

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 February 1997

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

SUPPLY BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

MULTICULTURALISM

A petition signed by 160 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Federal Government to give a firm commitment to the principles of multiculturalism was presented by Mr Rossi.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4 and 37.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: I wish to advise the House that, if the inquiry by the Anti-Corruption Branch does not deal with the allegations of conflict of interest by Mr Baker, I have arranged for the Crown Solicitor to inquire into them. To that end, the Crown Solicitor has recommended that Mr T.R. Anderson QC undertake the work and has engaged him for that purpose.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr **CUMMINS (Norwood)**: I bring up the tenth report, fourth session, of the Legislative Review Committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. D.C. Brown)—

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee—Report, 1995-96.

QUESTION TIME

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr **CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)**: Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs willing to assist the Police Anti-Corruption Branch in its inquiries by taking to it all

information he has in relation to allegations against the member for MacKillop?

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: It is not my responsibility; that is for the Premier. I can assure the House that anything the Premier wants in terms of that I will make available.

MEMBER'S TELEPHONE CALL

Mr **BASS (Florey)**: Will the Premier advise the House of the results of inquiries made following an alleged mystery telephone call made in this Chamber yesterday by a Government MP to an Opposition MP? This morning a media reporter alleged that a Government MP yesterday placed a call to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition offering embarrassing information on one of its members.

Mr **ATKINSON**: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that it is contrary to Standing Orders to ask whether a newspaper report is true.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Chair's understanding is that that is not what the honourable member asked.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: Many mystery stories have been written recently, and this is one of those stories. Today, South Australia awoke to unsourced reports of a mystery telephone call across the Chamber offering documents to the Opposition. Today, the Deputy Leader, suitably disguised as Inspector Clouseau—the Peter Sellers of the Labor Party—added to this piece of mystery by hinting that the message was deliberately concealed and that it was like a strangled sound. That was when he was talking about 'a call' this morning. But, when the facts emerged, I understand that the mystery caller was none other than the member for Florey, the Deputy Whip. Of course, since this came out publicly, the Opposition is now backgrounding the media: 'Oh, there was more than one call.' There are now two calls.

Having been caught out, they now have to bring up a second phone call, to give some credence to the mystery of yesterday. The member for Florey's call was simple: he asked the Deputy Leader, 'Do you want some questions?' Why was the offer made? Yesterday we were so embarrassed that the Opposition had run out of questions that we were prepared to offer some of our own. Members opposite were gazzumped yesterday with the ministerial statement, so the Deputy Leader, having been caught out with his series of questions prepared the day before, could not move quickly enough to restructure questions for Question Time. We thought that members opposite might like a question on jobs—you know, the most important issue in South Australia at the moment—and the Deputy Whip thought that he might assist the Labor Party.

It is no wonder that we saw the Deputy Leader scratching his head, not quite sure of the circumstances; he obviously missed the point. So, today we will say it very slowly for the Deputy Leader: it was a joke, Joyce. Does the Deputy Leader understand? Is that clear enough? We are happy to answer these questions, but the moral is twofold: just as some people still want to believe that Elvis is alive—

Mr **CLARKE**: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The removal and the standing aside of a Cabinet Minister and the calling in of the Anti-Corruption Branch is no joke.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! That is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. If members think they can continue to talk over the top of everyone, I am afraid they will find out that that is not acceptable. The Deputy Leader has been here long

enough to know that if he wants to rise on a point of order that does not entitle him to make a speech on any number of subjects.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me respond to the Leader's interjection that this is a whitewash. Is he suggesting by way of interjection that the Anti-Corruption Branch will operate in that way? This clearly demonstrates the approach of members opposite. They make unsubstantiated allegations and cast them in this Chamber and, without substantiation of those allegations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Leader.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:—they continue to make them. When the police pursue inquiries, members opposite then go and background the media. That is not good enough, because other questions need to be resolved. When they get blocked off by a ministerial statement, they have nowhere to go. They are trying to set the scene before any report is brought down. All I would ask the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition Parties to do is give him a fair go. What about backing off and letting the inquiries take place uninterrupted by political interference, interjection and innuendo? Every citizen in this State is entitled to fair consideration, and I would ask members opposite to show at least some fairness and equity in their approach to this matter. The other moral to this story—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the interjections continue, the Chair will do what the Opposition is very keen on the Chair's doing, that is, remove members from the question list. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The moral of the story is twofold, and I have mentioned the first point: just as some people want to believe that Elvis is still alive, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is clearly proof that the bumbling detective is also alive and well. The second component to the moral of this story is this: you cannot trust the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, the character who takes off documents—the fabricator, who stamps them and distributes them as if they are confidential information when they are not—has been caught out—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier seems to be referring to one of his colleagues when he talks about the distribution of information.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is on notice. If he or any other member continues to rise and make speeches without taking a point of order, Standing Order 173 will apply. Now that the Leader has made his speech, I take it that he wishes to rise on a point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, Sir. I therefore ask the Premier to withdraw his remarks.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Fabrication! You hand us the documents—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Local Government is out of order. I suggest to the Premier that he use other phrases besides the term he used: it is not conducive to the good conduct of the House.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me summarise by saying that over the past 10 years many newspaper reports by various journalists have substantiated that claim and certainly put that point of view on the public record. If people continue

to fabricate stories, so be it. The Opposition has been caught out. What it was trying to do yesterday was suggest to the media that the Government was offering new documentation, which simply was not the truth. We were offering the Opposition some questions for Question Time. The moral of the story for the media is: do not take on face value what this Opposition says.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): When and from whom did the Premier first hear of the allegations which were circulating in the South-East and the Liberal Party for over a year against the former Minister for Primary Industries, and did the President of the Liberal Party, Mr Martin Cameron, advise the Premier of these allegations before he appointed the member for MacKillop to his Cabinet?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I do not propose to answer a series of questions in this Parliament today when the Minister for Finance has stood aside so that the ACB and other inquiries can take place. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to show at least some semblance of fairness and equity. All he has to do is give the guy a fair go. Inquiries are being made. Let them be concluded without the interference, innuendo and unsubstantiation of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 98 provides that the Minister is required to answer the substance of the question. There is no question of *sub judice* in the question simply because a police inquiry is being conducted. Ministers cannot hide behind that shield.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member is aware that it is entirely in the hands of Ministers whether or how they answer any question.

STATE BANK

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Premier advise this House whether the bail-out of the State Bank continues to have an impact on the people of South Australia in this the sixth anniversary of the bail-out of the bank?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I understand the embarrassment of the Opposition on this matter. This week marks the sixth anniversary of the first State Bank bail out. It was the first of some four bail outs. It seems so long ago, but the simple fact is it remains a reality for South Australians. Every week throughout the past three years Cabinet has had to take into account the level of debt we inherited from the mess of the previous Administration. We did not create it, but we are more than happy to accept the responsibility to clean it up, and clean it up we will. It is not a quick fix. We cannot wipe out billions of dollars worth of debt in a few years: like a house mortgage, it will take a number of years to reconstruct the finances of South Australia.

That is exactly what we are doing with a budget strategy the integrity of which will be kept intact. Each year we still pay a massive penalty in interest rates for those billions of Labor's debt. More than \$200 million a year in interest goes to bankers rather than to essential services. That was the legacy of the former Labor Administration—\$200 million a year. Think what that could do in terms of assisting health, education, police services, investment opportunities, the environment, Aborigines and small business in South

Australia. That is the constraint that is consistently applied to the Administration in South Australia.

We cannot simply meet those requirements of essential services because of Labor's debt, and I am reminded why we cannot spend more money when I look at the other side of the Chamber and see the Leader of the Opposition. He is the man who said that the State Bank was one of the greatest success stories of South Australia. Do you remember that quote? This is the man who said that Tim Marcus Clark's appointment to the State Bank was a major coup for South Australia. That is what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about Tim Marcus Clark. He is the man who said that the State Bank was a careful and prudent organisation—so much so that it handed us \$3.5 billion worth of debt in one swoop. That is the calibre of the man whom Labor has selected to lead it.

It proves that we should never again let Labor loose on the purse strings of South Australia. Day by day we sit in this Chamber and they demonstrate that they have no plans, no vision, no capacity to lead South Australia, and it demonstrates consistently that they have learnt nothing from the last 10 years or so. They do not deserve any consideration for a return to the Treasury benches. Rather, this Administration, with a budget strategy focusing on the future, is laying a foundation so that we can rebuild South Australia for future generations. That is the positive approach for the future.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier categorically rule out having spoken to the member for Mackillop about the serious allegations against him concerning conflict of interest and other improper dealings prior to Wednesday 5 February 1997?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier, if he wishes to answer.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I have consistently taken a view that the—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Answer the question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, what were you going to say? The Leader of the Opposition has retreated from what he was going to say because I was going to repeat it on the record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You are as slippery as they come. You would not know the truth if it hit you in the face.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gordon. If the House wants to continue in this manner, the Chair will call on the business of the day. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE: My point of order, Sir, is that the Premier is imputing improper motives of the Leader of the Opposition

and, under Standing Orders, he is required to withdraw. It is a bit rich of the Premier to talk about slipperiness.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. The Leader is present and, if he wants to object to a particular comment, he is entitled to do so. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will not participate in a political kangaroo court. The simple fact is that inquiries are taking place. Those inquiries might source advice from many areas. In a fair go for anybody, those inquiries ought to be able to proceed without political innuendo, unsubstantiated accusations or other red herrings that the Opposition wants to put on the agenda today. All I ask for you to do is simply give the guy a fair go.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Premier report to the House what steps are being taken to identify skills and careers in the information technology area and, additionally, to provide suitably qualified people in the short and longer term to work in the IT industry in this State?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Information Technology Workforce Strategy Office under the directorship of Mary Beasley has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of work force demands for information industries in South Australia. This is the first time such an analysis has been undertaken anywhere in Australia. The results indicate that experienced IT professionals are in short supply; the experience required by the industry is product specific; there is a decline in the number of secondary school students, particularly women, undertaking the subjects required to enter computer science or engineering courses; the rate of growth in salary packages is competitive and often exceeds interstate comparisons; and there is no difficulty in recruiting base grade students, although recruiting is undertaken outside South Australian educational institutions. Not only have we had the IT industry start to establish, grow and expand in South Australia but we also have the defence and electronics industries, which have a significant demand for software engineers.

The Workforce Strategy Office is addressing these industry needs by implementing the following (and this is a very important step forward): two new chairs in IT at three South Australian universities, with universities assisting with another two chairs, to assist in the expansion of the State's IT research and development capabilities presentation 'Adelaide Advantage' to target IT professionals which will be held in Canberra shortly. Participating companies supporting this include British Aerospace, Motorola, Vision Systems and Celsiustech. In addition, an Adelaide web site has also been established to support the presentation, with links to web sites of participating companies providing direct information on job opportunities in South Australia.

The Economic Development Authority and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs are assisting with two immigration trade fairs, one in London, which will assist the focus on utilising Adelaide's advantage. With assistance from DETAFE and AITEC, a highly interactive careers guide CD ROM will be produced for release to all secondary school students and career counsellors to inform young South Australians clearly of the range of opportunities that is emerging in the defence, electronics and IT industries in

South Australia. Overall, it is part of a campaign to focus on initiatives in and around the State to heighten investment in the IT industry in South Australia.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to meet with senior officials from Motorola who were visiting from the United States. The Corporate Vice President told me that the Adelaide Software Centre is now highly regarded worldwide. It employs 145 staff, 65 per cent of whom are from South Australia and represent some 25 countries—a true blend of a multicultural society within Motorola itself. The other organisations have participated in presentations. They did a recent presentation for General Motors in Melbourne, where the remark was made that a team working on the new Saturn model had doubled its productivity since its use of Motorola and the Software Centre based here in Adelaide. This is an example of South Australian expertise and technology talent being recognised worldwide. Those are other reasons why South Australians should be proud of the emerging and growing IT base and the professional basis upon which we are proceeding in the future.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier request the anti-corruption branch to inquire into the relationship between the former Minister for Primary Industries, the member for MacKillop, and the person who made an offer of \$120 000 on 30 August 1994 to purchase the same parcel of land that had been the subject of an earlier offer from the former Minister's Banksia Company? The offer, dated 30 August 1994, said the purchaser wanted to buy the land for growing banksias. The bid was made on a letter with a fax header under the name R.H. and S.L. Crawford.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will not direct or request the Anti-Corruption Branch to do anything. The suggestion from the Opposition is absolutely outrageous. On its own initiative, the branch will take any course, make any inquiries, search for any document and undertake any investigations it wishes without, I hope, political interference from anybody. I would ask the Opposition, in a simple test of fairness and equity to another individual, to give him a fair go and let the inquiry take place unimpeded by the Opposition's continuing unsubstantiated accusations across this Chamber.

CRIME STOPPERS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister for Police inform the House on the success of the Crime Stoppers operation? The Crime Stoppers operation has now been advertised widely across the State for a period of more than six months as the contact point for members of the public wishing to report a crime to the police.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Crime Stoppers program has been an exceptionally successful program, and it appears that the public of South Australia have relished this opportunity. A total of 2 250 calls have come in from the public; there have been 305 apprehensions for almost 370 offences that have occurred; stolen property valued close to \$600 000 has been recovered; and nine rewards totalling \$2 500 have been paid out. The most significant arrest was that which occurred in relation to the offender involved in the two execution style murders at Lonsdale last year. After the first month, the ratio of apprehensions to call was one in 24, and it has improved every month to be now one in eight. The information coming in from Crime Stoppers callers has

resulted in the apprehensions of breakers, thieves, prolific con men, and drug dealers and growers.

The Police Commissioner has asked me to put on the record again that the Crime Stoppers telephone number is 1 800 333, or 000 between the times of 8 and 10 p.m., seven days a week. It is a very successful program in which the community and the police are working together to solve a lot of otherwise unsolved issues in this State.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Premier's last answer to my questions, does that mean that the police anti-corruption inquiry will be free to investigate allegations that the member for MacKillop used his ministerial position improperly in relation to personal business transactions in Hong Kong and the ordering of a departmental report designed to advantage a business in which he had a financial interest?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: South Australia ought to stop and have a look at the way in which this Opposition is behaving today, because the behaviour we are witnessing is absolutely outrageous. Here we have a position where the police, who rightfully will take no instruction from anybody—including me—are unfettered in the way in which they can make their inquiries. I do not know what they will look at. They could look at any manner of things; they are entitled to do so and, in the discharge of their duties, I would assume would do so. I can assure you of one thing, Mr Speaker: I will not be goaded by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in taking any precipitous action. I will not be goaded by the Deputy Leader to participate in any way in a political kangaroo court. I simply ask that for an individual who is subject to inquiry and investigation it be left to the respective authorities to pursue those inquiries and investigation without any political interference.

The behaviour of members opposite is outrageous, as is the series of questions that has been posed in this Chamber today. Members opposite are demonstrating to the broader South Australian public that they are interested, in this an election year, only in political point scoring: they are not interested in major issues that affect and impact on the lives of South Australians. I can assure the Deputy Leader that the public of South Australia is interested in rebuilding the economy of this State: it is not interested in pursuing unreasonably this line of questioning within the Parliament. It is a total abuse of the parliamentary proceedings within this Parliament.

But there is an interesting point that we ought note: the Leader of the Opposition did not participate in asking a question yesterday. Here we are, halfway through Question Time today, and the Leader of the Opposition has not asked a question, and what is the moral to that? The Opposition knows that this is a bit sleazy. The Leader wants to shift a little further down the line. The Opposition wants to undertake point scoring, but the Leader of the Opposition does not want to be closely associated. We know how closely associated he is: he drafted the questions.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Housing and Urban Development inform the House on the progress of a new electronic service for the State's development plan? I

understand that there are moves to provide an electronic development plan for the entire State and to make it available on a CD-ROM and on the Internet.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: On Saturday I launched the CD-ROM containing the development plans of all councils within the metropolitan area. The advantages of having these development plans on CD-ROM are many, not the least of which is the capacity for anyone to examine boundary lines and zoning requirements for a particular area, or any area with which they may have some association or in which they may wish to do business. As far as I am aware, this CD-ROM is the first of its type in Australia, and I congratulate the department for its initiative in placing this material on CD-ROM.

Importantly, by April all such details for the whole State will be included on CD-ROM and will be regularly updated. The next step is to have that material on the Internet for those people who would wish to access such information. Anyone who has had any association with development plans and tried to plough through a whole block of paper knows that it is a very tedious exercise. The CD-ROM has an index system, which makes it very easy for interested people to access the relevant details. The CD-ROM will assist planning; it will assist people who want to make business decisions; and it will assist householders, councils and everyone concerned.

As I said, on Saturday I launched the first of the series; by April details for the whole of the State will be included; and this material will also be on the Internet. In this respect South Australia is really showing the way to the rest of Australia.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. What delegation does the Manager of South-East Forests have to purchase land on behalf of the Government, and on whose authority did the Manager make a written offer on 14 July 1994 to purchase the property known as Gouldana on behalf of the Government for \$600 000? Minutes from the diary of the Elders agent, dated 6 June 1994, record advice to Elders from Mr Allan Gray, Manager of South-East Forests, and state:

Rang Allan Gray—message—all complete waiting for written confirmation from NVA (Native Vegetation Authority) before presenting to Minister.

The second minute, dated 15 June, records further advice to the agent from Mr Gray as follows:

Rang Allan Gray. Received letter from NVA today. Draft letter tomorrow or Friday. At Dale's office Friday or early next week.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Obviously the Deputy Leader has not been listening to the Premier. As he should know—if he knows anything at all about Government—officers, Ministers, or whoever, have different levels of delegation with respect to decisions that can be made. The Deputy Leader's question went on for quite a while: I will take his question on notice and bring back a considered reply.

WAGES, SAFETY NET

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CAUDELL: Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs advise the House what action the State Government is taking to ensure that employees in most need have access to a proper safety net, which includes affordable wage increases in their industrial awards, if they are unable to negotiate wage agreements with their employers? The Australian Industrial Relations Commission has heard the national wage case which will decide whether safety net wage increases will be payable to employees, and the South Australian Government has had the opportunity to put forward a submission on this issue.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Members of the House would recall that, more than three years ago when we were proposing our policy on changes to industrial relations, there were cries from the Opposition that people on the lowest salaries in South Australia would be the worst affected by the new industrial relations laws being proposed by the Liberal Government. It is interesting now, three years later, to look back and show what history has achieved for those people because, quite clearly, under this Liberal Government there have been three \$8 a week safety nets, totalling \$24, and a hearing is currently before the Australian Industrial Relations Commission for a further \$8 which this State Liberal Government is supporting and which will therefore take it to four \$8 increases, making a total of \$32.

For someone earning about \$400 a week that means an 8 per cent increase over that period, and for exactly the same period the inflation rate has been 8.7 per cent. Clearly, under the industrial policies of this Liberal Government, despite the fear mongering before the election campaign and immediately afterwards, we have maintained the real wages of the people at the lowest level through that safety net provision. In fact, for people in the public sector the increase so far has been \$36, with a further anticipated \$8, making a total of \$44, or an 11 per cent increase during a period when the inflation rate was 8.7 per cent.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It highlights the embarrassment to the Opposition. It highlights the fact that, as we said at the time of introducing enterprise agreements and other industrial changes, we would look after those people who needed the help through the safety net provision. That is exactly what we have done, and it shows that, under enterprise bargaining, the people who some assumed would be the worst affected have been protected and have maintained their real salary throughout that period. Therefore, I wonder whether Opposition members might like to go back and look at some of the outrageous comments they made at the time, particularly prior to the 1993 election.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. Did the member for MacKillop, while he was Minister for Primary Industries, direct his department to conduct research into matters affecting the production of proteas and, if so, was it against the advice of the department, was the report kept confidential, and will the Minister now table a copy of that report?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was largely answered yesterday, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister may respond in respect of those areas that were not answered yesterday.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: My only awareness of this protea report is from yesterday's *Hansard*, when the Deputy Leader suggested that the former Minister for Primary Industries asked for work to be done on something in which he had an interest so that he could then use the results. I did a bit of digging around this morning within the department and discovered that the approval for that project was granted in 1991-92.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I know that the Deputy Leader has a very short memory, but I believe that Labor was in power at that time. Again, as the Premier has said, one of the problems with this House and with the way we have protection is that one can throw anything around as an accusation and hope that it sticks. As I said, the protea project was approved in 1991-92, and that is the only project of which I can find any record. It was initiated by the department, and not by any Minister. It was undertaken by using Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation funds. It ended in 1993-94. At the end of the research the report was submitted and accepted for publication. From what I can gather this morning, there was no pressure on anyone to suppress the results.

I hope that the media and the public take note of how one matter which we laid our hands on immediately and which arose in this House yesterday has been misleading. That is the only report of which I can find any record. But, as the Premier said, the member for MacKillop, like any other Australian or anyone else, deserves a fair trial. To throw allegations around in here under the shroud of protection that we have is wrong. I do not think that what was said yesterday was at all helpful. I have put what I have been able to ascertain as the facts on the record. I hope that those who took note of what was said yesterday take note of this and put it into context.

HEALTH, PUBLIC

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Health inform the House whether he considers his criticism of Professor Lane's assessment of the performance of the public health service in South Australia was warranted?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Davenport for his question because it is a very important matter. As the House would know, last week I tabled a report by Professor Michael Lane on the 1994 HUS (haemolytic uraemic syndrome) outbreak in South Australia. On Thursday in a grievance speech in this House the member for Elizabeth accused the Government of having failed to respond to the Coroner's report. I notice that the member for Elizabeth is nodding. She did not claim that our response had not been inadequate: the member for Elizabeth said that we had done nothing. That assertion flies in the face of the facts, and I will provide a couple of examples. We have employed seven additional officers in the public health area. We have reviewed the Food Act and released a discussion paper very widely. A dual system of notifying doctors was put in place in June 1995 before the Coroner's report was tabled, and we have gazetted amendments to the Food Standards Code in relation to the microbiological quality of source meat and finished product. We have done a lot.

