

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 4 June 1997

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

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Petitions signed by 191 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to support the passage of the Summary Offences (Prostitution) Amendment Bill 1996 were presented by Messrs S.J. Baker, Becker, Buckby and Oswald, Mrs Penfold and Mr Wotton.

Petitions received.

LICENSED CLUBS

Petitions signed by 2 546 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow licensed clubs to sell liquor to a club member for consumption off the premises were presented by Messrs Allison, Andrew, Cummins, Lewis and Oswald, Mrs Penfold and Mr Wade.

Petitions received.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT BOARD

A petition signed by 84 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that the Passenger Transport Board include Aldinga in the metropolitan ticketing zone was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the eighteenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

AUTOMOTIVE TARIFFS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier remain totally committed to a freeze on car tariffs and to the continuation of export facilitation and, if so, did he speak last night to Alexander Downer and the other South Australian Liberal MPs in the Federal Parliament who gagged the motion that would freeze car tariffs at 15 per cent? Alexander Downer is quoted in this morning's *Financial Review* as describing any move for a tariff freeze as a 'grubby vote-buying strategy'. Mr Downer also said that the Export Facilitation Scheme would be abolished. This morning's press also reports that, and I quote: 'Several South Australian Federal Liberal MPs appeared to soften their stance against tariff cuts.' On Monday night, as the House was informed yesterday, the following South Australian Liberal members of Federal Parliament voted to gag debate on a motion to freeze tariffs at 15 per cent: Neil Andrews, Alexander Downer, Trish Draper, Chris Gallus, Susan Jeanes, Ian

McLachlan and Christopher Pyne. So, at least on Monday they were prepared to put their Party before jobs in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The Leader is now commenting. He knows full well that that behaviour is out of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition is demonstrating yet again in Question Time who the political opportunist is, and it is the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader referred to the debate in the Senate and the House of Representatives over the course of the past week, and he would full well—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader is inane with his interjections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Whilst the Leader of the Opposition chips away on political point scoring on this most important issue, we will not lose sight of the fight and arguing South Australia's case. The Leader can play petty local politics all he wants: we will maintain contact with our Federal colleagues. Let me pick up the point raised yesterday and today by the Leader. The opportunistic approach by Simon Crean in the House of Representatives was designed to bring about the result he got. He knew he would get that result in that the Federal Parliamentary Party had not considered the matter and obviously would not vote on the floor of the House until such a resolution had occurred. They knew that. It was a political stunt—the sort of political stunt we see all the time from the Leader of the Opposition.

Whilst the Leader of the Opposition has been playing his political opportunistic games we have been pursuing the case for South Australia. Yes, I did speak to Alexander Downer yesterday; yes, I did speak to the industry Minister yesterday; yes, I have spoken to the Prime Minister; and I will be speaking again to those Ministers. The Prime Minister affirmed yet again today just before lunch that he would speak to me again later today or tomorrow, based on the models that are being looked at and the options being pursued in consultation with industry in Australia, as indeed we are. The Leader of the Opposition talks about the EFS scheme that Alexander Downer—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You're the one talking about it; you've changed your stance already.

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader's constant interjections show him up for exactly what he is.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am not rattled at all: I am sticking to the main game. The main game—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows the rules and that he has been out once this session, so he is warned.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The main game is to get the right outcome for South Australia. In relation to the EFS scheme everyone knows that there will be no continuation of the current EFS scheme post the year 2000—that is accepted by all parties. What is important is the replacement EFS scheme which Alexander Downer and other Federal Ministers have been working on with industry—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —to ensure that we have an industry acceptable replacement export facilitation scheme for access to market for products in the future. That is the most important outcome. I have advised this House before—conveniently overlooked by the Leader of the Opposition—that the industry submitted to the Commonwealth Government an export facilitation access scheme which is supported by the industry and which is now being contemplated by the Federal Government. The South Australian Government supports the industry submission to the Commonwealth Government. It replaces the EFS scheme. The EFS scheme is WTO illegal. We seek to put in a scheme which is legal and which will carry the industry through to the next decade. We want to ensure that that prospect of \$2 billion of automotive component exports, as we see now in Australia, can grow to \$6 billion of exports by the year 2005. That has been the basis of the negotiation with industry and the submission of that plan and that scheme to the Commonwealth Government. I backed the industry in on that, because that will have a positive plan for the future, something that will constructively ensure that we get access to markets for our goods and services.

The tariff question is the other equally important component of this whole debate. Deliberations last night and again today are taking place in Canberra. I have been consulted and will continue to be consulted in relation to a range of those options. Our outcome is no different from that put down five months ago and seeks to ensure that we get continuing investment in the automotive industry in Australia and job security for South Australians in the industry and that we protect the regional economy of South Australia and its automotive industry base. They are the three principles upon which we have argued for five months and upon which we will continue to argue. We will maintain that position until we get the right policy outcome for Australia which, coincidentally on this issue, is the right policy outcome for Australia.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Will the Premier advise the House on recent reports reflecting improved economic indicators for South Australia, including improvements in the housing and export sectors?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am delighted to talk about recent improvements and some encouraging economic signs. I hasten to add that the economy in South Australia, whilst showing some tentative, cautious, optimistic signs for growth, has a long way to go, but they are encouraging signs—not the least of which is the Glenelg Holdfast Bay development. Off the plans the development has sold about \$19 million. This is before any further detailed demonstration has been given to the approximately 200 people who have shown an interest in that project. From the way in which it is selling we will have to move into selling stage 2 before stage 1 even starts construction. That is an indication of some renewed interest in housing, commercial and industrial development in South Australia: good encouraging signs and good sign posts for the future.

The ABS figures released yesterday indicating a very significant rise in exports is heartening news for South Australia. The areas in which a substantial increase in those exports has taken place are: first, motor vehicles, parts and accessories, up 171 per cent. That is a staggering increase,

and it underscores the importance of the current debate in relation to tariffs and the export facilitation scheme. Secondly, in petroleum and petroleum products, an increase in exports of some 36 per cent. Thirdly, wine, with an increase of some 29 per cent; and the escalation in the wine industry being able to track further processing into South Australia is certainly an encouraging sign for the future.

One of the key points to come out of the ABS figures yesterday was the 15.5 per cent jump in GDP to \$9.82 billion by the end of December. We will not hear the Opposition quoting that figure across the Chamber in any questions. It indicates a positive direction in the economy of South Australia. In relation to housing, one has only to refer to recent reports of Mr Gaffney of the Housing Industry Association, which clearly underpin the fact that the policy options we put in place last year in the deposit 5000 scheme and the stamp duty relief for first home buyers put in place this year are beginning to have some positive effect. Some 700 additional homes have gone into the system as a result of those two schemes; that is, 700 additional South Australian families are accessing a home.

As Mr Gaffney reported in the past few days, that is now starting to have an effect on the whitegoods industry; in other words, as the houses are constructed people are buying the whitegoods to equip the houses. These are sectors that will have flow-on benefits to the South Australian economy. One has only to look at new dwelling approvals which rose by about 24 per cent in April. That was preceded by a rise in the previous month of March. A trend estimate of housing approvals rose by 6 per cent in April and is now 39 per cent above the January 1996 low. Those indicators are encouraging, but it underscores the fact that we have to work harder at it to ensure that the economic recovery is sustained and that we are creating job opportunities for young South Australians in the future. Of course, there is a long way to go in that regard.

JOB CREATION

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Does the Premier stand by the credibility and accuracy of the conclusions of Professor Peter Dixon of the Centre for Policy Studies at Monash University and his claims that there will be 1 100 jobs from the United Water contract when the Premier and the Opposition have both disagreed with Peter Dixon's conclusions on the automotive industry? As the Minister for Infrastructure, the present Premier claimed that the United Water deal would create 1 100 jobs. On 17 October 1995 the Premier said:

An independent study by Professor Peter Dixon of the Centre for Policy Studies at Monash University estimates that the exports to which the company is committed will create at least 1 100 new, permanent jobs in this State.

Professor Peter Dixon of Monash University is the same professor who has done the analysis upon which the Industry Commission is urging a slashing of car tariffs to 5 per cent.

Mr Lewis: That wasn't comment, was it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Here is this negative, miserable Opposition, at a time when the economic indicators for South Australia are very good, trying to find something to pull South Australia back. It is like the member for Hart standing under the 'To Melbourne' sign, encouraging South Australians to leave this State. In fact, the trend estimates in the next six months will show that, for the first time, net migration and net immigration will match. Members opposite could

not achieve it under their Administration. Net migration has gone from 7 000 to 5 600 to 4 000—it is actually starting to come down. Net immigration is starting to rise.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Under Standing Order 98, Ministers are required to answer the substance of the question. The question related to Professor Dixon.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the Chair has pointed out to the Deputy Leader on many occasions, Ministers get far more latitude in answering questions than members do in asking them, and I refer the Deputy Leader to *Hansard* to read some of the answers given by the now member for Giles when he was a Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he should also pay attention to the Standing Order which provides that a member shall not interrupt another member.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: My point in talking about population growth is to demonstrate the inaccuracy of statements often put out by the Opposition. One has to check the substance of the statements rather than take them on face value. The fact is that in that area they are wrong. In relation to economic modelling, we have proved the Monash model wrong and claimed for it to be wrong.

Mr Foley: It is right on water.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order, and he is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Do you want an answer or don't you? If you want an answer, please listen to it. In relation to the Monash model that was introduced by the Productivity Commission, we challenged it on some of the criteria that were placed upon the model and the outcome. Monash went back and remodelled the plan. It delayed the Productivity Commission's report by several weeks, because we were able to demonstrate that what it fed into the model was inaccurate and altered the outcome. We proved in that instance that a mistake was made, deliberate or otherwise, by Monash.

In relation to the modelling done for the water contract, I would rather get past the model and talk about outcomes. The Deputy Leader has put before the House a report by independent auditors. What does that say? We are not talking about a theoretical model. We are talking about actuals. The actuals are \$94 million worth of exports, above the \$9 million in the contract. They are not theoretical numbers but actual, deliverable, independently audited and on the table numbers. The member for Hart cannot argue against that.

In a negative, carping criticising way the Opposition is attempting to tag the issue that is most important to South Australia: tariffs. This issue is too important for members opposite to play the petty politics that they are attempting in the Chamber today. We started out with a bipartisan approach to this, so I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition has veered off on a path of political opportunism.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr Brokenshire: You can't help yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson and the Deputy Leader for a second time.

ELECTRICITY AND WATER SUPPLY MARKET

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House of the so-called niche electricity and water supply market in this State?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Hartley for his question. Very important in the development of the electricity and water markets have been the opportunities to expand into that market of smaller South Australian companies. One of those companies is the Cowell Electric Company, which is based on Eyre Peninsula. It specialised as a company in small outback operations, spending a lot of time over many years quietly developing. Today this company employs 55 people, has just moved into Alice Springs and has won a significant contract in the Northern Territory. It is also now starting to move into the water industry.

It is because of the opportunities that have been set down by this Government in encouraging smaller companies to develop their expertise and expand into further areas that the Cowell Electric Company will now be supplying 48 Aboriginal communities in the outback of our State. It is expanding into Western Australia and is developing into this niche water market. It is an excellent little company that has taken the opportunity to grow and expand as we as a Government have put down this policy direction to encourage businesses to expand in both the water and electricity markets. Some 200 companies are working in this industry along with this company, and it is gratifying to see this small South Australian company now developing in the Northern Territory and Western Australia.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier in his role as Minister for Infrastructure. Does the Minister agree with a senior official from United Water who is now claiming that the City of Adelaide is largely to blame for the awful smell over Adelaide and not the Bolivar sewerage works managed by United Water? Mr Geoff Anderson—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That's right. Mr Geoff Anderson, a senior executive with the Anglo-French company United Water, has written to media newsrooms claiming that the current stench over Adelaide—which hardly smells like French perfume—results in large part from the smells generated by the city itself not being able to dissipate because of the particular weather pattern we are experiencing and cannot all be attributed to Bolivar. Mr Anderson is suggesting that it is Adelaide and not the United Water deal that really stinks.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is very interesting how the Labor Party turns on its own people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is very interesting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to point out to the House, particularly to the Deputy Leader, the member for Hart and others who have contravened Standing Orders and been suspended, that, if that happens again in the next two days, they will miss some of the budget Estimates Committees. Let me make very clear that the Chair will have no hesitation in applying Standing Orders, so they may miss participation in the budget Estimates Committees.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I know that we put out a press release last week—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart is coming close to having a quiet week.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —that clearly stated that the Bolivar works was part of the problem, and probably the most significant part of the problem. However, nobody in this community could ignore the fact that about 3 000 exit pipes come off our sewerage system, right around this city, that take the gases out of the system well before they get to Bolivar. They obviously have a significant part to play in it.

Also, no-one would ignore the fact that as we have changed from standard lead petrol to unleaded petrol a significant amount of hydrogen sulfide gas is emitted. No one would ignore the fact that there are many industrial smells within the community that also contribute to the process. There is no backing off by this Government as to the area which we believe is the major cause of the problem. As I announced yesterday, Mr Hartley, a professor at the Queensland University, is arriving tomorrow to give the EPA, SA Water and this Government professional advice on what he believes needs to be done to sort out the major problem at Bolivar.

I am always fascinated when the Labor Party decides to pick up these sorts of quotes and run with them: in particular, I am fascinated when the Leader of the Opposition picks them up, because I know there is a love-hate relationship between these two people. I know that there is a relationship between Mr Anderson and Mr Rann which is very public within the Labor Party, and it fascinates me that they should go out of their way to pick up this comment.

PRISONER'S DEATH

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): Will the Treasurer give the House an explanation of criticism made of him personally by a member of the Opposition in relation to his former position as Minister for Police? I have been provided with a copy of a media release dated 23 May 1997 issued by the Hon. Paul Holloway, member of the Opposition, which suggests that the former Minister for Police improperly intervened in a police investigation following the death of a prisoner in the Mount Gambier Gaol.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I note that the Leader of the Opposition is again absent from the Parliament in this very important Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is true that there was comment made by the Coroner in relation to the investigation into the death of one Mr Murat Susic on 16 December 1995. This comment from the Coroner was then editorialised and commented upon by that bastion of human values, the *Border Watch*. I presume they telephoned Mr Holloway, who has also commented upon the Coroner's report. I would like to give the House an explanation so that I can get an apology from the *Border Watch* instead of being editorialised by it for things that I have not done.

My visit to Mount Gambier was in April 1996, four months after the death of Mr Susic. Whatever happened in April 1996 had nothing whatsoever to do with the events that led to the demise of Mr Susic. It was my habit to visit police stations in both the metropolitan and country areas whenever I was visiting those areas. It gave me the opportunity to discuss matters of policing with those officers concerned. I can assure everyone in this House that my visits were welcome, because they gave an opportunity for interchange

on a range of issues, including the successes, frustrations and challenges of policing. My visits to the country areas were always marked by a renewed appreciation of the high regard in which the police are held within our community, particularly in country areas, where they do such a fantastic job.

The difference in relation to the Mount Gambier trip was that there were two areas about which I had some extreme concern before I arrived in Mount Gambier. One was the reports of very low morale at the Mount Gambier Police Station. The second was that the police and Group 4 were not getting on particularly well. I had already had some communications from the then Minister for Correctional Services on issues which he believed were fairly vital in setting up good relationships between the two bodies and obviously failed. The meeting that was held was very productive. About a dozen officers were present, including an Assistant Commissioner of Police.

We raised a whole range of issues, including some of the challenges of policing in Mount Gambier and the problems of transient people and those with mental problems, how they should be handled and liaison with the various authorities. At the end of that meeting I felt that it had been conducted well—because I was conducting it, obviously—and, with the interchange that took place among the officers on a number of vital issues, everybody made a contribution to that meeting. I was rather surprised that Sergeant Modra raised the issue of an altercation over Group 4 at the Coroner's inquiry, given that it had happened some four months after the event. I reiterate that it had nothing to do with the Coroner's inquiry, because it was four months after the event.

The relationship between the police and Group 4 at Mount Gambier was dysfunctional, and the records of both the Police and the Correctional Services Departments will show that. In the transcript of the evidence that was taken at the time, both officers who were quoted in the Coroner's report admitted that the relationships were extraordinarily strained between the two organisations. Both officers also said that after my visit the police and Group 4 actually started to communicate, so I would have said that the outcome was desirable.

I would also make the point that any perceptions of my remarks as claimed by the two officers before the Coroner did not impact on operational drug pursuit, as was again shown in the transcript of the evidence. I certainly did thump the table at the Mount Gambier Police Station, and I have never refuted that. When I was talking about cooperation, Sergeant Modra (and I am willing to name him), who was sitting at the end of the table, said in a very rude and aggressive fashion, 'Just what about drugs in prison?' My attitude was, 'Let's get on and cooperate.' It is useful to examine what was happening down there. Group 4 was under severe harassment, and I can only assume that it was from Sergeant Modra. A number of people are witness to the situation (and there are matters on file) that, if a prisoner was back late for work release and Group 4 asked the police to look out for him because he had not arrived back on time, an announcement would suddenly be broadcast about an escaped prisoner. This was one of a number of examples where Group 4 was seeking cooperation from the police but matters were being turned and twisted, to the detriment of both organisations. So, I suggest that everybody cooperate and make sure they do their job properly.

With respect to my interjection, it was quite clear that Correctional Services are responsible and have laid down protocols for drug management in prisons. The problem was

that Group 4 could not feel confident that if it raised an issue with the police it would not appear in the media and therefore detract from the efforts of both. I actually got some feedback from that meeting. I understand that Sergeant Modra was particularly angry and that he felt I had aimed my remarks at him. I presumed that everybody had quite clearly understood what I was on about, which was cooperation, so that drug enforcement could be pursued. Given that Group 4 did not feel confident about providing information to the police without it getting out into the media, obviously, the capacity to enforce the drug laws of this State had been thoroughly diminished. The Coroner did not mention me in his findings but mentioned the police officers' contributions.

