, but the media carries with it a huge responsibility, and that responsibility is for correct and balanced reporting. It is not good enough for a journal or a television station to come into this House for five minutes a day, take a 30 second grab and make a sensational story out of it. Too often that is the case. The public's impression of this institution is not looking around after tea and seeing the member for Hart trying to cajole the member for Mitchell into some favour or other, and it is not hearing decent debates on good topics—and there are many members in this House who contribute very much to the thinking of this place and to the quality of debates. The media do not bother with that but simply waltz in at Question Time to get a few shots.

The media try to get away with whatever they can and give the public the impression that Parliament is a forum that it is not. They give the public the impression that Parliament is a constantly adversarial process where no-one every agrees or acts decently and is basically a waste of time. They promote that image on the news services and pedal it through talkback radio shows. There is no cheaper or better hit in this State or any State of Australia than a politician. If you are running a talkback program and you have nothing about which to talk, you can always introduce politicians' pay, politicians' trips or any one of a number of other topics which are absolutely guaranteed to incense listeners because they will know very little about it but they will be sure to have an opinion. There are two jobs in this life that everyone knows

how to do: one is a teacher, because everyone went to school so everyone thinks that that qualifies them to be a better teacher than any teacher they ever had; and the other is a politician. Many of them have never been a politician or exercised the responsibility, but they all think they can because they have the privilege of electing us.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I was trying to make a sensible contribution. The member for Hart, as usual, is interjecting. I do not know—

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is completely out of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I do not know why I should be a bit offended because I have not heard the member for Hart talk much sense for several weeks in this place, but I am.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member must not impute improper motives.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I am just feeling a little bruised because he wounds me so deeply, Sir. It is very hard to take. I believe that, if the media are to be responsible and a responsible part of the development of democracy in Australia, they should take the job more seriously than currently appears to be the case. That is not a criticism only of the media in this House or of media reporting generally in South Australia—it is a criticism which I believe can be levelled at media around Australia. When I was in the United Kingdom recently, as I believe you were, Mr Speaker, I was most interested to read some of their papers and see the difference in their political reporting. They have much more detailed accounts. They cover topics in much more depth. It is much more a report of record which allows people to make up their own mind.

If you read Australian newspapers, there appears to be very little reporting of record. Most political reports in journals in Australia are political commentary pieces. You will not pick up the *Advertiser* tomorrow and find a straight record of what happened in Parliament: you will pick up the *Advertiser* tomorrow and find the chief political reporter's opinion of what happened in Parliament. I believe that people have a right to read the facts and then judge for themselves. I do not believe that the journals and the editorialising of the TV stations should be the only way by which people learn about this Parliament.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Mitchell.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** I would like to commend the Governor, Sir Eric Neal, on his opening address to the fourth session of the forty-eighth Parliament. It is always a pleasure to follow the member for Unley, who normally presents a very good speech to the House, and his contribution tonight was no exception. When it came to office the Government inherited a debt which has been well-publicised and which was based on recurrent expenditure of \$350 million, in excess of—

**An honourable member:** You're not reading!

**Mr CAUDELL:** No, you taught me better than that. The recurrent debt was \$350 million more than income each year, and the interest bill ran close to \$1 billion in real terms. With that in mind, the Government made certain hard decisions in relation to spending in education, health and law and order. As a consequence of making those decisions, the economy in South Australia is starting to improve. With the reduction of the recurrent debt—in 1996-97 we are looking at approximately \$110 million—the Government will shortly be able

to release those restraints on the economy and provide ever—increasing funds.

In my contribution tonight I will concentrate on those issues of Government policy that impact on the electorate of Mitchell. I will break it down into the areas of education, health, law and order, economic development and local government reform. In the area of education, it is well-documented and well-accepted by the school communities and the general community that South Australia provides above average services in relation to its ratio of students to teachers and SSOs. Although the ratio is similar to the Australian average, or above average, the figures are still of concern to Government members who would like to see a much higher level, which was previously the case. However, they are also mindful of the need to get the budget situation into reasonable shape prior to increasing expenditure in this area.

There are some difficulties in Mitchell which have been addressed by the Minister for Education. I refer to areas associated with learning difficulties for primary school students and those children being able to be assessed by guidance officers. Due to assistance from the Minister for Education, extra funds have been made available to this area of learning difficulties and assessment of those students to overcome the backlog that has been identified through basic skills testing. One area that has caused concern of late in the area of education has been the problems that have occurred following the mergers, amalgamations and closures in the Marion Road/South Road corridor. In particular, I refer to the closure of the Marion Road High School.

As a result of its closure, certain students who used to go to Marion High School were given the right to attend a school of their choice. A number of these students, who live in areas south of O'Halloran Hill, have chosen to attend Seaview High and Brighton High, and this has placed pressure on those two high schools in that year 8 in 1997 at both those high schools is fully occupied, with spaces available only to students living within a zone. This zone has created a problem whereby students who previously attended Warradale Primary, Paringa Park Primary, Glenelg Primary or Brighton Primary and who live just outside the zone in the suburbs of Warradale and Oaklands Park, can no longer attend the school that they would normally expect to attend, either Seaview or Brighton. They are required to attend Hamilton or, in some instances, other schools in Adelaide.

I have made representations on this matter to the Minister in relation to some students who are studying languages such as French and who, because they are unable to go to Brighton High, are now faced with travelling to Daws Road or schools in the city to follow their language studies. The problem with that is that the distance for students to go to the railway station and travel to that school is farther than that which they would have to travel to Brighton High. There are students who go to Paringa Park, who live at Warradale and who are part of the bilingual classes, speaking English for half the day and French for the other half. Those students are unable to go to the school of their choice, namely, Brighton, and are forced to go to Daws Road or opt into the private system.

This is causing concern, and it makes me wonder why we still have a zone system. A zone system basically breeds an uncompetitive operation. A zone system would be considered to be outside the guidelines set down by Hilmer with regard to competition. If we got rid of the zone system and had open competition with regard to the education system and the public school system we might end up with a better education

system throughout South Australia—an education system wherein schools would compete against each other to ensure that they provided the right facilities and the right curriculum choices and that they got together with the primary schools in the area to ensure that the languages taught at the primary schools were on offer at the secondary schools within that area, a problem that occurs at the moment.

Later this month I will have a meeting with the Minister for Education and Children's Services in relation to the problem caused by the closure of Marion High School and the concern it is causing families in the suburbs of Warradale and Oaklands Park, with those people being unable to attend the school of their choice. I will be having discussions with the Minister as to why we are continuing with the zone system. Possibly the zone system has well and truly outlived its purpose in providing education in South Australia.

Funds are being provided for redevelopment of schools in the area. Hamilton Secondary College is receiving funds for the implementation of its middle schooling program in 1998 as well as for the development of the special school facilities there. Also, funds are being provided for the much needed upgrade of Clovelly Park Primary School as well as for the expansion of Marion Primary School as a result of the closure of Sturt Primary.

In relation to health, in South Australia we have an ageing population. That situation is no different in the electorate of Mitchell, where health services are important. Recent initiatives in the Federal budget in relation to providing assistance for medical insurance will go a long way to assisting in providing worthwhile health services to the population of Mitchell.

However, actions by the Health Commission will also assist in providing better health services within the electorate. We have just seen the completion at Flinders Medical Centre of the accident and emergency facility, which provides a very worthwhile casualty facility for the south-western and southern suburbs. Currently, in conjunction with the Ramsay Health Group, the Flinders Medical Centre is providing a 100-bed private hospital facility adjacent to the Flinders Medical Centre, and that will provide an extra 100 jobs in the public ward as well as employment opportunities in the facility.

Shortly we will see the development of the long overdue medical centre in the Marion triangle. It will bring the different health groups at CAMHS and CAFHS together under the one roof and provide a much needed facility for the electorate of Mitchell. Also, it will help to provide a permanent home for the Marion youth project, which involves funds from the South Australian Health Commission and the Corporation of the City of Marion. This provides a very worthwhile and long overdue facility for the youth in the area.

In respect of law and order in the electorate of Mitchell we have seen the establishment of the new Sturt Police Station on Sturt Road. That station provides more police presence in the electorate of Mitchell than ever obtained previously and, indeed, provides greater security for the electorate.

Both during and since the election I have declared my interest in reintroducing laws dealing with loitering. I have seen the New South Wales Government introduce its own laws applying to groups of people loitering in the hours of darkness, and I have requested information from the Minister for Police and the Attorney-General and have asked them to look at the proposed legislation in New South Wales to

ascertain whether similar legislation can be implemented in South Australia.

In the area of economic development we see the greatest activity in the electorate of Mitchell with the commencement in May this year of the Westfield Shopping Centre redevelopment, which is a \$200 million investment in the South Australian economy. This investment will result in the Westfield Shopping Centre at Marion being the third largest shopping centre in Australasia. This \$200 million investment represents 60 per cent of the retail capital investment in South Australia over the past seven years. It will provide 1 650 jobs during the two-year construction phase and will provide an extra 81 stores, 16 cinemas and an adult entertainment area. The provision of these retail facilities in the city of Marion will be a great drawcard for South Australia.

However, concerns have been raised over the past few months in relation to the treatment of some tenants by the Westfield group. As a member of the local tenants' executive committee, I have raised those issues with Westfield Marion, and currently I am organising a delegation to visit the Premier, when he will be provided with details of the treatment of a number of tenants in order to ensure that there are changes to the retail leases Act, to ensure the protection of those tenants and, indeed, to ensure that they are given a fair go.