I am surprised that the member for Elizabeth does not recall these initiatives. Frankly, I am amazed that she can claim, as she did last Thursday, that we have done nothing. As Opposition spokesperson in the debate on the Public and Environmental Health (Notification of Diseases) Bill on 11 April 1996 she acknowledged that that Bill was part of the response to the Coroner's report. She said:

We support all measures in relation to implementation of the recommendations of the Coroner following the Garibaldi case, and this is one of those, so we . . . support it.

That was on 11 April 1996. Less than a week ago in this Chamber the member for Elizabeth said that we had done nothing. It simply belies the facts. It is surprising that less than 12 months ago she acknowledged that she was speaking in a debate in this House about one of the things in response to the Coroner's report. Yet less than a week ago, which is less than 12 months since she took on the important role of speaking in Parliament to make a law for South Australia—and acknowledged that this was one of the measures—she conveniently forgot about it. Either she is totally baseless and shameless and makes nothing but political capital out of human tragedy—which is possibly true—or she has absolutely no credibility whatsoever.

The Hon. E.S. Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Yes, or all of the above. In her speech the honourable member also questioned why the Government needed Professor Lane to investigate the outbreak. This was in spite of the honourable member having questioned me—

An honourable member: Who is 'she'?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Members know about whom I speak. This was in spite of the honourable member having questioned me in the House on 30 July 1996 as to whether Professor Lane would investigate the outbreak. She cannot have it both ways: either the member for Elizabeth wants Professor Lane to report on HUS or she does not. I would encourage members to look at the report. It did not ask whether the Health Commission did a good or a bad job. The report focuses on how the commission fared in comparison with other public health authorities around the world.

On the basis of academic articles and publicly available information, Professor Lane found that our services performed at world-class level. Does the member for Elizabeth believe that the data is concocted? Does she believe that Appendix B, with its five pages of data of case studies, was fabricated? Does she think the studies detailing 353 HUS cases and 64 deaths around the world were figments of Professor Lane's imagination? Obviously not.

The claims that, first, we did not do it and, secondly, that this is a whitewashed report are clearly false. The member for Elizabeth would rather grieve than think; she would rather carp than consult. If the Opposition cannot muster a vision for public health in the quiet tranquillity of public health, how can the voters of South Australia have any hope that it can do that job when it is in Government which, I am assured, will be many elections hence?

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. On how many occasions have documents or tapes requested of the South Australian Tourism Commission under freedom of information been destroyed or corrupted before they were handed over? In response to its FOI request, the Opposition has received a tape of the 16

October 1996 meeting of the South Australian Tourism Commission Board. A key portion of that tape was corrupted before it reached the Opposition, and an accompanying letter signed by Ms Judith Hughes of the Crown Solicitor's office confirms this. In a subsequent telephone conversation with me, Ms Hughes confirmed that this corruption occurred on 4 December 1996. On 5 December 1996 Ms Hughes was named by the Deputy Premier as the person who had witnessed a statutory declaration tabled by him during a no confidence motion against him in this House.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The question relates to the time during which I was the Minister and therefore it is better that I answer it. The honourable member opposite received a letter from the Crown Solicitor advising her that, during the typing up of that tape, the Crown Solicitor's staff made an error. The honourable member has received that information signed off by the Crown Solicitor. This is an absolute beat-up, and a beat-up in the sense—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the second time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The reason it was a beat-up is that there was a deliberate attempt to notify the honourable member as to what had happened and how it occurred. It was given to the honourable member freely—

Ms White interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is out of order.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Crown Solicitor's Office gave it direct to the honourable member. As the honourable member is aware, it had no bearing on the question of the tape from which the honourable member wanted to obtain information. It had nothing to do with it at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If members do not want Question Time, they can carry on this banter across the Chamber and the Chair will not give the call to anyone. It is entirely in the hands of the House.

SOUTHERN SPORTS COMPLEX

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Recreation and Sport advise the House of the current status of negotiations between the South Adelaide Football Club and the newly formed South Adelaide Soccer Club over joint use of the Southern Sports Complex?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am delighted to answer the question and, although I did it last week, I will again commend the member for Kaurna for the interest she shows in her electorate and the untiring effort she puts into it. I have made some visits down there with the member for Kaurna, and everyone says one thing: 'It is really good at last to have a member down here who works.' The member for Kaurna works tirelessly for her electorate, and this Southern Sports Complex is one issue on which she has made many representations. It is important that we get some facts on the table, because I understand that Opposition members are again spreading some rather unpleasant untruths down there about what is occurring. Let us lay all that to rest.

Some 12 months ago a local task force undertook a study to identify what other sports could be accommodated within the Southern Sports Complex, a large complex and one with the capacity for more use than has previously been the case. This study found that there was a significant need for the establishment of a premier league soccer club in the southern

suburbs of Adelaide because many young, skilled soccer players were missing out on either being able to take up the game altogether or being able to go on to the higher levels of the sport. Following an initial approach from the task force, the South Adelaide Football Club was approached about the possibility of jointly sharing the existing oval facilities.

Over a period of some six months it is understood that this club has been carefully considering how it can accommodate that request. Advice that I have been given indicates that the football club has been both very diligent and very willing to try to work out a joint use agreement. My advice further indicates that the club has at all times remained very open to and supportive of any proposals put to it. However, its ability to participate has been somewhat restricted by the current heavy demand being placed on the existing oval complex by Australian rules. I am aware of the challenges now before the Government from various sporting interests to meet the burgeoning demand for sporting facilities everywhere, and I am very pleased by the genuine efforts being made by the South Adelaide Football Club and the soccer community to work together cooperatively to ensure that maximum benefits are achieved for all residents, no matter what sport they play in the southern suburbs.

As I indicated to the House last week, the Government is currently reviewing the long-term facility needs. The Government is aware of the enormous enthusiasm for soccer and for Aussie rules, and I am pleased that those two codes are working so well together to try to bring about a resolution. Despite the interjections from members opposite who, of course, do not like one little bit hearing that there is a member in the south—in fact, there are members in the south—working hard for her community, she has brought two codes together to resolve a problem, and she will do that despite the efforts of the Opposition.

HOSPITALS, COUNTRY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Why has the establishment of regional health administrations resulted in a cut to funding for patient care and threatened the closure of small country hospitals? The Opposition has been informed that the cost to operate each health region is about \$300 000, financed from the budgets of country health units. A letter to the Minister dated 7 January 1997 from the Balaklava and Riverton District Health Service says that the introduction of regions has created confusion, reduced their budget for patient care by \$68 200 and introduced another tier of administration. The letter also says that a policy of attracting doctors to regional centres will result in the closure of small country hospitals.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Politics is an amazing game; it never ceases to be interesting. One of the reasons why it is so interesting is the propensity of the member for Elizabeth, particularly, to completely obliterate the past and distort the present. If I went anywhere into the country we could almost set up a chant of people who were interested in rural and country health: Blyth, Laura, Taillem Bend, Minlaton; Blyth, Laura, Taillem Bend, Minlaton. And on it would go. The hospitals in those towns were closed under the administration of the previous Labor Government. We know, as I am sure that the Labor Party then knew, that the closure of a small country hospital puts in jeopardy the economy of the whole town. If there is no hospital to which a doctor can admit patients, the doctor tends to leave the town. If the doctor leaves the town, there is no incentive for teachers,

police and other people to stay. So, there is a dropping off in the population in the town.

If there is a dropping off in the number of people in the town, the greengrocers, the butchers and so on start to be in jeopardy as well. We know that and the Labor Party knew that before, but, regardless of those economic consequences for people in the country, it went ahead and closed the hospitals, because it does not care about people in rural areas. Here in stark contrast is the difference between the Liberal Party in government and the Labor Party in government: recognising that country hospitals are a vital part of country communities, we provide what is known in the jargon as a Rural Access Grant. We provide a Rural Access Grant to nearly 20 hospitals around South Australia. Each of those hospitals, if we were economic rationalists—which we are not—would be subject to closure because they are non-economic. But we know what effect that would have on the rural economy and we will not do it.

Not only does that illustrate the difference between the Liberal Party in government and the discredited Labor Party in government, because it went ahead and closed four hospitals (and I understand that there were more on the books; who knows where they might have been), it also demonstrates the complete distortion of the facts of the present, which the member for Elizabeth has built up an unenviable and unfortunate propensity to do. The member for Elizabeth has questioned me on these matters in Estimates Committees and she has questioned me frequently on these matters across the Chamber. I have continually talked about rural access grants; I have continually said that no small country hospital will be subject to closure under a Liberal Government, but one can only imagine what would happen, if by some unfortunate circumstance, Government were to change.

STATE BANK

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and Family and Community Services detail what long-term impacts have been caused by the \$3.1 billion State Bank loss on his portfolio areas of environment and natural resources and family and community services? Day after day constituents come into my electorate office concerned about the massive billions of dollars lost to this State and the impact it is having on not only themselves but both their families and their children's future.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As the Premier indicated earlier, today we are celebrating—if we could refer to it as celebrating—the sixth anniversary of the blow-out of the State Bank in South Australia. Taking into account the question and also the explanation given by the member for Mawson regarding the concern throughout the community about the loss of that funding—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Exactly; day after day we get that. I thought it would be a good idea if I looked at how we could have spent that \$3.1 billion and I have done a few quick sums. As far as the environment is concerned, members might be interested to know that we could have built the Mount Lofty redevelopment 800 times over. It would have been enough to clean up the entire Murray-Darling Basin which spans Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia—and recognising the importance of that program—10 times. We could have upgraded every one of

our waste treatment plants in this State 20 times over and, if we measured it in the cost of trees that could have been planted in this State, we would have had enough money to plant more than 51 billion trees.

Instead, with that money down the drain, the road has not been easy for any one of the Cabinet members or anyone working with this Government, but in getting on with the job we have still managed to bring the Mount Lofty redevelopment to fruition as an environmental and international standard attraction. We have still been able to lead the rest of this country in the clean-up of the Murray River, and that is recognised nationally.

Also as Minister for Family and Community Services I am reminded far too often, as we all are reminded, of the direct link between family crisis and unemployment. There is no doubt that the State Bank issue has caused significant hardship to South Australian families in so many different ways, but particularly through the spin-off effects of unemployment. There is no doubt that many cases of family breakdown, family crisis, poverty and domestic violence have resulted from the State Bank fall-out which brought with it a lack of employment opportunities in so many areas.

Interestingly enough, the State Bank fiasco was also mirrored by a sharp and sudden rise through the Department for Family and Community Services in the demand by average South Australians for financial counselling, and that is why this Government has a strong economic focus to restore the economy, restore jobs and provide families with greater hope, greater financial stability and greater harmony within the home. Despite the inherited financial mess, in the area of family and community services this Government has boosted total funding out of the Department for Family and Community Services through family support services and varying forms of care from \$75 million a year under Labor to well in excess of \$100 million currently, and that is the first time on record that that type of assistance has been provided to the non-government sector in this State.

The job has not been easy. Some very hard decisions have had to be made by this Government, and that is part of the process of getting on and rebuilding South Australia for all South Australians, but it is interesting to note what we could have done for all South Australians if it had not been for the fact of the mismanagement of the previous Government regarding that issue.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the eleventh report, fourth session, of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

SHINE

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Minister for Industrial Affairs): I lay on the table the ministerial statement made earlier today in another place by the Minister for the Arts relating to the film *Shine*, which, I am sure all members would appreciate, early this morning was nominated for seven academy awards in the United States. We wish those

involved with *Shine*—the actors, the director and so on—all the very best for the finals.

JETTIES

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Minister for Industrial Affairs): I also lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to a jetty agreement made in another place by the Minister for Transport.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BASS (Florey): I feel a little like George Washington: I cannot tell a lie; I am the person who made the mystery phone call yesterday. Let us look at this mystery phone call yesterday. Towards the end of Question Time yesterday, it was obvious that the Labor Party had run out of questions. It was so obvious that the member for Playford had to ask a question about a matter he had discussed with the Minister personally some days previously. Realising that the Opposition had run out of questions, I discussed it with my colleague the member for Reynell and I said, 'Why don't we not help them?' As the Deputy Whip, I assist the Whip in giving questions to Ministers and I had a couple of good questions about the economy and jobs, so I thought I would ask whether they would like some help.

I picked up the phone and rang the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I asked him in my normal voice—not as he said on 5AN 'in a secret voice' as if I was choking—'Have you run out of questions, Ralph? I have a couple of good ones on jobs; do you want one?' He was amazed and looked around the Chamber. I burst out laughing. I turned the phone off. I turned to the member for Reynell and said, 'The fool does not even know who rang him.' Now let us look at the seriousness of this phone call. During the phone call I did not mention Dale Baker, nor did I mention anything like 'We will bring heaps across the floor' or 'We will supply you'—not a word. The member for Reynell was listening to me. The article in the *Advertiser* this morning states:

Mr Clarke's call was from a Liberal MP sitting on the other side of the Chamber—

he got that bit right—

He was offering further documents which would embarrass Mr Baker.

I think the honourable member thought that maybe the member who made the phone call would not stand up and say he had made it. As soon as I saw this article this morning, I thought, 'We have got you' and I rang the Premier. I said, 'Premier, I have to confess it was I who made the phone call' and I told him what was said. Members opposite cannot accept something: they have to twist it and tell porkies. They cannot deal with the facts: they have to take something and embellish it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition needs to deal in facts. If he looks in the dictionary, he will see that the word 'facts' appears between the words 'fabrication' and 'fool', and I can tell him one he does and one he is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had more than a fair go. If he wants to participate in proceedings today and if he wants the call in Question Time tomorrow, he must conduct himself in an

appropriate manner, or I will apply Standing Order 137, and on this occasion he will be put out for four days.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I do not know why I have been dragged into this issue by the member for Florey. Yesterday I asked a question about photo gun licences, which had been in my drawer for a week or more. Now I find out that we were so short of questions that I had to ask that question. We had so many questions that I could not ask it last week. I let this go by, but the Minister said yesterday that he had discussed the matter with me the week before. His recollection of my meeting with him is a bit different. I think he must be talking about someone else, because I met with the Minister at his request. He was the new Minister for Police and we had a discussion, ironically about almost everything except photo gun licences. As members know, I do not go into who discusses what with whom, particularly between a Minister and a shadow Minister. I did not raise the issue with him, but I did not say anything yesterday because it did not seem material to the debate.

The photo gun licence issue is becoming a bit of a saga. I get it every night at home because my missus wants her photo gun licence. She spent \$10 last year, and she feels ripped off. She met all the requirements by 8 November, she presented herself, and she queued up with a number of other people to have her photo taken. She paid \$10. Her licence expired on 31 January, as mine did. I rolled up a day or two later, well before the November deadline, and had my photograph taken.

I do not care about photos that are taken of me. When you are a member of Parliament and blokes up in the gallery stalk you every day with lenses that you can kill chickens with, you do not worry too much about extra photos. I have no idea what the Minister was on about as to the extra photos. It does not matter to me. If he is worried that there are too many photos of me circulating, that is very nice of him, and I take that kindness with the courtesy with which it is extended.

At the end of the day, I had my picture taken and I paid \$40, because I wanted my licence to extend from 31 January this year to 31 January next year. Why should I pay \$10 for two or three months just to see my photo on my licence? I figured that I might as well pay \$40 now and get it over and done with, so I did. The woman behind the counter said that everything was fine and I would get the licence in the mail. About six weeks later I received a telephone call saying that all was not quite right and that I had to provide a certificate. I said that I was told that I did not have to do that but I would do as asked. Two days later I went back and produced a certificate.

About a month later, I got a letter in the mail asking me to sign my name on another piece of paper because the way I signed the application was too big. I signed it again, and a month or so later I got it back again because my signature went outside the boundary of the space, which is only one centimetre high. I practised a miniature signature so I could fit it in. I sent it off, and six weeks later I still have not got it.

I am not worried about it, but my missus is, because she had to go through the whole process again for the 31 January expiry date, and she would like her \$10 back. She paid \$10 to have her photo put on a licence that expired over a month ago. She reckons that she has been defrauded and she would like her money back. She has been on my back for several weeks asking, 'When Parliament comes back, can you ask for my \$10?' That is what that question yesterday was all about. My wife wants her \$10 back. Either that or give her the

licence that she feels she was cheated out of. She would not even mind the new licence, which still has not rocked up.

If they want to save 45¢, they can stick it in the same envelope as mine, because I would like mine, too, and so would a large number of other people. That is what that was all about. What the Minister said yesterday I let go through to the keeper because it was irrelevant. I do not care about my photo being around the place because there are thousands of them, just as long as it is not up on a post office wall.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I advise the honourable member that the photograph on my licence is so bad that I do not need a gun. I just show them the licence and they drop dead. I call the member for Kaurna.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I should like to comment on crime trends in South Australia. Recently, the Minister for Police tabled the Police Commissioner's report for 1995-96, showing that offences against the person had fallen nearly 3 per cent, including an 8.2 per cent decrease for rape and attempted rape and a 4.1 per cent drop for other sexual offences. Robbery with firearms decreased 36.8 per cent and robbery with other weapons dropped by 13 per cent. Murders fell by 54.8 per cent.

These falls have been due in part to initiatives such as Operation Home Protection and Operation Daybreak, which were aimed at preventing and detecting daytime house breaks. Break and enter offences are down by 11.4 per cent but small-time vandalism such as letterbox damage and brush fence fires has risen by 9 per cent. Theft and illegal use of motor vehicles has decreased by 3.5 per cent, and while on the topic of motor vehicle theft I place on record my congratulations to the police officers working out of the Aldinga Police Station who recently apprehended a suspect in connection with over 100 vehicle breaks and stolen car incidents which spread as far as Melbourne.

Minor assaults as a result of looking for money for drugs, the drugs themselves or any alcohol-related problems have risen by 2.7 per cent. The core issue is the drug problem, and I support most strongly more resources being put into drug detection and prosecution. Most alarmingly, the incidence of dangerous, reckless, negligent driving has increased by 15.9 per cent. Speed detection is an important program for road safety and should be pushed as hard as possible. Some people in our community believe that those issues are only revenue-raising exercises for the Government and are not aimed at road safety. The comment can simply be made that it is voluntary taxation and, without the driver's consent, no revenue is raised. The choice is entirely up to drivers.

I support the policy stand to restrict police attendances in response to alarms on houses, etc. Statistics show that 97 per cent of activated alarms to which the police responded on private and business premises were false alarms. The new policy means that police can spend more time doing what they should be doing and waste less time dealing with false alarms. The property owner needs to take good advice from the people installing the alarm and check whether they will be monitored. Much in the budget papers related to making the Police Department work more effectively and efficiently, and one example is the expenditure of \$655 000 to upgrade the South Australian Police Department's telephone interception equipment.

With regard to law and order issues, several Labor candidates are asking residents whether they know that there is a break-in every 15 minutes. Most of those candidates should have asked whether residents are aware that the

number of break-ins has dropped from one every 16.5 minutes under Labor to one every 15 minutes under the current Government. There is no point trying to make these inane, stupid statements. The comparison is wasted on most people.

It is most important to remind the community what has happened under the Liberal Government, and I advise a candidate in my area that, since I have been a member of this Liberal Government, we have not closed police stations but actually opened two police stations—one very successful police station at Aldinga and an equally successful station at Colonnades Shopping Centre. As well as that, we have increased police numbers at Christies Beach by five, five extra CIB police and a community liaison officer who, in the time he has been employed there, has set up Neighbourhood Watch programs over almost the entire electorate of Kaurna. I am very confident that by the end of this year every area within the electorate of Kaurna will be covered by Neighbourhood Watch.

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

Mr ROSSI (Lee): In today's grievance debate I will continue to report on the surveys that I have made in the electorate of Lee. In January I made a survey on local council issues. In answer to the question, 'Are there any problems in your street in regard to footpath, lighting and graffiti?', 49 per cent were quite happy and saw no problems. The problems identified were footpaths, 16 per cent; lighting, 11 per cent; graffiti, 13 per cent; dogs, 2 per cent; and miscellaneous issues, 9 per cent. Another question was, 'Should council have two wheelie bins, with green tops for household scraps and yellow tops for recyclables?' I raised this question because in the Charles Sturt council area we have flimsy plastic bags for recyclable material which are hooked around the handles of the green household scraps bin. With the wind blowing down the street—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: Would the member for Spence please be quiet and show a bit of courtesy instead of acting like a rabbit? The bags that are supposed to be used for plastic bottles and other recyclable items are usually found not near the rubbish bin but somewhere down the street, and when replacements are requested none are available. The response to that question was: 'Yes', 76 per cent; 'No', 20 per cent; and 'Don't know', 4 per cent. Other questions and responses were as follows:

'Should council clearly identify and enforce zones for general industry, light industry and residential?': 'Yes', 95 per cent; 'No', 2 per cent; and 'Don't know', 3 per cent.

'Should the State Government ban all waste transfer stations within 300 metres of all residential homes and food shops?': 'Yes', 67 per cent; 'No', 18 per cent; and 'Don't know', 15 per cent.

The next question I raised was about speed limits, given that I believe the State Government is thinking of implementing a residential speed limit of 40 km/h. The question was:

'Parts of Adelaide have successfully trialled a residential speed zone of 40 km/h. What is your opinion?'

The responses were:

'Yes', 64 per cent; 'No', 18 per cent; and 'Don't know', 18 per cent.

'Are there traffic problems in your street?': 'None', 55 per cent; 'speeding', 40 per cent; and 'illegal parking', 5 per cent.

'Are you happy with council services in your street?': 'Yes', 64 per cent; 'No', 28 per cent; and 'Don't know', 8 per cent.

I also undertook surveys on social issues, and some of the questions I asked and the responses were as follows:

'Are you a member of a trade union?': 'Yes', 32 per cent; and 'No', 68 per cent.