Comments made at the time were contained in a transcript of evidence that was taken before the Coroner examined the evidence. I have already explained why I did not appreciate the Coroner's taking some interest in this matter; however, I reiterate that it was quite clear that strained relationships had to be resolved, and I believe the meeting achieved that end. When I made inquiries in my then capacity, given that I was in Adelaide and the Coroner was in Mount Gambier, about further input for the record, I was informed, first, that the Coroner would not hold any hearings in Adelaide; and, secondly, that if an Assistant Commissioner of Police was required to give his perspective of that meeting the Coroner would require that officer to be at Mount Gambier immediately because no further time was left for those hearings to be conducted. With due respect to the Coroner, it was absolutely impossible to meet that sort of timetable. I also note that, as I was no longer the Minister for Police, all the files were in someone else's office.

Mr Foley: Yes, the office of the Minister for Police.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That is exactly right. I demand a full apology from the *Border Watch*, which has made a number of claims. I simply—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Just hold on a second.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Mr Scott is another person who has some interesting agendas, and I will leave Mr Scott until later.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I make it quite clear that, when Mr Trotter was informed that he was in contempt of the Coroner because he had commented on the proceedings of the coronial inquiry, his next comment was, 'Well, I am under threat.' It is simply a fact that the Coroner relayed to Crown Law that Mr Trotter was in contempt. We then saw another misconstruction on a letter that was sent to the *Border Watch* relating to comments appearing in the newspaper. I know I will not get it, but I demand an apology from the *Border Watch*.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Given the admission by United Water that part of the smell now enveloping Adelaide—

Ms Stevens: And Parliament House.

Ms WHITE:—and Parliament House is attributable to a break-down in the biological process at Bolivar, will the

Minister explain why a major project to rehabilitate Bolivar's stabilisation lagoons has been allocated only \$550 000 in this year's budget? A senior United Water official, Mr Geoff Anderson, who wrote to the media explaining that odour problems were continuing stated:

It takes time because it's a biological process, not a mechanical one.

This year's capital works budget includes the \$2.7 million project for the removal of accumulated sludge from effluent lagoons at Bolivar to improve treatment capacity and the bacteriological quality of effluent, but the Government has allocated only \$550 000 in this year's budget.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As the member for Taylor knows, this incident occurred some six to eight weeks ago. Any cost in terms of budget for extraordinary items will be picked up from other parts of the budget and, if any further money is required in excess of the budget line, it will be made available. It will be made available—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The honourable member does not have to shake her head: the Government believes that this is a serious issue. The Government is aware that we have a major problem that must be remedied, and I have told the public that. If it costs us money to ensure that we remove the odour and sort out this problem in the biological process within the ponds, nevertheless it will be done. It is not a question of grandstanding over whether or not \$500 000 is in the budget: the problem will be fixed and it will be fixed not necessarily because the Government wants it fixed but because it must be fixed in the best interests of this community.

I do not know what the final cost will be. We have brought in an independent person from Queensland, Professor Hartley, so that no questions can be asked involving United Water, SA Water or me as Minister as to how this problem will be fixed in the short term. If this Government has to look at long-term issues it will do that.

EXPORTS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. Given the latest encouraging figures on exports from South Australia, will the Minister provide the House with any additional information on the situation with respect to the contribution being made by primary producers to that increase in exports?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Ridley for his question and acknowledge his interest in this area over a long period. As members would have read in this morning's *Advertiser*, South Australia is certainly enjoying the benefits of very significant increases in exports, which is certainly a very promising sign for employment prospects in the State. The latest ABS figures show that South Australia's merchandise exports increased by 17 per cent to \$4 497 million in 1995-96, and the importance of the rural sector to the South Australian economy is highlighted by the enhanced export performance of this sector over recent years.

Food and beverages at farm gate make up the largest export commodity group valued at \$1 766 million, or 40 per cent of total State exports; and, once we add the food and beverage processing sector, the value of the sector's input jumps to about 60 per cent of the total exports. South Australian wine exports increased to \$318 million in 1995-96, a rise of 345 per cent over the level in 1988-89. As a proportion of total State exports, wine has increased from

3 per cent in 1988-89 to 7 per cent, and this level will continue to increase. Since 1988-89 the value of seafood exports has increased 105 per cent from \$96 million to \$197 million; for the year 1995-96, meat is valued at \$245 million; and fruit and vegetable exports have increased by 132 per cent since 1989, from \$66 million to \$152 million.

Certainly, rural commodities will continue to dominate our exports in the years to come. The production of cereals in 1996-97 was well above the five-year average and, given reasonable seasonal conditions, cereals will continue to make the greatest contribution to South Australian exports. There has been cause for optimism about price increases in wool and, despite being somewhat depressed, wool and sheep skins have continued to contribute 8 to 10 per cent of our total exports. Certainly one of the ways we can improve further on exports is through trade delegations. We must take our products to the market and sell our message, for example, that South Australian wines won nine medals at the recent Asia Pacific Wine Show while France won only six medals.

As I mentioned last week, the efforts of our representative officers in Asia have been terrific, and this Government has got its export act together. The EDA and PISA will continue to work together to plan trade delegations for the food sector following the successful HOFEX visit and other successful trade delegations into Asia. This morning's *Advertiser* states that a flourishing export sector is leading South Australia's economic revival and, as that article highlights, it is not just the rural sector that is doing well. This Government totally understands the importance of exports and is playing a leading role in facilitating new export opportunities. We look forward to building on this momentum.

EDUCATION CUTS

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Government's cuts to education spending and jobs in education over the past three budgets, will the Premier explain his claim that the teachers' pay rise represents additional money for schools?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE: The Premier's budget pamphlet says that this year's budget provides an extra \$72 million for education; \$63 million of this extra money is allocated to salaries to meet the teachers' pay rise; and the balance of \$9 million matches exactly the Government's inflation forecast of 2.25 per cent in other programs. In the past three budgets the Government has cut State spending on education in real terms by a total of \$137 million and 789 full time jobs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Try as the honourable member will, the simple fact that she cannot ignore is that we are spending 7 per cent more in real terms on education than when we came into Government. More money is going into education than the previous Labor Administration injected.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: The highest student to teacher ratio in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes. My other point is that when we came to Government we inherited a health and education infrastructure that had been run down over decades with no maintenance and upkeep. We found schools without chairs and windows and schools with broken blackboards. With respect to hospitals, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for example, did not have enough pillows. They had to sell

morning coffee to buy pillows for the hospital. In one instance they had one shower for 30 patients. That was the level of the infrastructure that we inherited through the run-down infrastructure policy of the former Administration. We are starting to tackle that and put it back on an appropriate, professional, efficient keel by putting in place identified plans for the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

In relation to resolution of the teachers' dispute last year, it was not only the teachers' salary component that was resolved but a whole range of measures to benefit children in education in South Australia. We will see those policies being implemented during the course of this year. In addition, we have allocated \$3 million out of the priority funding program towards our schools for a simple painting program after schools were allowed to run-down under the Labor Government, where simple things such as painting were left for decades. On all tests there is no basis upon which the Opposition casts any stone at this Government on what it has been able to deliver in education and what it is delivering now for education to our students today in terms of building a foundation for their future.

BAROSSA PERFORMING ARTS CONVENTION CENTRE

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of the Government's involvement with the successful completion and opening of the Barossa Performing Arts Convention Centre at Faith Secondary School?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I thank the honourable member and his constituents who invited me to join them at the official opening by the Premier of the Barossa Convention Centre on Friday of last week. This facility is one of the best that I have had the good fortune to visit for some time. The opening night involved a full symphony orchestra, and this highlighted the acoustics of the establishment. As I said, I cannot remember having enjoyed a concert more or a time when I have been able to hear so clearly virtually every instrument in the orchestra. It really is a magnificent facility. Of course, this facility is a joint project of the Government, the Lutheran church and the Faith Lutheran Secondary School. It is a complex which comprises a performing arts centre, a convention and meeting facility, a drama theatre, a display area, a concert venue and a reception centre. Of course, that is quite outstanding for any regional area, and it must be one of the best regional performing arts and joint use centres anywhere in Australia.

A deed was signed by the parties to the agreement in February 1996. The project cost \$5.6 million, of which the Government contributed \$1.5 million. As a result of that contribution the facility will be made available to the public and to outsiders for at least 200 days a year. This facility proves what can happen when levels of government, private enterprise, a private school and a church all work together to provide a facility that probably none of those entities alone would have been able to provide. We have a facility which can now be used by a school and by the regional area of the Barossa—and a much broader area for many of the concerts—and which provides a vital need in terms of a convention centre in one of the key regional tourism areas in this State. I commend all involved with the project and, as I said, it is something of which South Australia and South Australians can be justly proud.

FOCUS 21 POLICE REVIEW

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Police guarantee that under the Focus 21 plan there will be no fewer sworn police officers directly serving the Norwood, Payneham, Henley Beach, Parks, Glenelg and Plympton areas? The Opposition has a copy of a South Australian Police Department document describing the Redeployment of Resources Project that has proposed staff reductions which provide that, in forming the Glenelg division, the Glenelg and Plympton police stations will lose 10 police officers; in forming the Norwood division, the Norwood and Payneham stations will lose 10 officers; and, in forming the Parks division, the Parks and Henley Beach stations lose 10 positions. This year's budget leaves the number of sworn police officers still 150 below the 1993-94 levels and 350 fewer than that promised by the Liberals at the last State election.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: First, let me refer to the assertion of there being 150 fewer police officers. One of the Deputy Leader's problems is that he does not bother to follow up with his union mates, because if he did he would know that, as part of the enterprise agreement signed between the Government and the union, it provided for a reduction in the order of 185 to 190 police officers. This was agreed to and supported by the union in a registered enterprise agreement. Let us forget about the 150 fewer police officers because, in fact, it is 180. We reached an agreed position to downsize because of the restructuring under the enterprise agreement. Part of the agreement for an increase in salary was that there would be fewer numbers in the police service.

The second point in relation to Focus 21 is that there are no fewer police. I note that yesterday the union, which the shadow Minister does not bother to talk to, supported the direction of the police in terms of Focus 21 and also supported the numbers the Government had put back into the process. Not only has the Police Commissioner set the direction in terms of Focus 21 but the union has publicly supported it. Focus 21 is about recognising what I would have thought the Labor Party would be all about, that is, increasing community safety and making sure that police officers are located in areas of most need.

If one looks at the demographics of this city with respect to its expansion north and south, one would have thought that, instead of criticising the fact that we will redeploy people from existing areas to the north and south of the city, the Deputy Leader would congratulate the Government for doing it, because we need more police in areas where the community is growing. It is typical of the Labor Party to knock an initiative which is supported by the union and officers of the Police Force. I suggest that it is supported by more than 90 per cent—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Let me get to that in a minute. It is supported by more than 90 per cent of all police officers. Ever since I was appointed as Police Minister and ever since the new Commissioner was appointed police officers have said that it is good to see a breath of fresh air at the top—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has had enough of the Deputy Leader, who seems to have taken it upon himself to completely ignore Standing Orders. I will not intervene again today or tomorrow. One further transgression and the Deputy Leader knows what is coming to him. This is not just another

warning. The Deputy Leader has more than tried the patience of the Chair. If the Deputy Leader wants to participate in the budget Estimates he had better behave himself. One more interjection and the honourable member is gone.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Police Force has been telling me that, with the new Commissioner, things for which they have been asking for years are beginning to happen. Again I point out to the Deputy Leader that it is the direction that the police union has been seeking for years. How we could redeploy and shift people around to places where they are most needed was discussed with the previous Commissioner. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he talk to the union about the directions that it believes the Police Force ought to be heading in because it is in direct line with the Government and the way in which the Commissioner is implementing this whole new direction.

DISABILITY SERVICES

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Disability Services advise the House of the Government's plans for the application of the \$5 million for disability services announced in the 1997-98 budget? A number of constituents in my electorate of Elder have raised their concerns with me about the unmet need for disability services in our community.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Elder for his question about this important matter and, in doing so, I acknowledge his constant raising with me of the concerns of his constituents in relation to the disability services area. As every member in this House would know, the State finances were dealt a bitter blow with the State Bank fiasco under the previous Government, and our finances are still recovering from that blow. By quarantining disability services from budget cuts, we have instituted an efficiency dividend within the disability sector, freeing up \$6.4 million and then reinvesting that efficiency dividend back into new services, and we have provided an additional \$5.4 million in funding in the 1996-97 financial year. Until this budget we had invested a total of \$11.8 million in extra services in the disability services area.

The high priority afforded to the disability sector was recognised when last December Premier Olsen appointed me as South Australia's first Minister for Disability Services. That is where we were at the end of this financial year. Next financial year (1997-98) the budget will continue this Government's strong commitment to disability services. There is a \$1 million additional one off allocation for equipment for people with a disability and for the frail aged. There is an additional \$2 million for extra teachers and school support staff to support disabled students who have integrated into mainstream classes. Perhaps, most importantly of all, an additional \$5 million is provided for disability support services. I assure members of the House and people with a disability that with all those additional funds this year's budget will be targeted to areas of priority.

In particular, there will be a focus on accommodation and personal supports for people who have an intellectual disability. It will be focused on the development of alternative community services, and increased and innovative therapy services will be a focus as well. It is an important initiative in the area. We will also continue to use benchmarking and tendering to improve service provision. In the past year the Government has tendered out—and it is a leading process—hearing services. In November, I informed the House that three hearing professionals were employed at the new service.

In case there is any misunderstanding, I point out that there were four hearing professionals at Hearing Solutions as at November 1996, sharing 2.2 FTEs. Collectively, they have 42 years of experience in the provision of hearing services. In the tendering process we are intent upon providing experienced and efficient services.

The Government's commitment to disability services contrasts sharply with that of the previous Administration. Under Labor we had the State Bank debt debacle and deficit after deficit, yet disability services suffered real term cuts year after year. Under this Administration we are overcoming the State Bank debt, we have brought the budget back into surplus and we are significantly increasing services for people with a disability. The choice is stark and clear.

SAMCOR LAND SALE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. What progress has been achieved in rectifying the error which saw the abattoirs bowling club inadvertently sold to Agpro under the SAMCOR privatisation deal? Earlier this year the SAMCOR land was sold to Agpro. In 1995, when the club learned that the State Government was going to sell SAMCOR, the club met with the former Minister for Primary Industries, Dale Baker, to seek a guarantee that the small parcel of land occupied by the club would not be part of the sale. In my presence as local MP and patron of the club the former Minister readily agreed to excise the bowling club site from the sale and offered the club extra land in order to assist it to expand and to build an additional green. The club was delighted with the former Minister's response.

Following the reshuffle, the club sought a similar assurance from the new Minister, and that commitment was provided in writing. Again the club was delighted. Earlier this year the club learned that the Government had allowed the land upon which it had been located since 1922 to be sold to Agpro by mistake. What progress is being made to fix the mistake which is causing enormous trauma amongst senior citizens at the club?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will respond to the question because the Asset Management Task Force was responsible for the sale of this property. The history is similar to that related by the Leader of the Opposition. Discussions—some of which I was unaware—took place at the time. The Asset Management Task Force was clearly informed of the bowling club's interest in securing its future. Of necessity that land should have been subdivided so that any sale could have excluded it. What happened was that it was never subdivided. There were letters of best endeavour, which were the official correspondence to which the Leader of the Opposition refers. I signed off one and the Minister for Primary Industries signed off one, which said, 'We will do all in our power to secure this piece of land.'

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I do not know what was said by the then Minister at the time.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am sure that the honourable member's recollections are correct. I am sorry that some of that information may not have translated properly in the process.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No. It may have been mentioned. Those undertakings were not part of the official correspondence. That is all I can say.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Hart should just listen. Obviously, from my point of view at least there was a clear commitment from the Government that we would use best endeavours to secure that property. When it came to the crunch SAMCOR said, 'This was all part of the property.' The SAMCOR proper land on which the slaughtering and the meat processing took place was under the same title as that of the bowling club. At the end, when the decision had to be made, our intention to continue to fight for the future of the bowling club was made clear to the buyer. However, at that time, there was only one way of transferring the land and that was by the full title. No other option was available to us at that time. In response, because the Asset Management Task Force no longer exists, officers of Treasury have held discussions with Agpro, the buyer of SAMCOR, and it is our intention to use our best endeavours to ensure that the future of the bowling club is secure.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Order! Yesterday the member for Spence raised a matter of privilege about an article that appeared in the *Adelaide Review*. Having perused the article, I agree that it is scurrilous, inaccurate and lacks objectivity. While undoubtedly a *prima facie* case could be made, I believe it should be beneath the dignity of the House to further deal with it, and I do not intend to pursue the matter further.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): As a former Lord Mayor, I believe that I have a duty to the people who elected me for six years to speak about the Torrens Parade Ground. I am absolutely appalled at and I deplore the proposal by the Federal Government's Department of Defence to sell the Torrens Parade Ground for commercial purposes. The land was designated as parklands by the surveyor and founder of our city, Colonel William Light. Along with every other South Australian, I demand that it be returned to the people of South Australia for this purpose, which would be in accordance with the City of Adelaide plan.

I am terribly disappointed in the Federal Minister for Defence, Ian McLachlan, in that he is proposing to sell off a piece of land which, incidentally, under the City of Adelaide plan cannot be developed because that plan clearly categorises the parade ground as zoned PL7, which is Parklands 7. In the council's Adelaide development plan, the area is part of the university oval precinct and, quite clearly, part of the parklands.

Anybody who loves this city, anybody who lives in this city and anybody who has a passion for this city will know that we were very fortunate some 158 years ago to have an English colonel sent here, who, today, is recognised as one

of the great city planners of the world, and who left us with the legacy of the City of Adelaide, which is one of the most beautiful cities in this country and possibly in the world.