South Australia has seen the greatest rate of growth in the hospitality industry. The Flagstaff Hotel is currently undergoing a \$3 million redevelopment, and the Marion Hotel will begin a \$1.3 million redevelopment during the next few weeks. Bankers Trust will move into Laffers Triangle, and that will provide a large number of jobs. There is also the Marion council development worth \$50 million in the northern part of the triangle. During the next few weeks, we will see the start of the Southern Expressway. MacMahon Constructions, a South Australian company, received approval and won the tender for the development from Darlington to Panalatinga Road.

The issue of open space is always of concern, and that is especially so for the residents of the electorate of Mitchell. Three areas are currently before the mind of the electorate for consideration, the first of which is in Laffers Triangle. I understand that there has been a meeting of various agencies to ensure that provision is made for open space. I have been trying to broker a meeting between local interest groups and the Minister to ensure that the point of view of residents is included. CSIRO land at Glenthorne became available under the previous Federal Labor Government. A group consisting of the Marion council, the Federal member for Kingston and southern members of State Parliament, community groups and me is looking at all the alternatives with regard to this open space to ensure that the requirements of local residents are taken into account when a decision is made regarding this part of O'Halloran Hill.

The Bowker Street Reserve was of serious concern to a number of residents within not only the electorate of Mitchell but also the electorates of Morphett and Bright. As a result of a proposal that I made to the Premier, the Premier placed a moratorium on the sale of that land and instituted a working party involving the cities of Marion, Brighton and Glenelg, the Marion Sports and Leisure Centre and Bowker Street residents. It is my understanding that the consultants appointed by this working party are in the process of handing down their report. I look forward to seeing their recommendations for the development of junior sporting facilities in relation to not only those areas at Marion, Brighton and Glenelg but also

the south-western suburbs, which is the picture that they looked at in their consultation process.

Local government reform has occurred in the south-western suburbs. The Marion council attempted to merge with Brighton and Glenelg, but unfortunately Brighton and Glenelg decided not to proceed with a merger at this stage. It is unfortunate that the merger with the Marion council did not occur because it would have provided over \$500 000 worth of savings to local businesses. Businesses at Westfield Marion would have saved about \$1 000 off their annual costs by being associated with this merger, and the South Australian Housing Trust would have saved \$250 000 per annum, but unfortunately this was not to occur. I am sure that further down the line the new City of Holdfast Bay will come to see that a city of 30 000 people would not be sufficient to sustain its viability in the future, and it may well look to the Marion council for discussions regarding the further development of this south-western suburb.

Regarding the environment, I have had discussions with the City of Marion in relation to the establishment of wetlands in Laffers Triangle. The Patawalonga Catchment Authority is having negotiations with the MFP for the purchase of land in the triangle for the establishment of wetlands. I wish to commend the Governor on his first speech, and I have much pleasure in contributing to this debate.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** Much has been said by Opposition members about the context in which we begin this new session of Parliament. Recently, the Auditor-General brought down his report on the State's finances. Extraordinarily, for the second year in a row, that report has been a damning indictment of the Brown Government's policies and an indication of the incompetent implementation of these policies by this Government. I note that in the Governor's speech last year it was stated that there has been 'a quite dramatic turnaround in State finances'. Last year, the Auditor-General concurred with that. In fact, his assessment as the independent umpire of the State's finances was that a single decision of the Brown Government had cost taxpayers of this State more than \$400 million: that is, if it had done nothing but continue the debt management strategy of the previous Labor Government, the State of South Australia would be more than \$400 million better off.

That was last year. This year, basically the Auditor-General is saying that the Government has cooked the books. The Auditor-General cannot account for over \$300 million that the Government says it has produced in savings. The Auditor-General asks, 'Where is it?' For the second year in a row, there has been a damning report from the Auditor-General. There is also the assessment from the Auditor-General that this Liberal Government is essentially exposing the taxpayers of South Australia to serious financial and social risk.

What has been the Government's response to the Auditor-General's warning that care and a change of direction are needed? The Government's response has been to deny the problem and to blame someone else when it is caught with the fact that there is a problem—whether it be the former

State Labor Government, the former Federal Labor Government, even the present Federal Liberal Government and now the Auditor-General. There is always someone else to blame.

As we go into this new session of Parliament, it is important to recognise the context in which we do so. The State budget that was brought down this year is in tatters. It was predicated upon serious underestimation of the Federal cuts that were to be delivered and now have been delivered in the Federal budget—\$4.5 billion this year and a \$7.2 billion cut over the next two years.

So not only do South Australians have to cope with a \$79 million cut to health, a \$45 million cut to education and tens of millions of dollars out of the TAFE budget but now they have to cope with the additional Federal budget cuts over and above what was predicted or allowed for in the State budget. However, at the time that the Federal Government was planning these cuts the Premier was urging the Federal Liberals to do just that: a cut of 10 per cent was what the Premier requested—an amount that would equate to 30 thousand jobs in this State—yet he has the audacity to get up in this Parliament and in public and say that he will address the problem of unemployment in this State.

An indication of the Liberals real agenda for jobs growth is the fact that after a year on this youth employment task force still there has been no action and no sign of action. In fact the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education sweeps the problem under the carpet by saying that it is not all doom and gloom, there are plenty of jobs out there and, anyway, we will change the method of how we measure the statistics for youth unemployment so that the figures look better.

What of the Federal Liberals and John Howard's pre-election promise that the most disadvantaged in society have nothing to fear from his Liberal Government? In reality the people hurt most by the Federal Liberal budget have been the sick, the unemployment, the elderly and the young. I was interested to hear the Premier on radio this morning talking about the motion he intends to move in this place to reaffirm his and his Government's commitment to some very disadvantaged people in our community—the Aborigines. Empty words indeed were those with regard to a commitment to Aboriginal people when we find that in addition to the Federal funding cuts to Aboriginal programs his own Government has severely hampered the reconciliation process by cutting funding to those very people. They were empty hypocritical words from the Premier this morning.

I will concentrate now on the portfolio areas that I cover and the impact that will be felt in this State by the recent Federal budget cuts to those areas. In tourism, during the Federal election campaign we may remember that the Coalition categorically stated that it would maintain funding to the Australian Tourism Commission. Well, \$18.5 million in this Federal budget was wiped out of funding to the Australian Tourism Commission over the next four years—a direct breach of promise which will have a dramatic effect on tourism marketing in this country and in South Australia.

What else have they done to tourism? There was much toing-and-froing, cuts and revising of budget decisions with regard to the export market development grants scheme. The Government attempted a real ruse on that scheme. It has suffered a massive \$280 million reduction over the next three years, which will impact dramatically on South Australia where the tourism industry is predominated by small business. It will have a dramatic impact on South Australians. The tourism and expo programs have suffered almost a 50 per

cent cut—\$6.7 million cut from the budget for those programs, but that is not all. Programs supporting Australian bids for infrastructure projects in Asia and support for Australian suppliers has just been abolished in the last Federal budget. What did the Minister for Tourism have to say to his Federal colleague about the impact this would have on the South Australian tourism industry? Absolutely nothing!

What the Howard Federal Liberal Government has done in the area of education can only be described as a massive betrayal of schools. What was marketed as a \$210 million increase for non-government schools is not to be. Government schools will get a net cut of around \$70 million over the same period. Cuts to untied grants to the States need to be considered because they represent a cut of \$1.6 billion over the next three years, or a \$300 million reduction to the State's discretionary fund for schools. So, on top of those cuts to non-government schools there are untied grants cuts to the States. Clearly, the claims that non-government school capital funding has increased in this budget are not true. The funding will fall from a high in 1996 of \$117 million to \$88 million in 1997. So, this represents a betrayal of schools in this State and around the nation.

We have heard much about the cuts to higher education, and they have been dramatic. The Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) debt repayment threshold is to drop from \$28 485 to \$20 701. HECS charges will be increased under the three-tier payment scheme. This means that law and medicine will cost \$5 500 a year, science will cost \$4 700 a year, and arts will cost \$3 300. Austudy is to be cut by \$460.5 million. Parental income means tests will be tightened, and the age of students eligible for independent rates will be raised from 22 to 25 years. This becomes even more absurd when one reads the fine print of the budget which says that students who commence a degree at the dependent age will be paid the dependent rate of Austudy to the completion of their course. This means that a student who begins a four year course at age 24 could be classified by this Liberal Government as dependent until the age of 28—a ludicrous situation indeed.

There is even worse. The proposed youth allowance will not mean, as people might have hoped, that people on Austudy will now get the same as people on the dole or that those inequities will go in an upward direction, but it will be a lowest common denominator approach. People will get less in their payments for Austudy. The cut to Austudy in the budget amounts to \$527.4 million. There are some particularly cruel aspects to that cut. For example, there is the ceasing of case management of secondary students on the homeless rate of Austudy and the end of the schooling incidentals allowance for those same students—a particularly cruel measure. University operating grants have also been cut in the Federal budget by an additional \$623 million. Discretionary funds have been cut by \$214 million. That amounts to a \$864 million cut by the Federal budget to university funding.

Further, the Liberals promised that existing students would be exempt from such measures, but this is not to be. In the fine print of the Federal budget, we find that existing students, not just future students and graduates, will be subjected to these extra HECS charges—a massive breach of the Coalition's election promise not to retrospectively change HECS arrangements. It is and will continue to be a huge additional impost to students. They will have to commence repayments when earnings reach a level almost \$8 000 below the current repayment threshold. That is a terribly significant

amount. It is a major blow to both quality and accessibility to higher education in Australia and in this State.

That is not the only area on which the Government has misled the public. The Government claims to have provided a major boost to vocational education in the budget for this coming year through the new Modern Australian Apprenticeship and Trainee System (MAATS). However, if you look closely, what you find in reality is that it is withdrawing a lot more from mainstream TAFE and vocational educational programs over the forward estimate years than is being injected through MAATS. There is the abolition of 5 per cent real growth for TAFE, a cut of \$91.5 million. It is cutting operating funding for the Australian National Training Authority by 25 per cent, a cut of \$12.8 million, and it is cutting incentive payments to employers of apprentices in training by \$43.3 million. In addition, there is a cut to the vocational education and training grants to the States of \$66.2 million.