'Do you feel that poker machines are having an effect on your business or home relationship?': 'Yes', 16 per cent; 'No', 68 per cent; and 'Don't know', 16 per cent. 'If 'Yes', should poker machines be reduced from 40 to 20 machines per premises?': 'Yes', 100 per cent.

'Do you believe that there should be more or less spending on social welfare?': 'More', 21 per cent; 'Less', 53 per cent; and 'Don't know', 26 per cent.

'Do you believe that young people under 16 years [of age] should receive a living away from home allowance if they live within 25 kilometres of the home of their parents or guardians?': 'Yes', 16 per cent; 'No', 68 per cent; and 'Don't know', 16 per cent.

'Should the Department for Family and Community Services be compelled to advise parents of the whereabouts of their children who are under the age of 16 years?': 'Yes', 90 per cent; 'No', 0; and 'Don't know', 10 per cent.

I raised that last question because some parents have come to me during my time as a member of Parliament complaining that the police and FACS were not telling them where their children aged 16 years and younger had gone. Most of these young children had been given cheap South Australian Housing Trust accommodation, were hanging around other undesirable people and were involved in drugs and other illegal activities. The survey also asked: 'Are you in favour of a policy which requires minimum work for unemployment benefits?' The responses were:

'Yes', 95 per cent; 'No', 0; and 'Don't know', 5 per cent.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Much has been said in this place about jobs, and I have spoken on a number of occasions on the issue of unemployment. One of the great contributors to unemployment in this State is the staff reduction in State and Federal public sector services. One of the key issues relates to the short term contracts of employment that are offered in the State public sector. Constituents have contacted me regarding this matter and in particular I will relate a very sad story. My constituents' daughter and son-in-law have now had to leave their relatively newly acquired home and move to Victoria to gain employment, because the son-in-law was on a three-year contract in South Australia which ceased and he was no longer able to pick up work. This means that their whole lives have been turned upside down and the State has lost a professional who was at the top of his field at that time.

This family and many others would have liked to stay in Adelaide and contribute to South Australia's development. The family has stated that three-year contracts are not conducive to employee qualitative and quantitative productive capacity and that their son-in-law was always looking over his shoulder and worried about what would happen after his three-year term expired. Additionally, it was put to me that often people on these contracts have a wage structure that is well below that which they earned when they were employed in a permanent capacity. The house that this family had bought has now been left in the hands of the parents-in-law to oversee until sale, and this is not only an emotional burden but also a financial burden on them.

We must ask why Public Service contracts have such a limited tenure. If it is due to some sort of funding constraints then perhaps these projects should be designed with more

care and thought, because families want real jobs. This family in particular wanted to stay here in South Australia, because we have a wonderful State. If we are able to get qualitative and quantitative productive capacity from employees they must be given adequate job security through longer tenures. A member of the Government recently strongly attacked economics being placed over and above human and social dimensions, and I applaud the honourable member for his comments. The destabilising and segregation of families as a result of inadequate periods of job tenure for families instils little confidence in a State that is already lacking the confidence of many business sectors.

Much of our talent is lost to other States, because those States are going forwards and not backwards, as is this State. We know that our housing industry is suffering, and much of that can be attributed to insecurity of employment. So, on behalf of this and other families that have contacted me—because these parents want their children back in South Australia—I say that this is an issue that needs to be looked at. As my constituents have said to me, they believe their daughter and son-in-law will never buy a house again, because they fear for job security. They do not believe that their family will be coming back to South Australia, because in their son-in-law's field it is unlikely that he will be given a longer term contract than three years, and they do not believe that they can raise a family on that. I urge the Government to look at this situation.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It was interesting listening to that last contribution to the grievance debate. One can only say that the member for Torrens and, indeed, the whole Labor Party should have a close look in the mirror. What the member for Torrens just described is the impact that 10 years of deplorable Government by the South Australian Labor Party had on South Australia. In essence, most of what she describes is correct. However, she did not go on to discuss talking up the community and suggesting ways of exploring opportunities that may have been open to her constituents' family. What it clearly identifies, as has been highlighted in this House time and again, is that the Labor Party has learnt nothing. I remind the community of South Australia that the problems that have occurred in the past rest solely on the shoulders of the South Australian Labor Party and, in particular, on the shoulders of the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mike Rann who, during the debacle experienced in this State, was the Minister for Infrastructure and Minister for Small Business and Regional Development.

During that time, more than 33 000 jobs were lost in South Australia. There was a massive exodus of headquarters from this State, a run-down in capital infrastructure, and in the period 1983 to 1993, as I have said before in the House, there was an accumulation of \$6 billion or \$7 billion worth of deficit. That is why the member for Torrens has a few problems with some constituents not getting jobs and not being able to see a future in South Australia. Again, clearly to blame—and justifiably so—are the Leader of the Opposition, who was a senior Cabinet Minister, and the incompetent Labor Party when it was in office.

I would like to talk about the positive things that are happening. I note that the Leader of the Opposition has just come into the Chamber. Last week, I called for him to table in this Chamber the doctored and totally fabricated report on police he claimed to have from Christies Beach. It is now a week since I called for that and, surprise, surprise, no document has been tabled. I trust that I will soon get that

document from another area, and then I will be able to continue on from what has been said by the Premier and the member for Florey today, that is, exploit the absolute fabrication and lack of respect for South Australian intelligence demonstrated by the Leader of the Opposition and his Party. Again, I ask the Leader of the Opposition, before Parliament rises this week, to table that phoney, doctored document with which he manipulated some of his Labor candidate colleagues—or at least one of them, I would suggest.

I would like to talk about the good news story of the McLaren Vale and Fleurieu Visitor Centre. Today, after three years of solid work, as Chairman of the board, I had the privilege to be able to hold our first board meeting in this brand new centre. Whilst the official opening will not occur for some time yet, I was delighted to see in that report that since 4 January, even though we have not spent any money on promoting the centre's opening—other than on a few billboards—and even though we have not completed our interpretive display, film production or the landscaping, up to 300 visitors have come through that visitor centre on any given day, averaging 1 000 visitors per week. That indicates that 1 000 hospitality, tourism and other economic opportunities per week are now being catered for in South Australia, in the south in particular, which was neglected for so long by the previous Government.

I would like to commend all the volunteer board members who have worked so diligently with me during the past three years, both as working party members and those who are now board members. They have great expertise. It has been pretty tough at times deliberating on all the issues, trying to build a centre, set up strategic tourism development plans, and coordinate and facilitate better opportunities for regional development boards and tourism marketing authorities, whether they are in the greater part of the Fleurieu Peninsula or the northern part.

Finally, I want to place on the record in this House something in which I strongly believe. I know that the Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism Marketing Board is looking to try to redetermine the boundary. Whilst I commend the work it has done as a board, and I will support it and encourage it to continue in the future, I also commend the work that the McLaren Region Tourism Association, particularly under the leadership of Mr Mike Vandeleur, has done for the southern region. Although I know it is proposing that the boundary should split at the Onkaparinga River, I will not support a split in that direction.

**SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION
(COMMENCEMENT OF REGULATIONS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Subordinate Legislation Act, 1978* was amended in 1992 to include a new section 10AA which provides that a regulation that is

required to be laid before Parliament comes into operation four months after the day on which it is made or from such later date as is specified in the regulation. Section 10AA, goes on to provide that a regulation may come into operation on an earlier date specified in the regulation if the Minister responsible for the administration of the Act under which the regulation is made certifies that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary or appropriate that the regulation come into operation on an earlier date. Section 10A was also amended to provide that if a Minister issues a certificate under section 10AA the Minister must cause a report setting out the reasons for the issue of the certificate to the Legislative Review Committee as soon as practicable after the making of the regulation.

The amendments were the initiative of Mr Martyn Evans, the Independent member for Elizabeth. Early in 1992 Mr Evans had introduced a Private Member's Bill which provided that regulations would not come into effect until four months after they were made, with the exception that those regulations that came into effect less than 4 months after they were made stayed in effect for only 12 months and then they had to be remade so that they could continue.

The then Government thought that this would create confusion and in discussion with Mr Evans arrived at the scheme which is now in the Act.

Mr Evans' rationale for the amendments was twofold. Firstly, to give the public and business the opportunity of examining in detail the regulations that will bind them and determine the problems which might exist with them and how they can implement them in their own life or business. The second rationale was to give Parliament the opportunity to examine, unfettered by the fact the regulation has already come into operation, whether or not it wishes to veto the provision as part of the normal disallowance process.

For a variety of very good reasons Ministers frequently certify that it is necessary or appropriate for regulations to come into operation on a date earlier than four months after the day on which the regulations are made. Often regulations need to be made, or amended, before an Act can come into operation and unless a Ministerial certificate is given the Act cannot come into operation until four months after the regulations have been promulgated, which may be some time after the legislation has been enacted. Such a delay in the operation of legislation would not be good administration particularly where regulations have been developed in consultation with an industry with the intention that the Act and regulations should come into operation together as occurred, for example, with the occupational licensing legislation and is occurring with the new community titles legislation.

Since mid-July 1992, when the amendments came into operation, Ministers have certified that it is necessary or appropriate for somewhere in the vicinity of 75 per cent of regulations to come into operation earlier than four months from the making of the regulation.

These figures suggest that the rationale for the introduction of the 1992 amendments has not been realised. This Bill amends the relevant provision of the Act to require that Ministers provide not just "reasons" for bringing a regulation into operation early, but "detailed reasons" for so doing. The Government, however, takes the view that in practice, as opposed to any theoretical reasons that may be advanced for the provisions, the rationale cannot be realised. If the rationale cannot be realised, no point is served by retaining sections 10AA and 10A(1a). The requirements of these sections have proved to be no more than an extra step which must be taken before regulations can come into operation, and the Government will be moving amendments to the Bill to reflect this position.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 10A—Regulations to be referred to Legislative Review Committee

This clause amends section 10A of the principal Act to require that Ministers provide detailed reasons for giving a certificate under section 10AA(2) (i.e. for bringing a regulation into operation before the expiry of the four month period set under section 10AA).

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAS (APPLIANCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

DEVELOPMENT (PRIVATE CERTIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill makes two important amendments to the *Stamp Duties Act 1923*.

The primary amendment proposed in this Bill seeks an extension of the stamp duty first home concession scheme. It is proposed that the scheme be amended for a 12 month period commencing 1 February 1997, by increasing the value of first home purchases eligible for a full concession from \$80 000 to \$100 000 and increasing the ceiling at which the concession phases out completely from \$130 000 to \$150 000. The increased concession will be in respect of contracts entered into on or after 1 February 1997. The increased concession will not be available for contracts entered into after 31 January 1998.

The extension of the stamp duty concession scheme will save first home buyers up to \$2 830. In an environment where home loan interest rates have been driven down to their lowest level for many years, this initiative will give the real estate market in South Australia a real boost.

This initiative is in addition to the Deposit 5000 Scheme introduced in late 1996 which provides grants of up to \$5 000 for approved new home buyers and the stamp duty rebate (up to \$1 500) for the purchase of new strata title home units in the inner city area. The expansion of the existing first home concession scheme will assist young families get over that final barrier of home ownership.

The real estate industry is traditionally a key economic indicator. Assisting the housing industry get under way will have flow on effects through the whole economy and help boost employment prospects.

This new incentive has won strong support from the Real Estate Institute and the Housing Industry Association and is another step in the Government's plans to get the economy moving. This Government's commitment to increasing job prospects for the unemployed and stimulating business activity in South Australia is evidenced by the range of taxation assistance and incentives offered by way of rebates and exemptions to employers for trainee wages and employees contributing to value added exports and now an increased stamp duty concession for first home buyers.

The expanded first home concession scheme is estimated to have an extra budgetary cost of \$3.8 million in total, comprising \$1.3 million in 1996-97 and \$2.5 million in 1997-98.

The other amendment proposed in this Bill deals with possible problems created as a result of a recent Victorian Supreme Court decision (*Commissioner of State Revenue (Vic) v Bradney*), which has the potential to create a wide loophole for the avoidance of stamp duty on conveyances.

In the *Bradney* case the Court decided that a long term lease for nominal rent was not an encumbrance for the purposes of the conveyancing provisions of the Victorian Legislation. It has resulted in the situation where it may be possible for valuable property to be transferred almost free of stamp duty, if the property is deliberately burdened by a long term lease for no rent, or through some other contrived arrangement which artificially reduces the value of the transferred property. It was never the intention that such a situation would be possible under the South Australian *Stamp Duties Act 1923*.

For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed provisions are designed to make the position clear and will enable the Commissioner to disregard interests, agreements or arrangements which have the effect of reducing the value of property which is being transferred. The provisions are framed so that arrangements made for valid

commercial purposes, which have the incidental effect of reducing the value of transferred property, will not be disregarded by the Commissioner, and therefore will not attract more stamp duty than would otherwise be payable.

In the 1995-96 financial year the conveyance head of duty raised approximately \$170 million, which is a significant portion of this State's revenue base. The proposed changes resulting from the *Bradney* case shall take effect from 7 January 1997, the date of the media release of the Treasurer. This measure is purely one that will retain the status quo and protect the existing revenue base.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for retrospective operation of the Act. All provisions other than section 4 will be taken to have come into operation on 7 January 1997 and section 4 will be taken to have come into operation on 1 February 1997.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 60A—Value of property conveyed or transferred

This clause amends section 60A of the principal Act by inserting detailed provisions in relation to the valuation of property (for the purpose of assessing the stamp duty payable on conveyance or transfer) that is subject to an interest, agreement or arrangement at the time of the conveyance or transfer or that will merge, on conveyance or transfer, with an estate or interest already held by the transferee. The provisions will only apply where the pre-existing interest, agreement or arrangement or estate or interest (as the case may be) was granted, made or acquired on or after 7 January 1997.

Proposed subsection (4a) provides that an interest, agreement or arrangement that has the effect of reducing the value of property being conveyed or transferred is to be disregarded unless the Commissioner is satisfied that the interest, agreement or arrangement—

- was granted or made for a purpose other than reducing the value of the property; and
- was not granted or made in favour of the transferee or a person related to the transferee.

Proposed subsection (4b) provides that where, on conveyance or transfer, an estate or interest will merge with an estate or interest already held by the transferee, the value of the estate or interest conveyed or transferred may be taken to be the value of the estate or interest produced by the merger or, where stamp duty was paid on the previously held estate or interest at the conveyance rate, that value less the value of estate or interest already held.

Proposed subsections (6), (7) and (8) are interpretative provisions (consistent with those contained elsewhere in the *Stamp Duties Act*) relating to the amendments described above.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 71C—Concessional rates of duty in respect of purchase of first home, etc.

This clause amends section 71C of the principal Act to provide an extension of the concessions available to first home buyers for contracts entered into during the period of 12 months from 1 February 1997. The proposed amendments are as follows:

- Subsection (1)(ab) is amended so that during the 12 month period the concessions will apply to properties valued up to \$150 000 (the maximum, otherwise, is \$130 000).
- Subsection (2)(a) is amended to provide that during the 12 month period no duty will be payable where the property is valued at \$100 000 or less (in other cases duty will cut out at a value of \$80 000).
- The formula for calculating the concessional duty in subsection (2)(b)(ii) is replaced by a new version which provides a lower rate for contracts entered into during the 12 month period.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY (VEGETATION CLEARANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electricity Act 1996. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill reinstates into the Electricity Act certain provisions that were supported in this House during the Second Reading stages of debate on the Electricity Bill 1996, but which were removed by an amendment moved in another place. The Government remains confident that the vegetation clearance provisions drafted for the purposes of the Electricity Bill 1996 are a very reasonable method of addressing the complex balance of self determination by local governments and the safety and reliability of the State's electricity distribution system.

It should be said that the emotive telecommunications and undergrounding issues have served to complicate what may otherwise have been a more straightforward transition from ETSA responsibility for vegetation clearance to the proposed system in which local governments assume that responsibility.

Negotiations with interested persons are continuing and it intended to complete these negotiations before the Bill is taken any further. It is the Government's intention to ensure that the Bill is passed as soon as that condition is met, and it is for this reason that I have introduced the Bill today.

The Government, in making this decision, has had careful regard to the need to ensure that rights and obligations are in balance. Those who own trees, and who seek to have a say in the management of those trees, should also be the ones to perform the relevant management tasks.

It is thus important that, to address the clearly recognised need for clearer accountability and increased local government discretion in the administration of vegetation clearance, these confusing factors are not allowed to delay unduly a worthwhile reform.

When introducing the Electricity Bill into this House last year, I explained that the emphasis in drafting that Bill had been on preparing for the day when ETSA must perform as purely a Government Business Enterprise in competition with other utilities, both from across State borders and from new entrants to the South Australian electricity market. The measures contained in the present Bill can be seen as one of the steps in that process. It is a step which fits well with the overall intent to ensure that electricity utilities in the 21st century spend most of their time producing, selling and delivering electricity. It is for local governments to determine how they determine and maintain the balance between visual amenity and the required standards of electrical distribution system safety and reliability.

South Australian legislation does not presently confer a statutory monopoly on ETSA Power for distributing electricity in South Australia. As is the case elsewhere, electricity networks are seen as a natural monopoly, but this does not rule out the entry of new network service suppliers in the future. This Bill is consistent with the potential, under the National Electricity Market, for other players to enter the business of delivering electricity. The present arrangements are not, and thus should be changed.

As I told the House previously, and very importantly, the Government expects ETSA Corporation to remain the operator of the State's transmission and distribution networks, as well as the main seller of electricity to domestic and small business customers in the State.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Under this clause, the measure is to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

The clause inserts a definition of "council officer"—a person authorised by a council to exercise powers conferred under the legislation on a council officer.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 55—Duties in relation to vegetation clearance

This clause imposes a vegetation clearance duty on each council whose area is wholly or partly within an area to be prescribed by regulation. The duty is to take reasonable steps to keep vegetation clear of specified public powerlines in accordance with the principles of vegetation clearance prescribed by regulation. The powerlines are those that are—

- designed to convey electricity at 11 kV or less; and
- within the council's area and an area prescribed by regulation; and

- not on, above or under private land (that is, according to the definition of "private land" contained in section 4 of the principal Act—public powerlines on, above or under land vested in, or under the care, control or management of, council and dedicated, or held for, a public purpose).

The councils having this duty are empowered to remove vegetation planted or nurtured near public powerlines contrary to the vegetation clearance principles and to recover the cost of so doing.

The electricity entity having the control of a powerline may carry out vegetation clearance work that a council has failed to carry out in accordance with its duty and may recover the cost of so doing and the cost of repairing any resulting damage to the powerline from the council.

Subsection (6) of section 55 of the principal Act applies, according to its current terms, to the duty imposed on councils. Under subsection (6), the provisions of section 55 operate to the exclusion of common law duties, and other statutory duties, affecting the clearance of vegetation from powerlines (whether the work is carried out by the councils or by a contractor or other agent).

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 56—Role of councils in relation to vegetation clearance not within prescribed areas

The clause amends this section so that it spells out that the arrangements contemplated by this section between electricity entities and councils do not apply to public powerlines within the prescribed areas where councils will have the duty to carry out vegetation clearance work.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 57—Power to enter for vegetation clearance purposes

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 58—Regulations in respect of vegetation near powerlines

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 82—Application and issue of warrant

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 83—Urgent situations

These clauses make amendments to the principal Act consequential on the amendment to section 55 of the principal Act.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEVELOPMENT (SWIMMING POOLS SAFETY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Housing and Urban Development) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Development Act 1993; to repeal the Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972; and to make a consequential amendment to the Local Government Act 1934. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

At the present time there are two separate Acts providing for safety fencing of residential swimming pools and two different standards of fencing required. When the *Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972* was implemented pool owners were only required to safeguard young children from gaining access to a pool from outside the property. In other words, it was not acknowledged that children who were resident or visiting a house were at risk and, tragically, a number of drownings occurred that could have been prevented if the resident child had been unable to gain access to the family pool.

In July 1993 more stringent requirements were introduced for new pools, requiring that access from within the property (including the house) be restricted, and these provisions are contained in the *Development Act 1993*. All new swimming pools approved after this date must be fenced to restrict access by young children, from both outside and within the property, to the immediate pool surrounds in accordance with the provisions of the South Australian Appendix to the Building Code of Australia. The *Swimming Pools (Safety) Act* was amended on 15 January 1994 so that it does not apply to any pool approved under the Development Act.

This means that the construction of all new pools must be approved by councils under the Development Act and these pools must have fencing in accordance with the Building Code of Australia. That fencing must be around the pool, but may include a boundary fence or a wall of the house provided that child resistant

latches are fitted. Councils are also responsible for inspection and enforcement.

Existing pools approved or constructed prior to 1 July 1993 must as a minimum have an adequate boundary fence and self closing gates with child resistant latches. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is responsible for inspection and enforcement.

The provisions of the *Swimming Pool (Safety) Act 1972*, requiring as a minimum a boundary fence, are no longer an acceptable standard for safety fencing, and it is those pools that the government and the community believe should be upgraded to a higher standard of safety. The Swimming Pool and Spa Association of South Australia estimates there are 50 000 pools in South Australia, but there is no reliable information on the adequacy of safety fencing of existing pools. A number of older pools are already adequately safeguarded, where owners have voluntarily installed fencing complying with the proposed legislative requirements.

The Development (Swimming Pools Safety) Amendment Bill will repeal the *Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972*, and will require all pools to comply with the Development Act, meaning that older pools will need to be fenced to the same standard now required for new pools.

These amendments to legislation are considered necessary because drownings in private swimming pools are a significant cause of death of children under five years of age. Over a period of time approximately three infant drownings have occurred each year in South Australia while the number of injuries caused by accidental immersion is unknown. Most of these could have been prevented by adequate safety fencing. Statistics indicate that the majority of drownings of young children occur in domestic pools. Swimming pool safety fencing does not replace parental supervision, but the combination of both are the most effective means to reduce accidental drowning of young children.