The list of members who are supporting this proposal is pretty appalling, because the only member to support its being returned to the State is the member for Hindmarsh, Chris Gallus. However, Senator Alan Ferguson, Senator Grant Chapman, Mr Barry Wakelin, Susan Jeanes, Mr Ian McLachlan, Dr Andrew Southcott and Senator Nick Minchin all say that the State Government should pay for it. What is even more appalling is that the member for Adelaide, Ms Trish Worth, who has been to so many Colonel Light ceremonies and should clearly understand the City of Adelaide plan, said in an article that the State Government should grab the opportunity to buy the property as the site for the planned national wine museum.

That is an appalling statement, because the Federal Government never bought the Torrens Parade Ground from the South Australian Government. It merely took charge of it for the paltry amount of about £2 000 when the various colonies agreed to federate as constitutional States when the Commonwealth of Australia was established in 1901 because the Federal Government was granted power by the States to control the defence of Australia. I see this as one of the most appalling rapes of our city.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: It is. In my opinion, it should be turned over to the Adelaide City Council. One suggestion that I have is that the parade ground be dug up completely and planted as a magnificent rose garden so that the men and women of this country who fought on land, on sea and in the air can be honoured by having the name of their battalions placed on each rose bush. It should become a memorial garden and I also support the concept of turning the building into a military museum. We must get serious about this, because the Federal politicians are treating this city as a joke, and that is a disgrace in itself.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I want to make a few remarks today about how the Attorney-General, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, has gone completely native in his portfolio. The Attorney-General is now simply a spokesman for bureaucrats in the Attorney-General's Department and the Office of Business and Consumer Affairs. He no longer brings any individual opinions or doctrines to his portfolio, still less does he bring the values and policies of the Liberal Party.

The first issue I raise is that of free range eggs. The *Sunday Mail* has exposed that a company called Gawler River Eggs, which runs three farms, two at Kangaroo Flat and one at Lewiston, is selling 150 dozen free range eggs a day without having any hens running free range. The eggs which it is selling as free range are not free range but are battery produced. I intended to ask a question about this matter today but, because the Government is covering up during Question Time and will not allow the Opposition to ask 10 questions, I was not able to get up a question about free range eggs.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order!

Mr ATKINSON: However, when the Attorney-General was asked whether he was willing to introduce a legal definition of free range eggs by regulation or statute, he refused to do it on the basis that he had advice from his department that it was impossible to define free range eggs. I find that remarkable, because I am sure that any consumer could define free range eggs in a reasonable way, given an

opportunity. It shows how far out of touch with the demands of consumers and the public our Attorney is. As soon as he is asked to do something useful for the public, he pads up behind the defences of his department.

Secondly, I had private member's legislation before the House recently to stop self-induced intoxication with drink or drugs being an excuse for crime. The Attorney-General ridiculed my Bill on the basis that there were no cases of people pleading self-induced intoxication with drink or drugs in our courts. He lightly dismissed the Bill and subsequently the Bill was—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Mawson interjects that the Attorney-General answered my question, and that is just what I am coming to. Having airily dismissed my Bill as being unnecessary and not deserving of parliamentary priority or Government business, the fact is that the answer which came through to my question about how many times is self-induced intoxication with drink or drugs used as an excuse for crime was 'Often.' For the benefit of the member for Mawson, I advise that was the answer. It is a real problem in our courts. It happens often, so the Attorney-General has, through his answer to a question which he signed, shown he had misled the other place. His department prepared the answer and he signed it without reading it.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. The honourable member has made a most serious allegation against the Attorney-General and I understand that the practice of this House is that, where a member is to be criticised, it must be done by substantive motion.

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the honourable member referred to comments of the Attorney-General made in the other place, which he is not allowed to do. I ask that the honourable member refrain from doing that.

Mr ATKINSON: I am sorry, Sir. The answer to the question proves that the Attorney-General misled the other place. The third question is whether the Director of Public Prosecutions—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: I said that the honourable member could not refer to debates in the other place and he repeated what he said.

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Spence quite clearly made an interjection—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —accusing the Chair of bias. I ask that he be asked to withdraw that immediately, as he, in this Chamber, is one of the greatest sticklers for the position of the Chair.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I heard the honourable member accuse the Chair of bias, and I ask him to withdraw that comment.

Mr ATKINSON: I withdraw, Sir; it is plain you are not biased.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Clearly, because of time constraints yesterday, it was not possible for all

members of this House to speak about the important issue of car tariffs. In this grievance debate, I indicate that I support all the Premier's championing and actions against the majority of the recommendations that have just been handed down to the Federal Government. The majority report has a cloud hanging over it, because Mr Bill Scales is involved in it. I can remember only a couple of years ago having to debate with my colleagues to make sure that, under the previous Federal Government of Mr Keating, the Scales' recommendations for the wine industry did not come into being. They would have done great damage in South Australia but especially in the McLaren Vale wine region in my electorate. One would have to ask whether Mr Scales has a deliberate plot to try to get at South Australia. To me, he seems to be a most un-Australian Australian, a person who works on ideology rather than on practical, commonsense economic strategy.

I want to put a few points on the record. First, whilst I am disappointed it has taken so long to get a final report to the Federal Government, I hope that the Prime Minister Mr Howard will quickly get on with the job of making a decision, but not to the point of being rash such that it will be detrimental to all those workers and their families who live in my electorate of Mawson. I have had a lot of pleasure in supporting Premier John Olsen, who has certainly led the charge around Australia to make sure that, where at all possible, a commonsense, rational and fruitful outcome occurs for South Australia and all Australians.

I want to place on record that the tariff reduction recommendation was created as part of the previous Labor Government's plan for the car industry. Of course, Mr Keating was very keen to get on all the air waves around Asia and Australia what a great thing it was that he as Prime Minister effectively put another nail into the coffin of Australian manufacturing industry. I will never forgive Mr Keating and the Federal Labor Party for that action in signing that agreement. There is no way known that there was anything like—or a possibility of—a fair level playing field for Australia and South Australia in the signing of that agreement.

However, that does not let our Federal colleagues who are now in government off the hook. Just because Mr Keating and the previous Labor Federal Government made mistakes does not mean that the Federal Liberal Party should make those mistakes, too. I have seen what great benefits there are in South Australia and particularly in the south as a result of a vibrant motor industry. Sir Thomas Playford, a fantastic Liberal State Premier, saw the importance of the motor industry in the 1950s, and we have benefited and prospered from that ever since. However, from the major companies such as Mitsubishi, Britax, Walker, and so on—and the member for Reynell referred to this in the House yesterday—right through to the small corner deli in my electorate, the value adding opportunities as a result of the economic viability and prosperity of the motor industry are so important to the south. I will continue to work with our South Australian Liberal Government to make sure that we fight the best case to ensure that a commonsense, prosperous and beneficial result is made in Canberra, hopefully in the next week or so.

When we first came into office as a Liberal Government, we worked closely with Mitsubishi and GMH to make sure we supported them in their expansions. Good agreements have been put in place that have allowed us to see major expansion at Lonsdale, Tonsley Park and Elizabeth. We have

been involved in a micro and a macro form in South Australia concerned with getting debt down and making it better and more viable to do business here. The Federal Government still has to deliver. It also has to look at wholesale sales tax, and it has to remember that 17 000 jobs in South Australia and tens of thousands of jobs in the rest of Australia are only the start. The value added component will more likely be double that, to around 100 000 people who will be affected if the wrong decision is made in the next few weeks. I continue to support what is going on. I reinforce to my constituency that I will not give up on this important matter.

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

Ms GREIG (Reynell): It was Napoleon who said, 'When China wakes, it will shake the world.'

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Acting speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! A quorum not being present, ring the bells.

While the bells were being rung:

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order, and so is the member for Spence.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

MEMBER, NAMING

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I name the member for Spence.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been advised that the member for Spence has been named for defying the authority of the Chair. Does the member for Spence wish to make an explanation or an apology?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, I do. I am very sorry for getting carried away during an exchange with members opposite. Unfortunately, I became overwrought about losing time during grievances. I sincerely apologise and withdraw for any offence to the Acting Chair.

The SPEAKER: The matter is of a serious nature, and the Chair cannot accept the explanation. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the explanation not be accepted.

The fundamental rules of this House are that, as a member, one accepts the position of the Chair and its role within the Parliament as being supreme and to be respected. If members are not prepared to acknowledge that and get carried away, they have to accept the rules and conditions of this place as laid down. That requires that the position of the Chair be respected and the acceptance of any penalty imposed as a consequence of not respecting that position and not upholding the traditions, respect and rules that must apply in this House.

An honourable member interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I find this extraordinary. We have a situation where the member for Spence has just given a serious and abject apology to this House. I do not believe that in any previous

naming I have ever heard anyone who has offended give such a commitment to the Chair to continue to uphold the traditions and apologise in such an abject way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Over the past couple of days there has been an extraordinary barrage of abuse from the other side of the House. I understand, however, that the honourable member's outrage was caused by a breach of an undertaking from a member opposite. These things happen from time to time in politics; these things happen from time to time in Parliament. But when a member, once named, stands up and gives an apology in the fashion in which it was given by the member for Spence, I believe it is incumbent on this House to accept that apology in the way that it was given.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I have never heard such a load of nonsense in my life as I have just heard from the Deputy Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —when he was talking about the rules of the House: that there is an obligation to respect the House and its rules. After the behaviour of the Deputy Premier a few weeks ago in this place, when you talk about some bit of argy-bargy between the member for Spence and the Minister for Health as somehow being a serious breach of the rules of the House, or the etiquette of the House, or whatever, it is absolute rubbish. I could have taken it from anybody else but to have it from the Deputy Premier—really, Mr Ingerson, of all people. I have never heard anything so hypocritical in my life. And I have never heard such a humble and almost abject apology from a member, either. It strikes me that, if the rules were breached, they were breached obviously not attacking the Chair, or anything like that—which is very serious, and I agree with that. But it was an argument between two members which, for goodness sake, happens all the time. The member for Spence gave the most full, complete and gracious apology I have ever heard, and it is still not acceptable. It just strikes me as absolutely absurd and utterly unfair. And it is the unfairness about these things that annoys me—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Giles!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —because if this was on the other side—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Giles!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —it would not have occurred.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will name the member for Giles if he does not cease.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If this was on the other side, if this was a member opposite—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —none of this would have happened.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can shout louder than you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The sitting of the House is suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You cannot shout me down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can shout louder than you can.

[Sitting suspended from 3.32 to 3.38 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the explanation not be accepted. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the member for Spence. I was upstairs listening to the debate and was not down here myself, but I heard the member for Spence's apology. I think that given all the circumstances that apology ought to be accepted. It is general practice, particularly during grievance debates and so forth, that some argy-bargy occurs across the Chamber between Ministers and members or between individual members of Parliament on either side in getting their point of view across. The member for Spence had been interrupted on a number of occasions during the course of his five minutes of grievance by what he could reasonably construe as frivolous points of order, but points of order nonetheless, to which the Chair at the time obviously has to listen. But it is extremely frustrating for that member to have a five-minute speech interrupted unnecessarily. It is not unknown for either side of the House to retaliate in kind on the other Party, and that has happened on both sides of the House over the 3½ years that I have been in this place.

So, some argy-bargy goes on when temperatures get a little heated but, provided the offending member has made the appropriate apology, I believe that it is in the best interests of this House as a whole for such an apology to be accepted. It is not such a gross affront to the dignity of the House or Parliament that such an apology should be accepted. For example, on occasions when the Deputy Speaker, for example, has been in the Chair and tensions have risen over certain issues, a fair degree of aplomb and humour has seen the situation stilled. The problem has evaporated because of the way the situation was handled, ensuring that the appropriate apologies have been made so that the dignity of the House has been maintained.

I would make another point about something that is extremely vexing for members of the Opposition, and I exempt the member for Ridley, who said something outside this House which caused him to be suspended from this place last week. From time to time we have continually faced a barrage of abuse from members opposite, particularly the member for Mawson, and you yourself, Mr Speaker, have had occasion to warn members. On a number of occasions the member for Mawson has been on his first or second warning but to my knowledge has never actually been named.

Yesterday, when the Leader of the Opposition got up to give his budget reply, the member for Mawson went red in the face and absolutely feral, making constant interjections throughout the speech. Every time the Leader of the Opposition stands to speak we see such behaviour from the member for Mawson, but he is never named. We see the Treasurer and Deputy Premier interjecting on regular occasions and I do not mind; it is a robust place. I understand the cut and thrust of politics—I love it and enjoy it—but at no time, other than a first warning being given, have they been named.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he relate his remarks to the acceptance or otherwise of the honourable member's explanation. He is straying very wide of the mark.

Mr CLARKE: I accept your ruling, Sir. In conclusion, it is also extremely vexing when a political reporter can get away with saying more about the Chair than we can ever say. It is extremely vexing to those members of Parliament who have been suspended for saying a lot less. That also raises the temperature of this place.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Like my colleague the Deputy Leader I, too, was listening upstairs and two people were interjecting: both the Minister for Health and my colleague the member for Spence. I recall the last time on which I was suspended from this Chamber, and you will recall it too, Sir, because (and I am not breaching any confidence) you said to me that had I only apologised I would not have been suspended. On my last indiscretion, I was told that had I been humble enough to apologise we did not need the matter to be heightened any further and an apology would be sufficient. My colleague has given a very good and humble apology—the most humble apology I have heard in this place—yet the House is deliberately disregarding that apology.

As somebody who has been suspended on a number of occasions, as have our Leader, Deputy Leader and now the member for Spence and perhaps others, I simply say that, with a nearly four-to-one majority and the constant barrage we tolerate from the Government, it is incomprehensible to imagine that members from this side can be suspended collectively seven or eight times in the course of 3½ years while only the member for Ridley, and only for a comment made about a factional blue outside the House, incurs the wrath of the Chair. I simply say that for 3½ years this Opposition, as you are hearing and witnessing now, has copped a torrent of abuse and interjection from members opposite, to my left and behind us, and they are never called to account or warned.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: The member for Peake—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: —is the main offender and we continually get no support.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Hart just calm down. This afternoon this House has engaged in behaviour that is well below what the public of South Australia expects from its 47 members of the House of Assembly. In my time in this Parliament I have not witnessed occasions when members have behaved so badly. Members should remember why they come to this Parliament: they represent the people, and they ought to conduct themselves in a fit manner. It is no pleasure for the Chair to take the steps it has taken today, but I have had to do so in the course of my responsibilities to maintain the dignity of the House.

Mr FOLEY: I conclude my remarks by saying that you may say to me, Sir, 'Calm down', but I am simply exercising my right as an elected member of the Lower House of this Parliament to speak when the time is appropriate, and I will speak in any manner and in any style I see fit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I simply say this: two people were involved in that altercation, and the Minister for Health is one of the great interjectors on the Government front bench. Every day during Question Time he throws insults and abuse at us. He goes unscathed. Why did the Acting Speaker fail to name the Minister for Health? It is because there is one set of rules for the Opposition and another for the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart knows full well that he is setting out to provoke an incident. He knows that those comments, to put it mildly, are unwise and foolish. I do not know whether the honourable member wants to experience the wrath of the Standing Orders, but I suggest that he cool down because the Chair does not want to take up any more time dealing with irresponsible comments.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I am pleased to inform members who were not here exactly what happened because I clearly was here. In my time in Opposition with Speaker Norm Peterson I was a regular visitor to the front desk to peruse Erskine May, as I am sure members who were here in those days would acknowledge. I say that to indicate that I am a firm believer in the disciplines and rules of the House. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicated that the member for Spence's grievance was 'interrupted unnecessarily'. I took a point of order when the member for Spence clearly called the Acting Speaker 'biased'.

That is not interrupting a grievance unnecessarily: it is standing up for the traditions of the House which are rooted in the Westminster system. I was surprised to have to point out the remark made by the member for Spence to the Acting Speaker because the member for Spence would hold himself up as a paragon of virtue in relation to the traditions of the House. In fact, yesterday the member for Spence rose on a matter of privilege and attempted to stand up for the Chair and the traditions of this place and to insist that the Chair not be brought into disrepute.

I took 10 to 15 seconds to ask the honourable member to withdraw his point about bias and, in fact, I accused him of saying that the Acting Speaker was biased. In fact, the member for Spence agreed with that because he then apologised for that comment. A quorum was then called by the member for Spence, and the member for Spence and I quite legitimately carried on, as one member opposite said, some argy-bargy, which I acknowledge. However, what no member opposite has acknowledged is that the Acting Speaker called the House to order. I did not hear that because the member for Spence and I were discussing matters vigorously across the House.

The Acting Speaker then spoke slightly more loudly, in his usual fashion. I heard him and I stopped because that is the tradition of the House. At that stage the Acting Speaker had risen from his Chair. The member for Spence looked at the Acting Speaker, who had risen from his Chair. That action quite clearly indicates that the Chair is making a formal statement that the House must come to order and that all members should be silent, which is well known by the member for Spence. Unfortunately, the member for Spence chose deliberately and maliciously to ignore that by continuing to talk, whereupon this train of events occurred. We must consider the circumstances and the fine Westminster tradition of this place, which is that the Chair must be obeyed. Without that tradition we would all go outside and put on boxing gloves and get out bits of two-by-four. The fact that the Chair can control this House and maintain order is what distinguishes us from a common bar-room brawl.

If that is not the case, let us go outside and have no order. This place has fine traditions, and the member for Spence has quite clearly chosen deliberately to ignore them, and I fully support the Deputy Premier in saying that the traditions and rules of this place must be upheld.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (32)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, D. S.	Baker, S. J.
Bass, R. P.	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Buckby, M. R.	Caudell, C. J.
Condous, S. G.	Cummins, J. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A. (teller)
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Penfold, E. M.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.

NOES (10)

Atkinson, M. J.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hurley, A. K.	Rann, M. D.
Stevens, L.	White, P. L.

Majority of 22 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Spence to withdraw from the Chamber.

The member for Spence having withdrawn from the Chamber:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the member for Spence be suspended from the service of the House.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The Chair named the member for Giles. Does the member for Giles wish to be heard in explanation and apologise for his conduct?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise, Sir.