These cuts alone amount to \$213.8 million, far exceeding the funding to be put into MAATS, advocated so strongly by the Government. What does this mean for South Australia? The Government is doing nothing to create work. The Government, in its Federal budget, admits that it does not expect unemployment to fall in the next year. In fact, it does not expect unemployment to fall in the next three years. It is not even trying to create more jobs.

Before the election, both the Federal and State Governments promised to direct savings from cuts. The Federal Government promised to direct savings from Working Nation Employment Program cuts into new apprenticeships and training for the young unemployed. In fact, John Howard suggested a trebling of funds to the apprenticeships and traineeships, which would mean an increase of at least \$600 million. But what actually happened? A total of \$1.8 billion is to be cut to jobs over four years, whilst putting in only \$160 million of this into MAATS. That is less than a 10 per cent return of the Working Nation Employment Program funding that is being ripped out by the Federal Liberal Government. The Liberal Governments, both Federal and State, are failing to deliver jobs, particularly for youth. Jobs are just not a priority.

One of the most dramatic effects of this budget, coming from a Party that cried loud about levels of unemployment, is the attack on labour market programs. Programs to be completely abolished from the Working Nation Employment Program include: JobSkill; the Landcare and Environment Action Program (LEAP); new work opportunities; JobTrain; the Special Intervention Program; Accredited Training for Youth (ATY); Skillshare; job clubs; Mobility Assistance Scheme; and formal training elements and direct assistance elements of the Training for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (TAPS)—a very long list and a huge amount of funding which has been ripped out of the budget and which will have an impact on this State where we have the highest rate of youth unemployment in this nation and an atrocious overall employment level.

The very low level of resources to be given to the new MAATS scheme is even less when the parallel reduction in the vocational education and training grants to the States is taken into account. In addition, a particularly cruel aspect is that basic employment assistance is no longer to be universal; that is, the Government intends to apply a 'capacity to benefit' test. That will mean that job seekers, for whom the task of finding work just seems all too difficult, will not be assisted. That is formal Government policy. In this State, in

this nation, we have Governments which are saying, 'We will just not try on jobs any more.' That is an indictment, and it is the context in which we start this session of Parliament.

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I am particularly pleased this evening to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply for the fourth session of the forty-eighth South Australian Parliament. First, before proceeding further, I wish to offer my very sincere appreciation and gratitude to the State's former Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, for her outstanding service over the past five years. Her performance in that office was indeed outstanding and I know that all South Australians can be extremely proud of her contribution to our State. I wish her well for the future.

I also place on record my formal congratulations to our new Governor, Sir Eric Neal, and on behalf of my constituents welcome his Excellency and Lady Neal to their new roles and wish them a very happy future ahead in their service to South Australia. I commend His Excellency on his first address to our State Parliament and, in particular, I recognise in his speech the continuing vision and plan by the Brown Liberal Government for the growth and development of South Australia, bringing to South Australians improved services, facilities and prosperity.

South Australia is continuing to progress under the Brown Liberal Government, and at this stage I want to refer to some key economic indicators pointing out the continuing improvement that is happening in the South Australian economy and, in particular, I want to refer to a few indicative trends and some facts which I put on record. First, the current gross State product increase of 4.7 per cent is above the national average for both the last quarter and for the 1995-96 financial year. In addition, private business investment is up 6 per cent and continues to improve, as do retail figures. Exports in the June quarter are 27 per cent higher than for the same period last year, and South Australia continues to out-perform most of Australia in growth with respect to the export sector. Overall, the 1995-96 year experienced a 17.6 per cent increase on the previous year.

In addition, the Brown Liberal Government from the outset recognised the importance that export income will play in the economic future of this State. In conjunction, a prime objective has been the reduction of overheads for industry to make South Australia the most cost competitive State in Australia. Indeed, labour costs are 5 per cent below the national average, electricity and water charges are reducing, and *per capita* taxation in this State is 21 per cent less than Victoria and 23 per cent less than New South Wales, and this is having an impact on business and production in South Australia.

South Australia's 4.7 per cent increase in GSP is above the national average, as I have stated, and job advertisements have increased in the past two consecutive months. The decision to double the rebate on payroll tax to 20 per cent for exporters of manufactured goods and services will further encourage business to pursue international markets from a base in South Australia. This, of course, is particularly relevant to my electorate with its strong horticultural base for exporting products. The decision should build on the 17.6 per cent export growth this State has experienced over the past year. This gave the State a \$1.4 billion trade surplus. On top of a tremendous grain harvest, wine export sales totalled \$315 million, a 26 per cent increase in one year, representing an overall 430 per cent increase in the past six years.

I refer briefly to the State's success in debt reduction. Over the past financial year the public sector net debt has been reduced by \$950 million to \$7.7 billion—a reduction from 26 per cent to 22 per cent of GSP. Over the past 12 months, forecast figures for debt by the end of the 1997-98 financial year have been revised from \$7.1 billion to \$6.9 billion. These figures confirm the real improvement in the financial position of this State, the result of a concerted effort in debt reduction strategies, incorporating asset sales totalling \$405 million for the past financial year, together with efficient and effective management of services delivered to the public.

This improvement translates into fewer interest payments, fewer burdens on the taxpayers of this State and ultimately more dollars for quality services, facilities and infrastructure for the people of South Australia. Public sector reform is also ongoing, as the Government looks set to achieve a target of the order of 12 400 fewer public sector jobs by June next year. This has been achieved without causing increased unemployment because, under the Brown Government, unemployment has fallen to 9.7 per cent from the figure of 12.3 per cent that we inherited from Labor. Many people have been employed in the private sector through the successful outsourcing of such areas as data processing, hospital and water management, metropolitan transport services, as well as correctional services. As I said, unemployment has declined to 9.7 per cent. Of the order of 26 500 more people have jobs in this State than was the case when this Brown Government took over. Of that number, 4 300 people are engaged in full-time employment.

I now refer specifically to a few issues relevant to my electorate of Chaffey that reflect on the value and importance of the policies of this Government over the past couple of years. I will mention this Government's achievements through its administration, its acknowledging the opportunities that exist currently and the incorporation into the proposed legislative agenda which has been referred to and which was outlined by His Excellency, and how that will bring advantages and continued growth and success to the region I represent.

First, I comment on the irrigation industry in my electorate. The Riverland is an area with a low average rainfall (of the order of 250 millimetres a year), and so issues relating to the importance of the Murray River and the effects of irrigation on the Murray River are critically important. In all Government highland irrigation districts growers have recently been asked to apply for self-management. Of the eight districts, six are within my electorate and one neighbours it. There has been a particularly strong response in the past couple of days, and SA Water's formal collation of these figures shows that 82 per cent of all growers have returned their application forms indicating the desire for self-management of their irrigation areas.

This indicates that growers see a unique opportunity for ownership and control of irrigation distribution systems. The move towards self management being managed by the Government Highland Irrigation Board will enable a buy-in by growers of all the irrigation assets—something of the order of \$150 million—debt free, the only payment being the 20 per cent contribution for rehabilitation which growers have already agreed to pay. Current infrastructure upgrading in Loveday is almost concluded and Cadell and Mypolonga are on track for proceeding and they will also be on the basis of a 40:40:20 Federal, State and grower contribution cost sharing arrangement. The financial management of the

irrigation infrastructure has been developed by the Government Highland Irrigation Board in a business plan which has been approved by the State Government. Under the terms and conditions of self management each irrigation district will become a trust under local boards of management. Irrigators will gain control of funds for asset replacement, maintenance priorities and setting the price of irrigation water. Since 1991 funds have been set aside for asset replacement.

As outlined by His Excellency amendments to the Irrigation Act are to be introduced to Parliament in this session to allow this process to proceed. I look forward to contributing to the debate and the passage of this legislation and, in doing so, supporting reforms which will facilitate this valuable and progressive move to self management. I commend the Government Highland Irrigation Board in the Riverland for its hard work and leadership over the past two years in this process. It has developed this buy-in of all the irrigation assets by water users as a preferred option to either privatisation or continuing Government ownership. I believe that self management will further improve irrigation management practices and generate greater opportunities for the horticultural industry as well as enhancing environmental benefits to the region. I will return to this issue shortly.

With respect to specific horticultural industry achievements, I will mention a couple which are shining lights in my region. The first example is the citrus industry, particularly citrus exports. In 1996, 757 352 cartons were shipped to the United States, double the volume sent in 1995 and, importantly, a 20 per cent improvement on the record 1994 citrus exports to the United States. This is only the fourth season of exports in this regard. More than 95 per cent of citrus exports were navels and now there is continuing growth with other varieties, including tangelos and mandarins. Development of the relatively new export market to the US has been in the hands of a one group joint venture company. Riversun Pty Ltd is supported strongly by local Riverland packing houses and marketers. This project has been a shining success in overcoming Australian exporters all too often fragmented marketing attempts.

Further, 70 per cent of supplies to that market, that is, 529 790 cartons were produced in the Riverland, hence the importance that the horticultural industry and I place on the citrus industry in the Riverland and its future prospects. Following the loss of viability and juice markets and, therefore, declining demand for valencias, the industry is adjusting with plantings such as new navel varieties, with the extended length of the navel season to almost 10 months of the year.

In this regard I refer to the ongoing issue of fruit fly. It is imperative that current protection measures be maintained with a regular review. Certainly, I thank the State Minister for Primary Industries for his and the State Government's support which has been significant in these last few months in maintaining our fruit fly free status. This has involved an ongoing commitment to surveillance, detection and eradication, plus a preparedness to introduce or reform practices to ensure that outbreaks occur less often, are managed effectively and have minimal impact on producers.