Pool owners will have 3 years to comply with the new requirements and all pools in South Australia should be acceptably safe by the year 2000. Councils will be responsible for administering the proposed legislation and will have the power to enforce the provisions. The Bill provides that if a swimming pool is not fenced in accordance with the statutory requirements the owner of the swimming pool is guilty of an offence and liable to a maximum penalty of \$8 000 and a default penalty of \$500 for each day that the offence continues.

The proposed legislation will not apply to public swimming pools, or to dams or natural waterways. The legislation will also not apply to small paddling pools less than 300 mm deep, or to spa baths.

The proposed legislation is the culmination of a long process of community consultation, which included the production of a White Paper, and has the support of safety authorities, the Local Government Association and the wider community.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the measure on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Under the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*, different provisions may be brought to operation on different days.

Clause 3: Insertion of Part 6 Division 6A

DIVISION 6A—SWIMMING POOLS SAFETY

71A. Interpretation

"owner", in relation to a swimming pool, means—

- in the case of a swimming pool that forms part of, or is a fixture to, land—the owner of the land on which the swimming pool is situated;
- in the case of a swimming pool that does not form part of, or is not a fixture to, land—the owner of the swimming pool.

"relevant authority", in relation to a swimming pool, means—

- in the case of a swimming pool situated in the area of a council—that council;
- in the case of a swimming pool situated outside the areas of councils—the Development Assessment Commission.

"relevant day" means the third anniversary of the commencement of Division 6A.

"swimming pool" means an excavation or structure that is capable of being filled with water and is used primarily for swimming, wading or paddling and includes a spa pool but does not include a spa bath.

"young child" means a person under the age of five years.

71B. Swimming pools to which this Division applies

This section provides that Division 6A applies to swimming pools constructed before 1 July 1993, or the construction of which was approved before that date.

Sections 71G and 7H apply to all swimming pools, whether constructed before or after 1 July 1973 and whether the construction of which was approved before or after that date.

This section also lists the classes of pools excluded from the operation of Division 6A and provides for exemptions under section 5 of the *Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972* in force immediately before the repeal of that Act to continue in force until—

- the third anniversary of the commencement of this measure; or
- if the Minister revokes the exemption—the day on which notice of the revocation is published in the *Gazette*; or
- if any condition, restriction or limitation to which the exemption was made subject is contravened or not complied with—the day on which the contravention or non-compliance occurs,

whichever is the earliest.

71C. Requirement that swimming pools be fenced

This section makes the owner of a swimming pool guilty of an offence if the pool is not enclosed by a fence or other barrier in accordance with Division 6A. The maximum penalty is a \$8 000 fine and there is a default penalty of \$500 for each day that the offence continues.

There is a defence if the pool owner proves that the offence resulted from the failure of a building owner to comply with requirements imposed by the pool owner under section 71G(1)(b).

71D. Fencing requirements until relevant day

Until the third anniversary of the commencement of Division 6A a swimming pool is required to be fenced in accordance with the current requirements set out in section 6 of the *Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972*.

71E. Fencing requirements after relevant day

After the third anniversary of the commencement of Division 6A a swimming pool is required to be fenced in accordance with the Building Rules as they apply in relation to a swimming pool the construction of which requires approval under Part 4 of the Development Act.

71F. Powers of relevant authority in relation to unfenced swimming pools

This section empowers the relevant authority to give the owner of a swimming pool a notice requiring the owner to carry out specified work within a specified period if the relevant authority has reason to suspect that the pool does not comply with Division 6A.

If the owner fails to comply with the notice the relevant authority can cause the necessary work to be carried out and recover the costs of doing so from the owner. A swimming pool owner who carries out work pursuant to a notice is required to notify the relevant authority of the completion of the work. The maximum penalty for non-compliance is a \$2 000 fine.

This section also empowers a relevant authority to enclose a public swimming pool if, in the relevant authority's opinion, the lack of fencing makes the pool dangerous to small children. This provision will replace section 346a of the *Local Government Act 1934* which is to be repealed (*see schedule*).

This section also contains a provision giving a relevant authority immunity from liability in respect of any matter or thing done or omitted to be done by the relevant authority in good faith in connection with the operation of this section.

71G. Building work affecting fencing of swimming pool on adjoining land

This section requires a building owner of land or premises adjoining a swimming pool to give the pool owner notice of any building work that involves the temporary or permanent removal of any part of a fence, wall, building or other structure or barrier that encloses the pool.

The pool owner may require the building owner to carry out such building work or other work as may be required to ensure that suitable barriers to the pool are in place until completion of the building work.

The building owner may apply to the Environment, Resources and Development Court for a determination of what proportion of the work required by the pool owner should be borne by the pool owner.

The maximum penalty for a failure by a building owner to comply with this section is a \$8 000 fine and there is a default penalty of \$500 for each day that the offence continues.

71H. Subsequent action on adjoining land affecting fencing of swimming pool

This section provides that if a fence, wall, building or other structure or barrier that encloses a swimming pool in compliance with the requirements of Division 6A or the Building Rules ceases to comply because the owner or occupier of adjoining land or premises constructs or places something on the adjoining land, the owner of the swimming pool is not required to take additional action to ensure compliance with those requirements.

SCHEDULE

Repeal and Amendment

The schedule repeals the *Swimming Pools (Safety) Act 1972* and section 346a of the *Local Government Act 1934*.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Environment Protection Act 1993. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Environment Protection (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 1997* introduces changes to the *Environment Protection Act* to address a number of minor deficiencies which have become apparent since the commencement of the Act on 1 May 1995. The proposed amendments will enhance the efficient operation of the Act.

The Bill proposes an amendment which increases the perceived independence of the Authority by allowing the Governor to appoint any member of the Authority to be deputy to the Chair. The other amendment will clarify and increase certain provisions relating to Schedule 2 of the Act. A new section is also inserted to provide for the making of false reports to the Authority.

Specifically, section 12 of the Act, which establishes the membership of the Authority, will be amended to allow the Governor to appoint any member of the Authority to act as deputy to the Chair. The Act currently requires one member of the Authority to be a person assigned to a Public Service position, and this person is to be deputy to the Chair. At present, the Executive Director of the Office of the Environment Protection Authority has been proclaimed by the Governor as the public servant member on the Authority and, thereby, is deputy to the Chair.

The Executive Director's role on the Authority includes representation of the Government's perspectives with respect to the Authority's deliberations and decisions, with the five other members of the Authority providing expertise and experience from outside of State government in the areas of environmental conservation, industry, waste management, local government and environmental protection.

Section 16(6) of the Act, however, gives the presiding member a casting vote. When the Executive Director is acting in the Chair, it may, therefore, be perceived that the Government's interest and level of control are given greater weight than the concerns of other members of the Authority. Whilst this has not been a problem to date, the amendment will reinforce the structural integrity of the Authority and maintain the perceived independence of the Authority from Government.

The Authority is also concerned that there is no provision in the Act to discourage the deliberate making of a false report calling for action by the Authority. The proposed insertion of section 120A will establish the making of such a report as an offence. Further, through the court which has convicted the person of an offence under this section, the Authority will be able to recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred in investigating the veracity of such a report.

The transitional provisions of Schedule 2 purport to limit the transitional rights of an activity which was operating legally before the commencement of the Act. By regulation, this transitional period

was to end on 31 October 1995. The wording of clause 5 of Schedule 2, however, does not clearly limit transitional rights. Consequently, an unlicensed operator could potentially escape successful prosecution under section 36 of the Act by applying for a licence and arguing that transitional rights had not been lost.

The proposed amendment to Schedule 2 closes the transitional rights of operators as originally intended and endorsed by Parliament.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Under this clause, the measure is to be brought into operation by proclamation. Clause 5, however, is to have retrospective effect to the commencement of the principal Act, 1 May 1995.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 12—Membership of Authority

Under section 12 of the principal Act in its current form, the deputy of the chairperson of the Environment Protection Authority is the *ex officio* Public Service member of the Authority. The clause amends the section so that the Governor may appoint any member of the Authority as the deputy of the chairperson.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 120A

This clause adds a new section that would make it an offence if a person knowingly makes a false report to the Authority or a person engaged in the administration of the Act and the report is such as would reasonably call for investigation or action by the Authority. Provision is made for an order to be made by a court convicting a person of the offence for payment of costs and expenses incurred by the Authority in responding to the false report.

Clause 5: Amendment of sched. 2

Clause 5 of schedule 2 of the principal Act contains the transitional provisions enacted in relation to the commencement of the Act. Under those provisions, an entitlement was created to the grant of a works approval, licence or exemption to authorise a person to continue a previously lawful activity. The clause adds a provision limiting the right to apply for such an approval, licence or exemption to the six month period from the commencement of the Act (that is, from 1 May 1995). This limitation has been contained in a regulation under the Act and is to be inserted into schedule 2 of the Act to address concerns as to the validity of the regulation.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 932.)

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise a matter relating to the Premier that might amuse the House before we move to the substance of the supply debate. Sometimes there is a need for some levity. I have received from the Motor Trades—

Mr BROKENSHERE: I rise on a point of order, Sir, and draw your attention to the Standing Order regarding relevance to the debate.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have not yet said anything.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have not heard anything at all from the Leader, so the Chair is unable to make any deductions. The Chair will listen carefully.

Mr Brokenshere interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The longer the member for Mawson carries on like that, the longer I will talk, don't worry about that. I have a letter from Richard Flashman and, I suppose, it is about small business in this State, about which, apparently, the member for Mawson has no interest. The letter, which criticises me, states:

Dear Mike, I recognise that in the cut and thrust of political debate, many sensitivities can be aroused. Such a sensitivity has indeed been touched by your reference in reply to the Premier that his background was that of a car dealer. Quite clearly you have stated no more than the factual situation. However, in the context of the debate, I have been advised that the inference was meant to be derogatory. I can assure you that the vehicle dealers who are

members of this association would find such an inference to be offensive to themselves and to the Premier. No doubt the Premier may receive a letter similar to this one from the AJA on behalf of its members and in defence of their current, and your own, prior vocation.

The letter is signed, 'Yours sincerely, Richard Flashman.' It seems that the used car dealers of this State do not want to be associated with the Premier of this State, in terms of recognition of his prior background. It is interesting that in 1989 the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, said that he was launching a code of practice because he was worried that politicians had been the subject of numerous inquiries and royal commissions and needed to regain the trust of the people who had elected them. The Premier told the *Advertiser* the following:

Somewhere on the popularity scale we sit near the bottom, with journalists, used car salesmen and real estate salesmen.

What I am saying to the motor traders and the used car salesmen is: if you are not proud of your own, who are you proud of? It is as simple as that.

I rise to support, on behalf of the Labor Opposition, the provision of supply. This is likely to be the final session of Parliament before the Premier calls an early election, and we know why this Premier is afraid to allow the Government to run its full term: he has not got the guts to bring down a budget; and he has not got the guts to wait to see what is in store in the Federal budget. Yesterday a market research firm, called Bell Market Research, started telephoning people in the seats of Hanson, Reynell, and elsewhere in their hundreds. Unfortunately, such is the competence of Bell Market Research that it got the candidates' names wrong, but that is another issue. The company asked about John Olsen and what people thought of him, and then offered to pay people \$35 to attend a meeting to discuss—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, that is right. Perhaps they will be given a Myer voucher or a show bag. This company—

Mr Rossi interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Lee will come to order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —wanted to pay people to come into a room and discuss what they thought about John Olsen and others. Apparently, last week, another political opinion poll—and I hope that none of these polls, by either the former Premier's group or the present Premier's group, is being paid for by the taxpayer—asked about the veracity of the Premier, that is, his honesty and his credibility, and whether people feel that he perhaps does not quite tell the truth. Obviously these revelations in the Parliament and elsewhere—

Mr MEIER: Mr Deputy Speaker, my point of order concerns relevance. I understand that the second reading debate on the Supply Bill must deal with the substantive Bill—in other words, with supply. It is in the grievance where one can be more general and broad. I believe that the Leader's comments have been very broad and not specific to the Supply Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's point of order is perfectly correct. The Leader is in fact treating the second reading debate of the Supply Bill as if it were a general grievance. He has made no mention of the matter of supply, so far.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. Of course, this is central to the question of supply. I talked about why the Premier will not bring down a budget, and that is central to the issue of supply. The fact is that the Government has these

focus groups trying to find out whether the public of South Australia thinks the Premier does not tell the truth.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That, in my view, is central to the issue of the Premier's credibility.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the Leader that he was sent out of the House before by the Deputy Chair for precisely the same sort of behaviour he is showing to the House now: for ignoring the Chair; turning his back to the Chair; and continuing to talk when the Chair is on his feet. The Leader is trying to defend his own case against the Chair's ruling of a few moments ago, and the Chair simply does not accept his defence. The Supply Bill is a perfectly normal Bill to be brought into this House. It bears no reflection upon the possibility or otherwise of an early election, and the Chair takes the Leader's argument as being somewhat specious. The Chair simply asks the Leader to resume his debate on the subject matter of the Supply Bill.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We know, just as the South Australian public now knows, that the economic record of this Government is one of abject failure. We all know that the majority of the three years of Liberal Government is rising joblessness and rising despair. We know that, despite the Premier's claims that he will give more resources to our struggling schools, hospitals and community services, he wants an early election to break these promises should he win the next election. The last thing that John Olsen wants is to be judged on his first budget, due at the end of May, especially with yet more Howard-Costello cuts on the way from Canberra, which will have a direct relevance to supply. We know that the Premier fears the prospect of Parliament running its full course—

Mr ROSSI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that Standing Order 152 provides that members should be referred to by their electorates and not by their names. The Leader of the Opposition should have more brains and more experience than to transgress that order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All members are aware of the protocol in the House.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We know that the Premier fears the prospect of Parliament running its full course—something that could have only one result. That result, as the Government and the Opposition know full well, is for more information to come out about the fact that this Premier has not told the Parliament and the public the full truth about his water privatisation deal with the French and British companies. He has dissembled before the Parliament, the public and the media about every significant aspect of this atrocious deal. On 15 November 1994 he told the Parliament that the Government would not outsource large chunks of EWS. Three weeks later he proceeded to do just that. When his taxpayer funded polling—polling he later denied ever took place—showed how repugnant to South Australians the idea of French and British multi-nationals controlling our water systems is, he promised United Water would become 60 per cent Australian-owned within 12 months.

With all the credibility of a wild west medicine show he told Parliament that 60 per cent Australian equity in United Water International was non negotiable. Today, United Water International, the company that is merely a shopfront legitimising and allowing the French and British to run our water systems, remains 95 per cent foreign-owned. The Premier, as Minister for Infrastructure, promised a public float of equity in the company so that ordinary Mums and Dad could buy in. Yet we know that, before signing the

contract, he was advised by his own lead negotiator that this would not happen.

The Premier denied that we were giving control of our water systems to the French and British, but the company that operates and manages our water systems is 100 per cent foreign-owned. The cash registers ring in Paris and London every time someone in Adelaide turns on the tap or flushes the toilet. No amount of dissembling by this Premier changes that for even a second. The Premier promised cheaper water, but everyone knows that they are now paying an average 25 per cent more in real terms for their water than they were just three years ago under a Labor Government. For all users the first 136 000 litres has increased by \$52 or 43 per cent.

I refer to the polling—the polling the present Premier and the former Premier deny ever existed. With that, the standards of government in South Australia have plummeted yet further. If all that were not enough, the Premier will call an early election—probably around 9 March—because he knows that there is still more the public has not been told about how the contract was awarded to United Water. He will try to cut short investigations and inquiries. The Premier will call an early election because he knows that some of his Ministers have failed to live up to the appropriate standard for ministerial conduct, and more is to come. Finally, the Premier—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Minister obviously thinks that the inquiry—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do not believe that this inquiry should be the subject of his knowledge. I do not know how he can say that, just as I cannot understand how the Deputy Premier could say today that the Minister concerned was not guilty. That is an extraordinary statement from the Minister for Police before the inquiry is even completed. It says something very much about standards in this Government. Finally, the Premier will call an early election because he chairs a Cabinet and a Party room riven with divisions and leaking like a sieve. There is much more to go. It was the member for Fisher who told the truth about this Government when he said:

I have seen some pretty unethical behaviour. People who hold ministries actively lying... I don't think the public of South Australia wants that.

That was said by the former Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Let us refer to the South Australian economy. The Premier says that he has a single-minded focus on jobs, particularly when he wants to avoid questions about his integrity and about the honesty of his Government. He wants us to forget that before becoming Premier he was the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and that he had his hands on all the State's economic levers that could have given jobs to more South Australians. Here are the facts about the Premier's stewardship of the State's economy; it is a record of failure.

Let us look at economic growth. From 1994 to the September quarter of 1996—nearly three years, commencing with the election of the Brown-Olsen Government—South Australia grew by just 4.3 per cent. This is an annual average of just 1.6 per cent. Over the same period, national growth was three times greater than here in South Australia at 12.3 per cent, or an annual average of nearly 4.5 per cent. Seasonally adjusted, South Australia had the worst performance of any State or Territory for the year to September—at just 1.4 per cent, compared to 3.8 per cent nationally. The

bottom line of decent rates of growth is more jobs and lower unemployment. But what the Liberals have achieved in the past year is less than half the rate of growth usually regarded as necessary to hold the level of unemployment constant. I repeat: this is just half the rate of growth required not to reduce the level of unemployment but simply to hold it constant—not to improve the situation but simply to prevent it getting worse.

Over the period December 1993 to December 1996 (three years) South Australian job growth was just 18 500 seasonally adjusted, or 2.9 per cent. At the same time, national job growth was over 613 000, or nearly 8 per cent. The rate of job creation in South Australia has been about one-third that of the nation—just as the annual average rate of economic growth of this State has been about one-third that of Australia. The figure of 18 500 jobs over three years represents a massive failure by John Olsen to meet his target of 20 000 new jobs a year. After three years he is 41 500 jobs short.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Mawson does not care about jobs in his electorate, and that is quite clear from his interjection a few moments ago—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Well, I do; I care about the south—the forgotten south under your stewardship.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those most untrue comments about me. My record is clear: I am committed to the south. He was not, and he never will be.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot accept the point of order. The member for Mawson was antagonising the Leader with his interjections, and the interplay was invited across the floor. I simply advise members to give the speakers a chance, and there will probably be fewer opportunities to make personal explanations at the end of the day.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I repeat that the rate of job creation in South Australia has been about one-third that of the nation's, despite the claim by both the former Premier and the present Premier of meeting their targets—not just announcing targets, because they actually claimed that they had met their targets. After three years the Premier is 41 500 jobs short of what he said he would meet. If South Australia had merely kept pace with the rate of job creation nationally, the State would have been a full 51 000 jobs better off.

Taking last year alone, the story remains just as depressing. In the 12 months to December 1996 there was no growth whatsoever in employment. The figure for the total number of employed in South Australia in December 1995 was 657 700—exactly identical to the figure for December 1996. During the first six months of 1996 there was some job growth, but from July 1996 onwards total employment in South Australia has been in decline. Unemployment for the December quarter of last year averaged 9.5 per cent, while the figure for Australia was 8.6 per cent. South Australia has the second highest rate of unemployment in the country, just ahead of Tasmania. But there are two good reasons to assume that 9.5 per cent unemployment understates the real level of South Australia's unemployment problems.

I want to commend the former Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (the member for Fisher) for telling the truth—that he believes that the level of unemployment under this Government is much higher than the statistics reveal. First, South Australia's participation rate has been

falling in recent months, and this reflects the greater level of job seeker discouragement. With worsening economic conditions, fewer will actively seek work. Reflecting this, South Australia's participation rate of 61.6 per cent was a full two percentage points below Australia's rate of 63.6 per cent. Once again, this simply reflects the fact that, with fewer actual job opportunities in South Australia, there are fewer people actively seeking work. If we take these hidden unemployed into account, we can infer that the real level of unemployment in South Australia may be around 10.5 per cent or more.

That is exactly why the claim that we are doing as well or as badly as Queensland does not hold water. One might see headlines from time to time saying that there is a jobs boom here in South Australia. Unfortunately, those headlines have not been true and are not true. Let us go back to the claim that we are doing the same as Queensland. Queensland may now have an unemployment rate equal to that of South Australia, but it has a participation rate a full three percentage points higher than ours. Despite an official level of unemployment equal to ours, Queensland is a much more fully employed society than our own. Let us not forget that almost 7 000 more people are leaving South Australia for other States than are coming here each year. Most of these are driven to leave by their inability to get a job here in South Australia.

Our youth unemployment, at nearly 40 per cent, is the highest in the nation. The closer we look into the State's economic position, the deeper the dimension of South Australia's jobs crisis appears. The present level of total employment is below the pre-recession high of 660 300. Under the Liberals, despite massive growth in jobs nationally, we have exceeded the post-recession high briefly on three occasions, only to fall below it subsequently. Not only do we remain below the pre-recession peak of employment, we have been shedding full-time jobs at an alarming rate. The pre-recession peak for full-time employment was nearly 507 000 in June 1990. The average level of full-time employment over 1996 was only 472 300. There was a fall of over 10 000 in the number of full-time employed from December 1995 to December 1996. What we are seeing very clearly in South Australia, as the conservative Access Economics has recently pointed out, is a high and rising level of under-employment.

Under-employment is defined as the unemployed plus part-timers wanting to work longer hours, plus full-time workers on short hours, plus an estimate of discouraged workers who have ceased to look for work. It needs to be recalled that the ABS labour force survey that is used each month to estimate employment and the level of unemployment counts a person as employed even if they have worked only one hour in the previous week. Let me read the quote from Access Economics for the benefit of the member for Mawson, who does not seem to care about this issue and how it affects his electorate. It reads:

Under-employment is over 20 per cent in Tasmania and South Australia. In Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania there are fewer full-time jobs than at the previous peak, and under-employment is a substantial problem.

I am happy to send that quote to the member for Mawson so that he can realise what is happening in his electorate. Independent commentators are painting a bleak picture of South Australia's future unless something is done to fix the problems. Syntec and the Centre for Policy Studies believe that South Australia will have the worst economic growth and the slowest job growth of that in any State in Australia. Equally, Access Economics believes that we will have an

11.3 per cent unemployment rate by the year 2001. I could go on about the fact that private investment has been languishing; about the fact that new house starts are at their lowest level since the keeping of records commenced; about the fact that retail sales are well and truly down; and so on.