The SPEAKER: In view of the previous rulings that I have given, and as the Chair has no desire to raise the tempo of this House, the Chair will accept the apology in the spirit in which the Chair normally tries to accommodate all members.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Debate resumed.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): It was Napoleon who said, 'When China wakes it will shake the world'. China is waking and opening its eyes not too quickly but quickly enough to embrace western economies, accept us as trading partners and at the same time in the back of its mind close its eyes to the atrocities and violations of its own people's basic human rights. Again today, as I have done in the past, I bring to the House's attention the horrific massacre of innocent men, women and children in Tiananmen Square during the pre-dawn hours of 4 June 1989. For several hours the People's Liberation Army fired on pro-democracy demonstrators. Young people were machine-gunned while riding their bicycles to work, leaving the crippled bodies and bleeding corpses of young students and workers. I remember film footage of a burning bus, a bus full of young people screaming as they burned to death.

China is confusing. As she is awakening she has reached the intersection of two of the most important trends in this the latter part of the century: the collapse of communism and the rise of East Asia as an industrial powerhouse. I ask all members in this House to take a good look around. Today, 4 June 1997, in Adelaide there are no military patrols roaming our streets. We are here in a building that is a symbol of our freedom and democracy. We can speak openly in favour of or in opposition to decisions that impact upon us. We can protest. We can make people aware of the atrocities committed against others, and we can do this in a peaceful way without fear of arrest or intimidation. Our freedom is a basic right, a right we take for granted. I do not think that we in South Australia would ever imagine it any other way.

As an Australian it is hard to imagine what it would be like not to have basic fundamental rights. We have not had to live under a regime of ultimate control which maintains its supremacy, strips you of respect and dignity and which places no value on human life, basic rights and survival. We have never experienced a culture which maintains obedience and discipline through guns, other weapons and torture. I hope and pray that this is something we never have to face. The massacre of 4 June 1989 of many innocent people in the streets on and around Tiananmen is an atrocity that opened my eyes to how twentieth century China values its people. Today I pay tribute to the many innocent people whose lives were wasted but whose deaths were a strong symbol of the true value of freedom and democracy.

Napoleon Bonaparte was right: when China wakes it will shake the world. It will do so unless the rest of the world intervenes and unites as a power that will force China to recognise the wrongs of its ways. Until China realises that it can no longer control minorities through fear and intimidation, until it realises that it cannot control what is not rightfully its and until it learns that it will never stop the fight for democracy and real freedoms, no matter how many people it gaols or murders, China will never be a fair or just society for its people or its neighbours. Today we mourn the memory of many Chinese students. We also share our grief with Tibet, the Turkic people of the north and the many oppressed people of the wakening dragon. In the throes of death a Chinese student asked that we not hide the incident of 4 June 1989 but that we record everything that happened. He wanted his death, like many others, to mean something—and it does.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): In an extraordinary outburst during last Thursday's Private Members' time the member for Mitchell, in addressing a report of the Public Works Committee, made a number of statements in relation to the committee's deliberation of the Wilpena resort development. In particular, the member for Mitchell made a number of statements and observations about my part in those deliberations. I shall set the record straight, because I have checked very carefully the dates on which the committee deliberated with respect to that report.

The first meeting at which the Public Works Committee considered the Wilpena development was on 19 March, and at that meeting the agency presented its submission. All members of the committee, except the member for Mitchell, were present. The member for Mitchell said that at that stage no problems with a draft lease were raised. If he had been there he would have known that, as part of the initial submission, the matter of the lease was just one of many matters presented to the committee for its consideration. As

no draft lease was available at that time, detailed questioning about it was inappropriate.

At the next meeting on 2 April all members of the committee, except the member for Morphett, were present. The committee received the lease on that day and not seven days before this day as the member for Mitchell asserted in his contribution last week. I have a copy of the minute, dated 1 April, that accompanied the release of that draft lease document. The member for Mitchell was therefore incorrect in what he said. On 17 April the committee conducted a site inspection of Wilpena at which all members, except the members for Davenport and Ridley, were present. During his speech last week the member for Mitchell said:

At no stage did the members for Taylor or Elizabeth address issues associated with the draft lease . . .

On that particular site visit, the committee did not meet together as a group. We walked around asking questions of the various people giving advice. I did not notice the member for Mitchell sneaking around behind me listening to what the member for Taylor or I were asking. The honourable member would have no idea about what went on. Again, it was a complete exaggeration.

At the next meeting on 23 April, all members of the committee were present. That was the meeting at which the member for Taylor moved the motion about getting an independent assessment of the lease, which I seconded. On 13 April all members but the member for Taylor and the member for Ridley were present. Wilpena was not listed on the agenda and it was not dealt with. We had a Tanunda site visit on 7 May and the members for Mitchell, Davenport and Ridley were not present. The presiding member and the Opposition members were the only members present and the matter was not raised. The meeting on 21 May was the one which the member for Taylor could not attend and she asked that the committee hold over the report. The comment that I had abstained because I had read neither the draft lease nor the draft report is false and a complete misrepresentation. The comment that I said that aspects of the committee were not my political responsibility was also a complete misrepresentation.

Certainly, the member for Taylor and I will take lead responsibility for particularly complex submissions, but both of us look at all assembled facts and recommendations. The comments about my not attending meetings are clearly not borne out by the facts. I attended all the meetings—more than the member for Mitchell. As I said last Thursday, this says more about the member for Mitchell than about me. It shows the honourable member as impulsive, impetuous, careless with the facts and freely prepared to misrepresent others when it suits him and, I say to his Liberal colleagues, it is ample evidence for his supreme unsuitability for any sort of office except that of a backbencher.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Tourism): Mr Acting Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order or a question. I deliberately waited until the honourable member had finished speaking because I did not want to be accused of interrupting for a political reason. Will you provide guidance? I understand that during her speech the honourable member referred to matters which occurred in a standing committee of the Parliament: in much of the honourable member's speech she did not but in some parts she did. It was my understanding that matters which occur in a standing committee of the Parliament are subject to the privilege of that committee and should not be divulged. I am seeking

guidance regarding whether my understanding of those requirements is correct or whether a member can refer to matters which have occurred or statements which have been made in a standing committee?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): It is my understanding from some of the honourable member's explanations that it was a site visit and not an actual meeting. I understand that the member for Mitchell in his grievance made reference in much the same way as the member for Elizabeth has done and there were no problems in that case.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Mr Acting Speaker, it is really a point of clarification. It is important. I was not present when the member for Mitchell made his statement, but my understanding is that the member for Elizabeth referred to statements which were made in committee meetings. The honourable member certainly did refer to a non-formal meeting, if I can put it that way. As I said, it is not the honourable member of whom I am trying to be critical: all I am trying to do is firmly establish what the rules are. I was of the opinion, as I said, that matters discussed within the confines of a standing committee were privy only to that committee.

The ACTING SPEAKER: If it is a public meeting, then comments can be made outside that meeting. I do not know whether those meetings were public meetings or whether they were *in camera*. I cannot make a ruling without knowing those details.

Mr VENNING (Custance): Today I asked a question of the Minister for Tourism and yesterday in the House I referred briefly to the Barossa Convention Centre. I will elaborate further on this brilliant, state-of-the-art venue which has been built on the campus of Faith Lutheran Secondary School at Tanunda. The Barossa Convention Centre, which cost \$5.5 million, was officially opened by the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. John Olsen, last Friday night, 30 May. It was dedicated the Sunday before that by the Governor of South Australia, Sir Eric Neal. As the Minister for Tourism said in Question Time, it is a superb venue. It is a fully equipped performing arts centre capable of hosting international artists. It also comprises a convention centre, a meeting facility, a drama theatre, a display area, a concert venue and a reception centre, as well as providing the school with a space to hold its assemblies, dedications and religious services. It certainly is a multi-use building.

Two major Rotary conventions have already been held in the Barossa Convention Centre, attracting more than 1 200 visitors to the region. The spin-offs from this enterprising project are already evident and widespread. Local businesses benefit from more visitors, youths benefit from training and employment, and that boosts their confidence, and performers and musicians enrich the cultural life of the Barossa and South Australia. Certainly, one wonders how much more richer the Barossa can become, because it enjoys a magnificent musical heritage, which I have enjoyed and appreciated very much in representing the area.

Several other conventions will be held in the centre this year, including the 1997 State Tourism Conference, which is to be held in July. No doubt, the Minister will be present again and I hope he enjoys the experience. Bookings continue to be made up to the year 2002. The centre has no regional equal in South Australia—and that is a strong boast—perhaps even in Australia. It is an excellent example of how a private organisation, that is, Faith Lutheran Secondary School and Governments, both State and Federal—the State in major part

and the Federal Government in minor part—can work together. The State Government is contributing \$1.5 million to the project over five years with \$439 000 coming from the Federal Government. Faith Lutheran Secondary School receives support from 33 Lutheran congregations and the loan for the convention centre with the Lutheran Layman's League amounts to \$2.26 million.

The support from the community and parents of Faith students has also been immense and a wonderful testimony to their generosity. Last Friday's official opening heralded the beginning of an exciting relationship with the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, which performed on the night. The centre's management is also working closely with the Barossa Music Festival to plan future concerts. The management committee and the chairperson are still to be finalised. Some appointments have been made but, in all, it is anticipated that there will be 12 representatives on that committee coming from the various interested areas of the communities, that is, school representatives, me as the member of Parliament and the Minister as well as nominees of the district council, the Barossa Wine and Tourism Association and the Arts Council of South Australia. There will be open management of the centre by the community.

The artistic director is Graeme Tyler, who also happens to be the head of music and performing arts at Faith Lutheran Secondary School. He did perform last Friday night and it was a magnificent performance. He performed with the orchestra and brought the house down with a standing ovation. The marketing director of the centre is Mr Robert Gerrie. The Barossa Convention Centre was designed by North Adelaide architect, Mr Geoff Nairn, and the builders were Marshall and Brougham Pty Ltd. The main theatre, which can seat more than 1 000 people, is named after a South Australian born violinist and conductor, Brenton Langbein AO—Barossa born and bred. An adjacent smaller theatre can seat approximately 200 people. The equipment, sound, lighting and so on are all state-of-the-art. There is even a vertical thrust stage which is hydraulically operated: it can be moved up and down fully loaded.

All in all, a magnificent project has come to fruition. I particularly wish to congratulate all those associated with Faith Lutheran Secondary School for their vision, for their hard work and for bringing their vision to reality. To have been involved with this project has been an absolute pleasure.

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

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

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

Motion carried.

BANK MERGER (NATIONAL/BNZ) BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the transfer to National Australia Bank Limited of certain assets and liabilities of Bank of New Zealand and for related purposes. 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 inserted in Hansard without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the transfer of the assets and liabilities of Bank of New Zealand ('BNZ'), located in South Australia, to its parent, the National Australia Bank ('National').

Bank of New Zealand ARBN 000 000 288 is a company incorporated in New Zealand.

National Australia Bank ACN 004 044 937 is a company limited by shares incorporated in Victoria and is a company within the meaning of the Corporations Law.

BNZ became a wholly owned subsidiary of National in February 1993.

National carries on the business of banking throughout Australia and elsewhere in the world and BNZ carries on the business of banking primarily in New Zealand and also in Australia in all Australian jurisdictions, with New South Wales having the largest share of BNZ's business.

On 1 October 1996 the Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer of NAB, Mr Don Argus, wrote to the Treasurer seeking the South Australian Government's sponsorship of legislation to facilitate the transfer of the banking business of BNZ to NAB following NAB's full acquisition of BNZ in February 1993.

NAB has indicated that BNZ will continue in existence after the Bill has been proclaimed.

As with the Advance Bank/BankSA and Westpac/Challenge Bank mergers, present Reserve Bank of Australia policy requires one banking authority for each banking group. BNZ is therefore required to surrender its banking authority before the middle of 1997.

In addition, following an acquisition of one bank by another, the full benefits of the acquisition cannot be realised until there is full legal integration of the banking operation of the two banks.

For these reasons it is proposed that with the exception of certain excluded assets, the assets and liabilities of BNZ in Australia will be transferred to its parent company, NAB. In order to facilitate the transfer of the BNZ banking business, it is proposed that enabling legislation be passed in the States and Territories where BNZ conducts its business.

NAB is seeking to have the relevant legislation come into force as soon as possible, preferably in the May session of Parliament.

The Bill will transfer to NAB the assets and liabilities of BNZ with the exception of the goodwill owned by BNZ in South Australia. Plant and equipment which is owned by BNZ will be retained by BNZ and leased to the Bank for an appropriate fee. The name BNZ will after legislative integration of the assets and liabilities of the two entities continue to be used in South Australia for business activities.

BNZ employees in South Australia have already been transferred to NAB including seven BNZ employees from its one branch in South Australia.

The assets being transferred by BNZ to NAB in South Australia comprise loans and receivables which, for stamp duty purposes, can be divided into two major groups:

1. Loans secured by mortgages and corporate debt securities;
2. Unsecured loans comprising leases, hire purchase agreements and other facilities.

In South Australia, BNZ has approximately 275 overdraft accounts, 1 300 mortgage related accounts, 1 300 current deposit accounts and 50 term deposit accounts.

The Government is of the view that the absorption of the one BNZ branch operating in South Australia into NAB's South Australian banking operations will not lead to any significant diminution in competition or consumer choice between banks in South Australia.

The Bank Merger (National/BNZ) Bill 1997 is conventional and largely follows the form of legislation which has been enacted in respect of other bank mergers.

The legislative approach to effect such mergers has in the past been adopted because of the large number of accounts and other assets and liabilities required to be transferred. In the absence of this type of legislation it would be necessary to contact every customer of BNZ for the purposes of gaining authorisation to transfer their accounts to NAB. Even with the relatively small level of BNZ's banking operations in South Australia, the work involved in preparation of documents and contacting parties concerned would be an unproductive and expensive exercise for the bank. It would also cause great inconvenience to customers of the bank.

The Bill includes a section to ensure that the transfer of registered company charges from the bank of New Zealand to NAB complies with section 268 of the Corporations law.

The Government is currently contemplating the possibility of omnibus legislation to provide a framework for any future bank mergers. However, in order to meet the timing requirements of the NAB, specific legislation is proposed in this case.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause contains definitions for the purposes of the measure.

Clause 4: Act binds the Crown

This clause confirms that the measure binds the Crown.

Clause 5: Extra-territorial application

This clause provides for extra-territorial application of the measure but ensures that the operations of BNZ in a jurisdiction in which it remains a separate entity are unaffected.

PART 2

VESTING OF BNZ'S UNDERTAKING IN NATIONAL

Clause 6: Vesting of undertaking

This clause vests the undertaking of the Bank of New Zealand in National Australia Bank Ltd.

Clause 7: Transitional provisions

This clause ensures a seamless transition for the merger from the Bank's and customer's view points. Provision is made for National to take over BNZ accounts, securities, cheques etc.

Clause 8: Direct payment orders to accounts transferred to BNZ

Instructions for direct payments to a BNZ account are to be taken to be instructions for direct payments to the corresponding National account.

Clause 9: Registration of title, etc.

This clause provides for the recognition of the merger by the Registrar-General or other registering authority without further formality.

Clause 10: Exclusion of obligation to inquire

This clause removes the need for a person dealing with BNZ or National to inquire into whether an asset to which the transaction relates is or is not a transferred asset.

PART 3

GENERAL

Clause 11: Taxes and duties

This clause exempts transactions under the Act from stamp duty, financial institutions duty and debits tax but requires National to pay to the Treasurer an amount estimated by the Treasurer as equivalent to the foregone duties and taxes.

Clause 12: Notice of assignment of charges under Corporations Law

This clause ensures that the Australian Securities Commission receives fees for the assignment of registrable charges on company property under this Act.

Clause 13: Name in which National carries on business

This clause enables National to carry on business in SA in the name of Bank of New Zealand Australia.

The clause also provides for registration of certain other names on the application of National.

Clause 14: Service of documents

This clause provides that on or after the appointed day service is effective whether it is on National or BNZ.

Clause 15: Evidence

This clause enables the CEO of National to certify whether or not assets or liabilities are transferred assets or liabilities under the measure.

Clause 16: Act overrides other laws

This clause provides that the measure has effect despite other laws.

Clause 17: Effect of things done or allowed under Act

This clause ensures that the measure does not have undesirable commercial consequences.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BANK MERGERS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to facilitate the merger of banks and for other purposes. 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.

Members will recall that two bank mergers have recently come before the House to facilitate the integration of the banks' assets and liabilities. The integrations are a condition of Reserve Bank approval of the relevant Bank mergers which requires the banking license of the acquired bank to be relinquished. The previous mergers were between Advance Bank and Bank SA and Westpac and Challenge Bank.

The Government has decided to progress with specific legislation in the case of the merger between the National Australia Bank and the Bank of New Zealand due to the timing requirements imposed and the fact that this process commenced before the development of a general merger framework.

Given the level and extent of continued rationalisation occurring within the banking industry and the release of the Wallis Report into the Australian financial system, it is likely that further banking acquisitions and mergers will occur which, in due course, will require each State and Territory to pass relevant legislation to enable the legal merger of the entities to occur.

The Bank Mergers (SA) Bill proposes a general framework which will allow bank mergers to be dealt with by:

- a set of case-specific regulations which will have the same effect as the previous specific legislation; or
- regulations adopting the relevant law of another State or Territory with modifications as necessary; or
- a combination of these two mechanisms.

The Parliament of New South Wales passed similar legislation last year and other jurisdictions are known to be considering a similar course which would effectively enable the Governor in Executive Council to make regulations, orders or proclamations providing for the merger of two or more banks.

The Bill allows the regulations to provide for the continuation of the special arrangements with respect to the superannuation rights of State Scheme employees as well as the continuation of the guarantee attached to certain BankSA deposits.