Last summer's outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly rather than the more prevalent Queensland variety focused considerable attention on the lack of uniformity between the States when responding to an outbreak. This State Government has acted with a range of measures, including improving public awareness, increasing the number of officers with the power to search for infected fruit, addressing areas where there is a

lack of uniformity between States and increasing penalties. We are reliant on our fruit fly free status to maintain our exports.

I refer now to some areas of infrastructure which are relevant to my electorate and to which this Government's action has certainly been of valued assistance to the growth and development of the electorate. I have spent much time in the House advising of the progress or otherwise of the Berri bridge. Since its formal commencement at the end of June, I am pleased to inform the House that work at the site is continuing to advance. The contractor, Built Environs, is confident that the project is on schedule for a September-October 1997 completion, although high floodwaters at the moment may have an impact on the rate of construction. Nevertheless, construction work is in progress and it presently includes piling for piers over the water, approach road embankments on both sides of the river and associated stormwater culverts. We have seen the completion of site clearing, alignment surveys and piling for the land-based piers. The electorate is appreciative of this long overdue infrastructure need and is more than happy that it is finally coming to reality.

The redevelopment of Glossop High School is currently at the design stage. The project will involve a dual campus redevelopment, which will provide a senior secondary site at Berri and a junior secondary campus at the existing Glossop High School. The establishment of a senior secondary campus at Berri will allow stronger links with the TAFE college there. The school community has accepted the completed concept for both the junior and senior secondary sites. Feasibility estimates have put the cost at \$3.8 million for the senior secondary project and \$1.3 million for the junior secondary development. Services SA is currently engaged in the sketch design of both aspects. Construction at the existing Glossop High School site over the Christmas vacation period at the end of this year and into 1997 is being investigated as the preferred course. I am pleased with the progress on this long-awaited redevelopment project, which will enhance the educational services available to the Riverland community.

With respect to the water industry I note that, in my electorate, local industries, particularly the food industries, tourist operators and domestic users, are looking forward to the Government's delivering on its promise of clean, filtered water. Since the House last met, Riverland Water has been announced as the successful tenderer for the \$110 million contract to finance, build and operate 10 water treatment plants in rural South Australia, five of which will be in my electorate of Chaffey. Further, the contract commits Riverland Water to provide export sales in excess of \$200 million, a value-added export which will be additional income into South Australia, and which will give valuable impetus to the development of a water industry in this State. An updated briefing was provided locally only last week, and it is expected that 70 per cent of the project's construction requirements will be sourced locally. It was pleasing to hear from the schedule that three of the plants in the Riverland will be commissioned in 1998 and two in 1999.

The State and Federal Governments have made budget commitments this financial year to upgrade Adelaide Airport, with \$15 million and \$48 million respectively. The runway extension is of particular interest to my electorate and will go a long way to providing improved market access for fresh fruit and vegetables, which means additional export dollars for South Australia. There are markets in Asia for our high

quality produce, and this Government will assist by ensuring that air freight needs are met with direct, reliable and cost-competitive services optimising the quality of our produce, and this will be achieved by extending the airport runway.

A current initiative about which I make mention in this Address in Reply is the case for a rural partnership program in the Riverland, which the State Government and I support. As members would be aware, the Riverland economy is strongly horticulturally based, with over 30 000 hectares of irrigated horticulture.

There is significant value adding, and predominantly it is export focused. There is the potential for increased production through the development of new products and irrigation, and even more significantly by the restructuring or redevelopment of existing properties. These issues, which were the subject of a development strategy produced in 1994 by the Riverland Development Corporation, have been the subject of comment in this place previously. The strategy identified expansion of horticulture as a key objective for the economic growth of the region and, as a result, the Riverland Development Corporation commenced a project, which was supported by eight State agencies plus the Commonwealth initially, to attract horticultural development to the region and identify new sites for growth. Production of high value horticultural crops is closely tied to irrigation, the driver of the Riverland economy. Water for irrigation expansion must come from the restructuring of irrigation districts and the transfer of existing allocations. The replacement of channels with pipelines which will reduce water usage by at least 20 per cent and improve productivity by up to 50 per cent.

New plantings of vines, vegetables, native flowers and orchards have been established by large and small developers, particularly over the past couple of years. Even on existing small properties significant restructuring and replanting has occurred to improve longer term prospects. Much of this comes as a direct result of the irrigation restructuring of the highland irrigation area in the Riverland. Large corporate ventures are responsible for much of the new vineyard expansion and, in particular, the strategy project team has been locating potential sites for new development starting with large tracts of land south of Loveday and north of Monash; and the search is continuing around Loxton, Lyrup and Waikerie where options are being formalised. I believe that considerable momentum has built up during the course of this development strategy. Because of this work, growing enthusiasm in the Riverland and in this State Government has occurred for the existing strategy to be extended under a rural partnership program. This is seen as a logical and progressive move.

This program is operated by the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industries and Energy. It is a program for sustainable development which concentrates on drawing a bigger picture for the region's future and building appropriate organisational structures which can access Federal funding packages. It is under the rural partnership program that the strategy to revitalise Eyre Peninsula has been established. What is particularly attractive about the program is the opportunity offered with the proposed Loxton rehabilitation requirement which will cost over \$20 million and which is aimed to commence upon completion of the current rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas. The existing regional strategy can be reworked and expanded in partnership with the programming and funding arrangements for rehabilitation of supply infrastructure in the Commonwealth owned Loxton irrigation district, which covers an area of 2 600 hectares.

Once rehabilitated, the resulting efficiencies could support 1 000 hectares of new irrigation development.

Local representative and State Government officials are enthusiastic that a far better deal for this Loxton rehabilitation project can be negotiated if it is included under a rural partnership program. The Loxton Irrigation Board, with the support of the district council, has demonstrated very strong leadership over the rehabilitation problem and has already gained agreement from irrigators to contribute \$100 000 towards a cost benefit study of the proposed rehabilitation. This study has been approved by the State Minister for Infrastructure, and he along with the Federal member for Wakefield is involved with ongoing representations and negotiations over this issue with the Federal Minister for Primary Industries.

I am aware that the Federal budget decreased funding to agri business, but I understand that expenditure on rural partnership programs will continue. I emphasise that the study of the Loxton irrigation district is critical. I emphasise and acknowledge that it must be competitive against submissions from other regions, and I am very optimistic that that will be the case. A submission for the Riverland to be included in a rural partnership is due to be completed by the end of December 1996. The Riverland Development Corporation, together with Primary Industries SA, is responsible for its progress to this point, and the Minister for Primary Industries in South Australia has agreed to State Government funding for an initial scoping study which I commend and which will assist by updating the regional development strategy.

From my understanding of the process, I believe the outcome will be a coordinated strategy which draws extensively on community and industry participation, utilising existing initiatives and opening up more avenues for sustainable regional development. On this basis, I believe that the Government at any level will effectively be investigating and will be convinced to fund what will be a good investment in a local economy that will be of benefit both nationally and regionally.

I note that in his speech His Excellency referred to the Water Resources Act. The Government is determined to see the passage of progressive and practical legislation in this regard that will provide for the future enhancement and management of the State's water resources in the next century on the basis of sustainable development. Many issues are involved in this Act, and I have been particularly involved in the construction of this legislation. There has been an extensive consultation process involving discussion papers, draft issues papers and draft legislation. There have been big picture issues, particularly with respect to the Murray-Darling Basin, involving the Murray-Darling 2001 Project, the influence of COAG, interstate trading and interstate water capping. Many issues will be incorporated in this Bill, including the whole restructuring of water resource management in this State, based on a State water plan and sub-catchment water plans. I will address these issues in more detail when this Bill comes before the House.

I wish to mention a couple of other local issues that are in progress. I note that a passenger transport study for the Riverland that was released in June of this year has provided a comprehensive assessment of the current situation. Easily affordable transfer services between the towns in the region are almost non-existent, and a considerable mismatch between demand and supply creates a real need for various sections of the Riverland population. A community transport

brokerage system is proposed, and the study outlines the benefits that would be generated by its implementation in the region.

I have raised the findings of this study with the Minister and have presented the Transport Passenger Board with a report, and I am continuing my representation to both parties in an attempt to achieve a satisfactory outcome. It is an important issue, and one that I wish to assure Riverland constituents is a significant priority of mine.

I wish to refer also to the Riverland Health Authority and to health services in the region. I acknowledge that we are starting to see some very positive outcomes from a significant transfer of responsibility from the South Australian Health Commission to regional boards. The Riverland Health Authority received its first budget in mid August this year—an allocation of \$18.56 million from the South Australian Health Commission.

The authority is accountable for budgetary and service outcomes. Its role will be to encompass service development and planning, providing joint administration where possible. I am very pleased that the four Riverland health units will share in \$2.3 million of additional gross funding this year.

The overall objective of regionalisation is to provide a better health service for the dollars available, maximising allocation and resources and rationalising services based on regional needs. These goals are achievable through coordination and integration of services, with local community input and a focus on primary health care. The key advisory structure, enabling planning and coordination of the service, is now in place, following the recent establishment of a clinical services advisory group.

I also note that commencing in February 1997 eight fifth year medical students per year for three years will be placed in the Riverland. This is a national trial established by Flinders University in conjunction with Riverland health providers. It is very good news for the region and should help develop mechanisms for attracting medical practitioners to country areas. The Regional Manager of the Regional Health Authority and the Riverland Division of General Practice are to be congratulated for taking the initiative over this matter.