But even the poor growth figures I referred to earlier would have been worse were it not for the fact that there has been a more than 23 per cent increase in our exports in the year to October. This increase in exports is welcome but, as the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies has pointed out, about 90 per cent of this growth is accounted for in improved agricultural exports. This is largely seasonally based and there is no reason to suppose that it can be sustained over the longer term. Without that lift, our performance in recent times would have been worse.

Let us talk about existing industry development. I believe that, if the Olsen Government had a strategy for South Australia's industrial development, we could be doing much better. When the Premier is attempting to avoid responsibility for the breaking of promises or for the shabby standards of ministerial conduct that have become the hallmark of his Government within three months of his assuming the Premiership, he resorts to shallow rhetoric. The Premier has claimed that Labor has no strategy and no vision. He said so again yesterday. He says the same mantra every time he gets caught out, every time he is found out, every time one of his mates gets stitched up—not by the Labor Party but by Liberals who hand us the documents and tell us what sort of things have been going on inside this Government.

I am certainly not going to divulge the Opposition's policies for the Premier's convenience only weeks away from the announcement of an early election. Let me tell the Premier today that there is a lot more to come from his friends inside the Liberal Party. If I were the Premier of this State and knew what that was, I would be very concerned. It is one of the few benefits of being in Opposition that the record of the Government is on display for all to see. It is, once again, a record of failure. The Olsen-Brown Government has been nothing but a policy-free zone. The Olsen Government has largely turned its back on the many South Australian firms that have been committed to making things and employing people in this State for many years.

It has chased foreign and interstate firms at enormous public expense. The Premier has enjoyed the limelight while busily cutting ribbons. But after the ribbons were cut and all the florid speeches and boasts given and made, and all the egregious claims of jobs created, many of the promises have been found to be more shadow than substance. Existing industries are the forgotten heart of the South Australian economy. While we have been losing jobs hand over fist from traditional sectors of manufacturing, construction and retail, the Olsen-Brown Government has sat on its hands.

Since June 1995 South Australia's manufacturing employment has fallen by 4 per cent, that is, by over 2 200. In the year to December 1996 alone, retrenchments from our largest manufacturing employers were over 1 500, according to the quarterly survey of manufacturing employment in the December quarter 1996. I have written to over 3 000 existing businesses about their view of the South Australian economy and what can be done to increase their contributions to our State's economic future, and I have been pleased by the response. What stands out is that they are tired of the alibis and excuses of this Government. They believe that an economic strategy is needed for the broad sectors of the State economy, not just for one or two anointed firms.

They have told me they believe that there is no adequate strategy in place. They say that the Premier is not focusing enough on local, established South Australian companies that have been producing goods and employing South Australians for years. Although the arrival of a new overseas based company may be more newsworthy for politicians, the steady growth of existing businesses will have a much greater impact on jobs and on the health of the State economy.

Any forward looking economic policy for South Australia must recognise the contribution of existing industries and that we can create new jobs from company expansions and retain jobs that might otherwise be lost. South Australia needs a business retention program that assists existing businesses to expand within our State rather than move elsewhere. My attachment to existing South Australian industries is not just sentimental or opportunistic: it is plain commonsense and good economic strategy. Labor strategy puts growth and jobs at the top of the list, and it is existing industry with decent help and facilitation that will help generate or retain the overwhelming majority of jobs.

Help and facilitation is one of the key roles of the State Government: it is one of the things that State Governments are elected to do—help and facilitation to restructure and retrain their existing work force; help and facilitation to take on new people, particularly our young unemployed; help and facilitation to develop new and innovative products and practices; help and facilitation to take up new technologies to help them become more competitive; and help and facilitation to expand rather than close down. It was that need for help and facilitation that led to the Labor Government's setting up the Centre for Manufacturing, which has been an outstanding achievement and one about which I am constantly hearing from members of industry in terms of a positive stimulation to assist them to become more competitive and employ people. Like many of the business people who have written to me on this matter, the Labor Opposition believes that the Government must do better, that it must stop boasting about things that do not happen and start listening to those existing businesses that put their blood, sweat and tears into trying to ensure that people are employed and wealth is retained in South Australia.

The Deputy Premier came into this House and challenged me to name the Liberal leakers in the Government, and I will to respond to that. For three years senior Liberals have been leaking to the Labor Party. One senior Liberal, on many occasions, provided the Opposition with information damaging to the former Premier. More recently, I have been given information by a different source, again a senior Liberal, with the clear intent of damaging the present Premier, John Olsen—damaging his credibility and his closest supporters. That information included information about Dale Baker, the Minister for Finance, as well as the 800 pages we received about the water deal. The same source that gave me the Dale Baker information also gave me the information about the water deal and the water polling.

Today I have been asked by the Deputy Premier to name that source. I have also been asked to name both these leaks. I am certainly prepared to do so to any legitimate inquiry—a privileges committee or the new Police Commissioner, Mal Hyde—if it assists with inquiries into wrongdoing by the Liberals, because the public interest must come first. However, I stress, in the light of this debate, that I am not the source of these leaks. Both leakers are clearly senior Liberals with access to Cabinet documents and confidential Liberal Party information. There is no doubt that the war raging

within the Liberal Party is damaging the Government and the Premier. The Premier lurches from one crisis mode to another.

However, I am concerned that innocent people, including Ministers, members of Parliament, public servants and Government staffers, have been unfairly accused of being the source of leaks to me: these people are under suspicion and unfairly so. I believe that it would be the decent thing for both senior Liberals to come forward and own up. If they leaked information in the public interest, they have nothing to hide by naming themselves, and by doing so they will clear the names of innocent colleagues who are now under suspicion—people who have been confronted with those suspicions and people who have been questioned. However, if these people are leaking material purely as some form of vendetta against Liberal Party colleagues, I suspect that both sources are already well-known to their colleagues.

I was given documents and information about Dale Baker in the same batch as the recent water documents, and I am more than happy to discuss these matters with the Police Commissioner if it helps the police with their inquiries. The fact is that there are people in this State inside the Liberal Party who are prepared to damage the Government to serve their own end, but also I believe that there are people who have been leaking to us who do so because, quite simply, they believe that the public has not been told the truth, that the public and the Parliament have been misled and that the public of South Australia and the media have been lied to. So, there might be different motives for the leaking of this information to me. I simply appeal to the Liberal leakers, to both major Liberal leakers—the leakers before the Premier was elected and the leakers since—to do the decent thing and own up.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Today I will focus on the reason why the State Government needs to allocate adequate funding to assist in the promotion of renewable energy sources to reduce strategically the use of traditional energy, such as that generated by fossil fuels. One of the most significant issues confronting Australia, particularly South Australia, is the need to develop strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Some exciting initiatives are being developed in councils in South Australia and Leichhardt council in New South Wales with regard to the active promotion and implementation of rebate systems to encourage use by the general public sector of household and business energy efficient appliances.

In Whyalla, for instance, the Government is committed to joining with five councils in a partnership for local agenda 21, which focuses on the adoption and implementation of the principles for ecologically sustainable development. This initiative has come from the State Government's report titled 'Towards the renewable energy target for South Australia'. The report was released in 1995 and was claimed as the Government's decision to generate its renewable energy policy. As I understand it, the report commits the Government to a 10 year program under which 20 per cent of the State's energy, excluding transport, will be gained from renewable energy sources.

The Whyalla council initiative is to deliver a 10 per cent rebate to ratepayers towards the cost of the installation of solar hot water services. The council has estimated that approximately 7 per cent of hot water systems in Whyalla are replaced each year. There are approximately 6 000 privately owned homes in Whyalla and the council hopes to increase

the installation and usage of solar hot water services by 20 per cent per annum. The council has budgeted approximately \$20 000 for 1996-97, and the sum total of the rebate per household is \$200. Reports from the environmental services in the Whyalla council shows that it is on target to meet the strategy agenda. This direction also has substantial benefits for the development of small businesses, with the capacity to generate significant employment and training programs.

Another aspect of the rationale behind these developments by the Whyalla council is that it reduces the impact on resources and the need for fossil fuel based electricity. The council is on target to meet its agenda. As I said, this direction also has substantial benefits for the development of small business. There is the capacity to generate significant employment and, more importantly, training programs. Importantly, the initiative develops communication and understanding between local government, the community, the State Government and industry authorities.

The implementation of this rebate system allows individuals within business and households to be directly involved in energy savings, giving them a measure of control in local terms. Both the Federal and State Governments have come under criticism from environmental groups for not actively implementing and promoting renewable energy strategies. For instance, in one report it was claimed that South Australia was to identify renewable energy in research and development as a priority area. According to my information, ETSA is reducing its research into energy renewables from \$6 million to \$4 million in the next triennium and South Australian Government funding on research and development on energy renewables is proposed to be just \$.5 million in 1997-98. If that is the case, I suggest that funding for energy renewable research and development is not being given priority.

I agree that the overall area of energy renewable resources and environmental sustainability must come under a national, uniform approach and, until that is the case, State Governments might be at a slight disadvantage. However, as I have outlined in the Whyalla case, there are policy areas in which the State Government could be involved successfully. Already there are some international examples which show how renewable energy sources such as solar energy can be utilised to take the pressure off State and national electricity grid systems, thereby contributing to a reduction in higher financial risks and costs.

A report entitled Review of the National Greenhouse Response Category—Whyalla City Council Submission cites a number of international examples, which members will find most enlightening. The report states that in Las Vegas, the Nevada Power Company started offering rebates and, in six months, 20 wholesale and retail outlets were competing in the price and breadth of efficient lighting systems. Energy utilities began to pay consumers for each kilowatt saved, no matter how it was done, and they have also tried to reward trading partners who remove old, inefficient equipment or who sell and install electricity energy-saving devices.

The Southern California Edison Company has also given away more than 80 000 compact fluorescent lamps. The Taunton, Massachusetts, municipal lighting plant leases such lamps for 20¢ per month and replaces them free of charge. Thus, customers can pay for efficiency over time, just as they would otherwise pay for the construction of power plants.

In Osage, Iowa, which has a population of about 4 000, a utility manager launched a nine-year program to 'weatherise'

(an American term which means 'insulate') homes and control electricity loads at peak periods. These initiatives saved the utility enough money to pay all its debts, accumulate a cash surplus and cut inflation-corrected rates by a third. I understand that it attracted two factories to the town. Furthermore, each household received more than \$1 000 of savings each year, boosting the local economy and making shops noticeably more prosperous than in comparable towns nearby.

The report goes on to say that saving energy utilities in electricity output means that, over time, reductions in the number of power stations required and the billions needed to operate them would result in net savings. The development of energy efficient appliances at local level would increase employment opportunities and probably far supersede the employment that is now dwindling in our power stations.

My interest in the Whyalla council's proposals and initiative is that it could establish a positive and productive precedent for other councils. In my electorate of Torrens, if applied, the rebate system could in the longer term provide the possibility of some much needed small business development and, in particular, much needed jobs whilst at the same time contributing to the reduction of greenhouse gases.

I understand that the Whyalla council has approached the State Government to match the council's 10 per cent rebate at a cost of approximately \$16 800. To date, my advice is that no official response has been received from the State Government. I should like to know whether the State Government intends to commit itself to a partnership with councils in matching such 10 per cent rebates. Although this is a small contribution, it could be a catalyst upon which South Australia could set a lead nationally and internationally in the application of technologies to encourage wider public usage of environmental sustainability.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Tourism): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the consideration of the Bill.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): About 18 months ago in this Chamber I spoke on the outstanding work done by the South Australian Traffic Safety and Promotion Section of the Police Department. Today I want to highlight again the work of this unit under the leadership of the officer in charge, a good friend of mine, Sergeant David Hearn.

In a society which is devastated by tragic car accidents and the untimely death of people of all ages, our job is to help prevent such catastrophes in whatever way we possibly can, although we often seem helpless. I am sure that not one person in this place has not been affected by a road death, perhaps of a loved one, a relative, a friend or an acquaintance. I remember clearly in 1973 hearing about the tragic death of my best friend—in fact, the best man at my wedding—in Perth at the age of just 31 years. He was married with two young children. It was a tragic waste. I was shocked and deeply saddened by his death.

The Traffic Safety and Promotion Section plays a significant role in our community in helping to prevent death and severe injuries. This team of traffic educators has reached thousands of young children and older students in most schools in South Australia during the past decade or so. I have known David Hearn over the past decade through my former career as a teacher, and I congratulate him on a job

which is superbly done and on work which is invaluable in the community.

The unit for which he is responsible involves the presentation of youth driver education programs to schools with year 11 and 12 students throughout the State, and that is just part of it. Many of these students are just beginning to drive, so it is very important training for them. The unit is also responsible for the sponsorship of monitor vests and 'Thank you' certificates for young people who carry out duties as school monitors, and that is also a very important job. Further, the unit is responsible for the training of school monitors throughout South Australia and for the presentation of bicycle and pedestrian road safety programs to children who attend the children's road safety school, which is sponsored by the Motor Accident Commission.

This year, 434 groups participated in the youth driver education program. Approximately 14 445 students from both public and private schools attended the two two-hour lectures or programs. When I was teaching I also had the privilege of being involved in those programs, and they were most enlightening. As one would expect from such a professional unit, there was widespread appreciation from the schools, which were unanimous in their view that this program of educating school children must continue at all costs.

The unit's main aim is to present road and cycle safety education to school and community groups at the road safety school. It aims to train and authorise student volunteers at both primary and secondary school level in the safe and efficient management of marked crosswalks and school pedestrian crossings. In 1996, 203 groups involving over 10 833 students were trained. The monitoring system is now in its 35th year of almost accident-free success. Monitors, who are student volunteers who have received parental permission to be involved, have played a tremendous role during that time.

The members of the traffic safety section are also involved in the lecturing of community groups on road safety and traffic law. These include junior and primary students, service clubs, business, church and youth groups and Government and semi-government authorities. In 1996 and up to the end of this month, 35 179 people were lectured. It is impossible to measure how many lives are saved through the work of the traffic safety and promotion section—surely, I would think, many. Over 140 000 contacts with the people of South Australia are made each year through lectures and displays, a truly magnificent effort which involves a very high proportion of our community.

The main aim of Sergeant Hearn and his team is to liaise with principals and senior staff of schools and colleges throughout South Australia, to ensure the continuation of the youth driver education program and to ensure that all driving age students are given the opportunity to attend the program. I wish I had had that opportunity when I was beginning to drive a few years ago, because I think my skills would probably be a lot better than they are now. This driver education program saves lives, and I believe that that is what it is all about. I congratulate Sergeant Hearn and his dedicated team and I wish them all the very best for 1997 and the future.

Mr WADE (Elder): The *Directions for South Australia* program on Channel 9 is screened too late in the evening.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr WADE: Obviously, you do not watch TV or it is on too late. The member for Hart does not see it. I suppose it is

a matter of cost, but what price do we put on educating and advising the South Australian people of the marvellous and innovative achievements of their fellow citizens of this State? *Directions for South Australia* is a program highlighting achievement, but, more importantly, it is a program that tells people the way we are going—forwards and upwards. It is a visual display of confidence in ourselves.

Perhaps it should be repeated in the early hours of the morning for the night owls, insomniacs, the member for Hart and others who find themselves watching an hour advertisement on the newest mechanical abdominal developer, how to get a perfect memory in four audio tapes (and I forget how much the course costs), or even how to walk over broken glass or burning coals after receiving a few days of an intensive course on motivational mentalism from a wide-mouthed, full-toothed American guru who achieved fame and fortune in three short years. I understand that he achieved it by showing others how to achieve fame and fortune in a few short years. There seems to be something hollow in these programs. Because we live in a world of the quick fix and the 20-second TV commercial grab, because we can microwave our steak in minutes rather than cook it in an hour, or because we now travel faster to our physical destinations, we tend to think that everything else in our lives should be instantaneous.

The popular thought of the late twentieth century in South Australia (and I guess we are not alone in the world; it is a global disease) is that we can get it—and should have it—all now. If we want a new 68-centimetre colour stereo TV we tend not to start putting money aside, \$10 a week in 1997 for two years, so that we can pay for it in cash in 1999. Why do we not do that? Why are we addicted to the here and now and not to the save to obtain regime? Our grandparents worked on the cash economy. In the 1950s our parents were introduced to the never-never payment by instalment system, but cash still gave them a hefty discount. Nowadays, when you present cash at a counter for an article above, say, \$500, the counter staff say, 'I am sorry; I am not authorised to take cash.' I did that once, and the assistant called the manager, who then entered into the transaction.

If you stay in a hotel and pay for your room in advance by cash (and I did that once, as well), you will be hit with a \$100 per night cash deposit which the hotel will refund when you leave. Cash is not a popular medium of exchange for goods and services with major retail and accommodation outlets in the late twentieth century. I can only assume from that that the counter staff are either not trusted by management to handle cash transactions or not trained to open a till. I can only assume that a person who wants to pay cash for staying at a hotel is presumed to be dishonest and someone who will skip with the hotel's towels, maybe the bar refrigerator contents, maybe the bar refrigerator itself, the Gideon's Bible and a few other bits and pieces. A plastic card is traceable, but cash is not.

However, I digress. I was asking myself why we are addicted to the here and now and not the save to obtain regime. I think there are a number of reasons. First, the plastic card system allows purchases on credit. The interest rate is criminal, but parents will bear it to ensure that their children have a good Christmas or that they have shoes that fit. It is a temptation to get a car repaired using a plastic card so that you can get to work, especially after you have just paid for ETSA and gas bills, car registration, rent or the mortgage, school fees and school uniforms. Few of us would resist that temptation to keep things going on as usual. We

avoid a crisis now in the hope that we do not face a financial crisis later. Instead, we find ourselves paying off a plastic card whose balance never seems to go down. We are in the system.

Therefore, the plastic card is our key to instant gratification of our physical needs, wants or desires. It is a future debt, and today is the tomorrow that we all worried about yesterday. Why save when you can have it now? If you need cash now, sell something; you can always use the card to purchase a more up to date model later. That is the second reason why we are addicted to the here and now. Technological improvements are happening at such a rate that what we buy in a shop today was obsolete yesterday and will be replaced by the newer model tomorrow. That model is obsolete already, because the one on the drawing board is about to start production for a limited time, and that is to be replaced by the one in the planning stage. This one does not look at all like the new CAD design that the designers printed out last week. There is no way in the world that we can keep up, yet we still want what is in the shops, what our friends have or, more importantly, what our neighbours do not have. This merry-go-round started spinning in the 1950s and has now reached a point where, once we are on it, we cannot get off.

We use plastic to enjoy it now on the basis that we will upgrade later—using plastic, of course. The third reason we are here in our society is one of prices. In the past, members may remember saving for nine months to buy a pair of roller skates. They were the same price nine months after you decided to start saving to buy them. They were the same skates. You could plan how much of your pocket money or paper route money you wanted to put aside. You watched your money grow until it reached a set objective, and you then purchased your skates. It is virtually impossible to do that nowadays. The pair of skates which were \$60 nine months ago are now \$80. You meet your savings objective only to see that someone has shifted the goal post \$20 further on. In frustration, you continue to save, and you finally save the money but the skates are no longer available because they have been discontinued, or they have been replaced by a new model.

Some stores allow a lay-by system which is happily embraced by thousands of shoppers. This system falls down when the shoes, computer or whatever you had on lay-by for six months is offered on sale at half the price you are paying. You are locked into the full price while somebody else walks into the shop with a plastic card and buys it for half the price. The sheer inconsistency of sale prices, interest rates and product variations work against saving as a normal way of life. When economists say Australians are not saving enough, they should look closely at the reasons why—not the economic reasons, but the social, everyday hard facts of life that face us all on a daily basis.

South Australians understand debt. We live with debt. Most of us have debt now or have had it at some time in our life. South Australians do not understand why they cannot have reasonable goods and services now, even though the State is in debt. The plastic card system and fluctuating prices, new models and an insecure future have trained us all to live with debt and have the goodies now—and hope we can pay for it all later. Reality is that the later upon which Labor relied came sooner than expected. The Liberals did not make the debt, but we have accepted responsibility for reducing that debt to a manageable level.

Our task—and it is one that we have generally failed to complete—is to demonstrate to South Australians that we can

reduce the debt and still supply adequate services, create opportunities for employment and forge a future for all South Australians. However, it will be a future based not on loyalty to unions and employers—that has been a proven lie—but forged in the security that comes from within ourselves. That is our task, to give back to South Australians confidence in themselves, confidence in their Government and confidence in their future. Maybe then we can start to save again and, when we do, it will have nothing whatsoever to do with economic rationalism. It will be to do with the people, their attitude, their views and their confidence in themselves.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): That was a quality economic lecture from the member for Elder. It is always a pleasure to hear such economic drivel and nonsense from members opposite, and that was an amusing little contribution. I rise in this debate to discuss a number of issues. However, I want to begin by making a brief comment about the program we have seen on Channel 9 in the past few months called *Directions for South Australia*, which was paid for in part by the Economic Development Authority. We are yet to find out how much the authority has paid, but no doubt it is many hundreds of thousands of dollars for a program that is an absolute waste of taxpayers' money.