Because of accounting and legal requirements, merging banks invariably require legislation to be proclaimed on the same day in all relevant jurisdictions. Banks have encountered a significant practical difficulty in the past in their attempts to coordinate common proclamation dates in several jurisdictions at the same time. This can be a very difficult task to achieve because of differing legislative priorities, Parliamentary sitting times etc in each State.

The establishment of an ongoing legislative framework for bank mergers would improve legislative efficiency, by reducing the level of relatively routine business requiring Parliament's direct consideration.

The legislation is consistent with the Government's commitment to facilitating business efficiency in South Australia without prejudicing the integrity of the State's revenue base.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Interpretation

This clause extends the meaning of bank to include wholly owned subsidiaries and defines merger to include any form of amalgamation or merger. It also includes other definitions for the purposes of the measure.

Clause 3: Regulations for the merging of banks

This clause provides general regulation making power for facilitating bank mergers. The powers given cover the matters currently provided for by special Acts of Parliament for individual mergers. The regulations may override State laws. A special provision is

included for the continuation, modification or exclusion of government guarantees by regulation.

Clause 4: Application of merger laws of other jurisdictions

This clause allows the regulations to operate by applying a law of another jurisdiction relating to a bank merger as a law of this State subject to any modifications specified in the regulations.

Clause 5: Extra-territorial operation of regulations

The regulations are to extend to any jurisdiction outside the State.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES (RATES OF DUTY) 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.

The *Stamp Duties (Rates of Duty) Amendment Bill 1997* seeks to amend the Stamp Duties Act in respect of three separate issues.

The first amendment proposed in the Bill provides an exemption from stamp duty in respect of transfers of property from the Official Trustee in Bankruptcy, or a registered trustee, to the bankrupt or former bankrupt.

The exemption has been constructed so that where the conveyance is from the trustee to a person other than the bankrupt, the benefit of the divorce exemption and the spouses' exemption will still be applicable.

The second amendment proposed in the Bill deals with the treatment of conveyances of property from superannuation funds to Pooled Superannuation Trusts (PST), in exchange for units in the PST.

Since the commencement of the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993* (Cwth) ('the SIS Act') Commonwealth Government policy has placed the onus on superannuation fund trustees, including the trustees of small funds from 1 July 1996, to formulate and implement broad investment strategies for the purpose of risk minimisation.

The best way that small funds can achieve the required diversification is by effecting *in specie* transfers of their members property to PST's, in exchange for units in the PST. In undertaking such a strategy, prohibitive costs would be incurred, including a significant stamp duty component. Passing on of these costs could result in losses for members, which could reduce the benefits obtained by complying with the SIS Act.

It is therefore proposed to amend the Act to provide a concessional rate of stamp duty, being a flat fee of \$200 or the actual amount of duty, whichever is the lesser, on the transfer of property from a superannuation fund to a PST in exchange for units in a PST, where such funds comply with the SIS Act.

This proposal will be welcomed by the Superannuation Industry and small business and will ensure that those who prepare for their retirement will not see their benefits eroded by costs incurred in complying with the SIS Act. The proposed amendment is consistent with approaches taken interstate.

The final amendment proposed in the Bill involves the stamp duty payable on the transfer of marketable securities made by way of gift.

Under the existing legislation, such transfers are subject to conveyance rates of duty with marginal tax rates ranging from 1 per cent to 4.5 per cent. Transfers of marketable securities by way of sale however attract lower rates of 30¢ per \$100 of value for listed marketable securities and 60¢ per \$100 of value for unlisted marketable securities.

This is viewed as an anomaly when compared to the duty applied to transfers of marketable securities by way of sale, and the practice in other jurisdictions of applying the same rates of duty, irrespective of whether the transfer is by way of sale or gift.

The Bill therefore, seeks to amend the Stamp Duties Act to reduce the rate of stamp duty payable on the transfer of marketable securities made by way of gift so as to align with transfers by way

of sale ie, 30 cents per \$100 of value for listed marketable securities and 60 cents per \$100 of value for unlisted marketable securities.

Removing the anomaly increases the degree of consistency in this tax regime, simplifies calculation of duty for the industry, and removes a possible trap for persons who are not familiar with the present provisions in respect of share transactions. Additionally, for those taxpayers familiar with the current provisions it removes the need for taxpayers to have to artificially construct transactions to take advantage of the lower rate of duty.

These amendments although they are not major are consistent with the Government's desire to take action, wherever it can within existing budgetary restraints, to ease the burden on the taxpaying community.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the various tax industry interest groups for their ongoing willingness in providing valuable input into the development of these proposals.

I commend this Bill to the honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Insertion of s. 71CD

Clause 2 inserts new section 71CD into the principal Act. This provision treats the Official Trustee in Bankruptcy and a registered trustee in bankruptcy as being in the shoes of the bankrupt for the purposes of stamp duty. Consequently a transfer of property from the Official or registered trustee to the bankrupt is exempt from duty and a transfer to any other person will be assessed for duty as though it were a transfer from the bankrupt.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 71DA—Duty on certain conveyances between superannuation funds, etc.

Clause 3 inserts two new subsections into section 71DA of the principal Act dealing with transfers of property from superannuation funds to pooled superannuation trusts or from trusts to funds or to other pooled superannuation trusts. Paragraph (b) of the clause updates the definition of 'complying superannuation fund' which is used in subsection (1) of section 71DA.

Clause 4: Amendment of schedule 2

Clause 4 amends the duty payable on transfers of shares by way of gift as already discussed.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act 1988. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to expand the electorate for elections for a member or members of the South Australian Superannuation Board, and make a number of other minor technical amendments which will ensure the Act and the two schemes covered by the Act operate as originally intended.

In relation to Board elections, the Bill proposes amendments to provide that contributors under the Superannuation Act; members of the scheme established by the Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992; and the members of the scheme established by the Southern State Superannuation Act 1994, be eligible to vote at an election for a member or members of the South Australian Superannuation Board. At present only the contributors of the two schemes covered by the Superannuation Act are eligible to vote at an election, and yet the Superannuation Board is also responsible for the administration of the schemes established under the Superannuation (Benefits Scheme) Act 1992, and the Southern State Superannuation Act 1994. This amendment will therefore ensure that all the members of schemes for which the Superannuation Board is responsible have a say in who they want to represent them on the Board.

The other technical amendments being proposed in the Bill deal with issues which have arisen in the administration of the Act. One of the amendments proposed is in respect of members of the closed

defined benefit lump sum scheme who elect to "roll over" their accrued benefits to some other scheme on resignation. As private sector superannuation schemes are now well regulated by the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993 (Cth), which is administered by the Insurance and Superannuation Commission, there is no need for the Superannuation Act to have its own set of criteria to determine 'approved schemes' to which an accrued benefit can be transferred. The discrepancies that currently exist between the two sets of regulatory controls will be removed enabling members to more easily transfer their accrued benefits from the lump sum scheme.

The unions have been consulted in relation to these amendments and general support has been indicated.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. Clause 8 of the Bill amends the definition of 'n' in the formulas in section 34(1) and (2) of the Act. The value of "n" is determined by the number of contribution points accruing from 1 July 1992 to the date of retirement. Clause 8 rectifies a problem caused by the fact that a contributor who is over the age of retirement may cease contributing and thereby cease to accrue points (see section 23(7) of the Act). Clause 8 needs to operate retrospectively from 1 July 1992 to cure this problem.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

Clause 3 inserts a new factor 'P' in the formula in section 4(5) of the principal Act. The new factor caters for a contributor all or part of whose employment has been part time employment.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 8—The Board's membership

Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act to provide that the two elected members of the South Australian Superannuation Board will be elected by members of the superannuation benefit scheme and the Southern State Superannuation Scheme as well as contributors to the two schemes under the principal Act.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 20A—Contributor's accounts

Clause 5 amends section 20A of the principal Act so that the phrase 'rate of return' used in that section encompasses both positive and negative rates of return.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 28—Resignation and preservation of benefits

This clause makes the amendment relating to the rollover of accrued benefits already discussed.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 31—Termination of employment on invalidity

Clause 7 makes a minor drafting amendment to section 31 of the principal Act.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 34—Retirement

Clause 8 amends section 34 of the principal Act. Section 23(7) of the principal Act provides that an old scheme contributor who has passed the age of retirement (60 years in most cases) and who has the required number of contribution points is not required to continue contributing which means he or she does not accrue further contribution points. For the value of 'n' in the formulas in section 34(1) and (2) to work as intended points need to be credited in these circumstances. The amendment addresses this problem.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 38—Death of contributor

Clause 9 amends section 38 of the principal Act. Subsection (1)(a) requires a person who was not the spouse of a deceased contributor when he or she stopped work to be the spouse of the contributor for at least five years before the contributor's death in order to be entitled to a benefit. The provision applies to both legal and putative spouses. The amendment clarifies the position where, during the period of five years, the spouse ceases to be a putative spouse and becomes the contributor's lawful spouse.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 39—Resignation and preservation of benefits

Clause 10 amends the definition of 'NM' in section 39(7) of the principal Act.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: 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 comprehensive revision of the Local Government Act is progressing and it is the Government's wish to work with the Local Government Association and to reach substantial agreement on the proposals to be included in exposure draft Bills for the new Local Government Act prior to their release for public consultation.

The proposals contained in this Miscellaneous Amendment Bill need to be in place before the revision of the entire Local Government Act can be completed. In particular it is important to ensure that a process continues for achieving changes to the structure of Councils. The provisions which establish the Local Government Boundary Reform Board and the current process for dealing with proposals for the creation, abolition, amalgamation, and alterations to the boundaries, of Councils are due to expire at the end of September 1997. This Bill extends the operation of the Board and the current processes for 12 months to provide for the completion of proposals initiated before 30 September 1997 and for the management of further proposals for changes between 30 September 1997 and the enactment of the new Local Government Act.

The Government does not propose to continue the capacity of the Local Government Reform Board to initiate its own structural reform proposals after 30 September 1997. The Act was amended in 1995 to provide for a defined period of intense structural reform in Local Government and, to the credit of the Local Government sector and the Board, the significant results which the Government anticipated will be achieved within that timeframe.

The Government takes this opportunity to congratulate without reservation all those who have been involved in the process which has so far reduced the number of Councils in this State from 118 to 69 creating estimated benefits in the form of savings and improved services worth at least \$20 million.

There are also other issues of concern to the Government and to Local Government which are of a high enough priority to warrant being addressed in this Bill. Increases in penalties for littering and enhanced enforcement arrangements together make up one of these, and clarification of the provision in the Act for limitation of Councils' general rates in the forthcoming two financial years is another.

In relation to littering, the proposed increase in penalties forms part of the multi-faceted approach of the State Government to litter control and recycling. The approach is based on the results of the KESAB survey of 1992, the findings of the Litter and Container Deposit Legislation Working Party, and the Environment Protection Authority's 'Litter! It's your choice' public discussion paper. The Government's strategy includes education and clean-up campaigns and container deposit legislation as well as increased litter penalties and expiation fees. The 1992 survey results, with unusually high returns from Local Government authorities, indicated that a majority of metropolitan councils thought the level of expiation fee for littering inadequate and considered the maximum penalty inadequate. Approximately one third of country councils were also dissatisfied with the levels of both.

The Government is also pleased to put forward a complementary proposal from the Local Government Association to enable Councils' authorised officers to ask persons suspected of littering to give some evidence of their identity as well as to state their name and address. This is consistent with the powers of authorised officers under comparable legislation and should strengthen the enforcement process.

In relation to the provision for limitation of rates in the financial years 1996-97 and 1997-98, the Government has received representations from the Local Government Association and certain Councils about the interpretation of the phrase 'same land' in section 174A. After extensive consultation a proposal has been developed for inclusion in this Bill clarifying that Councils may disregard revenue gained from certain growth in their rates base for the purpose of calculating the amount of general rates they may aim to recover in the next and following financial years. The proposal will allow

Councils to gain increases in revenue associated with improvements in the value of property in their areas other than improvements solely in market value and home improvements. The effect of the amendment will be that where development growth occurs which potentially increases Councils' service costs, the revenue attributable to the growth will not be included in the maximum revenue permitted from general rates. I emphasise that the amendment is designed to help Councils in growth areas by allowing modest increases in revenue outside the rates cap where that is appropriate to local conditions.

The opportunity has also been taken to bring forward a number of necessary technical amendments.

It is proposed to exclude from the requirement to be laid before Parliament specific types of rules provided for in the Local Government Act which have not previously been laid before Parliament and which relate to the internal organisation of authorities, enable artificial legal entities to operate, and are not of a legislative character affecting the rights of individuals. The rules affected are amendments to the rules of the Local Government Association approved by the Minister, rules of the Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme and Local Government Workers Compensation Scheme, and rules of controlling authorities established by a single Council or by two or more Councils. Although the practice has been that these rules not be laid before Parliament they have not previously been specifically excluded from the operation of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*. The proposed amendment will put their status in this respect beyond question.

The Local Government Superannuation Scheme has requested that it be enabled to bring into immediate effect an additional category of changes to its rules under section 73, such that amendments conferring a benefit or right on persons can enter into operation without delay. This is consistent with practice elsewhere in the superannuation industry and is included in the Bill.

A recent petition for Ministerial intervention in a dispute between Councils has drawn attention to the absence of provision for Councils who are parties to a dispute to meet the costs of such a resolution process. It is no longer appropriate for the State Government to meet such costs on behalf of Local Government and the Bill includes a provision to remedy this deficiency.

The Bill also includes technical amendments to replace references to a 'licensed valuer' employed or engaged by a Council with 'a valuer who is a member of the Australian Institute of Valuers and Land Economists' and to amend the period for objecting to a valuation made by a Council-employed valuer so that it is consistent with proposed amendments to the Valuation of Land Act concerning the period for objecting to valuations made by the Valuer General.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The Act, other than the provision extending the period within which objections to valuations made by a council may be made, will come into operation on assent. The other provision will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation in order to allow co-ordination with amendments being proposed to the *Valuation of Land Act 1971*.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 21—Formulation of proposals by the Board

Another clause of this measure provides for the extension of the operation of Division X Part II of the Act until 30 September 1998. In conjunction with that extension, it is proposed that the Local Government Boundary Reform Board will not be able to formulate a structural reform proposal under section 21 of the Act after 30 September 1997. (This restriction will not affect a proposal or process commenced on or before 30 September 1997.)

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 22E—Protection from proceedings

This amendment rectifies an incorrect cross-reference.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 22G—Expiry of Division

This clause provides for the extension of the operation of Division X Part II of the Act until 30 September 1998.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 34—The Local Government Association of South Australia

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 34a—Local government indemnity schemes

It is possible to argue that various rules and constitutions that operate under the Act may be subject to the operation of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*. In order to avoid any argument to this effect, the operation of that Act is to be expressly excluded.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 73—Local Government Superannuation Scheme

Section 73 of the Act provides for the continuation of the *Local Government Superannuation Scheme*. The scheme may be amended by regulations made by the Local Government Superannuation Board. Section 10AA of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* does not apply to these regulations, but section 73(3) provides that, as a general rule, amendments to the regulations come into operation four months after the day on which they are made (or at some later time). Some exceptions exist. It is intended to add an exception where an amendment confers a benefit or right on a person (other than the Local Government Superannuation Board).

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 83—Powers of authorised persons
Other clauses increase the penalties prescribed by the Act for offences relating to littering and abandoning vehicles. In connection with those moves to increase the effectiveness of those provisions, it is considered appropriate to enhance the powers of authorised persons to some degree. At the present time an authorised person may only require a person who is reasonably suspected of having committed an offence against the Act to state his or her full name and address. It is intended to extend the operation of the provision to include circumstances where the authorised person reasonably suspects that a person is committing, or is about to commit, an offence against the Act, and to allow the authorised person to require the production of evidence of the person's identity.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 171—Valuation of land for the purposes of rating

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 172—Valuation of land

The term 'licensed' valuer is no longer appropriate. The appropriate reference is to a valuer who is a member of the Australian Institute of Valuers and Land Economists.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 173—Objections to valuations made by council

It is intended to alter the time within which objections to valuations made by a valuer employed or engaged by a council may be made. The current rule under the Act is that an objection must be made to the council within 21 days after the objector receives notice of the relevant valuation (unless the council allows an extension of time). An objector will now have 60 days, or until 30 September, to lodge an objection, whichever is the later (unless the council allows an extension of time).

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 174A—Limitation on general rates—1997-1998 and 1998-1999 financial years

It is proposed to allow councils to disregard certain aspects of capital growth within their areas when applying the provisions of section 174A(1).

Clause 14: Insertion of s. 201

This clause proposes the insertion of a section that will expressly provide that the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* does not apply to the rules of a controlling authority under the Act.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 721—Differences between councils
Section 721 of the Act establishes procedures for resolving differences between councils. It is intended to make provision relating to the costs of the proceedings. In connection with this, an amendment will be made to require the Minister to consult with the relevant councils about the appointment of any person to conduct the proceedings before the appointment is made. The Government has also concluded that it is appropriate that a person be appointed to conduct the proceedings in all cases.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 748a—Depositing of rubbish, etc.
This clause amends section 748a(1) of the Act to increase the maximum fine for depositing litter and other matter on a street, road or other public place to \$4000 (currently this offence carries a maximum penalty of \$500). The expiation fee is also increased to \$200 (currently \$50).

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 748b—Apparently abandoned vehicles and farm implements

This clause amends section 748b(1) of the Act to make the penalty for abandoning a vehicle or farm implement in a public place consistent with the penalty provided in relation to section 748a(1).

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMUNITY TITLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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 reading it.

Leave granted.

The Community Titles Act was proclaimed to operate from the 4th November 1996.

Twenty-six applications for a variety of community titled development have been lodged with the Development Assessment Commission. These represent a wide range of developments proposed or in the process of being developed, ranging from conventional small scale residential schemes to innovative suburban infill, schemes including viticulture and aquaculture, rural and country living schemes and industrial estates.