I am also encouraged by the changes occurring through the realignment of mental health services, which will see an additional \$1.8 million become available for country mental health in the current financial year, with an additional \$3.2 million thereafter. In particular, 20 in-patient beds will be available specifically for country areas. The Riverland Mental Health Advocacy Project in 1995 reported some deficiencies. I believe that this realignment of services, together with regionalisation, will have the capacity to deliver further real benefits, coupled of course with the telepsychology unit service, which has been operating for more than 12 months, and an increase in staff over the past year.

I want to conclude with some very positive facts for my region with respect to unemployment. The latest unemployment figures for the Riverland show that the rate has dropped from a high of 16.7 per cent in June 1992 to 7.7 per cent in the latest figures. In all local government areas it is below 10 per cent, while four years ago unemployment exceeded 19 per cent. This improvement translates into about 600 fewer unemployed, and much of this progress was brought about by successful programs such as Kickstart, which uses a close working relationship between DETAFE and RDC. A complete business package is offered to Riverland businesses. Since its inception in 1993, 40 projects have been run, with 487 people gaining employment. Many of these positions

have been in the food processing industry as new factories have opened, new export markets have been established and niche marketing has improved. Also, there has certainly been an increase in the awareness of the role of quality in generating greater returns.

It is very pleasing for me to be an advocate for and representative of an area which is progressing and growing and which is willing to step on board with the Brown Liberal Government, to work cooperatively with it in the progress, development and improved services, facilities and infrastructure that this Government has continued to deliver with its plans and program over the past 2½ years. I am very pleased to support the motion.

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** I also support the motion and congratulate the Governor on his speech opening the fourth session of the forty-eighth Parliament. I have had the Governor and his wife visit Gawler on a couple of occasions since he was inducted as Governor, and I must say that they are a very congenial couple and mix extremely well with members of the public. They make people feel very relaxed in the manner in which they approach the job.

I would also like quickly to place on record my congratulations to Dame Roma Mitchell on the excellent job that she did during her term as Governor of this State. There is no doubt that she had great energy for the job, and the amount that she could fit into a day just amazed me. I am sure that we all benefited from both her wisdom and her enthusiasm in her term as Governor.

I turn briefly to a number of points that were noted by His Excellency. As much of his speech has already been covered by other members in this place, I will not dwell on it for long, because it would only waste the time of the House. The Governor noted in his speech that the Government had undertaken economic and financial reform since being elected in December 1993. That is an understatement. We came to government with a recurrent deficit of \$350 million, a long-term debt of some \$8 billion and a State that was in severe danger of collapse.

In three years this Government has turned that debt strategy around. We are now in the situation whereby, come the budget for 1998, by all predictions at this stage we will see a positive, a surplus, in terms of the recurrent deficit. The asset sales that have been undertaken since this Government came to office have now reached \$1.75 billion, which is in front of what was forecast when we first came to government.

In many cases one could say that it would be advantageous or, if one looked at it sympathetically, that it would be good still to have a State Bank, but this Government was faced with no other option than to reduce the debt and sell off such assets because of the amount of interest we were paying on that debt. One really has to question the motive of members opposite and the Auditor-General raising the issue of the sale of those assets and the amount of money returned in dividends. Obviously, prior to selling an asset you restructure it and establish its profits in such a way as to generate the best possible outcome for the sale of the asset, and to predict an outcome were it to have continued is not correct. The reduction in the recurrent deficit has not been achieved without pain, and no Government likes to come into office and then have to reduce budgets. Obviously, every member who comes into this place likes to see the demands made on him or her by various sectors of the economy catered for, but there is no way out of a debt of the size that we faced.

That reminds me of an interview I had a couple of weeks ago, leading up to the teachers' wage and conditions dispute, when three teachers from Light came to see me. I said that we had a severe debt problem and, as they considered there should not have been any reduction to the Education Department whatsoever, I asked how that money should be accounted for and how it might be made up. To my surprise, they suggested to me that this is a very low taxed country and that we should be increasing taxes. One can see where that thinking comes from. You only have to look at the strategies of the Labor Government during the 1980s to see that that strategy of increasing taxes and costs to businesses and individuals is the very reason why this State lost so many businesses during the 1980s, when so many people shifted out of this State and went interstate, taking those businesses with them as they left. The Labor Party now wonders why we are coming from such a low base and why clawing our way back up the ladder is so difficult. It is because of that policy and because of the fact that when companies leave States they make 10 to 15 year investment decisions, and getting them back again is very difficult.

Under Sir Thomas Playford this State had the reputation of being a low cost State where the lower costs of doing business in South Australia outweighed the differential in transport costs between South Australia and other States—about 10 per cent of the production price of goods produced here—and, as a result, businesses set up here in South Australia. It made economic sense to do so. Unfortunately, that was all ruined during the 1970s and 1980s. This Labor Opposition does not like to hear that, because it reminds people of the mismanagement that occurred during that time. Unfortunately, the public of South Australia is now paying a very high price for that mismanagement. This Government is attempting to rebuild that industry base and is also attempting to lower the costs of doing business in South Australia. For an example, one has only to look at electricity costs to business in South Australia, which costs have now been reduced by a significant amount and which give businesses here cost competitiveness.

His Excellency also mentioned the expansion in the mining industry. The \$1.25 billion Olympic Dam expansion proposed by Western Mining Corporation is extremely significant for our economy. When one thinks that that mine may not have gone ahead because of opposition to it, it is quite amazing now to see the number of jobs that Olympic Dam supports and the wealth that it brings to this State. In addition—and I have mentioned this before—the aeromagnetic mapping program, which was introduced under the Labor Government during the 1980s and which has been continued by this Government, is reaping substantial rewards by locating and identifying prospective areas in which mineral companies can undertake exploration. When I was with the Centre for Economic Studies a few years ago, at that stage mining exploration funds amounted to about \$9 million or \$10 million, and South Australia was one of the lowest States regarding the expenditure of mineral exploration moneys. This year, it is expected that \$35 million will be expended in South Australia on mineral exploration—a 300 per cent increase over the past five years. This Government continues to encourage mining companies to come into South Australia, and it is now reaping the benefits of continuing the mapping program.

His Excellency also mentioned the focus on exports in South Australia under this Government. As other members have mentioned, exports have increased significantly during

the term of this Government because of its focus on that area. Regarding the water industry in South Australia, the contract with United Water drawn up by this Government is now cited by the World Bank as a leading water contract, one which other countries should look at and adopt in the same manner as has South Australia. As the economic base of Asian communities increases—that is, as their standard of living improves—so too will the demand for clean water, sewerage systems and proper drainage—all those things that go with a growing economy and an improved standard of living. We are in an excellent position to benefit from that growth by supplying water technology to those places.

The Adelaide Airport runway was also mentioned in the Governor's speech. I will not reiterate too much in that regard, but in terms of agriculture and other manufacturing industries in South Australia the extension of the runway will make quite a difference. In addition, the provision of a terminal with covered walkways to planes will finally turn the Adelaide Airport into what can be termed a truly international airport rather than what can best be described as a country airport.

The Federal Government is contributing \$19 million to the erection of a tunnel from Devil's Elbow to Eagle on the Hill. I undertook an economic impact study on that project when I was at the centre. I am particularly pleased to see that it is now going ahead. From memory, I think about 1 300 jobs will be generated during that project. This will not only benefit the State in terms of economic activity but also reduce some of the most dangerous parts of the Mount Barker Road.

Much has been said about Hilmer reforms. This Government is continuing down the path of initiating legislation to adhere to those reforms so that South Australia does not miss out on economic benefits from the Federal Government for undertaking reforms. Again, a number of difficult decisions are to be made in this respect to ensure that we conform and that competition occurs in all industries.

After moving around country South Australia as Secretary to the Minister for Health, I must say that it is pleasing to note the attitude of regional boards that have been set up. The devolution of funding to those regional boards that has occurred under this Government has been a welcome aspect of health. Those regional boards can then look at where their demand is the greatest and use those funds as they see fit. I was in the Riverland only a couple of weeks ago, where it was mentioned to me that three hospital boards had been amalgamated into one. The whole system was working and functioning extremely efficiently, and they were pleased with the outcome. I was also pleased to hear the Minister make a statement in the House today regarding the turnaround in the profits of Modbury Hospital. Of course, that is under private management, and it shows that in areas where there is room for improvement the private sector can make significant savings under the contracting out of Government services.

I now turn briefly to a few matters involving the electorate of Light. I was pleased that the Minister for Education announced that tenders would be called for the Hewett Primary School, which is a school with some \$3.9 million in building value. It will specifically have an impact in Gawler, because there is no school on the other side of the North Para River. Significant development has occurred there, and even more will occur with the Harkness Heights development as time goes along. The school will have a special needs class, for which I have been asking the Minister for some time. That will help those people in the Gawler area who have children with specific learning difficulties. Building will commence

in February/March 1997 and will be completed some 12 months later. The school will commence operations in February in term 1 of 1997 in temporary buildings. I am pleased that that has occurred, because it has been announced in a couple of budgets and it is now under way.

Along with that development goes a community centre within Harkness Heights towards which the Kapunda-Light council is putting money. It will be of benefit to that area. As well as that, a new Congregational Church is being built in that development. So the community will have a significant hub on which to focus. I received a phone call from the Congregational Church minister from Melbourne, who has been transferred to Hewett, wanting to know more about the area, so I was able to fill him in on that.

Another significant occurrence in the past few weeks has been the opening of the Pig and Poultry Research Centre at the Roseworthy campus, following the relocation to Roseworthy of the Northfield Piggery Research Centre. It really is a state of the art development, and the pig producers of the South Australia, through the Swine Compensation Fund, are to be commended because a great deal of the funding has come out of that. They now have a research facility that is attracting interest from all over Australia and it will serve their needs extremely well. Similarly, the Poultry Research Centre is a fine research centre which will benefit South Australian farmers.