It is not a good economic stimuli for the economy or a good expenditure of taxpayers' money to put on a program in Adelaide at 11 o'clock at night to tell us how much we like each other, to tell us how well we are going, to get the feel good factor going. If you are going to spend that sort of money on television programs, why not be a little clever and spend it on a target market in the Eastern States, where we might gain some economic good. In this State, it is about time we stopped getting up, patting ourselves on the back and telling ourselves how well we are doing, when clearly that is nothing more than Government sponsored Party political propaganda. It is a very clever way, if you can—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The ratings in the paper today say there were some 40 000 to 50 000 viewers each night. That is not a bad target market for members opposite. What does it matter that you spend \$500 000 in taxpayers' money to get it? In the lead up to a State election, it is a clever misuse of the taxpayers' money. Of course, we have seen that in many examples such as the Southern Expressway where there has been never ending propaganda.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Mitchell should be pretty happy. His face appeared in taxpayer funded propaganda, distributed to his electorate and southern electorates, with Party political intent in place. This Government has been extremely clever, but it is unwise to use taxpayers' money to meet Party political ends, as this Government has done. There can be no other explanation for the *Directions for South Australia* program. It was interesting, and Keith Conlon is a good quality presenter. It was good television, but for what purpose? To make the public feel good about their State, as we lead into a State election.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The only words we ever hear from the member for Colton is when he interjects. He would have to be the honourable member who speaks least in this Parliament. Come on Steve, give us a few more interjections. The only way we hear from the member for Colton is through his interjections, so come on Steve, make a few more comments.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: That's fine. Rise today and speak, instead of always slinging off—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: If you think that I am sitting in Semaphore and doing nothing, I am sure that you will run a strong campaign against me at the next State election. The point I am making is that it is obvious to everyone that *Directions for South Australia* is yet again another example of this Government's neglect in respect of properly using taxpayers' money; there can be no other reason.

I want to touch on the tariff debate. It has been interesting to watch the Premier say how well and how hard he will fight for a 15 per cent tariff level. We see other Ministers rise in this place and say how strongly they will take on the Federal Government. The Federal Government is a Liberal Government. They are the colleagues of members opposite. The member for Elder might doubt that but, believe me, the longer the Federal Liberal Government is in power, the more we will keep reminding you that they are your colleagues. I am talking as a member of a Party that has had some experience when I say that they tend to do us a bit of a disservice: Federal Governments, regardless of their political persuasion, tend to ignore South Australia to an extent.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Yes, that's true. The point I make is that John Howard is a Liberal. Members opposite will have a far better chance to influence the outcomes of the tariff debate than we will in the Opposition. However, we will take part in a very robust debate. In 1993, then Senator John Olsen was a supporter of John Hewson, who wanted zero tariffs. The former Premier, the member for Finnis, was on the steps of this Parliament supporting John Hewson saying, 'Labor's got to go, Labor's got to go.' And in your platform—

Mr Caudell: He was not a Senator in 1993.

Mr FOLEY: No, at the time of the Federal election he was still a Senator.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Whenever he was a senator in the Federal Government, under John Hewson's leadership he was a zero tariff man. The member for Finnis was a zero tariff man, and the member for MacKillop, the Minister for Finance, is a well known zero tariff man—he has made no secret of that. Ian McLachlan, a Federal Liberal member, is a zero tariff man. Ian McLachlan was the shadow Federal Minister who pushed a zero tariff for automobiles in this State. So what hide and what cheek does the Government have to say that it is the protector of the car industry.

The Government has made the investors in Mitsubishi and Toyota in Japan and Ford and General Motors very nervous. Four years ago the Ian McLachlans of this world, the John Hewsons, the Dean Browns and the John Olsens made the investors in America and Japan extremely nervous, and they started to question the Liberal Government's commitment to the auto industry in this nation. So it is a bit rich for Government members to be now so strongly putting forward a facade—and that is all it is—of supporting the auto industry when, in 1993, like the meek little fellows that they were, they lined up behind John Hewson to support zero tariffs. The dry line.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Zero to five.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Excuse me, but the policy of the member for Barker, Ian McLachlan, was zero to 5 per cent. The definition of zero to 5 per cent—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Zero to 5 per cent, and that is defined as a negligible tariff.

Mr Caudell: It is not zero, is it?

Mr FOLEY: Once you get to 5 per cent, you are about gone.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Mitchell does not understand economics. The zero to 5 per cent tariff level is considered, in all terminology, to be a negligible tariff, and you, Sir, and members opposite were very much supportive of it. What we could do to end this very damaging debate is simply knock the Productivity Commission's report on its head now. Let us not wait for the final report. We have had the interim report, and we know what the final report will say. The commission will not go against what its interim report indicates. John Howard has no excuse for not now simply saying, 'We ignore the Productivity Commission's recommendation.'

John Howard can say that now because in Tokyo and in Detroit they are very nervous and very anxious and, as the weeks and months go by, as John Howard and his Federal colleagues debate whether or not they want it, decisions made by this nation and its reputation will start to be damaged to a point where there could still be collateral damage, even if the Productivity Commission's final report is rejected. John Howard should show some leadership, and the Liberal Party nationally should show some leadership for this State and support the car industry properly.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I cannot help but make a few comments on the tirade by the member for Hart. He talked drivell. The member for Hart has obviously forgotten that the world did not begin in December 1993, and that the world did exist well before then. I want to talk about the program, *Directions for South Australia*, on Channel 9 and the drivell that uttered forth from the member for Hart. He forgets, from his short time in private enterprise, that private enterprise is a confidence game—it relies on confidence. *Directions for South Australia*, put out by Channel 9, is an attempt to stimulate confidence in the environment.

We all know what happened six years ago today when an announcement was made by the former Premier for whom the member for Hart was an adviser. Six years ago the former Premier made the announcement about the State Bank, and that was like a sledge hammer between the eyes for small business in South Australia. When you talk about confidence or the lack of confidence, the State Bank disaster did more damage to this economy than any other issue in the history of South Australia since 1836. The efforts of the previous Government six years ago when it announced the first bailout of the State Bank shattered the economic confidence of small business in this State.

The efforts of one television station to put forward, in conjunction with the EDA, a program to develop confidence amongst small business is to be applauded. Talking about Party political programs, if you are going to put on anything for Party political purposes, you would not attempt to put it on at 11 p.m. It is not really the peak viewing time of the people for South Australia. After the end of the news and the sports programs, the general public who are not involved in small business will not necessarily hang around until 11 p.m. A number of constituents involved in small business have come to me and spoken about this issue, and they have applauded the efforts of Channel 9 and the Southern Televi-

sion Corporation in relation to that program and the efforts that are being put out in the marketplace.

We remember what happened six years ago when the member for Hart was an adviser to the former Government. As I said, when the first announcement was made it was like a sledge hammer between the eyes. The member for Hart talks about economics but he just turns a blind eye completely. His economics is associated with forecasting the future without learning any lessons from the past. I can assure the member for Hart that the world did not begin in December 1993. He has the absolute audacity to stand here in this House and talk about Party political propaganda. He then mentioned the Southern Expressway.

The member for Hart, who previously worked for the Bannon and Arnold Governments, was responsible for and involved in the distribution of three glossy brochures on the Southern Expressway through the electorates of Mitchell, Reynell and Kaurna. I am talking about the first brochure that was issued in 1983—a brochure on transport issues for the south. It was a glossy brochure: not a newspaper issue that we put out, but a glossy brochure that included the issue of the development of the Southern Expressway, which the then Government called the third arterial road. Prior to the 1985 election the Labor Party had some of these brochures left and it had the audacity to use these brochures—paid for by the people of South Australia—in its election campaign.

The Labor Party reissued the brochure with stamps overprinting the front page that stated, 'We've done this; we've completed this; we've ticked this off; and we've achieved this.' The then Labor Government released a brochure in 1985—paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia in 1983—during the election campaign that year, yet the member for Hart has the audacity to stand up in this House and say that, when the Liberal Government puts out something about the Southern Expressway or if we try to build confidence in our economy, we are Party political. The member for Hart needs to hang his head in shame because this is typical of the type of twaddle that we have been put through in the past two weeks.

The Labor Party attempts to take an issue, expand it and put it out in the market place with the hope that someone will run with it. With respect to the Southern Expressway, the Opposition should be damned for attempting to come out with so much twaddle. Last week I had the opportunity to partake in a consultation process with local community groups, including the Friends of Warriparinga, the Bedford Residents Association, the city of Marion, the City of Mitcham and the Kaurna Heritage Committee, to look at the proposals associated with the Southern Expressway going through Sturt triangle. The consultation process looked at greening that area, developing wetlands and reintroducing environmentally friendly plants which grew in the area before 1836. In this respect, local community groups made worthwhile contributions.

I commend the efforts of the contractors—Maunsell, and MacMahon Constructions—as they have continually consulted with local residents and ensured that their work is environmentally friendly. When stage 1 of the Southern Expressway is completed, we will have a project in the southern region which is second to none. The Southern Expressway project will provide new opportunities for residents in the southern suburbs and will provide necessary jobs for people in the southern electorates of Mitchell, Reynell and Kaurna.

Landscaping of the Southern Expressway commenced with the planting of over 10 000 trees and shrubs, the majority of which were grown from seeds collected from existing trees in the expressway corridor at Beach Road, Noarlunga. Some 2 000 seedlings were supplied by Trees for Life, and the first plantings were conducted within the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park north of Majors Road. The earth works for the Southern Expressway have been completed in that area, and it is anticipated that over 80 000 native trees and shrubs will be planted as a result of the construction of stage 1 of the Southern Expressway. I look forward to the completion of this road.

I refer to the Patawalonga and its clean-up. The Government has remained committed to the progressive improvement of water quality in the Patawalonga catchment basin. Recently, there was a public meeting in the Marion council chambers at which there was discussion on the draft plan to remove the concrete drain in the Oaklands estate reserve and transform the area into wetlands. Once work in this locality has been completed by the Patawalonga Catchment Board, we shall see a vast improvement to the area, to the quality of the water and to the lifestyle of those who live in this area.

A lot has been done to improve the water quality in the Sturt Creek within the electorate of Mitchell. The local Anglican church, St Elizabeth's, received support from the board in its plans to divert stormwater run-off into the underground watertable. The efforts of the local community in this respect are to be applauded. The issue has also been addressed by local companies that want to see what they can do to ensure that stormwater is diverted into the underground aquifer. When the Department of Mines conducted testing in that area, it found that water reserves were 35 metres below ground level.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): First, in support of the Supply Bill, I refer to the newly established water industry, which has exceeded its first year export targets of \$9 million by at least \$22 million, with the placement of an order of \$31 million. Products such as motors, water instrumentation and engineering services have been supplied to the Da Chang Water Treatment Plant in China, water supply projects in Thailand and waste water plants in Indonesia. Pope Motors has won \$1.4 million worth of orders for New South Wales and New Guinea. South Australian taxpayers are being saved \$1 million a month in the cost of managing Adelaide's supply of water and waste water. The turnaround in South Australian waste water management has resulted in a 1995-96 operating profit of \$67 million after tax, compared with the 1992-93 operating loss of \$47 million. This means that the total three-year profit under this Government was \$210 million.

The Aldinga sewage treatment plant is well on stream to be commissioned on time. This project is being built by Henry Walker & Co. as a BOOT scheme and will provide valuable water as an end product for use in the Willunga Basin. Recently in my electorate the Seaford Ecumenical and Health Centre was opened by the Governor-General. This is an internationally recognised development, the first of its kind in Australia. The South Australian Government contributed \$1 million to the health centre portion of this combined development.

The Southern Vales Health Centre has been relocated to the Seaford area and provides a good central service for the region. It is easily accessed by residents in the Sellicks Beach and Aldinga Beach areas following the dramatic increase in bus services as part of the improved transport facilities that

began on 1 January 1997 provided by Transit Regency. As already reported to the House, patronage increased by 67 per cent since the introduction of this new service, including Saturday and Sunday services as far as Sellicks Beach. Clearly, the community has voted with its feet to support this long awaited and hard fought for service in the deep south. As an aside, I wish to place on record my sincere thanks to Margaret Staples and Narelle Looker who, along with a range of other community members, fought tirelessly for improved transport in our region. The resultant supply is an indication of the successes that can be achieved when communities and Governments work together.

TransAdelaide has also greatly increased and improved services within the area of the electorate covered by its service. The improvements include a shopping loop run around Seaford Rise, Moana and Seaford, and an east-west service to improve cross-suburb connections to the Noarlunga Centre, TAFE and Noarlunga Health Services. Nightmoves, conducted by TransAdelaide, has been a very successful and sensible innovation, allowing safe passage for party goers who are smart enough not to drink and drive. I pay special tribute to Mr Nick Gianetta who, until recently, was Manager of the Lonsdale TransAdelaide depot. All southern members appreciated the way that Nick responded positively to the needs of the community, and customer service was his number one priority. I wish him well and every success in his new position at Mile End.

The southern community appreciates the introduction of Transit Police to maintain a safe environment on public transport systems in our area. The upgrade of the Noarlunga interchange has been very successful both from a convenience and a safety point of view. The consultation programs for the upgrade of Commercial Road and the bypass of Port Noarlunga township have almost been completed. Locals will have noticed considerable surveying and road marking taking place over the last few months. An absolute priority is to get this work started this year, particularly to light the traffic control devices on the Seaford Road-Commercial Road intersection. To delay the upgrade of this intersection and that leading into Maslin Beach another 12 months is not acceptable to my community.

The Southern Sports Complex has had a successful year, with the South Adelaide Football Club now making its mark in the south. I have worked very closely with the South Adelaide Football Club and the South Adelaide Soccer Club to secure an agreement for soccer to collocate at the Southern Sports Complex. All southern members have welcomed the Minister's announcement of the Southern Sports Complex board, and we wish the Chairman, Mr Bob Bache, our best for the future directions of the complex. I intend to meet with the Chairman in the near future to discuss areas of common interest in progressing this complex towards the year 2000. Southern members have a united aim to see premier league soccer played in this complex in 1998.

From 18 November 1996, the Deposit 5000 scheme has been running in South Australia. This offers a one-off grant as a deposit to build or purchase a home. The amount is up to \$5 000, depending on income, and is available to those people with incomes of less than or equal to \$1 000 a week and a property of value equal to or less than \$140 000. The Deposit 5000 scheme is offering \$4 million to boost the building industry and to make housing more affordable for South Australians.

A \$2 million South Australian Housing Trust deposit assistance scheme is available to offer grants of up to \$5 000

to help trust tenants raise the deposit necessary to purchase their own home or to help them purchase a vacant property owned by the trust. As well as this, the Olsen Government has cut stamp duty payable for first home buyers in South Australia, which will benefit 4 000 buyers in the next 12 months. This will result in concessions of \$1 540 for houses valued at \$140 000.

Labor members have spent the past three years complaining about what they perceive we were not doing regarding unemployment and complaining about what we should be doing. In that whole three year period they have not put forward a single positive issue to stimulate employment in South Australia. For the whole of the past three years we have listened to the complaints of the Opposition questioning all positive initiatives in a purposeful attempt to set a mode of discontent and lack of confidence in South Australians. Labor's main game has not changed: it has always been and has continued to be the support of unions, promotion of unionists as candidates, and pushing pro-union stands on all issues rather than pro-economic development and progress in South Australia.

In contrast to this syndrome, the Liberal Government has just got on with the job. The VET program in schools has encouraged schools to introduce curriculum in line with making industry more relevant to education, and has linked schools to business in the areas of tourism, business, multimedia, recreation and sport, and aquaculture. Since 1994, 3 000 trainees have taken part in the South Australian traineeship scheme. Kickstart continues to be a very successful training program in the south. Mitsubishi is part of the largest cooperative State-industry training scheme in Australia, and this company has recently taken on 700 new employees. As a response to the Premier's Youth Employment Task Force, a detailed youth employment strategy has been released by Minister Dorothy Kotz, with wide ranging initiatives to stimulate jobs and young people's ability to qualify for jobs.

Job Shop was launched in my electorate recently, and I recognise the assistance and work done behind the scenes by the member for Davenport to encourage the adoption of a brokerage model for Job Shop. We travelled to Geelong to investigate the programs running there, which have been set up by Rotary, Lions and Apex, and we made a submission to the Minister to have a similar scheme introduced here in South Australia. The Job Shop brokers match targeted unemployed people with identified employment opportunities. I am pleased that in the electorates down south we have a considerable degree of interest from Rotary, the Southern Development Board, Zonta, Willunga High School and Y-Train. The target group is the 15 to 19-year-olds, and the Job Shop brokers must identify employment opportunities, recruit the participants, match the employers and ensure that 20 hours paid work per week is given to those young people. Employers are exempt from a WorkCover levy and have a rebate for payroll tax, also avoiding unfair dismissal claims. The target of Job Shop is 1 000 young people, and it has an annual budget of \$400 000.

In closing, I would like to put on record my sincere sympathies for the members of the family of Harry Bowey, recently deceased, of my electorate.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I wish to cover a few programs in my electorate that will be supported under the Supply Bill over the next few months. I have already mentioned in this House the new Hewett Primary School, which has opened

extremely successfully with over 100 students in the past couple of weeks, and my congratulations again to the principal, Mr Con Karvouniaris, who is doing an excellent job there. The school numbers some 30 in excess of the expectation of the Department of Education and Children's Services, and I know that it will continue to be very successful. The tenders have now been decided and let for the bricks and mortar part of the school, stage 2. At the moment Demacs house the students, but the brick buildings will now be started.

It is a \$1.2 million stage that will encompass the main buildings, the grassing of oval areas and open play areas for children. In all, it will be an excellent facility. I congratulate the Minister for Education and Children's Services for approving this program. It is a much needed school in the northern area of Gawler and the only school in Gawler that is north of the North Para River. I know that, as the school buildings go up, next year many more parents in the Willaston area will take advantage of sending their children to a new school, one at which there is an extremely enthusiastic staff making sure that the school gets the best facilities it can and delivering a very high standard of education to the young people who attend.

I am also pleased to say again that the special class that the Minister approved for that school is working extremely well. Five students are now receiving special attention, and that will be expanded over time. That is another excellent facility for the Gawler area and for those parents with children who have very special needs.

Another aspect that will be supported under this Supply Bill is a tourist strategy for the Barossa Valley roads. I spoke with the Minister for Transport about 12 months ago and, knowing that there were tourist strategies for Kangaroo Island and the Flinders Ranges, suggested to her that we should run a similar program for the Barossa Valley roads. The Barossa Valley is one of the icons of Australian tourism. When you talk to international tourists, you find that Ayers Rock basically is number one; the Gold Coast and the Great Barrier Reef are number two; and the Barossa Valley is number three in the recognition of all international tourists.

It is extremely important that we have a road system that is able to cope with the increasing number of tourists who are coming into the Barossa Valley. The Barossa Valley Way has been in its current form for as long as I can remember, yet the traffic along that road has increased by an incredible amount since it was first laid. To cite one instance, SPD Transport, which has the contract for taking all wine out of and bottles into Orlando winery, runs some 4 000 vehicles up that road every year. That is 8 000 trips—4 000 up and 4 000 back—on that road alone. And that is just one company: it does not include the sand trucks that come out of quarries in the area, plus the other winery transport, plus all the tourism transport, plus the local people who are travelling to Gawler or Adelaide using the only road that they can travel. I am very pleased to see that study go ahead.

Another initiative that will be occurring within the next six weeks is the installation of traffic lights at Alexander Avenue to service Trinity College. Again, I gained the support of the Minister for this initiative. It is an extremely busy crossing. Some 2 000 students attend that school, and it is in dire need of traffic lights. I am very pleased to see that that will occur.

One other topic that is very pertinent in my area, in the Barossa Valley and in the electorate of Culance (Mr Ivan Venning's electorate) is water filtration. The previous Government did nothing about the filtration of water in

country areas. Metropolitan Adelaide has had filtered water for some 10 years now, and the country regions have been paying the same amount for water but in essence getting extremely dirty water.

The filtration plant, which will service the Barossa Valley and environs, will be up and running in February-March 1998—and it is not before time. I am very pleased to see that the previous Minister for Infrastructure, the now Premier, placed six filtration plants on the books under the BOOT scheme, which was one way of using private capital to get a system built to deliver clean and filtered water to the Barossa Valley and other areas. It was only a week ago last Monday that I was deluged with probably 20 or 30 telephone calls from people complaining that the water in which they were washing their clothes was brown—again the fault of the system. It is good that this Bill will attend to that situation.

I touch on one other particular success story which has occurred in South Australia; that is, the television program *Directions for South Australia*. The principal sponsor for this program has been the Economic Development Authority. The program highlights very successful South Australian businesses, including small businesses. Each business tells its story and says, 'This is how we did it and this is a pattern that other businesses can well follow.'

Mr Bass: That was the show about which the member for Hart was talking.

Mr BUCKBY: I am reminded that the member for Hart criticised this program, which has 40 000 to 50 000 viewers each week. I am sure that many of them would be small business people looking for ideas for their own enterprise. The large audience this program attracts indicates an ongoing need for information highlighting successful businesses throughout the broader community, promoting innovative ideas, export ideas and ideas to which other small businesses can adapt. It was also good to hear some positive news about the economy through that program. While one might say that it is advertising, it is exactly what this State needs, because one of this State's problems is the perception of the other States that South Australia is not performing well and is not a place in which they should be interested.

This program highlights successes—and there are many—occurring in South Australia. They do not have to be successful on a large scale. It shows what small business can achieve and how it can generate income and employment for this State. I congratulate Keith Conlon on his production and I suggest that it should continue. I also congratulate the EDA on its initiative and for developing a program such as this which demonstrates the fact that there are opportunities for small business in South Australia and that those opportunities are there to be taken. For instance, small business proprietors can approach the EDA for support, knowledge and to see what opportunities are available or what markets they may be able to tap into. This has been an excellent program and one of which the Government and also the small businesses that have taken part in the program can be very proud.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I raise an issue which featured on the front page of the *Guardian Messenger* of 5 February this year. It relates to a headline attributed to the Mayor of the new Holdfast Bay council, Mr Nadilo, who claims:

Pat backslides as State Government dithers.

I have been asked to put some facts on the record because, as far as the Government is concerned, the statement made by

the Mayor is outrageous and shows some lack of understanding of the magnitude of the project and the time frames within which we are working. It certainly creates a perception that this Government has not planned the project and that the project is going backwards. First, in the 11 years under the former Labor Government absolutely nothing was done about the Patawalonga. In fact, the people of South Australia were sick and tired of hearing about 'The Pat' and listening to the public protests. It was only when the Liberal Government came into power in 1993 that things started to happen.