It was originally envisaged that access to the Strata Titles Act would be limited from the 4th November to the completion of schemes which already had planning approval. During the public and industry education program prior to the commencement of the Act, it became apparent that there was a problem with the transitional provision proposed for the Strata Titles Act.

It became apparent that some developers first seek approval to construct a building then subsequently seek approval to divide the land by strata plan, not taking account of the Development Act facility for both approvals to be granted at the same time. As a result there was a possibility that some developers would have been caught with a building intended to be strata titled for which they had not sought subdivision approval. Had the transitional provision become operative, these developers would have commenced their scheme under the Strata Titles Act and then have completed the development under the Community Titles Act.

It had been the intention that existing developments would be completed under the same regime which they had started.

Taking these matters into account it was determined that the most appropriate course was to suspend the operation of the sections limiting the future operation of the Strata Titles Act, until they could be appropriately amended.

Consideration has been given to an appropriate form of transitional arrangement between the Strata Titles Act and the Community Titles Act.

This Bill will allow for a cut off date for new schemes under the Strata Titles Act where proceedings for the deposit of the strata plan have commenced before a date to be set by proclamation. The date will be set following industry consultation. Proceedings for the deposit of a strata plan will be taken to have commenced either when application for subdivision by strata plan was made, or when application for approval to construct the building to be divided by the plan was made, whichever application was first.

The Bill is essentially technical in nature and will enable the smooth transition from land division under the Strata Titles Act to land division under the Community Titles Act.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 41—Amendment of s. 8—Deposit of strata plan

Clause 2 amends section 41 of the principal Act in the manner already discussed.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.
(Continued from 3 June. Page 1552.)

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I add my comments to those of the member for Custance regarding the Barossa Convention Centre. I, too, attended the opening of that centre on Friday night last and believe it to be one of excellence. I extend my congratulations to the Faith community on their vision and on the very hard work that they have done in raising over \$1 million so far from their community. From sitting in the theatre, I have to say that the comfort, the acoustics and the benefits of viewing an act there are equal to those of the Festival Theatre and, as the member for Custance said, surely there is no other facility in another regional area in Australia

that is as good. I stand to be corrected on that, but the Barossa has an excellent centre.

I turn now to the Government's budget of 1997-98 and particularly to many of the comments of members opposite yesterday in that regard. One has to say that we have in our midst an Opposition that is negative, pessimistic and carps consistently. In fact, I cannot think of anything positive that Opposition members had to say about the budget. It reminds me of an old saying about pleasing all the people all of the time. You can please some of the people all of the time and all the people some of the time, but you cannot please all the people all of the time. This Labor Party Opposition adds a new dimension to that because it is the group that we can never please any time.

It was suggested yesterday by the member for Elizabeth and perhaps other members on that side that this budget is a hoax. This budget is no hoax. The budget has a surplus to the tune of \$1 million and the Government has turned around the State's finances by \$366 million in the last 3½ years. Let us look at what the Labor Government budgets between 1990-91 and 1993-94 did once the first bail-out of the State Bank debt was announced. I well remember that because I was in an press lock-up for that, representing the Centre for Economic Studies. I remember when the then Under-Treasurer announced a bail-out of \$1.2 billion, and it was the first of what was expected to be many more.

Let us look at the 1990-91 budget of the then Government. At that stage the recurrent deficit was \$369 million. One would have thought that, following the State Bank debacle, the Government would seek to redress some of the recurrent deficit, but not the Labor Government. In the 1991-92 budget, the recurrent deficit rose to \$470 million from a forecast \$330 million.

In 1992-93, things improved a little. It was reduced to \$317 million, and in 1993-94 the then Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins) announced in the budget that we would have only a \$24 million deficit. Unfortunately, it obviously all got away, because the actual deficit for 1993-94 was \$266 million. I will just run that past members again. From a budget with a proposed \$24 million deficit it went to an actual deficit for 1993-94 of \$266 million. On my figures, that works out to be a difference of \$242 million—quite amazing! When Opposition members say that this budget is a hoax, I have to raise my eyebrows and give a somewhat wry smile as they, when in Government, could not achieve any advance on the deficit resulting from their own mismanagement and from the State Bank debacle.

In late 1993, when we came into Government, an audit of the accounts showed that the State was \$365 million in debt. We have managed to turn that around, but it has not been easy. I commend the South Australian public for putting up with the cuts that Ministers have had to take in the budgets. Nobody likes doing that; it is of no benefit to anybody, but with this budget we had to bring it back to a situation where we were earning the amount of money we were spending, and I congratulate the Treasurer on the excellent job he has done in achieving that.

I will turn to this budget and its effects on the electorate of Light. This year a further \$2.1 million will be spent on the Hewett Primary School. I was pleased when the Minister for Education approved that school, which now has 136 students when it was estimated to have only 70. It is the only one on the northern side of Gawler, and construction is proceeding extremely well.

With regard to new works in Gawler, \$1.2 million has been allocated to the Gawler High School. This school, in terms of upkeep and maintenance of infrastructure, has been an absolute tragedy. In the 10 years Labor spent in Government, not one cent was spent on that school outside the usual back to school grants, etc. I remember going there and picking up chairs. When we were running fund-raisers for the local Rotary Club, we would borrow chairs from the Gawler High School, and I noted that fascia boards were split, louvres were broken and paint was peeling off, yet nothing was done. In our second budget I am pleased to say that at least those minor repairs were effected, the place was given a coat of paint, and some pride was returned to the school. I am pleased to see that \$1.2 million is to be spent at the school. That is for the replacement of many of the transportable buildings, and for meeting needs existing in the areas of senior science, art, technology, general and specialist teaching facilities, student service facilities and improved administration facilities. This provision is long overdue and should have been available 10 years ago.

I am also pleased to see—and the member for Custance highlighted this in his speech last night—that in the budget this Government has supported the Barossa Valley Country Club to the tune of \$2.5 million, \$2.2 million of that to be spent this year. It will commence in September 1997, and we are aiming for completion in December 1998. This will be an excellent addition to the area. It will go alongside the proposed Kinsman development at the Tanunda Golf Club and will really focus conventions into that area.

Turning to water resources in the area, there is ongoing mains work, with an extension to serve Angle Vale, Virginia and Two Wells. The sum of \$1.4 million is being spent in the budget this year from a total of \$14.9 million for the project. There are new works for the Elizabeth/Gawler trunk sewer stage 3, which will commence in 1997, with completion expected in 2001—a total of \$8.1 million for an upgrade of sewers.

Roads is one area where this Government can stand tall. I am pleased to say that the Minister for Transport has approved \$5.5 million to be spent on the Barossa Valley Way, for junction upgrades, minor realignments and widening. Further, the Sturt Highway will receive another \$4 million, and this is for overtaking lanes at Bastion Hill and Moppa Road. That has been needed, and the Daveyston bypass is about to be completed this year. Of importance is the additional police staff in Gawler. Before I first came into this place and was door knocking prior to the election, one of the things the people of Gawler requested was an additional patrol car. We have been given that this year, together with an additional 15 police staff at the Gawler Police Station. I have been asking for that, too, since I came into this place, and I am sure that the previous member for Light also door knocked for it. This is an excellent budget, and I commend the Treasurer for its introduction.

Mr WADE (Elder): I congratulate the Olsen Liberal Government on achieving something that no previous Liberal or Labor Government has been able to achieve in living memory. This Government has presented to the people of South Australia a balanced budget—a budget that balances Government expenditure with Government income, plus a small surplus. In December 1993, State debt was out of control. The incoming Liberal Government was faced with a mind boggling debt of over \$9 billion—a debt incurred by the Labor Government but having to be paid back by the

people of South Australia. Each day, the State was going into further debt to the tune of \$1 million. This extra \$1 million every day was needed to fund the day-to-day expenses of Government. No household can survive when debts exceed income: sooner or later, the credit card will be exhausted. No business can survive when its expenditure exceeds its profit, and no Government can survive if such a situation is allowed to continue.

Labor's legacy to this State was debt, depression and pessimism for the future. It saw no light on the horizon. Labor had ruined this State and knew it. The 1993-94 Labor budget, in its financial information paper No. 2, at page 8, outlined the economic conditions facing South Australians as follows:

The outlook for the economy as at mid-1993 appears to be one with growth continuing to be at a pace that will not be sufficient to make major inroads into the unacceptably high rate of unemployment.

It continues:

The State's tourism sector remains weak and does not appear to have benefited from the strong growth in international tourism to Australia.

There are further depressing views on page 8, as follows:

In South Australia, there is the added influence of a weakened outlook for rural production.

Labor had lost it; it knew it had lost it, and it had no answers, seeing only a gloomy and bleak future for the State of South Australia. The Liberal Government's fourth budget is not just one of hope for the future. It is tangible proof that the State does have a future and that this future can be attained through careful financial management. The first few years were difficult, but everyone knew they would be difficult. There was no easy fix, and our financial situation is still tenuous. However, as the Treasurer stated:

This year, we will live within our means.

We will do it without imposing new taxes and without increasing our current rates of taxation. We will live within our means and further reduce the debt, which has already been reduced from \$9 billion to \$7.5 billion. We will live within our means and extinguish our \$4 billion superannuation liabilities left by Labor for the people of South Australia to pay. We will live within our means and still pump into this State nearly \$70 million for economic development construction. We will pump into this State over \$31 million for employment programs and over \$10 million for health initiatives. The sum of \$1.6 million has been allocated to the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital for day surgery. Those people in my constituency will be most pleased to know this.

New funding amounting to \$5 million will be committed for disability services, to provide relief in priority areas such as accommodation, respite care, day support and family support services. In fact, this Liberal Government has injected nearly \$17 million into the disability sector and will allocate an additional \$1 million to provide equipment for people with disabilities and older persons. Young people suffering drug abuse and psychoses will be able to be treated in two drug psychosis units to be set up—one at the Flinders Medical Centre and the other at Glenside—at a cost of \$1 million. We have additional mammography screening services. The sum of \$2.5 million for primary health care grants and better management of acute illnesses, such as asthma and diabetes, are all positive signs that family and community health remains a priority for the Liberal Government—and a high priority, indeed.

My constituents receiving concessions will be relieved to know that \$68.5 million has been allocated for concessions to help people pay their council and water rates and power and transport costs. The homeless and victims of domestic violence will have access to nearly \$25 million in relief funding. Foster care is strongly supported through a \$7 million budget allocation. A further \$4.5 million has been put aside for new alternative care services for children unable to live at home. And on top of this, a further \$14 million has been allocated for residential and youth services. The Charitable and Social Welfare Fund will receive \$3 million, and problem gamblers will receive help from the \$1.5 million provided to the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund.

We will live within our means and still care for our young, our aged, our disabled and our frail. In fact, the Home and Community Care Program will receive \$67.7 million in this budget, an increase of over \$14 million since 1993-94. We have doubled the support provided for carers over the past three years. That can only be good news for those of my constituents in Elder who need these services. I have a large proportion of Housing Trust tenants in my area, and I welcome the \$55 million maintenance program for 1997-98. The South Australian Community Housing Authority will also provide over 300 extra units of houses in 1997-98. The Liberal Government has increased spending on education by \$72 million. South Australia still spends more on education per student than any other State.

In my area, in particular, Ascot Park Primary School is receiving a \$100 000 upgrade plus \$5 540 for external repairs and painting—something denied them by the former Labor Government. Repairs and paint programs have been approved for the Ascot Park, Clarence Gardens and Vermont Kindergartens, the Edwardstown and Forbes Primary Schools, and the Harcourt Gardens Preschool. That is good news for my schools, because they have all gained from this budget. Students needing speech pathology will have access to a further \$1.2 million over two years. The Liberal Government has committed \$75 million over five years to help schools and parents purchase computers and related infrastructure. Compare this with the paltry \$360 000 provided in the last Labor Government's budget for computer purchase. Labor was a disgrace. It had no vision for the future then, and it has no vision for the future of our children today.

This budget is a 'steady as she goes' approach to our financial and social situation. It is not a budget of hope: it is a budget of achievement. It is a reflection of this Liberal Government's ability to pull this State from the brink of catastrophe, and do it in its first term of Government. It is a budget firmly facing the future. It is a budget that establishes a stable financial base from which we can pursue the quality of life that South Australians deserve. I commend this budget to the House.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I would also like to address the positive impact of the 1997-98 budget. I believe it is important to acknowledge the work of our Treasurer and his team. The Government aimed for a balanced budget, and it has reached its target. Four years ago, the Government was given the task of restoring South Australia's finances, following the disasters of the mid-1980s to the early 1990s. Last Thursday we delivered. A budget was put before this House that balances income with expenditure; a budget that reaffirms our commitment to job creation. My electorate is already benefiting from this Government's achievements. We have seen an increase in spending on our community's priorities:

education, health, law and order and the disability sector. I am particularly pleased to see my local police station, Christies Beach, receive an allocation of \$2.75 million for the building of a new police complex. The community wants extra police on the street, and we are delivering.

The sum of \$3 million has been allocated for the collocation of metropolitan fire services with the South Australian Ambulance Service, and I acknowledge the collocation of the South Australian Ambulance Service with the Metropolitan Fire Service at O'Halloran Hill. This site was launched on Sunday 1 June, and full credit goes to both the South Australian Ambulance Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service for making this collocation a success. I also acknowledge the work of the member for Bright who, through his vision and forethought, put this idea in place and has seen it progress. He has worked quietly, so it is an achievement for him as well.

There has been a \$72 million boost in the education budget. Of significant interest to me is the funding to assist students with learning difficulties, including those identified by the basic skills test. This is to be increased from \$3 million to \$4 million. There is a record \$105.8 million for capital works and maintenance to improve school facilities for students and staff. It would be remiss of me not to mention the redevelopment of Christies Beach High School—a real coup for the local community. Finally, after all these years, something significant is to happen which will provide a quality learning environment for all students at Christies Beach.

In health, we have demonstrated a real commitment to restoring and reshaping the fabric of our public health units. The reason why this commitment has been necessary is the former Labor Government's disregard of our public health system, which was run into a shocking state of neglect. Since taking office this Government has embarked upon a major process of redevelopment, which has resulted in health units across the State undergoing massive refits: the RAH first-stage development, \$5.8 million; strategic works in country facilities, \$5.7 million; a day surgery facility at the Daw Park Repatriation General Hospital; a new laboratory complex at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, \$3.6 million. The list goes on.

I also highlight the diverse range of measures taken in the 1997-98 health budget, specifically in the areas of hospitals, rural and Aboriginal health, disability services and preventative health. Hospitals will get an extra \$40 million this financial year to allow them to operate more effectively, to sustain the impressive increase in the number of patients treated and to continue essential maintenance. The sum of \$10 million has been targeted for a range of areas, including specific improvements in surgical practice, the establishment of two drug psychosis units at Flinders Medical Centre and Glenside, and providing equipment for people with disabilities and older people. I congratulate the Minister for Health on taking on the responsibility for the disability area—a very important status to achieve for that portfolio area and for the people involved.

Some \$5 million of new funding committed to the disability sector will address priority areas such as accommodation, respite, day support, personal care, family support, therapy and alternative community services. The budget has many positives for the community, particularly my area. We are seeing restored confidence within our commercial and industrial sector. The member for Mitchell spoke about cranes in his electorate. This same indicator has a strong

presence throughout Lonsdale. I only have to look outside my office door and I can view the newly developed Southgate shopping plaza; further down the road, a \$6 million aged care complex; and we have welcomed to Lonsdale Alfon Industries and Seeley International. Dicksons Glass, Protector Safety, Quality Crash, Team Poly, Kilkee Products and a number of other companies have all expanded in the electorate—larger factories, better facilities, more staff. It is happening, and it is happening locally. Surely, this is a positive indicator in restoring local confidence.

In talking with businesses in my community, I am finding that they still have the feeling that our economy is missing something. They acknowledge that fiscal recovery is on track but, no matter what we do (and that includes what we do well), we still have a problem, and that problem is attitude. While members of Parliament are constantly degrading this State and knocking anything and everything we do, things will not happen as quickly as we want. However, if we truly want the State to improve and get back on track, we have to talk up our State and what is happening with it. The Leader of the Opposition constantly calls for a bipartisan show of strength in achieving the goals of this State. If the Opposition Leader truly believes in a bipartisan approach, he must embrace a positive outlook, he must believe in restoring confidence and he must back our Government's plan for getting South Australia back into a healthy financial state.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): On previous occasions members will have heard me talk about the most important challenge confronting us as a State if we are to survive. Quite clearly, it is not possible for us to address the unemployment problems we have in this State unless we can expand our economic base. The only way we can do that in an enduring way is not to try to take industries from other States and bring them here to sell to customers local to Australia; that is just shuffling the deckchairs. What we must do is expand the size of the economy within our State by pursuing export markets for whatever it is that we are producing. Clearly, that can be done by expanding demand overseas for the goods we can produce or the services that we can provide from South Australia. There is another form of development in the economy which some people classify as an export, and that is encouraging overseas capital investment in opportunities here in South Australia which then go on and produce the goods and/or services to which I have already referred.

There are problems related to each of those matters, which I wish to talk about now. The goods that we can produce are not just manufactured goods but are also from primary industries and emerging parts of those primary industries—the sunrise industries that I have spoken about before—such as aquaculture and niche marketing of a wider variety of cereals, fruits and nuts of one kind or another. I include here the expansion of olive, almond and pecan production and so on, as well as the things that we already produce very well, and finding a stronger demand for them in a wider variety of markets, such as our oranges. They will be entering Korea later this year. They have not been able to get access to that market before without paying a very considerable import duty. That will amount to several thousand tonnes of citrus. In South Australia we produce about 200 000 tonnes altogether. We are about to start harvesting a navel crop of more than 80 000 tonnes right at this minute.