Tenders have also been called for the Daveyston bypass, and that will complete the upgrading of that section of road to national highway standard. It has been long overdue because, for those people who travel between Daveyston and Greenock, there is the long climb up Penfold's Hill, with very few chances for overtaking. A passing lane to be built there will provide significant benefits to motorists on that road.

In relation to local government amalgamations, recently the Barossa, Angaston and Tanunda councils have amalgamated. I am pleased to say that that council will settle down well and it will face elections in May next year. There was also the amalgamation of the Kapunda and Light councils, the first ones amalgamated under this Government. Both are working extremely well, and I look forward to the Local Government Reform Board's making some recommendations about what will happen to Gawler and Mallala councils in terms of boundaries of their areas.

Finally, I commend the CFS members, the State Emergency Service members and the Mallala council workers who assisted during the floods a couple of weeks ago in the Two Wells area. They are a strongly committed group of people, staying up all night to monitor floods, putting themselves at risk from time to time (perhaps not so much in this instance but certainly in other floods) and helping out householders and landholders. The CFS, State Emergency Service and the Mallala council are to be commended for the voluntary work they do in this community. I do not know how we can replace that sort of work. Anyone suggesting that we should get rid of volunteers in this community should look at the cost that the community would have to bear as a result. Also, people have a feeling of goodwill when they undertake voluntary work. In conclusion, I commend His Excellency for the speech with which he opened the Fourth Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament and I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak tonight to the interested audience that I have. I ask that the Deputy Premier stay awake. The members for Price and

Light are in for a delightful 15 to 20 minutes. We will see whether my prodding and probing of the Government draws any more to the Chamber. Already the member for Davenport has come running in. I congratulate the Governor, Sir Eric Neal, and Lady Neal, on his appointment as Governor. The roles they will respectively carry out over the course of their term is very much a partnership.

Both Sir Eric and Lady Neal will have a full agenda for the next four or so years during which they will serve their term. It is interesting to note that Sir Eric is a graduate of a primary school within my electorate—the Largs Bay Primary School. My son goes there and it is nice to know that a graduate from the Port can rise all the way to the top and become Governor of this fine State. It is a role model for all on the peninsula and from the Port, including the electorate of my colleague the member for Price, in having the ambition to achieve the highest office.

I also put on record my appreciation and congratulations for the excellent service provided by the previous Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. In her unique way she has been a magnificent Governor of this State, a fine appointment by the former Bannon Government, which showed a great astuteness in selecting Dame Roma as a Governor of this State. That appointment has been well respected on both sides of politics and I wish Dame Roma well for the future. She has certainly achieved some extraordinary milestones in her illustrious career and deserves to be recognised as being one of our State's truly great Governors.

Let me now refer to the Governor's speech and the economic performance of this Government. It was an interesting speech to listen to and read at a later moment. It is not appropriate for me to reflect in any way on the fine delivery of the speech by the Governor, but I would hope that, next time a Governor's speech is prepared, Ministers of the Crown will put a little more effort into giving our Governor a little more excitement and quality upon which to build the speech.

I thought that it lacked real vision and direction. At the end of the day I suspect that that is a hallmark of this Government, because it has now been in office for three years, and the Premier is the only person I have come across in recent times who actually thinks this economy is doing well. Circulating, as do most members, with many business people and members of the community right across the social and political structure of this State, I simply cannot find someone who will concur in the Premier's view (to paraphrase his words) that our economy is the best performing of any State in Australia.

The member for Light is a man I respect because he served on this august body, the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, headed by Professor Cliff Walsh. When this Government first came to office Professor Walsh was held in high esteem, but he is not necessarily in that position now because he has, indeed, been a strong critic of this Government. In the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 8 October—

*Mr Evans interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I will, because it quotes the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies in a truly independent assessment of our economy. Let us consider some of the key indicators because, quite frankly, they are an indictment on the economic performance of this Government. Gross State product for the year to June 1996 stood at 5.3 per cent. Of course, that is a figure which at first glance seems somewhat impressive, but let us consider the comment attributed to that high figure, as follows:

Such a 'high' rate of growth of the economy is largely a reflection of a sharp rise in rural exports—following last year's much improved season and, as such, the number overstates the general health of the SA economy. Activity in most sectors of the SA economy remained much weaker than this.

That is a very telling commentary on our economic performance. The next indicator, employment growth, stood at .7 per cent in the year to August 1996. The commentary states:

Data on job vacancies and other surveys all point to employment growth remaining weak in the foreseeable future.

That statistic was confirmed by Access Economics, the Liberal Party's own economic think tank—the architects of Fightback—which predicted in the out year an unemployment rate in this State approaching 11 per cent. The next economic indicator, unemployment, stood at 9.2 per cent as at August 1996. One will find that the September figure was slightly higher than that. The commentary stated:

The unemployment rate will likely go higher, with any significant improvement being unlikely until at least mid-1997.

With respect to retail sales, the Premier told us today that they are on the improve: 2.8 per cent growth in July 1996; a change on the previous three months. The commentary (as we all know) states:

In total, retail sales have resumed an upward path over the past six months—but the growth has been restricted to 'food retailing' [in other words, fast food] and 'hospitality and services'.

We know what that is: poker machine-driven retail growth. It is hardly a figure about which any of us should be getting remotely excited: if anything, we should be quite the opposite. New vehicle sales were down by 7.2 per cent. Automotive sales are one of the key indicators of the strength of the economy. New home loan approvals showed a modest change on the three previous months of 3.9 per cent. The commentary says quite clearly that home building activity remains at a very weak level. House prices are an indicator that will cost this Government dearly in a political sense. If I were in a marginal seat in the southern suburbs such as Reynell, Kaurna and, certainly, in a mortgage belt seat such as Wright where the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations lives—

**The Hon. S.J. Baker:** That's not a southern suburb.

**Mr FOLEY:** No, I was stretching around to the north-east. House prices have declined by 1.9 per cent. So, for those people who have invested their life savings, who have a significant mortgage, their only hope to acquire wealth is their ability to reduce their mortgage and the capital appreciation they should get on their house, and they have witnessed a decline. That is a statistic that will be placed on the agenda, I might add, and it will be a significant issue as we run into the next election.

Let us look at capital spending, another key indicator when assessing the overall performance of the economy. Manufacturing is down 11.9 per cent. All industries private sector capital investment is down 25.9 per cent. That is an absolute disgrace. What we see in those indicators—and I need not go on further because it is a depressing message—is the very vulnerability of our economy, the overwhelming under performance of our economy, and the very lacklustre and stalled position in which we now find ourselves.

Members opposite cannot keep blaming the past. They cannot keep blaming the Federal Government. They cannot keep blaming the Industries Commission. They cannot keep blaming the Adelaide City Council. They cannot keep blaming everyone except themselves. It is not good enough to have a Premier of this State who is not strong enough and capable enough to own up to the real problems of this economy, to talk openly and honestly to the people of South

Australia about our difficult position, and work through it with a constructive approach, most importantly an approach that has a degree of vision and excitement.

If members were to walk out into the street and talk to anyone, across any grouping within our community, they are telling all of us that nothing is happening. There is no economic activity. There is no jobs growth. They fear for their future. They fear for their children's future. That is something that Governments cannot ignore. Governments cannot keep coming into this place and going into the press and saying, as the Premier had the audacity to say today, that we are the best performing State in this nation. Where is he coming from? Who does he think we are? Does he think that we will actually buy that line? Does he think the media in the gallery, his colleagues the backbenchers in this Government, even his fellow Ministers, really believe that? Of course they do not.

All of us live and work within our electorates and know what is happening out there. What is happening is nothing. I would have thought that with three years under their belt, with a year at most to go until the next election, Government members should be looking very closely at their economic performance because, despite their rhetoric, this Government has had no vision. It has been a Government that cannot take bold measures. It has been a Government that has done very little. It has been a Government that has been marking time.

Whilst previous Governments have deservedly been criticised, so too will this Government be criticised for having missed the opportunity to give this State the drive, the vision and the excitement that it so desperately has needed. In years to come, people will look on this term of the first Brown Government—and hopefully the only Brown Government—and will say: what an opportunity lost. I suppose that, as much as the Labor Government has suffered defeat and criticism—and as I have said in this place before, in most parts deservedly so—we have not been to blame for the past three years. This Government has been to blame and, I think, quite frankly, that our State has a very uncertain future, a very concerning future for us all because I simply do not know what has happened in the past three years to give us any confidence that we will see an economic upswing of any great order in the years ahead.

We have also seen some sideshows which have been poorly handled by the Government. By way of explanation, I refer to one issue, which of course is the fiasco surrounding the Commonwealth Games bid, the fiasco of, yet again, a Premier who simply cannot bring himself to make a tough decision, a bold decision, and be honest, open and frank with the community. Last week, the release of important documents obtained under Freedom of Information showed that the Government was quite right to assess that the Commonwealth Games did put our State at a financial risk, a financial risk that, on balance, was not worth taking.

The Premier was advised by the Crown Solicitor of this State, Mr Mike Walter, and the head of the Major Events Corporation, Mr Bill Spurr, that the Commonwealth Games Association effectively wanted to extort somewhere upwards of \$35 million from whoever would be the successful Australian bidder for the Commonwealth Games. Together with other unknown commitments in which a Government may find itself, the sound advice was that, 'Prudentially or responsibly we cannot advise you, Premier, to bid for these games. However, you have a choice. You can either bid for the games and cop one hell of a bill or you do not. If you are

prepared to spend the money, it is a political decision, not one of any financial propriety.'