The history of that first year is one of intense planning, and I was fortunate enough to be the Minister at the time. During that first year we renegotiated with the Federal Government to shift the Building Better Cities money from the Gillman site across into the western suburbs which gave us a fairly large capital base on which to plan some very substantial projects for the west. The first one was the clean-up of the Patawalonga. That gave us the opportunity to combine some \$4 million (provided by the State Government) with the money from the Building Better Cities program. Some of that money went towards the clean-up of Mile End and some of it went towards the Henley Beach Road redevelopment. Today I am concerned only with the development at Glenelg.

Since the moneys were put together a considerable amount on actual capital works has now been expended and, in particular, the Pat has been dredged. Not only has it been dredged but new banks and beaches have been created. The Government then saw fit to allocate another \$7 million to the harbor project and, if anyone visits the site now, they will see that the harbor project is well under way. The southern breakwater has been extended and the dredging process is positioning the channel, but what is important is that the breakwater has gone. The other bonus from the dredging process is that black plume, which used to move into the gulf and up the northern beaches, no longer exists. Last week the development also completed a sheet piling wall across the northern aspect of the lake which will become a permanent weir and which will be the final catchment for any silt, logs or heavy floating material coming down, so that nothing more can flow into the lake.

In summary, over the past two years an enormous amount of progress has occurred and the last thing anyone can accuse this Government of, whether they be in Government or local government, is dithering. When over the course of two years a Government can stand back after so many years of inaction and say that it has dredged the Pat, done the banks, put in the weir at the end and dredged the harbor, as well as being able to say that the famous (or infamous) sandbank and the plume have gone, that is the action of a Government that has got on with the job.

The further criticism is that we are procrastinating over what will happen next. The EIS, which is on public exhibition until 24 June this year, related to the Glenelg harbor project as well as the Patawalonga and West Beach. Because of the allocation of moneys the first step the department had to take was to address the EIS as it related to the Glenelg harbor project because we had an obligation to get the harbor under way, commitments having been made to the Kangaroo Island ferry proprietor that we would endeavour to have a safe harbor in place before this coming winter.

If we had not taken that priority, members of the City Council of Glenelg, now Holdfast Bay, would have been the first people to criticise the Government for not getting on with the harbor project. This Government put its resources

into getting that section of the EIS completed so that construction could start on the harbor. The time for closing the public exhibition of the EIS was 24 June and construction was under way from late October or early November and into December, and that is a fantastic performance for any Government project. It was quick, decisive and they got on with the job. Now the EIS team can give its attention to the rest of the EIS, which relates to the lake and to the outfall at the northern end of the lake.

The other matter that should be understood by the council at Glenelg is that the catchment management board sought to get additional information on the water flows down through the catchment, particularly when experimenting with different types of catchment gates, when experimenting with the flushing of seawater at different times and at high tide, and when testing. The board took additional information and my advice is that those reports were to go to the board at its last meeting, which was either last week or this week. Those reports also have to be taken into account by the EIS team.

From the advice that I have received, I expect that, over the next two or three months, the EIS for the balance of the project will be concluded, and then the Government will take a decision. It should also be understood that, if any additional works are to take place, no money is allocated until at least the 1997-98 budget, so we will not see any work on the northern end of the Patawalonga before 1 July this year.

In summary, let me say that the project has proceeded and is within a few months of being on track. In addition to the project are the off-airport works and the relocation of parts of the golf course. It is probably the largest earthmoving, urban project that has been undertaken in this State for many years. It is not the sort of project about which the Holdfast Bay council should be saying that the Government is dithering over. Rather, the Holdfast Bay council should be praising this Government from the top of the town hall clock.

My advice from three independent councillors is that it is not a unanimous view of council, although the Mayor is quoted in the press as saying that the council is furious. My advice is that council is not furious and that a large number of members think that the Liberal Government is doing a good job down there. It is doing something which the former Government was never game to tackle. We have got on with the job, and it would be nice to hear praise from everyone in the Glenelg area, not just a selected group. It is a first-class, world-class project and people are coming from interstate to view the methods of cleaning up and to see how the contaminants are handled. We know how to do these projects well in South Australia, and it is a classic example for everyone to see at Glenelg.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I support the Supply Bill. In so doing, I should like to encourage members of the public to look at the Leader of the Opposition's deplorable, childish speech on this Bill. He spent most of his speech saying that the member for Mawson was not interested in business in the south or interested in the south in general. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I know that my colleagues in the south, who are also very committed, would support me.

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition any day, any place, any time to debate with me what I as a member of the Liberal Government have achieved in three years for the south compared with what he as a senior Cabinet Minister in the Labor Government achieved for the south in an 11-year period. I would blow him to bits. That would not be a

problem. He talked about jobs. In the private sector, I have had the great privilege of being able to create real jobs in the south and I have continued to do that with my colleagues since I have been in office. It is my absolute commitment to the south—and I am particularly proud to represent the electorate of Mawson—that I will give all my energies to create more opportunities, and I will talk about those opportunities shortly.

In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition spent all his time trying to pull the State apart. He spent all his time criticising the debt reduction strategy, suggesting that the Government was not committed to the social aspects of the State, and criticising the fact that jobs have not been created. It was an absolute fabrication. Very soon the Leader of the Opposition will be embarrassed again. He was embarrassed in this House today and the people of South Australia think that he is an embarrassment as a Leader. I will embarrass him again very soon, because it is clear that the documents that he has been pushing about policing in the south are doctored pieces of information.

The people of the south are intelligent. They gave the Labor Party 11 years to get on with the job of supporting them; yet over that time the south was known as 'The Forgotten South'. Another major commitment was made by our Government today involving the sports complex, and my colleagues the members for Reynell and Kaurana and myself were delighted about that. The complex is a reality now. Minister Kym Mayes and the Labor Government called it a Taj Mahal.

In three election campaigns, the former Labor Government said that it would build a third arterial road, but it did not happen. A hospital was built for political point scoring but there was no funding for it and it remained unopened for a year under Labor. Today there is increased financial budgeting to the Noarlunga Hospital, we have great mental health services, and we have a long-term plan for proactive and positive health services in the south. We are improving bus services in all electorates, providing crossover transport to feed the interchange, and we are making the interchange a safe and enjoyable place for those using it.

The Government is spending millions of dollars on TAFE construction and it is revamping schools that were neglected for decades. For seven years under Labor, many of those schools wanted an upgrade and could not get it. I have great pleasure in advising this place that nearly all the schools in my electorate have had major amounts of money spent on them over just three years of the Liberal Government. More and more money is going into education in the south, and that will continue. More and more money is going into health in the south, and that will continue. More and more money is going into economic development in the south, and that will continue. More and more money is going into general care for people in the south, and that also will continue. It will continue because local people represent the south.

In the past under Labor, the candidates were brought in from other areas, including New South Wales; they bought a house for those candidates and dumped them there, and they said with contempt to the people of the south, 'Vote for this person. They've got their heart in it.' They dropped their football club stickers on the back window, they became members of Trees for Life, they got on boards, and away they went. They stood up and said, 'I am for the south and I will always be for the south.'

Guess what happened? When they did not win the election in 1993, they headed west, north or even east. They even

headed interstate. Michael Wright was a classic example. I will never forget the declaration of the polls when Michael Wright stood up and said to the people—he went on for about 15 minutes—'I will never forget the south. I am here with you and, even though you did not elect me, I will do things for the south.'

What happened to Michael Wright? His house in Woodcroft went on the market within two months of the election. He was obviously never a boy scout because he does not know anything about a compass and direction. He is now running against the member for Lee in the western suburbs. It was a bit hard for him to pursue a seat in the south particularly as he moved in there only because he wanted to follow his father. He did not win it, so what did he do to the south? He deserted us. What did the Labor Party do to the south? It deserted us. What did it do to South Australia? It drove us into a declining financial spiral.

The Leader of the Opposition wants to talk about jobs. Well, again I remind my electorate that the Leader of the Opposition did not create any jobs when he was the Minister for Small Business, Industry and Regional Development—he lost them. He lost over 33 000 jobs. He did not create opportunities for the south or for young people. When he is no longer Leader of the Opposition—and I hope it is sooner rather than later—I do not believe that he will take a job in South Australia; I will be very surprised if he does. I will look back in *Hansard* in future years to see what the Leader of the Opposition does when he finishes his parliamentary career—and that is what it is to him: a career, not a commitment to help rebuild the State that he messed up.

When a person crashes into somebody else's car, they get out of the car and offer assistance and apologise. The Leader of the Opposition crashed the State and still has not apologised, and he then gets taken off track by a young member of Parliament, the member for Mawson, who distracted him to the extent that he wasted half his contribution on the Supply Bill debate saying that I am not interested in jobs in the south. He well knows that he has lost the plot. All he wants to do is try to divide our Party, confuse the State and get in there to cause more problems. He is worried about the election, and I bet he will get a hair change and a better suit and we will see a big image change just before the election. However, the bottom line is that my community is intelligent.

I have not achieved everything that I want to achieve for my electorate: there is a lot more to be done, and I am the first to acknowledge it. I will describe what we have achieved. Members should drive down Main South Road at the moment and look at the expressway. The Leader of the Opposition talks about privatisation. The truth of the matter is that there has not been any privatisation. We have created real jobs in the private sector. Where this Government did not have to be involved in matters that were not the core business of Government we got out of them, because we cannot afford to run the gambling risk such as that run by Mike Rann and the Labor Party. One can see how quickly the private sector is getting on with that road. The Department of Transport is involved, so these are partnerships, not privatisation. It is partnerships that are involved in the Southern Expressway, TransAdelaide Lonsdale and the Transit Regency Bus Service in my electorate that is servicing other areas in the south. It is all about upgrading schools, giving the private sector a go and, most importantly, giving families and people a go.

Much more must be done yet, but we are on the way. This is a great Supply Bill; we are in the last quarter of this term and we have turned the corner. It will still be a rocky road and

I continue to remind my community of that, but together we can talk up and capitalise on opportunities. We should not talk them up when they are not accurate, but we should recognise all the good things that are happening down our way, such as the expansion of Mitsubishi, the Woodcroft Shopping Centre and the money that is being spent on hospitality, tourism and the wine industry. Two brand new wineries are about to be opened in my electorate, there are new dining facilities, a visitors' centre is now completed, main street programs are well under way, and the list goes on and on.

Again I say to the Leader of the Opposition, 'Get on with the job of supporting us or bail-out', because the South Australian community and particularly the southern community are sick and tired of people who want to come in here and destroy opportunities rather than help create them. Anybody can knock—it is easy to be a knocker—but it is much harder to plan with vision, to be positive, to bite the bullet and get on with the job. I believe that there are far more opportunities for people to get on with capitalising on those opportunities now than there have been for the past seven or eight years. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I too wish to make a contribution to the debate. When people come to Centre Hall they often ask me what the alcoves are for, and they notice that they are empty. They are empty because we never have saints as politicians. You will not find any Liberal, Labor, Democrat or Independent saints there. However, it is important to put what we can and actually do into perspective. The Opposition often accuses us of bringing back the past. If one were to witness what goes on here from the strangers' gallery, we could be forgiven for overdoing it when we remind the Opposition of the State debt and the affect it had on the economy.

When I look at the opportunity cost in true perspective, I have to agree with a famous man in history who said that those who are ignorant of the past are condemned to live in it. There is no doubt that in December 1993 the Labor Government was condemned by its past, and rightly so. It would want us to relive the past, not learn by its mistakes, and condemn South Australia's future to that same past. Well, it is obvious from the reforms that we have taken that we will not let South Australia down. No responsible Government could let down South Australia and the future of South Australians.

In 1993 South Australia was in dire straits—there is no question about that. The State cannot recover overnight, and tough decisions have been made. The Premier (Mr Olsen), the Treasurer and all members on this side would agree that tough decisions had to be made. We agree that people are hurting out there and that we still have a long way to go before we can restore faith and trust in South Australia.

The Opposition accuses us of talking up the economy all the time and talking of things that have not taken place. The reality is that we are making progress. Given how depressed South Australians were before 1993, when they had the worst disaster—not only in South Australia's history but also in Australia's history—it is important to encourage them and show them where they are succeeding. We are succeeding in many areas. We have not made miracles—there have been no saints in the alcoves since 1993—but we have made progress, and that progress must be acknowledged.

With regard to debt reduction, as a percentage of gross domestic product, South Australia's net indebtedness

increased from 15.1 per cent to 26 per cent between 30 June 1990 and 30 June 1992. No business, government or organisation can run efficiently by having 26 per cent gross State indebtedness. We have to do something about it. Of course we would like to spend money on education and health and, as soon as the climate enabled us to do that this year, we have given that priority. I look forward to more being given to those areas, because they cannot be neglected. Indeed, the Premier has said time and again that they are a high priority.

Today the Opposition Leader talked about our high unemployment rate of 9.6 per cent. It is higher than the national average but, again, we must look at things in perspective with regard to what we have done in the past three years. We had 11 per cent unemployed when we came to Government. We had a high youth unemployment rate then, and we still have an unacceptably high youth unemployment rate, and we have to do something about it. I know that Premier Olsen and every member on this side of the House sees that as a top priority because, if we do not tackle the youth unemployment rate, we will have social consequences. There is no use talking about other areas unless we deal with those basic problems of unemployment. We should give it priority, and we are doing so.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about 7 000 people emigrating from South Australia and about the decline in participation rates, the hidden unemployment, and so on. I agree that there are still problems. However, we must remember where we have come from and the opportunity cost involved. If you have such a depth and such a problem, you cannot do all the things you want to do. As the Premier clearly outlined today, if you have a huge mortgage on a house, you are limited on what you can spend in other areas. You cannot buy a new car if you have a high mortgage. South Australia had a second and third mortgage, and reasonable members opposite will agree with that. No-one can deny it. To accuse us of being insensitive, and so on, is a little unrealistic, given what we had to work from. Spending was out of control. South Australia was paying out about \$1 million a day more than it earned. We could not go on like that. I am sure that, if the Labor Party had retained office, it would have implemented the same policies to reduce the debt, because it had to be done. Because it had to be done, the opportunity cost is that you cannot expand in other areas as you would wish.

In 1997-98, Government debt will be approximately 18.6 per cent of gross State product. That is a big shift from 26 per cent, and it gives us greater flexibility to look at those areas we have to deal with and to put more money into education, health, community safety and into the environment. However, despite all the problems, we have made progress. We need only look at the environment and what has happened to the Torrens River and the Patawalonga. Those boards are making progress, and the environment is becoming cleaner.

In the long term we will be seen as the Government that really turned at the crossroads to make sure that South Australia not only promoted growth but did so in an environmentally responsible way. The EPA is doing that. We are spearheading major clean up efforts within industry which have improved environment technology, productivity and export potential. For example, we have negotiated more than \$250 million worth of environmental upgrades with industry in a new era of environmental awareness that is assisting in improved production techniques and the creation of jobs.

The environment and economic growth need not be poles apart. We have to work together because, if you do not create jobs, you have social problems that also affect the environment. Those two go hand in hand, but you cannot do those things overnight. We are making education a top priority. We have the \$18 million early years strategy to improve literacy, teaching and learning in the vital early years of education. We have had basic skills testing and, although there was some controversy, it was accepted by the majority of parents. It is now accepted that it is a good tool to gauge where students are at and, if it is necessary, to do something about making improvements.

We have made progress in the area of multicultural and ethnic affairs. The ethnic chambers of commerce on Greenhill Road have paid dividends, with export earnings available in the future. There has been a lot of talk about water. The reality is that we have not sold the assets, and there is no intention to sell any assets, because it will not happen. What we have done is outsource the management of the water supply. There have been great benefits. The quality of water being supplied to Adelaide people has improved since United Water's involvement.

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

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

Dr SUCH (Fisher): I would like to promote an idea I have had for some time that, as the centenary of Federation draws closer, all the States and Territories of Australia, with the support of the Commonwealth, create a scholarship scheme whereby students at tertiary level (university and TAFE) could study in another State or Territory. In that way, the cost to any one State or territory would not be unduly significant but would offer an opportunity for us, through our young people, to celebrate the centenary of Federation. These Federation scholarships, I believe, would highlight the fact that, whilst we have States and Territories within Australia, we are one nation—we are a Federation—and Federation scholarships would be a fitting addition to existing scholarships, such as the Rhodes scholarship.

In the past I have raised with some of my parliamentary colleagues the fact that I would like to see the States, the Commonwealth and the Territories getting together to create Federation scholarships, with some funding made available so that young people, whether from a university or TAFE background, could study in another State or territory within Australia. I would like to see that concept developed over the next few years.

I was very pleased to see that the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Rob Lucas, has agreed to expand the school alarm and fire detection system within schools. I know that members in this place have other issues on which to focus, but it has been a hobby horse of mine for a long time. I remember taking up the issue with the Hon. Susan Lenehan when she was the Minister. I visited Victoria many years ago and was convinced then that what Victoria was doing in providing alarm systems in virtually all classrooms at risk to detect burglar movement, as well as fire, had cut its school damage bills drastically—to something less than one-tenth of the bill before that program commenced. I have been continually arguing that case to Minister Lucas and I am delighted that, in recent times, he has agreed to expand the program, because in this day and age it is one very

effective way of curtailing the damage that is done to our public school system.

To her credit, the former Minister agreed that Aberfoyle Park High School would trial a system. The very publicity associated with the installation of those warning devices and the installation of hidden video cameras did a lot to protect that school, because would-be vandals were never sure whether or not the video cameras were operating or where they were located. I believe that an extension of alarm systems in classrooms will bring about positive benefits to everyone. While I have always been able to understand but not approve of people stealing things, I have never been able to understand why people destroy things. I do not condone the motive of theft, but I find it strange that people destroy things.

As Minister for Youth Affairs, I was able to put forward a program which is being implemented this year called the 'ownership program', where students in primary and early secondary school learn that they own public property—schools, playgrounds and facilities such as that—and that, therefore, it is not in their financial or other interest to damage or in any way harm that property. Having grown up at a time, and in a family, when we did not have a lot of material things, I place a lot of importance upon looking after things. It is a case of if you do not have much, you tend to appreciate it. I have always found it rather strange and bizarre that people would want to damage property, be it private or public. It saddens me greatly when I see and hear of people damaging places of educational instruction, because that is the very means which can and should be directed at helping disadvantaged young people in particular. Education is the passport for most people, particularly those in our community who are at the disadvantaged end of the spectrum. Sadly, there are far too many of them.

Recently, I was pleased to hear the Minister emphasise the importance of values in State school education. I am a great believer in the State school system. It is true to say that good teachers have promoted values for a long time. Some people suggest that many young people do not have values, and I do not believe that is correct. You either have good or bad values, but the school is one part—and an important part—of conveying to young people the importance of positive and constructive values. I know that there was some criticism of the Minister when he announced that, but I think it was misplaced; indeed, quite a deal of work took place behind the scenes to bring about that focus on values within the State school system.

I emphasise the fact that good teachers have promoted good values in our schools all the time, but it is a question of being more explicit rather than apologetic about it. The school system has an important role, but it should not be seen as a substitute for the responsibility of parents and others to convey positive values to their children. Indeed, the media has a significant role to play as well.

I refer to the Belair rail line and to comments by Derek Scrafton, who suggests that the Belair line should be scrapped—perhaps he should be called 'Derek Scrafton'. That suggestion is short-sighted. I would like to see more people use public transport. As I mentioned recently in this House, we need to develop a more sophisticated public transport system in this State—whether it be electrified (preferably), monorail, light rail or heavy rail. I am a strong supporter of movement of passengers via a rail system of one kind or another. It is very short-sighted for someone such as Derek Scrafton to suggest—if he has been reported cor-

rectly—that the Belair rail line be scrapped. As a rail line it needs to be promoted, and I urge more people to use that transport system.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Do you use it?

Dr SUCH: I certainly do. I have used it for more than 20 years: I am a great believer in the public transport system. In conclusion, I highlight the need for an expansion of the joint use library at the Hub at Aberfoyle Park. It is a joint facility provided by DECS and by the Happy Valley council. Recently, it almost earned a guernsey for expansion. I believe that a new initiative which would enable the school and DECS, in effect, to provide additional space but not need to contribute extra money by relocating some of its senior students out of the library would resolve the current impasse.

Today I had some discussion with the Hon. Rob Lucas in this respect. We can make progress on that issue, because the people in the area are above average in their occupational and educational levels and are great users of the library system. More retired people are moving into the area—no doubt because of the local member—and as such are very keen to use that library. As a result, it is under great pressure. I continue to urge the Minister to be very supportive and to see whether we can solve the accommodation crisis in the local library via this new innovative approach of the school providing space and the Happy Valley council providing \$600 000. I commend that initiative to the Minister.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I would like to say a few words about why the State is in the financial mess it is in at present, which is due to the previous Labor Government. In 1968, I was a 20-year-old person who started work in private enterprise. During that time, I came across many small manufacturing business people who said that they were working seven days a week, 12 hours a day but getting less money than the employees who were working eight hours a day, five days a week. After a period of time, when they could not find their way out of this situation, they decided to sell their business, because Don Dunstan was pushing at the time for worker participation, equal pay, no sex discrimination and no racial discrimination, yet the laws for offenders—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: The crime rate started going up as the then Premier was indicating that children, for example, had individual rights. A paper called 'White-anting the Constitution: The Constitutional Centenary Foundation', given to the Samuel Griffith Society by John Stone in Brisbane, dated 30 July 1994, a copy of which was given to me by the member for Ridley, in part states:

There is an American saying to the effect that 'if it looks like a duck, waddles like a duck and quacks like a duck, then it's almost certainly a duck.'