Those goods of the type I have just mentioned and the other services of tourism and education that we can sell in great quantity certainly need to be strongly supported by

initiatives from Government. They will not start up of their own volition. There is no existing infrastructure or profession, and no union is working in those new industries to be its political advocate, yet we as a total community must pay attention to the necessity for those industries to be established. As members of Parliament and part of the people—in fact, the most important part of the people, in our role in the determination of policy (that is, the body politic of society)—we need to draw attention to the benefits that can be derived from these new industries, otherwise nobody will do anything about it. We need to support our Ministers in the initiatives they take to sell those goods and services overseas. Therefore, we must find an appropriate social structure that delivers a management process to develop markets for those services.

I draw the House's attention to the problem that I see at the present time. This Government took a unique initiative. Through the establishment of an organisation called the Council for International Trade and Commerce of South Australia (CITCSA), there is the means by which so-called ethnic chambers of commerce can affiliate and focus their attention upon selling those goods and services to which I have just referred into the countries from which the people who might form part of the membership of each of those so-called ethnic chambers of commerce came.

The Government took as its model some outstanding successes, such as the Italian and Chinese chambers of commerce and, more recently, the Indonesian chamber of commerce, under the guidance of one person in particular, but the whole committee is very competent; Kieran Kelly has done a great deal in that regard. Other chambers of commerce have been successful to varying degrees. Through CITCSA they can structure their activities and their focus to get more effective results for the wider South Australian community in selling those goods and services into those economies.

However, what we see is that they have been under the umbrella of funding from the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, until very recent times. That has just been renamed the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs and, under a new director, some shifts have been occurring that have disturbed me immensely. I think it would be highly inappropriate, indeed, very undesirable, if an arm of Government such as the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs, which has previously been focused upon promoting a better understanding between the culture in South Australia and the countries of origin from which people have come to us, were to take control of CITCSA, which is at arms length from Government and which at present cannot be criticised for being a policy arm of any political Party. It is separate from political Parties and from Government, and it must remain separate. It would be quite inappropriate for anyone to contemplate bringing that under the umbrella of the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs and its new director.

I commend the work that has been done by the previous Chairman, Mr Malcolm Clemens; the new Chairman, Mr Bekakis; and the current CEO who has been there since its inception, Mr. Joseph Tuma. They have all done an outstanding job, along with the assistance of the board. It is focused upon exports and trade, and those exports are of the type to which I have referred. We must take advantage of its unique structure; we are the envy of the other States in that respect. Earlier this year I attended a conference in Canberra which attempted to set up similar structures in other States and nationally. They understand the benefits we are getting from it but are not able to emulate it. I believe we should not

simply cut it out and/or bastardise it by shifting the fashion in which it is funded but leave it to function in the way that it is, achieving the successes that were referred to today on pages 1 and 2 of the *Advertiser*. I seek leave, Sir, to incorporate in *Hansard* the statistical table of this export boom.

Leave granted.

RURAL		
	1996-97 Estimate (\$ million)	Percentage Increase (first 9 months)
Cereal	1 100	+25
Wine	385	+26
Wool	400	+3
Fish	180	-10
Meat	170	-31
Fruit and vegetables	150	-6
Livestock feeds	40	+14
Dairy	35	-10
Live animals	35	+26
Animal/veg. materials	20	-10
Hides and skins	12	-18
Other rural	80	n.a.
Total rural	\$2.6 billion	
OTHER INDUSTRIES		
Petroleum	270	+36
Gas	95	+35
Metals	600	n.a.
Power generating machinery	160	+150
General machinery	121	n.a.
Electrical machinery	72	-25
Motor cars	700	+170
Leather	50	n.a.
Other	425	n.a.
Total Exports	\$5.1 billion	+12.8%

Mr LEWIS: I draw attention to the fact that it is not an accurate table in that it is a record only of what goods have been exported from South Australia. It does not include those goods that have gone across the border of necessity to find swift passage on aircraft to the markets to which they are going, being exported then out of Melbourne and Sydney after going on domestic flights to those terminals. Whereas wine is up 26 per cent, cereals up 25 per cent, live animals up 26 per cent and livestock feeds up 14 per cent, it looks as though fruit and vegetables are down. That is not true.

They are up but they are being exported out of Melbourne and Sydney. All the more reason we should commend this Government for having a plan and extending the runway and doing something about putting in place the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. I also commend the work being done to bring together the people in the education industry by a gentleman from TAFE who has just been to see me, Mr Roger Griffiths, and the people who are working with him from both the private and public sectors in selling education.

We need to do more of that, and the Minister for Health at the bench also knows that we can get several tens of millions of dollars by marketing our health services in East Asia. That is where our future lies; that is from where the jobs will come. Those jobs will be real; they will not be pretend; they will be enduring; they will be well paid; and we can do that better than any other place in Australia.

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I rise to commend the Treasurer and the Government on this fourth budget. It is a well-planned budget and has certainly delivered on this Government's election promises. Not everything is hunky-dory, and the Opposition criticises us for that, but it is a responsible budget and a budget that is on track. This Government has

fundamentally changed the gloom and doom that was part of the South Australian landscape when we came to office to a place which has hope and which has a foundation for the next century. Yesterday I listened carefully to Opposition speeches, including the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition.

All members opposite could do was refer to our not achieving our targets for employment, with particular reference to the youth unemployment rate, about which we make no apology. We are as concerned about youth unemployment as is the Labor Party. That issue must be tackled. It is a top priority of the Premier and this Government, and that is why we have put in place incentives for young people. Our \$30 million youth unemployment plan includes incentives for businesses to employ young people, exemptions to employers who take on young people from paying the WorkCover levy, and payroll tax rebates on wages for young people.

Measures are in place to ensure that the issue of unemployment, a concern to all South Australians, is being tackled. When we came to office, and members opposite can testify to this, how many members of Parliament employed trainees in their own offices? This Government led by example in providing traineeships for young South Australians by employing them in electorate offices. This Government set an example. We must give young people a fair go, and the best way to do that is to provide schemes, such as those established by this Government, and to lead by example, as well as the other incentives I have just outlined.

When this Government took office State debt had escalated to in excess of \$9 billion on the back of the State Bank and SGIC disasters. The Government was spending more than it was earning by \$1 million a day. In real terms the debt as a percentage of gross State product has been slashed from an unsustainable 28.1 per cent in June 1992 to 20.6 per cent as of June 1997, and it will continue to fall. No Opposition member can deny this fact. That is not phoney: that is reality. The percentage of gross State product to debt has been reduced. We have tackled the unfunded State superannuation blow-out of \$4 billion. We have been responsible.

As the Premier said, we would have liked to do more in some areas, but you are restrained by what you inherit. You cannot make a statue from sandstone if you do not have the funds. If the funds are not available, you have to do the best you can. If one looks at what has been accomplished, the Government and the Treasurer should be commended. History will show that it was this Government that took South Australia from gloom and doom and gave it a future. As the member for Ridley said, much has been achieved in the export area. South Australia has a declining birth rate and an ageing population, and you do not have to be a Keynes to understand that you are limited in what you can provide when faced with those sorts of demographics.

Despite that, this Government has tackled the problems and is giving this State a future. The youth unemployment rate of 39 per cent is a problem and must be tackled. The Government is doing that. But the general unemployment rate of 11 per cent decreased to 9 per cent, and I know that generally that type of statistic applies across Australia. It is not that South Australia is isolated from what is happening. We cannot be blamed for structural unemployment. The Opposition talks about hidden unemployment, but the reality is that structural factors have caused this unemployment and we are tackling that.

As the member for Ridley said, we must expand, we must export and the ethnic chambers of commerce have done that. Today's *Advertiser* shows that we are on track and that we are delivering. Not one member opposite talked about the increase in rural and manufacturing exports. The figures are there for all to see. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday said that it was a no hope budget and that it failed to deliver for South Australia. Members opposite had time to assess the budget and, no doubt, to make constructive criticism, and that is what an Opposition should do: it should tackle the budget, go through it and tell us ways in which it could be improved.

We have an Opposition that is not an Opposition. An Opposition means that it has an opposing position: it should not just oppose. This Opposition has no position; it has no plan. It is a hitchhiker Opposition. A hitchhiker waits on the side of a road for something to fall off the back of a truck. All we have heard from the Opposition is criticism of Government members, the Premier and Ministers. It is hitchhiker mentality: whatever falls off the back of the truck, pick it up and talk about it today. The hitchhiker does not know where it has been, where it is going or who will pick it up next, and it puts itself in danger of going somewhere where it will not be safe.

Is that the type of alternative Government this State needs? No. We had enough of that mentality in the past. We need a plan. We need to know where we have been and we must acknowledge that there were past mistakes. We must assess where we are. We must understand what luggage we have and we must be in control of our vehicle. We must not hitchhike on Federal issues, as the Opposition did yesterday, or on what some journalist said about members of this place but, instead, get on with the job. Premier Olsen and this Government want to get on with the job of delivering for South Australia.

I refer to what has taken place in my electorate since we were elected. I know that we have been criticised in relation to education, but this budget provides a \$72 million boost for education, extra help for children with learning difficulties and better school buildings. In this respect I refer to the East Marden Primary School and to its state of disrepair when we came to office. The same could be said of the Newton and Hectorville schools. This Government has provided money for upgrades of those schools as it has with the \$3 million Norwood-Morialta development. These projects will provide jobs and there is the multiplier effect in that respect.

Members opposite have a right to assess the budget and its specifics, but I note that they do not do that. They are not listening or assessing the budget properly. They have the hitchhiker mentality. Lord help us if someone were to pick up the Labor Party and say, 'Here you are in government; lead South Australia.' South Australia deserves more. We cannot return to the past. We understand the present as a Government and we are providing a future for all South Australians.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I support the Appropriation Bill and congratulate the Treasurer, Premier Olsen and, indeed, the Government. Budgeting is all about responsible management. I am not a great economist, but in fairly simplistic terms to budget means to control one's finances and expenditure and to balance the books. Again, I congratulate the Premier and the Treasurer because the books balance. It is an historic moment in South Australia's history. It is the first phase of the massive job undertaken by this Liberal Government to clean up Labor's mess.

It is rather astonishing that at a time such as this absolutely no-one is representing the Opposition at the moment in this House given that, in fact, over the last 11 years they created such an almighty mess. As the Premier said, we will take on the responsibility of cleaning up the mess; indeed, this has been done through responsible government. Jobs have been created. Small business has been given a life-giving injection. Health, education, the environment and regional development have been made this Government's top priority.

You cannot spend more than you earn. If you do, there will be a day of reckoning. In the end, you go bankrupt; you go broke. That is exactly what happened to South Australia. When this Government came to power in December 1993, our debt was \$9 billion. The State was crippled. Taxation levels and unemployment were choking this State to death. There was great depression, particularly in small business and in other areas of government such as education and health. The 1997-98 budget represents a balancing of the books. However, achievements are not confined just to Government finances or to the economy. Investment in areas of social capital has improved our quality of life and made South Australia the perfect State in which to live, work and bring up one's family. There is a sense of hope which was missing for so many years prior to 1993.

Specific areas of the budget which affect the electorate of Hanson include: education, health, law and order, police, small business and outstanding capital works such as the Mile End development, the upgrade of the airport and the extension of the runway which will, indeed, boost tourism and trade. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to traverse the Hilton Bridge and see the tremendous developments taking place in the Mile End area in terms of the athletics and netball stadiums, which are due for completion towards the end of this year.

The electorate of Hanson includes a very large percentage of people in the older age bracket who are concerned about their property and their well being. They have worked very hard all their lives and do not want to see their property in any way damaged or vandalised. It is logical that a \$21 million boost for the South Australia police will make the community safer. This will be enhanced by the introduction of an extra 165 police on the beat. The people will breathe a sigh of relief in the knowledge that they will, indeed, be a lot more secure.

There are over 1 800 small businesses in the electorate of Hanson. The former Administration had scant respect for business investment in this State. Incentive was down. Businesses and once proud family operations in some cases in the electorate of Hanson were forced to close. They went to the wall; they went bankrupt. During the past 3½ years this has been turned around. The Olsen Government has protected small business. There are no new taxes; there are incentives for local companies to develop export markets; and 93 per cent of industry assistance funds go to local companies.

Obviously, the two crucial areas for any Government, if you seek to single out two, are education and health. The electorate of Hanson mirrors the overall State scene. Under this Liberal Olsen Government, there have been great changes in education. Certainly, there have been school closures, but I believe they have been necessary and beneficial to South Australia. Two schools in my electorate of Hanson will close at the end of 1997. They are the Netley and Camden Primary Schools, which have given outstanding service over many decades. They will close to make way for a super R to 12 complex on the Plympton High School site.

This will be an exciting new development, an outstanding initiative and a new school which will benefit residents in the western suburbs. Congratulations are in order to the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Rob Lucas, for his initiative.

Coupled with this, extra help will be made available to children with learning difficulties in schools. I note that \$60 million has been guaranteed over four years for school computer infrastructure. There is no doubt that students and teachers will be the big winners from a massive \$72 million boost to the education budget, which will take spending on education to an all-time high for any South Australian Government. Many of these extra resources this year will be spent on significant pay increases for teachers and staff, as negotiated earlier in the year by the Premier, the Minister for Education and Children's Services and the school unions. Increased education spending will mean that South Australia still spends more on education per student than does any other State and that we maintain the best student to teacher ratio and the lowest average class sizes of all mainland States.

While there is no large public hospital in Hanson, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is outside my electorate, plays a vital role in the western suburbs. A tremendous number of residents who become ill are transferred to the QEH, which has played a strategic role over the past four decades. In this budget another \$45 million will boost the provision of health services. The QEH has received special attention in the 1997-98 budget. Critical care facilities at the QEH will undergo an upgrade worth \$2 million. Construction of the 40-bed psychiatric facility at the hospital will also continue, with \$4.34 million going towards this vitally important project, which will see specialised in-patient facilities available to people with mental illnesses throughout the western suburbs of Adelaide. When delivering the budget speech on 29 May the Treasurer said:

Compare that to 1993 when Labor was spending \$1 million a day—every day of the year—more than it was receiving in revenue and grants. . . Labor was expecting our children, and our children's children [our grandchildren], to pay for those excesses.

This budget, through great economic management, will mean that South Australia will now pay for its day-to-day spending from the income it earns. I commend this Bill to the House.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this debate on the Appropriation Bill. There is no doubt that this budget heralds a major milestone in the history of this State: for the first time in living memory, South Australia has a balanced budget. What a great achievement! It is something which should have been achieved years ago and, if it had been achieved years ago, South Australia would be that much more prosperous than it is now. We have had to make some very hard, tough decisions in the past three years. These tough decisions were necessary because we were spending, in the first instance, \$300 million per year more than we were earning. It was an absolutely reprehensible situation but one which the previous Labor Government had continued until the \$300 million blow-out occurred before we took office.

What have we done in that three years? We have had a very carefully orchestrated program to seek to reduce the deficit to zero by this budget, and it has been achieved. We were spending \$1 million a day more than we were earning but, from the recurrent budget point of view, those days have now come to an end. It is little wonder that people generally—and the business community certainly—are applauding

this Government for the action it has taken. It has not been easy.

It is worthwhile for members to reflect on what we have had to do during the past three years to bring about the result in this budget—or, perhaps I should say, not what we have had to do but what we have not been able to do in the past three years. We have not been able to spend \$1 million per day which we could easily and irresponsibly have continued to do. It has meant that the areas of key spending such as education, health, the police and social services have not had as much money in the past three years as they would have liked.

But, as a result of our responsibility, in this budget we are demonstrating that we can get back to some sort of an even keel. We have also managed to slash spending in many other areas. I refer to the efficiencies we have created, for example, in the State car fleet. Members will recall that when we first took office thousands of cars were unaccounted for—we did not even know whether they existed. That has all been attended to and we have cut the State fleet by more than 25 per cent. Again it means we have freed up money for education, health and other areas.

We have also had to make some very tough decisions in the area of Public Service staffing. There are 12 000 fewer positions in the Public Service now than when we took office. It was not an easy decision to make. It is one that has caused the Government heartache and one that has obviously caused many public servants some heartache. Although, as we know, not one was dismissed: they all had the opportunity to leave if they so desired. I guess we should say a 'thank you' to the many thousands of public servants who decided to take up the Government's offer of a package. Therefore, the salary bill that we are faced with on a fortnightly or monthly basis is vastly less than it was when we took office.

As a result of these decisions and many others, South Australia can look to the future with great confidence once again. We now have a situation where our primary and secondary students enjoy the best pupil teacher ratio of that in all mainland States. Our hospital waiting lists have been reduced significantly and, equally importantly, our hospitals have been recognised as the most efficient in Australia. In the area of police, even though they had to do it tough for a while, major crime has been reduced. A reverse trend has occurred. Whilst acknowledging that fact and because we want the trend to be ongoing, again our budget allows for 165 extra police on the beat. We can be somewhat satisfied with the indications but it has to continue.

Our transport infrastructure has changed remarkably in specific areas and I highlight the Southern Expressway, that project that was promised year after year, decade after decade. The first section will be opened in the not too distant future. It is a wonderful achievement. It is a tragedy that all the land that the previous Liberal Government in the 1979-82 period had bought for the extended freeways through the city along South Road and so on was sold under the Bannon Labor Government to generate immediate money to put into areas that now are lost, and that land is no longer available to build new roads in that area. Also, we have managed to achieve the almost impossible in extending the Adelaide Airport runway. That will help an electorate such as mine markedly, because for years now the primary production sector has been hamstrung in so many ways because it could not put extra goods onto the planes to get them out of Adelaide. The planes have left only two-thirds to three-quarters laden. It will help South Australia enormously.

Then there are the roads in the rural areas that have remained unsealed. I am absolutely delighted that already most of the roads from Blyth to Brinkworth and from Snowtown to Brinkworth have been sealed. For years I have had to travel on that unsealed road. I dare say that you, Mr Speaker, would have travelled on that road too, and on many other unsealed roads. In as little as three years under our Government those two roads have been virtually completed and we are undertaking to seal many other arterial roads in this State.