What did the Premier do? If he had said, 'I have decided to withdraw our bid because we are being put into an unacceptable position by the Commonwealth Games Authority,' he would have earned respect from me as the shadow minister, from the Leader of the Opposition—from all of us. For once our Premier would have been strong enough to take a stand and to put forward a position that showed real leadership. But what did the Premier try to do? As he has done many times, he tried to find what he thought was a politically clever way to get himself out of it. As we uncovered last week, we had a minute which stated, 'Premier, you always have the option of signing an amended endorsed contract for the Commonwealth Games.' and, as the advice read from his most senior adviser, 'This option would have little effect.' However, it would have given the Government the opportunity to say that it had at least tried. The advice which I released last week stated that.

But given a choice between a hard decision and a half-baked clever political decision, you can always back the Premier to take the half-baked somewhat clever political decision. In the end he looks silly. He made himself look silly in the eyes of our interstate competitors; he made himself look silly in the eyes of his peers throughout the nation. But probably most damaging to him was that he made himself look silly to his own people. I give that example by way of illustration of what has been some very clumsy government.

*The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The current Treasurer interjects and makes comments about what the former Labor Government did or did not do. I have said in the House many times that there were terrible mistakes made by the former Labor Government that should not have been made. For that we have suffered as we should have suffered as a political Party. I am not walking away from that. But we have not been in Government or making the decisions for the past three years: your Government has been, Deputy Premier, and you must be prepared to stand up for those decisions. You simply cannot throw back to the former Government. You cannot keep doing that, as much as you will try.

*The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I can see the election adverts now, but the people will not be fooled. I move on because I am not being distracted by the onslaught of interjections and heckles coming from the other side. I am going so bad, I think the Clerk of the House will interject, just to lighten up the place. Feel free. I am giving a very solemn and measured contribution tonight.

*The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** No. Will it read well in the morning? We have other conservative driven threats in this economy and, in recent times, we have had the election of a Howard Liberal Government. I mention the issue of car tariffs and the Productivity Commission, as it is now known. I digress and relay something interesting I recently learnt. From memory, the Premier in this place called the Productivity Commission fools or idiots in one of his normal, polished performances. He basically denigrated the Productivity Commission. I learnt the other day that the new Deputy Head of his Development Council comes from the Productivity Commission. That is just an interesting aside.

*The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Perhaps he did. As we know, the car industry is under review. There is no more important sector

to our economy than the automotive industry. It is more important than any other sector, information technology included. It is the backbone of any sophisticated manufacturing economy. We know that Bill Scales of the Productivity Commission will be very keen to see those tariffs driven down to negligible levels of 5 per cent—the sort of levels that John Hewson and Dean Brown were advocating before the 1993 Federal election. We have vivid memories of Dean Brown standing behind John Hewson on the steps of Parliament House chanting, 'Labor's got to go.' Of course, the main plank in Hewson's economic strategies for manufacturing was negligible tariffs.

We see a different tune from the Premier now because he realises that if tariffs fall below 15, and probably should they fall below 25 per cent, we will see a car industry under real threat and suffering the real risk of major disinvestment and major wind back, and that event will be catastrophic for this State's economy. I do not think that there will be any more important issue for this State over the next six to eight months than the outcome of the Productivity Commission. I appeal to all Liberals, in a bipartisan and constructive manner, to lobby their Federal colleagues hard to make them understand just how important the car industry is to this State.

It is not worth the risk or the gamble, and it is not worth experimenting to see whether or not 0-5 per cent tariffs will work because, once Mitsubishi and General Motors unbolt their presses and machinery and ship them back to their respective home countries, they will not come back. Should that be allowed to occur, we will have vacant factories from Elizabeth through to Clovelly Park as monuments to the foolish behaviour of the reckless bureaucrats and politicians in Canberra.

I want to touch briefly on several issues in my electorate. I have often mentioned the fireboat *Gallantry*, so I was pleased in part to see that the Minister chose not to dispense with the *Gallantry*. Indeed, he has chosen to keep the *Gallantry* in service on LeFevre Peninsula. However, I am concerned and most annoyed with the Government's decision to reduce the manning for the *Gallantry* which will now operate from the Largs North fire station and, should the *Gallantry* be called into service, backup crews will be called from other fire stations in the area. Regardless of what the Fire Brigade may like to say, there is a reduced effort and commitment to fire fighting on LeFevre Peninsula. A fireboat is important for all of us who live on LeFevre Peninsula. We are surrounded by water and several volatile industries are located on the peninsula such as the fuel dumps and depots at Birkenhead, Adelaide Brighton Cement, Australian Submarine Corporation, Penrice Soda Products and the Outer Harbor Wharf.

We have a large and diverse industrial presence on the peninsula and a fireboat is a vital piece of equipment which is certainly needed. I refer to the suggestion that, just because the Fire Brigade has not been used to fight a fire at the airport for the past 20 years, we should close the fire station there. That is a nonsense argument, and the same applies with regard to the fireboat. It may well be an indulgence to have such a quality fireboat but, when the safety of lives and property result from having such a boat, it is an indulgence that I will support at every opportunity.

We also have a commitment by the Government for funding for the upgrade and maintenance of our State's jetties, and in my electorate we have two of the State's finest. I know in your electorate, Sir, you have about 150 jetties, but I have two fine jetties and I am pleased to see that the

Government has allocated a substantial sum. However, I will wait to see whether or not those two jetties receive a sufficient share of that allocation, because Largs Bay Jetty and Semaphore Jetty are substantial pieces of our history. At present they are very close to being a liability in a safety sense and are close to suffering severe damage, should they be buffeted by strong weather.

It would be inappropriate for me to conclude my speech without reference to the fine performance of the Port Adelaide Magpies Football Club in recent weeks. I know my colleague the member for Price, the member for Gordon, my comrade and colleague the member for McKillop, the former Leader of the Opposition and Minister, and others who barrack for Port Adelaide enjoyed the great victory the weekend before last, because it again demonstrated the power of the Port Adelaide Football Club. We are really very good. The club has been a delight to watch in all the years I have been following football. As the captain, Tim Ginever, said shortly after the game, 'A Port Adelaide premiership is a bit like Christmas—they come around every year.' It is fair to say that in Port Adelaide we have a touch of arrogance when it comes to our football. True, this is not a quality I demonstrate as a politician but, in following our football, we are a little arrogant and expect that we will win regularly, and we do.

I want to congratulate Tim Ginever and all the players of the Port Adelaide Magpies Football Club on providing such a great win for their thousands of loyal supporters. They have done their community proud and have shown that, when it comes to people from the Port, we are simply the best. Also, there will be a great year ahead for the Port Power AFL Club as it goes into the AFL. It should not be underestimated that, as much as there is hype about the new Adelaide Rams in rugby and the Adelaide Crows, the contribution to be provided to the small regional economy of Port Adelaide by the advent of Port Power will be substantial.

I suspect that Port Power is already a medium-sized employer in the area, and Port Power's turnover is budgeted to be between \$10 million and \$12 million when it is fully operational in the years ahead. That is a substantial business. Turnover will increase from \$1 million to between \$10 million and \$12 million. Of course, Mr Deputy Speaker, a great company from your electorate, Scott Transport, will be a major sponsor of Port Power, and that is a great acknowledgment by Alan Scott of the potential that Port Power offers.

The Magpies, the team that will operate within the SANFL, will be building new training facilities within my electorate at the Ethelton football oval. It will spend a substantial amount of money on that facility, which is within my electorate, and it brings me great joy to know that we have the training facility in my electorate. I have been co-opted onto the board of the Port Magpies in recent months, and I look forward to fulfilling that job as best I can—

**Mr Leggett:** Is that why they won?

**Mr FOLEY:** The honourable member can draw his own conclusions, but I am happy to take that. If he is suggesting that I had some role in their grand final win, far be it from me to dissuade him from that viewpoint. It is good to see the Port Magpies setting up at Ethelton. They have a great future. We will be leaders in the SANFL, as we will be competitive in the AFL. I thank all members for listening to me in relative silence, obviously hanging off my every word.

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** I place on record my congratulations to the Governor on a fine address in opening the fourth session of this, the forty-eighth Parliament. I also congratulate Sir Eric and Lady Neal on achieving their positions, and I wish them all the best. I am sure that they will perform their role very successfully for the State.

I want to touch on a few things that the member for Hart and other Labor members mentioned in this debate about the performance of the Government and how one cannot continually reflect on the performance of previous Governments. The voters will reflect on what the Labor Party Australia-wide has done to the Australian community—in Victoria under Cain and Kirner; in Western Australia under Burke; in South Australia under Arnold, Bannon and Rann; and federally under Keating. There is no doubt that the people will remember for a long time what the Labor Party has done to the average mum and dad, the average family. I am sure that they will remember come voting time.

The average family does not expect any Government to turn around totally in three years what the Labor Party took 22 years out of the past 25 years to wind down. The member for Hart should come clean and say to the people of his electorate and the State whether he believes that there should be an increase in taxes within the State. This Government has essentially stuck to its pre-election promise of not increasing taxes. There has been no increase in taxes above the CPI. Does the member for Hart agree that there should be no increase in taxes above the CPI?

The honourable member should come clean and state whether he believes in the principle of Governments operating with a budget surplus or at least a balanced budget. When this Government took over, the budget deficit was \$350 million. In other words, the previous Government was spending \$1 million a day more than it was earning in income. The member for Hart was an adviser at the time, and we all know how many schools, SSOs and extra teachers we could employ at \$1 million a day. From memory, the SSO reductions imposed by this Government amounted to between \$5 million and \$7 million, but that is just one week of the overspending of the previous Labor Government.

Let us let us make it very clear what the people are judging. The Labor Party has not come out and said that it wants increased taxes. It is silent on that issue, unless one takes into consideration the opinion of Gareth Evans, who I am pleased to say is not related to me. He is on record publicly, as a member of the Federal Opposition, as saying that the Government should put up taxes.