That quotation made me reflect on the members of the Labor Party in regard to the following questions I would like the member for Ross Smith to answer. How many members of the Labor Party in this present Parliament have been in large private business management? How many of them have been in small private businesses? How many members of the Labor Party in this present Parliament have been successful in any small business? How many Labor Party members in this Parliament have been faithful to their electors and their union organisation? How many of the Labor Party candidates for the next South Australian election have been in large private business management or even small private businesses? Will they be faithful to their electors, and how will they discharge their duties to the electors? Based on the perform-

ance of Labor leaders in the past, I do not have much hope. For example, we had Don Dunstan, Bob Hawke, Paul Keating and Joan Kirner.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: No, they didn't play for Richmond; they were all leaders when organisations came near bankruptcy. Of course, it was also Labor leaders who passed legislation regarding homosexuals, gambling, extended shopping hours and poker machines; who abolished hanging and corporal punishment; increased land taxes; and introduced worker participation laws, penalty rates for workers, Education Department policies on caning of children, children's rights and divorce laws. Labor politicians have always been the ones asking for higher pay for their positions. We had the State Bank and the ASER development, for instance. Of course, when John Bannon was Premier he was also President of the Labor Party and trying to do two jobs at once, and he did neither of them very well.

The other point I would like to make relates to a minute I have here from the Spence District Assembly held on 7 November 1985 at Whitefriars School at 7.30. In this the Labor branch moved a motion as follows:

That the Spence District Assembly calls upon the Premier to take appropriate action to counteract the attempts of Olsen and Tuxworth to gain political mileage out of the Darwin-Alice Springs railway controversy.

That was moved by Don MacLeod and seconded by S. Kightley. I have raised this matter because I understand that, in the near future, legislation will be introduced to make that a reality, whereby the Liberal Government will attempt to build the railway line from Adelaide to Darwin. It is about time and I totally support the project.

The Liberal Government has been in power since 1993 and it has done many good things. The general public has not been made aware of much of it by the media, but as a person who made a speech at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital some time ago when the renal unit was upgraded said, I say that, like a pregnancy, it takes nine months from the time of conception to the time of fruition. With these big projects, although the seeds were planted three years ago, it will be five or six years before they come to fruition.

My other point concerns small business. I have particular sympathy with those in small business and the work force who wish to have a four-day break over Easter. I understand that the Minister for Industrial Affairs has already made a press release, but I stress that I totally support the decision he made. We in this modern world place many pressures on the family due to the stresses and demands of the society we have created. I believe that the family is always the cornerstone of a healthy society. The Easter weekend occurs at an ideal time in the southern hemisphere, enabling workers and shopkeepers to have a break prior to the winter season.

As an elected representative, I expect to be the voice for the opinions of my constituents, be they Labor or Liberal. However, I find it disconcerting when a campaign is formulated and driven by a group who are not directly affected by the issue at hand, and I take as an example the shop trading issue. The issue is an important one, but I dislike being bombarded by preprinted cards and facsimiles from unnamed sources, which are not traceable. I imagine these types of tactics are supported and encouraged by the Labor Party. It is deceiving, and I have received many duplications, with preprinted postcards obviously being the product of a clever and costly union drive. Some were not signed by the sender. One such card was marked 'Devoted family member. Name

withheld.' We as politicians need to have truthful, not misleading, information from those constituents who need us to represent their opinions.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I refer to a local issue which is certainly creating much interest in my electorate; that is, the proposal being put forward for an alternative racing project by a company called TeleTrak. Mr Speaker, as you would be aware—and I thank you for your presence on the evening of 30 January, and I was also pleased by the presence of the Minister for Racing—a large gathering, something in the order of 600 people, attended at the Waikerie Institute to foster what was obviously some very significant interest and support for the project currently being promulgated not only in the Riverland but also in other areas around this State. I put on the record a few points concerning my involvement in and my understanding of this issue as it has developed over the past two to three months.

My objective, as I am sure it is for all those responsible leaders in the community, is to improve the quality of services, facilities and infrastructure and create extra jobs in my local area. My stance at the outset when this proposal was first mooted has been very publicly that I will support any regional development project that is put up, so long as it is credible and is likely to have a viable future.

In the process of representing my constituents' views, interests and desires, and the community's requirements in this regard, I certainly have not been directed or instructed to take any particular line by other interested parties, whether it be the South Australian Jockey Club, the Thoroughbred Racing Authority, the Minister or other colleagues in this place. My approach and method of pursuing this project on behalf of the community has involved a number of very distinct strategies and actions over the past two to three months. It has involved some degree of research on the project, including significant consultation with the Waikerie District Council and the Riverland Development Corporation. It has involved putting the views of the community, formally in writing and by personal discussion with the Minister, the Premier and other directly related Ministers.

I was also successful in getting the various parties together before Christmas, and representatives of the District Council of Waikerie came to Adelaide in a deputation to have discussions with the Minister. Further, I supported the requirement for the Minister to be present at the public meeting. Part of this strategy has been to get an appropriate, objective and valid investigation and assessment into establishing the real facts of this project by the Racing Industry Development Authority (RIDA) through its inquiry offered by the Minister last December.

There was some concern subsequent to the Minister's offering this inquiry by RIDA from the proponents of TeleTrak. This continued for a month or so with supportive groups and individuals in the local community concerned as to whether RIDA would be the appropriate body to conduct this inquiry. Right from the outset, I have always believed that RIDA is the most appropriate body to carry out this inquiry. Very simply, my reasons are that it is an independent statutory authority, answerable not just to the Minister but also to this Parliament. Pursuant to statute, it does have a legislative responsibility to support, assist and develop the whole racing industry, not just current existing elements of the industry such as the South Australian Jockey Club.

There was also concern that the South Australian Jockey Club had membership on RIDA. I understand that only one

of the six members on RIDA is a member of the jockey club. It should be noted that, with respect to being a controlling authority and having an influence on the policy of racing, it is not the SAJC *per se* which has the influence but it is actually the South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority.

Also there was concern as to whether RIDA would have the appropriate ability to make the full economic assessment. I have been assured that it does have the opportunity and ability to use other resources such as the Economic Development Authority to conduct its inquiry. I am very pleased that some time in January the TeleTrak proponents agreed to actually cooperate and work with RIDA to contribute information and get on with the inquiry. I believe that has been a very positive step to progress the issue before the public meeting was called. I have indicated quite publicly in all avenues in the local media that I support any project, including this one, involving the concept of proprietary racing, provided some questions are answered and some aspects are resolved.

I would put this into three categories: first, probity, or the integrity of the proponents and directors of the principal investors. A comment was made on the night of the public meeting by the proponents on the basis that probity of the employees would be greater than those currently operating casinos. Of course, no comment was offered with respect to the proponents. I understand that the District Council of Waikerie and RIDA will have responsibility to make investigations and assessments in this area. Presumably, when TeleTrak decides to formally float a public company and so register a prospectus with the Australian Securities Commission, this aspect will be further scrutinised.

The second aspect about which I have concern is the legal issue. The project must operate within the current laws and, if it cannot, I have given an undertaking to support an investigation into what changes must be made to the law to enable the project to proceed. The third issue is viability. There needs to be some independent assessment to indicate whether the project has a reasonable chance of long-term financial viability.

I do not back away from those requirements and, as I indicated at the public meeting, I need to sleep with a clear conscience. I need to make decisions that are based on evidence, facts and information, as does the Government, and that evidence can be substantiated or verified only by the appropriate inquiry, which is under way. None of us should make decisions based on the information provided by one side or in the heat of the hype and expectation that is being generated. As I said on the night, if that is seen to be conservative or cautious, I still believe that is the way to operate.

It was disappointing for me to find that, although I acknowledge that it is a fact of life, in an issue where great promise, expectations and hype have been generated it is very difficult to control the third person comments that are made about what I or other people have supposedly said. It makes it difficult to maintain rational debate and rational assessment.

Despite the interest that has been generated publicly, I have been surprised at the minimal amount of contact with me or my office by members of the public. I have been in contact with a strong action group and the press, and my constituents have raised general concerns as to whether the project has been assessed objectively. There has also been concern that 100 years of hard work within the district based on horticulture and agriculture—those deep roots of local

community enterprise—will be discarded for a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. That may depend on laws made not necessarily in this country but in other countries, such as our Asian neighbours.

There is also concern about the district council and whether a due diligence process took place as part of the process to provide the initial \$25 000 to be part of the bid, and for council to borrow and agree to make available a further \$210 000 for the project. I maintain that, if this project stacks up, it deserves support and should be supported.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I wish to speak briefly on a matter that confronts us all as members of Parliament, and that is the sometime expectation put on us by all our electors and members of the public generally. A strange trait in the Australian character is that at one time people want their heroes and at other times, as soon as someone is in any position of authority, they seek in minute detail to look for fault or failing. With one hand they like to raise them up and with the other hand they like to pull them down. I do not think that is limited to politicians by any means.

If one looks at some of our great sporting and folk heroes—people from all walks of life—while they walk tall, the Australian people are very proud of them; yet there is almost a malicious glee in finding some fault. It is almost as if you have to be perfect, but not too perfect. In a perverse way that applies to every member of the House, whether they are Labor or Liberal. We get elected to do a job but the minute we are elected we are despised because, by definition, we are politicians, and if there is a national sport—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith interjects that he can well understand my constituents' views of me. I applaud the member for Ross Smith, but I must tell him that I have heard constituents of the member for Ross Smith say similar things about him. Unlike him, I am charitable and think that, if they say that about me in Unley and they are wrong, and his constituents say that about him, in Ross Smith they might also be wrong. Of all the negative things that I know about the member for Ross Smith, one thing I have heard, and I am sure that he will describe it as a malicious rumour, is that he works in his electorate and tries to represent his electors. He can accuse me of slandering him and not telling the truth if he wishes, but that is the rumour that I have heard.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Then the member for Ross Smith comes round to my point of view, because those for whom he works hardest are probably the first to say that he did not deliver enough. I say that only because this place is composed, to the best of my knowledge, considering the limited time I have been here, of basically principled and largely decent people who have come here because they seek to do a job and try to do it to the best of their ability. You have been here longer than I have, Sir, and you would know that this place is truly a reflection of society. There are at any given time in any Parliament people with an enormous range of abilities and talents—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: —and I shall be interested in talking to the member for Giles afterwards—and that is the great strength of this institution, and it is also its great weakness. One can have the greatest intellect in the world in this place, but you still have to present your argument to 46 other people from different backgrounds, experience, levels of experience,

different ages and different in all their aspects. If you are capable of surmounting that hurdle, putting a point of view and having it accepted by 46 peers, then and only then have you a chance of having something passed into law. That is as it should be, because we are here for the people, we represent the people and we are of the people. We are not greater than any of our electors and we are not better than any of our electors—we are simply their representatives, and somehow they often seem to miss that point.

At the point when they elect us, they often see us as putting ourselves above them and, therefore, they look for reasons to criticise. I put that point to the House because it touches on the political life of every one of us. One thing that is still capable of hurting me is when I go to a meeting and someone says, 'You are just a politician and you are just doing this to feather your own nest.' I would say that most of my colleagues on both sides, whatever motivation they have, are not here to feather their own nest or because the lifestyle is—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Giles says there is not a feather to be found in this place. I have not been here as long as the member for Giles, nor have I had his unique experience of having served in both Chambers; and nor have I been here as long as you, Sir. However, if the member for Giles says that there is not a feather to be found, I will cease looking. The problem for us is to be of the people and for the people to understand that they cannot expect more of us than they expect of themselves. They can look to us, for example, for earnest endeavour, but they have no more right to look for perfection in us than they do so in respect of the rest of the community.

Just before I came into the Chamber, the member for Hartley told me that he recently told the House that the niches in centre hall are empty because there are no saints in Parliament—neither Labor, Liberal nor Democrat. I would agree with him: there are ordinary people in this Parliament trying to do an extraordinary job, and sometimes that is very difficult. The people in this Chamber are just as ordinary as the people who sit in *Hansard* and try to do an extraordinary job up there.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I would say that it is easier for *Hansard* to decipher my ramblings than it is to make a sentence from the jumbled cacophony of words often strung together by the member for Ross Smith. The point of raising this matter is the Supply Bill; it is very difficult and a reflection on the six years after the State Bank disaster. I do not think the right or wrong of that catastrophe matters as much as getting the mechanisms right to see that it does not happen again. It is very easy to stand up in this place, point the finger and say that it was all your fault or somebody else's fault.

Mr Clarke: You lot do it to us every day.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, in a sense we do because, as the elected Government, members opposite bore the responsibility. Surely for the Opposition side of the House as much as for the Government side the point of that disaster is to see that such a matter is never presented to this Parliament again. It gives my Party no joy to know that it won the election as a result of that disaster. I think most of us would have preferred not to see the State Bank disaster but would rather have fought the election on traditional arguments and traditional lines. What this, the next and the Parliament thereafter should be looking at is putting structures in place to ensure that no State Bank disaster can ever happen again. We will get better

Governments in the future; we may one day get a better Government. We will get worse Governments in the future without doubt, but what we must ensure as an institution—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Mitchell doubts that we will ever get a better Government. I am vain enough to agree with him, but those in future Parliaments might disagree with us. What we must do as an institution is make sure that, whatever Government the people of South Australia get in the future, be it a better Government or, more particularly, where it is a worse Government, structures are in place that will allow no Government to so bungle the finances of this State as to saddle any future generation with a State Bank disaster. In Government we have paid a heavy price for the State Bank over the past three years, and the people of South Australia continue to pay a heavy price for it. According to their abilities each member in this place must say, 'Enough is enough: let's set up structures to ensure that, whatever the quality of representation, there can never be another State Bank disaster in South Australia.'

Mr BASS (Florey): My contribution will be fairly brief. I will speak about two things in my electorate, the first being the recent attempt by the Tea Tree Gully council to change the zoning regulations within the Tea Tree Gully area. Just 12 months ago on 28 February 1996 the Tea Tree Gully council called a special meeting to discuss the proposed plans to change the zoning regulations in the central residential zone to allow for high density multi-storey buildings.

The residents of this area worked very hard to ensure that this meeting, which was not well advertised, was well attended by many of the residents. It is estimated that 450 to 500 residents attended the meeting. Those people who spoke, including me, gave a very firm message to the Tea Tree Gully council that they did not want multi-storey buildings in the residential central zone.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BASS: You have been in enough trouble today. Just be quiet. The council then decided that it would form a subcommittee to look at the proposals, and two local members, Mr Barry Moore and Mr Ron Elliott, volunteered to be on this subcommittee, which changed its reference from looking at the residential central zone to all the zones within Tea Tree Gully. After 12 months of very hard work by Barry Moore and Ron Elliott, another meeting was called on 4 February 1997. Again, it was well attended by local residents due to the hard work of Mr Moore, Mr Elliott, Jim and Gwen Rawlings and Bob and Marie Mogg, and again the residents spoke very strongly against multi-storey buildings. The councillor who chaired the subcommittee obviously saw the light, because he altered the motions that he was to put to the council that night and capped the construction at two storeys.

During the debate on the motion, the councillors talked about how they had listened to the people and how they had done what the residents wanted. If the council had listened to the residents on 28 February 1996, when in excess of 450 all wished to see no change to the height regulation, they could have settled this argument within a matter of six weeks after that meeting. However, the council still pushed on to try to bulldoze these changes through. Again, I congratulate those people whom I mentioned and all the other residents who worked together to ensure that Tea Tree Gully still retained its motto: 'One City Naturally Better'.

I also refer to the SHIP program (Students with High Intellect Potential) that has been launched at The Heights

School this year. I raised this matter in this place some time ago after The Heights School was selected to be the first South Australian school to run a SHIP program. I think it is very important that we cater for not only students who have difficulty in learning but students who obviously have high intellect potential.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BASS: The Deputy Speaker says 'Hear, hear', and I know that, as a teacher, he would know that students who have high intellect potential find a normal class very boring. Within 10 minutes they absorb what the teacher has told them and for the next 40 minutes they are dawdling or looking around. They want to learn more, but they cannot because they are held back by other students. As I said, the 30 students were selected at the end of last year, and it is good to see that the students were not just from what they call the elite side of town—the eastern suburbs: there were students from the northern, southern and western suburbs.

There were country students, including some from Clare and the Riverland, and even a young lady called Holly Deere from Kangaroo Island. The 30 students were selected from 300 who had applied to undertake the special program. Although in its initial stage this year—and it will proceed for the next four years, each year another 30 being selected to join the program—already, within the first two to three weeks, notwithstanding a few minor technical hitches—and, on my information, a little homesickness for some of these students—the class is well under way, the students have settled down and they are now being taught in an accelerated program.

I congratulate the teachers from The Heights School who have taken on this difficult program. I also congratulate DECS for making sure that the students have settled in. Some extra money has been allocated to the school to cover the extra curriculum that needs to be attended to. The Heights School council itself and the school community has not just stood back and accepted money from DECS but has also put finances into the project to make sure that it is successful. I congratulate all those involved at The Heights School. It is a wonderful program. It will be successful, because the teachers involved are dedicated and they will make sure that it is successful. The students, notwithstanding a little bit of home sickness, as I have said, have settled down and are working hard, and I know that it will be a successful program.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I will highlight some of the positives from the Yorke Regional Development Board. Members would appreciate that many of the regional development boards in rural areas have been set up with the assistance of the State Government. I compliment our Government on the work it has done in this respect. I fully appreciate—

Mr Clarke: The Labor Government set them up in the first place.

Mr MEIER: Yes, I will give acknowledgment there. In certain select areas of the State, the Labor Government did establish regional development boards. What upset me at the time—and I certainly made a clear point of it—was that we were identifying some regions of the State for regional development, for special attention, and neglecting others. The Yorke Peninsula and the Mid North were among the neglected areas. I wish to pay special tribute to the Liberal Government for having established regional development boards throughout the State. In fact, I compliment the Yorke Regional Development Board tonight.

It is interesting to have a look at its annual report and financial statement for 1995-96. During that period, it was under the chairmanship of Mr Malcolm Germein. Other members of the board were Mick Rucioch, who is now the Chairman, Ray Agnew, Graeme Ball, Colin Cook, Jeff Cook, Grantley Dodd, Don Dale, Graham East, Nigel Hand, Chris Manners, Wilhelmina Deutschke and Graham Wearn. The board was incorporated in December 1993, and its first meeting took place on 9 February 1994. It is almost exactly three years old. A lot of work has been achieved during this period, and certainly a lot of research has been undertaken. Members should appreciate that there are many opportunities for development and high yielding investment in the region. In fact, the annual report indicates the following:

Land is affordable, infrastructure and support services are well developed, the location is accessible, local labour is available and the natural environment offers enormous potential. There are investment opportunities in agribusiness (including grains, seeds, horticulture and aquaculture), tourism and hospitality, transport extractive industries and aged care services.

There is no doubt that Yorke Peninsula and the Mid North, particularly as it applies to the Yorke Regional Development Board through to the Wakefield Plains District Council, have many positives available for people wanting to establish businesses in those areas. It should be remembered that regional development boards are there not only to establish new businesses: many regional development boards have been assisting existing businesses to assess their markets and helping them to assess their future needs in terms of possible expansion, or continuing to operate at much the same rate.

I cannot over-emphasise the need for businesses, be they existing or new, to assess their market potential. I know that from time to time a potential business operator has come to me and asked for my assistance. My first question has always been, 'I appreciate your coming to me, but we have a Yorke Regional Development Board specifically set up to assist you in business.' And the answer on each occasion has been, 'We have already been to the regional development board.' In several cases I have sought to look at the matter further.

In one particular instance a potential operator was very upset with the regional development board because he felt that it had not given assistance to what he perceived could only be a successful proposal. I will not identify what that person was seeking to manufacture—it was something unusual—but there was no doubt that it had a potential market. I asked at what price that item was being manufactured and the person said, 'I could sell them for between \$20 and \$25 per item.' I said, 'That's fine. There probably would be a market, particularly from overseas tourists. I don't know that you would sell too many in South Australia but in areas such as the Gold Coast and perhaps in the Eastern States there would be quite a market.' He said, 'Exactly. You have identified that just as I did.'

I said, 'Didn't the regional development board help you at all?' to which he replied, 'Yes, it looked into it and found that the distributor would want to purchase the items—if they were to be sold for between \$20 and \$25—at a price not exceeding \$12.' I said, 'That makes sense. What sort of money did it cost you to make them?' to which he replied, 'Between \$10 and \$12.' I said, 'We have a problem, don't we? If it's costing you between \$10 and \$12 and the distributor will take them only at \$12, you will not make very much.' The person argued with me and said, 'That's just it: surely I should be able to sell them direct?' I said, 'There's no problem about that, but how will you establish your markets? That's what you must look at.'

The reality was that the person had to attempt to manufacture that product at about \$4 per item if he wanted to sell it to a second channel at \$12, which would then sell it to the public for between \$20 and \$25. Of course that person went away a little dejected, but the Yorke Regional Development Board had done its homework: it had pointed out to the person that, if he invested his money in that product, he would not make a success of it. I would like to compliment the Yorke Regional Development Board for pointing out these matters to my constituents and other people who may wish to invest in the electorate of Goyder and its surrounds.

I note that the board's specific charter is to assist regional industry and business to grow and expand. The board is an organisation designed to intervene in the development process to achieve outcomes for local communities that would not be available without concerted local action. Target sectors are tourism and hospitality, agribusiness and information technology. When people ask me, 'John, why is your Government not doing more to attract new business and industries into our area?' I say, 'We have these regional development boards specifically set up whose charter is to do just that.' They say, 'But I don't think they're doing enough', to which I reply, 'You indicate to me what particular business or industry you think can establish in the electorate of Goyder.' Without exception, no-one has been able to give a specific answer to that point.

Of course, we would all love to see perhaps a car manufacturing plant, a mining operation or a major processing plant of wool or whatever, but people realise that that requires more than just capital. It needs potential markets and full consideration before anyone would want to invest tens of thousands or even millions of dollars. Time does not permit me to highlight some of the achievements of the Yorke Regional Development Board. However, I pay a compliments to the board, which has a new CEO, and I wish him well in his work.

Mr MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 13 February at 10.30 a.m.