If the Labor Party wants to go to the next election advocating a big increase in taxes, I am happy for it to do so. We should put on the record what options are available to Government. This Government went on record clearly saying that it would achieve a balanced budget, and it has done a credible job in trying to achieve that. Difficult decisions have been taken, and we all expected that. Certainly, we made very clear to the electorate that we would sell some assets and take some decisions to achieve a balanced budget. The electorate will not judge us anywhere as near as harshly as it is about to again judge the Labor Party whenever we next go to the polls.

Some of those decisions that have been taken relate to the education area, as I have mentioned with SSOs, but in my electorate we have been fairly fortunate with the capital works program. We have an allocation of \$750 000 for the collocation of the Belair Primary School and Belair Junior Primary School. The collocation resulted from a decision

made by the committee of the two schools. It was not by any stretch of the imagination forced on them by Government. It took about 2½ years of negotiation between the school community and the school council, and they decided of their own free will to collocate.

Blackwood High School currently has a \$240 000 allocation and Daws Road High School will receive approximately \$1.8 million as part of the restructuring of schools in the Marion Road corridor. So, my electorate has been reasonably well served with capital works projects from the education budget. Like all members, I would always argue for more but, in reality, given the tightness of the State's finances, I think Davenport has been reasonably well served in the capital works area. However, obviously we are negotiating for more all the time.

I will touch on a number of points in this Address in Reply debate that have come to life over the break and during the start of this session. One of those matters, which I have mentioned to the Treasurer, is the Auditor-General's Report. Because of different budget timings, I know that we are trying different systems to deal with the Auditor-General's Report. I make the point, as I have to the Treasurer, that when the Auditor-General's Report is before the House next year it is only appropriate that members of the Government's back bench also have a chance to raise questions.

I am sure that the Treasurer takes that not as a criticism but as an observation. It is something that we need to consider next year when the Auditor-General's Report comes before this place. It is important that members of the Government's back bench have the opportunity to raise questions on that report.

One of the projects with which I have been involved over the break and, indeed, during the past 18 months is a youth employment project. I happened to become involved with this project through a past affiliation with a service organisation known as APEX. A group of six people has set up an employer broker scheme in Victoria—the other five people involved are Victorians. We set up the scheme in Geelong and now Ballarat. The scheme has employed well over 120 previously unemployed youths. We have managed to find approximately 120 jobs in 14 months. The scheme works with the local Rotary Clubs, APEX clubs and the Chamber of Commerce in those regional cities in Victoria to provide local unemployed kids with jobs. It has had the strong support of the Victorian State Government. It has been a low cost project and it has been very successful.

Given the youth employment task force report that was presented to this Parliament two or three months ago, I have raised the matter with various Ministers of this Government and, ultimately, I hope that this Government will take up that project. It is a community based project and it is extraordinarily successful. Essentially, any voluntarily run scheme which produces 120 jobs in 14 months needs to be taken up by this Government, and I will certainly be following it through because, although I have been involved in Victoria, which may seem unusual, my attitude to life is that, if I can get a kid a job anywhere, I will try to get him or her a job. We are now trying to develop the same scheme in South Australia.

Another organisation which I have been trying to help establish and which is now up and running is designed to help people who are living with family members or associates who have attention deficit disorder, a condition that has received much media coverage over the years. We have been successful in setting up an organisation known as PLAD (people

living with attention disorders). I am on the State organising committee, and it is certainly working very well. I have no doubt that in five or 10 years—hopefully sooner—it will be a significant organisation for those who have family members experiencing that condition.

Another organisation which I am trying to get off the ground in South Australia is known as Rails to Trails. A volunteer organisation, it takes disused railway tracks or roads and converts them into recreational or environmental trails. This organisation has been very popular in America and Canada, and groups have started in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia. They were looking for a South Australian contact, so I have visited them in Victoria and looked at some of their rail to trail conversions. I am convinced that, in the long term, this is something that Governments of any persuasion could take up in South Australia.

Another point on which I wish to comment is an idea that arose during the break, namely, the concept of changing some of the public holidays in South Australia to better assist the Royal Adelaide Show. Someone has raised with me—and I have raised it with some of the Ministers concerned—the concept of taking one of the holidays that normally falls on a Monday and shifting it to the first Monday of the Royal Adelaide Show. In that way, it would assist the show with a greater attendance, as we would get the long weekend during the show, thereby providing a better chance for country people who are not displaying at the show to make the trip down over two or three days and have a chance to stay here and visit the show.

This is something that the Government needs to look at. It would not reduce the number of holidays—although I know that some from the Employers Chamber and others may argue with that. I am not necessarily arguing that tonight. All I am saying is that there is a chance, in my view, to streamline the public holidays to bring them in line with the Royal Adelaide Show so that the first Monday of the show would be a public holiday. I think that would assist the show and also streamline some of the public holidays in regard to schools.

Some of the city's schools allow a day off for the show; other schools do not. If you have got children at both primary school and high school and one gets a day off and the other one does not, it creates problems for some families. If there is a public holiday in the show week, that basically resolves the matter, because there would not be a need for schools to give a day off for the show other than the public holiday.

One of the issues on which I wish quickly to comment is that of Carrick Hill. This matter has been a thorn in the side for Governments for some years. I wish to float an idea for members to consider while they think of the future of Carrick Hill, which I believe is an ideal location for the wine museum. Carrick Hill is a property of approximately 100 acres in Springfield that was left to the State by the Haywards, and to me, it is an ideal place for that museum. My view is that we could easily keep the historic gardens that are there. There is plenty of room on the property to generate a boutique winery—some vineyards, if you like. We could have an annual Springfield picking day, when the community could get together and pick all the grapes. We could squash all the grapes and taste the vintage—not dissimilar to what happens at the Bushing Festival. I think it is a great way to get the community involved in Carrick Hill.

The budget for the development of the wine museum is about \$10 million to \$20 million. There have been a number of reports into Carrick Hill and the maintenance repairs that

need to be done. They range from \$100 000 to about \$1.5 million. However, if there is a \$10 million to \$20 million budget for the wine museum, that would obviously be ample to cover the development of Carrick Hill into a wine museum. That would have some very strong benefits for the development of Carrick Hill, which I think is an ideal spot for the wine museum.

Some people have said to me that people will not travel to Carrick Hill, which is all of eight minutes away from the centre of Adelaide. My argument to that is quite simply that, if people go to Victor Harbor to watch whales, to the Birdwood Mill to look at cars, to the Barossa Valley for a glass of red, or to McLaren Flat for a glass of wine, to Murray Bridge for a day at the fun park, they will certainly travel for eight or 10 minutes by bus to Carrick Hill.

I think that that is a reasonable solution and I ask members to think about it. I understand that not too far into the future the select committee will be reporting—and what it will report I would not have a clue—but we will need to think about the options for Carrick Hill. And that is my view. One point is that we would need to have a strong management agreement for environmental controls in regard to the vineyards. We would need to be very careful about the sprays used and so on, given that it is a residential area. But I am sure that, with proper planning and consultation, all those matters could be overcome. We are a pretty intelligent society and those sorts of things can be overcome. I am sure that that would have the support of the local residents who, I suggest, would probably prefer any option other than housing on the land. Those comments on Carrick Hill are worth members thinking about in the future.

I was travelling down the freeway the other day and it struck me that we may be missing an opportunity with the development of the tunnel from Devil's Elbow to Eagle on the Hill. We will have a lot of excess soil from that tunnel, and I think there is an opportunity for that soil to be used throughout the Adelaide Hills in developing and upgrading sports grounds. For those members who have not lived in or played sport in the Hills, I point out that many of the grounds have been either hand dug over the years, through community effort, or done by horse and dray 50 or 100 years ago, and they slope enormously either across the ground or from end to end. We have an opportunity to bring out hundreds of tonnes of soil that will need to be placed somewhere. My view is that we should be looking at upgrading some of these sporting grounds within the Hills community to bring them up to a far better standard for the local participants.

One oval that could easily be upgraded with some of the soil is the Heathfield community oval, which is not in my electorate but which was my home oval in playing for Mount

Lofty. That slopes 18 feet from one end to the other, which is an incredible slope. That is one oval that could do with upgrading. Another is the Bridgewater oval, which is right next to the Bridgewater Creek. That is another that could be easily upgraded at very little cost. I understand that some of the soil may be used in upgrading one of the old Eagle quarries. I would be horrified if all the soil was put there to upgrade the quarry and again the sports grounds missed out. Members would know that I have a very strong interest in sport and recreation, and there is an opportunity for the local authorities and the State and Federal Governments to get their heads together and have those sports grounds upgraded.

There are a couple of local issues which I want to comment on tonight and which I will be watching with interest. One is the report into the future of the Old Belair Road, which has been a thorn in the side of every member for the area in living memory. There is no doubt that the traffic management needs upgrading, and I am pleased that the Minister for Transport in another place has agreed to undertake an investigation into an improvement of that road. Given the development down south in Aberfoyle Park and beyond, with people using the route through Blackwood into Adelaide, enormous problems are created in the mornings for those trying to use Old Belair Road to get into the city.

One of my concerns with traffic through the Hills is in regard to the unfortunate circumstance of a bushfire occurring at the wrong time. If a bushfire went through the Belair area at the wrong time, in peak hour traffic, there would be no escape from those roads at all. That is something that Governments now and in the future will need to address. There have been fires through there in the past and there will be fires through there in the future.

Another issue that I will be watching is the Craighburn development. Members will know that local residents have fought against the Craighburn development for over 20 years, and it was announced recently by the developer that the Craighburn development is commencing. The first 130 allotments will be subdivided over the next three to four years, depending on market conditions. It will take three to four years to sell. The local community will no doubt watch with some interest how traffic management will be handled. With those few comments I again pass on my congratulations to His Excellency the Governor and indicate that I support the motion.

**Mr MEIER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 11.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 16 October at 2 p.m.