Not only have significant advances been made in hard economics but also much has been done in the area of the environment to assist this State. I am delighted that through this budget Innes National Park, which is in my electorate, is about to have in excess of \$1 million spent on works. The new road will be fantastic. Some of the new facilities will help to attract an increasing number of tourists to the tourist path that attracts the highest number of tourists outside the metropolitan area, and I am delighted with that. Equally important is the fact that this Government has undertaken so much in the area of business development and in seeking to get the unemployed off the unemployed list and onto the employed list. I wish to compliment the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, who is in the Chamber at present, for the excellent job she has been doing and will continue to do to ensure that our youth are looked after in the best way possible. The best way possible is to make sure that jobs are available for them when they finish their study.

This budget takes that a step further, with many business developments proposed. We must not forget that some of the policies that we have lived with for the last three years have been of real benefit to the business community. One of those was no new taxes. In addition, South Australia is more competitive than ever in electricity and water costs compared with the other States. In fact, in this budget overall, \$70 million will be spent on economic development incentives, and that will help people find employment.

In so many ways this budget is a culmination of what this Government has been working towards for some three years. Our task has just begun, but at least we now have a balanced budget. We have much more work to do, we are aiming for more horizons, but I am proud to be a member of a Government that has turned South Australia around after the disastrous years of Labor rule.

Mrs HALL (Coles): What do these names and places mean to South Australians: Roxby Downs and the \$1.5 billion upgrade of Olympic Dam; Adelaide Darwin railway; redevelopment of Rundle Mall and the Capital City project; Adelaide Airport runway extension; Glenelg West Beach project; Wilpena; the National Wine Centre; Mount Lofty Summit; and the Southern Expressway? With other parallel projects, they represent the future prospects of this State.

What do these names and places mean to South Australians: 333 Collins Street; the Remm centre; a hopelessly indebted State Government Insurance Commission; the State Bank collapse with the greatest debt in Australian corporate history; a failed plan for the Glenelg development; no progress on the railway to Darwin; and the Hindmarsh Island bridge fiasco? They are the symbols of Labor in office—the barren ground of hard Labor.

South Australians cannot afford to return to the bizarre financial management of Labor, and they are too smart to give it another chance. The Leader of the Opposition will tell us that he has changed, that he has metamorphosed from the

Labor caterpillar to the new age Labor butterfly. However, his behaviour when he was recently overseas demonstrates that nothing has changed in the standards, or lack of them, that he brings to politics. Scurrying ahead of the Premier to Japan, he tried to squeeze every vote out of South Australia's time of crisis as we await the decision on tariffs and the future of the car industry.

This budget is a program for South Australian growth. It is an overall picture of the fundamentals pulled together by our Liberal Government and the utmost support by Government of the major projects that underpin our future. It is a budget that contains no new taxes and a capital works program of nearly \$1.3 billion, which will support more than 20 000 jobs. There are stamp duty exemptions, financial assistance to small and medium business, incentives for business to employ young people, WorkCover exemptions for employers to put young people on the books, and payroll tax rebates on the wages of young people.

I will not repeat the many aspects of the 1997 budget that deserve the plaudits of South Australians. However, one of the paradoxes of the current public scene is that our living standard is measured in material possessions, and they continue to grow. Yet there is a broadly held view that we are experiencing the toughest times in years and I ask why this is so. The unemployed and often part-time employed need jobs and have little resources for more than the basics. The economic success of the two-income family has placed great pressure and often hardship on those restricted to a one-income household.

Probably the greatest destabiliser is the rate of change on an almost daily basis. The Premier has aptly described it as reform fatigue, and I have no doubt it will be with us well into the year 2000. The South Australian Government is meeting these challenges with leadership that acknowledges that we are in a new social era. To move into the future, we need to rediscover the remarkable individuals who have inspired our community in the past. In a sense, they represent the legends that give our State's short history the drama and the pride that we carry into the future.

We know of them well from frequent reference: one of our Nobel prize winners, Howard Florey; the Antarctic explorer, Douglas Mawson; the sporting legend, Sir Donald Bradman; Sir Mark Oliphant; and Sir Robert Helpmann. The legends list continues. What of Robert Stigwood, a giant in the world of entertainment? There is a surprising and impressive number who fit into the category of South Australian greats—the legends of South Australia. We do not do them or ourselves justice by honouring them only in individual displays and collections. We need a central venue in Adelaide to display and describe the lives and successes of our South Australian legends. Could it fit into the new Capital City development? Would the Torrens Parade Ground be an ideal venue? Wherever it might be within the city precinct, we need to point to the future by saluting our impressive past heroes in a legends centre of their own.

One of the disconcerting negatives about Australia's national development is its failure to build the railway line to Darwin. On the surface of the argument, this could be put down to the dominance of the Eastern States in the Federal Parliament. However, the national interest in this matter is so imperative that it should override any consideration of State rivalry. We will have to face the question that will be asked some time in the future: is Australia dinkum in really possessing and developing this continent? I congratulate the Premier on the determined and, one could almost say,

fanatical way in which he has involved himself in negotiating this project with both private investors and the new Federal Government.

The runs are already on the board in another vital transport link, and I congratulate the Government on successfully negotiating the increased capacity of the Adelaide Airport. Another area where there are not just runs on the board but cranes in the air, workers on site and buildings coming out of the earth is at Mile End. I refer, of course, to the sporting facilities at Mile End which are nearing completion: the \$8 million-plus netball stadium; the \$8 million-plus athletics stadium; and further to the north the magnificent upgrade of the Hindmarsh soccer stadium. These projects demonstrate clearly that, after years and, some would say, decades of neglect by Labor, the commitment and promise of this Government is being delivered.

I now refer to the administration of our two main public utilities, the electricity and water supply systems. I have very much enjoyed my association with these organisations in my role as parliamentary secretary. South Australia's water and electricity infrastructure represents a collection of State assets conservatively valued at more than \$10 billion. They are protected and regulated by various Acts of Parliament. Using these resources effectively, delivering water and electricity services while at the same time finding a way to continue their structural development improvement has been one of the most significant challenges facing the Government of this State since the Second World War.

During the Playford years our infrastructure was considered an economic imperative. However, since the late 1960s, successive Labor Governments allowed the bodies which administered service delivery to become less efficient. They drifted and their competitiveness declined. Labor Governments simply wrote the problems off as being too hard. That neglect ended just over three years ago when this Government decided to tackle the problems of a State with more than \$10 billion worth of non-paying assets. The initiatives were bold and applied the same level of scrutiny as in private enterprise to our electricity and water supply systems. In short, they were expected to start paying their way.

A period of radical restructuring followed and that, I am happy to report, has been highly successful in both areas, and the budget bears that out. SA Water, by contracting out the management of the State's metropolitan water resources and infrastructure to United Water, achieved results far exceeding expectations. In the first year of operation, United Water as required under the terms of its contract achieved significant water-related exports. These were in the order of \$24 million, \$14 million more than the export target. We have saved more than \$15 million on running expenses in relation to the State's metropolitan water supply. Simultaneously, we have improved the water supply for South Australians. Another private company, Riverland Water, established a series of water treatment plants along the length of the river. We will have cleaner, healthier water in rural South Australia because of our decision to involve private operators in our water supply system. These plants would not have existed under a Labor Government.

This year new filtration plants will be built to serve the residents at Waikerie, Mannum, Barmera and Berri. I congratulate the Minister on his action and determination to remedy this position. Our ETSA organisation has been thoroughly revamped and is delivering substantial and impressive benefits to the State. This year it will, like SA

Water, continue to improve its own structure. In the coming financial year, it will also introduce a new working and management system to be known as the works and assets management system. This is a \$19 million upgrade of its internal management system and will place the ETSA Corporation at the forefront of public utility management in Australia. This year the ETSA Corporation will spend around \$9.6 million on that program. In the outer metropolitan area, ETSA will continue to improve its infrastructure, with \$2.3 million being spent on constructing and upgrading a new substation at Paralowie, along with an upgrade at the Salisbury substation. In addition, ETSA will spend around \$20 million on improving electricity delivery to the State's country areas, and the capacity of the system is scheduled for improvement.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): By far the most concerning issue for the majority of families in this State is unemployment and job security. Both the State Government and the Federal Government budgets have failed to deliver on a real jobs strategy. Umbrella organisations such as the Small Business Association, South Australian Council of Social Services, South Australian Council for the Ageing, Youth Affairs Council and even the Farmers Federation and trade unions have criticised this State budget as having no real vision for employment and vocational training, health, regional development, education or housing. Families with younger and older unemployed members were looking for a positive sign from the Government to inject some life into employment and training development. They simply did not get it. There was a major reduction of home and care funds to community organisations, and a reduction in the funds for seniors; community and health services have been cut, as have public transport services for the elderly.

For the people in my electorate of Torrens, who need public housing, we have seen their wait lengthened and their wait to have maintenance work started delayed even further. There is little commitment to public housing by this Government. Sadly, families, particularly those in my electorate in need, are suffering because of that. What was actually delivered after all the hype was a budget that has bush-whacked the less well off in our communities, and the Government has abandoned the lower income families in our society. After all the hype over the number of jobs that would be delivered, only around 950 jobs have materialised for unemployed youth. There was no employment strategy to assist older citizens to get back into the work force, and spending on a capital works program, if consistent with the previous State budget allocation for capital works, will be held back, reducing jobs for South Australians even further.

What has happened to the 1 500 traineeships? We get 500 traineeships announced but nothing regarding those existing 1 500 places. What has happened to them? Frankly, the employment target set by the Government is an abject failure, because it provides too few jobs, and past experience shows that the Government is unlikely to deliver on what it has promised. I cite the example of the 20 000 jobs that were promised but never eventuated.

Further job losses are expected in South Australia as BHP and Telstra—which is already moving to take 100 high tech jobs to Victoria—Australian National, the banking industry and other businesses continue to shed jobs. On top of this are the growing job losses from ETSA, should the

Government embark upon its privatisation push. If this was not enough, the Government is continuing to shed jobs in the public sector, with a budget of \$40 million to pay for the TVSPs. What does that do? That adds to the growing level of high unemployment in the over-40 age bracket. The Government should be strengthening public confidence in respect of job security, not fuelling job insecurity. Many workers who have taken retrenchment packages or TVSPs from the public or private sector are still unemployed. Out of the 12 689 jobs shed from the public sector this financial year, as outlined in the budget statement, can the Government say with conviction that none of these workers remains unemployed?

Job stability in the public sector was always a positive factor for the consumer economy, even when the private sector was in recession. The fact that consumer spending is down merely reflects the general public's nervousness about job security and a lack of confidence about the state of the job market. Tragically, in this State we have the highest national recorded youth unemployment rate at 42 per cent—some 10 600 young South Australians out of work. Both the Federal and State budgets have failed to come up with any policy initiative that will make inroads into reducing this horrendous level of youth unemployment. What sort of message is this sending to our youth in South Australia? Not a good one. The proposed Federal work for the dole scheme, which has taken approximately \$30 million out of the current training program, is not seen as a credible and alternative way to resolve the youth unemployment crisis. It is likely to impede jobs and objective vocational training programs and access to these programs.

During the previous sitting of State Parliament, the Government mooted the idea of linking State school educational personnel and resources to employment brokering and training program initiatives in schools. This is something which concerns me, and I suppose it can be looked at in two ways. If schools and their personnel resources were sidetracked from providing basic education which youth desperately need, I would see that as a major step backwards. State schools have already experienced cuts in funding of some \$137 million, which has resulted in fewer teachers, larger class sizes and limited access to educational materials and equipment. The pressure on schools to provide a further resource in the area of job brokerage and vocational training is beyond the realms of credibility. However, I see that schools can play a networking and communicative role, with an authority established to link and liaise with schools in order to identify those students who are unlikely to complete years 11 and 12, particularly those who are likely to drop out of school at age 15 years.

The question I ask is this: what opportunities are there for young 15-year-olds who drop out of school to immediately access vocational training as opposed to the school environment with which they had become disillusioned? There are just simply too few. My inquiries show that students who drop out of the system at 15 years of age have to wait some 13 weeks before they are eligible for case management through the Commonwealth Employment Service. The onus is on us in this Parliament—and, indeed, the Federal Parliament—to give young people a chance to find directions in life that are positive and to try to lead them away from the slippery slope of idleness and petty crime.

This Government has turned its back on the unemployed and on the youth, and that can only encourage youth alienation. We need to show that we value our youth and the skills

of the unemployed by training and retraining them, if necessary. Shortages of skilled labour exist because the Government has not taken the initiative in this area nor instilled confidence in business to be involved in training programs. I heard an honourable member say previously that he could see hope growing in this State. I suggest that he come out into some of our areas and look. There is no hope, and they are not just my words but the words of people in my electorate.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I want to make a few brief comments about the impact of the Federal budget on our electors in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The matter before the Chair is that we are noting grievances in relation to the State budget.

Ms WHITE: I want to comment on the impact the Liberal budget has had in recent weeks. One really cruel measure inflicted on young people in South Australia is the attack by the Liberal Government on higher education, with cuts of nearly \$400 million to tertiary education in this budget. That affects thousands of young South Australians in their opportunities to find work. The South Australian budget has been cut from \$312.2 million in 1996-97 to \$307 million—a cut of 3.6 per cent in real terms. Over the past two years, the Government has stripped more than \$250 million out of vocational education, nearly \$900 million out of the universities system and nearly \$2 billion out of labour market programs, many of which were provided through TAFE and which are and have been vital for skills training and job readiness.

There have been massive increases in HECS charges, a lowering of the HECS debt repayment threshold and a squeezing of Austudy and Abstudy schemes. These cuts have been made to vocational education—\$70 million; and, under the University Industry Places Scheme, 4 700 undergraduate places have been cut. There has also been ongoing confusion about the proposed youth allowance. These budget cuts are made on top of the introduction of up to \$100 000 up-front undergraduate fees, and on top of the Federal Government's reduction of 21 000 university places. These cuts have had a dramatic effect and impact on South Australian higher education students.

The vocational education and training funds have been cut in the Federal Liberal budget for the second consecutive year on top of last year's budget cut of nearly \$2 billion over four years to the Working Nation labour market programs. There has been a 6.9 per cent real cut to vocational and industry training. Last year more than 230 000 training places were slashed. Now \$1.8 billion is being cut from labour market programs. The sum of \$14.3 million has been cut from vocational industry and training, and another \$72 million from education and training grants to the States, on top of the \$183 million cut in last year's budget. The number of apprenticeships has fallen under Federal funding. The rate of growth in traineeships has fallen from 117 per cent since Labor was in office to just 68 per cent in John Howard's first year.

One group in the community which has been impacted upon most severely is young people. The work-for-the-dole scheme is touted as something that will create employment in a big way. There is a lot of hype about that scheme, but the Federal Government has already admitted that that scheme will do nothing whatsoever to reduce Australia's high and rising youth unemployment rate. South Australia suffers from a cruel unemployment rate of over 42 per cent currently. It

is the highest in the nation and has been rising. Since the Government put its much touted \$30 million youth employment strategy—which was announced last year—into place, youth unemployment has risen. It has not decreased and it has not stabilised; it has risen. It now stands at 42 per cent.

These factors are further compounded by funding cuts to science and research in the last Federal budget—an area in decline under the Howard Government. The budget has ignored science and innovation, which means that jobs for the next generation will be sacrificed. Funding for agencies and programs like CSIRO and AIMS, and Australian Research Council grants, National Health and Medical Research Council grants, Cooperative Research Centres and the Energy Research and Development Corporation is set to fall, in real terms, from this budget on. On top of all that, there was a massive \$2 billion in cuts to the research and development tax concession in last year's budget. This has a massive impact on South Australia, in particular.

In the other area in which I am particularly interested, the tourism industry—which is a very important economic development industry in this country—the Federal Government has again shown its disdain of tourism as an industry that can potentially create a great number of jobs. There was a paltry \$3 million in extra funding to the Australian Tourism Commission, which is only a partial redress for the \$18 million cut last year. By 2001, the Howard Government will have ripped out \$65 million from the tourism budgets from the baseline of 1995-96. The tourism industry has been ignored in this Federal budget. Not one new initiative has been put forward, not one new idea, and no new funding has been proposed in this budget. The tourism industry—like jobs and education for the young—has been ignored by the Federal Government. It has meant a double whammy, when we take into consideration the impact that has occurred through the State Liberal Government's budget, and what it all adds up to is bad news and a worse future, particularly for young South Australians.

[Sitting suspended from 5.52 to 8.15 p.m.]

Mr BECKER (Peake): Much has been noted in the media in the past few weeks regarding the obnoxious smell over the City of Adelaide. Since 1988 I and several members from the western suburbs have complained of the smell from the Glenelg North Sewerage Works. Under the heading 'Sludge city: Glenelg sewerage works slated for killing sea life and creating a health hazard' the *Westside* newspaper of 22 November 1989 described an EWS report. The then Minister for the Environment and Planning, Susan Lenahan, said that the sludge would be stopped by 1992. If I remember rightly, we were in an election campaign and the Party spokesman (Hon. Martin Cameron) went on to advise the media of the contents of the EWS report, but he only confirmed what we who lived there already knew.

From there, the Government of the day commissioned the Public Works Committee to report on the cessation of sewage sludge disposal into the sea from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide sewage treatment works. The reason for that commitment by the Government to spend some \$13 million to upgrade the Glenelg sewage treatment works and build a pipeline from Glenelg North through to Bolivar was that we had lost so much of the seagrass and sand from the beaches at Glenelg North and West Beach.

The parliamentary Public Works Committee reported to Parliament on 22 August 1991, and on page 7 had this to say, in part:

The scheme consists of approximately 37 kilometres of 200 millimetre diameter uPVC pumping main from Glenelg via Port Adelaide to Bolivar together with a number of pumping stations and main cleaning facilities along the route, and a new series of drying lagoons at Bolivar. A schematic representation of the system is shown on Exhibit 2 plan No. 91 310 [which was given to the committee].

The report also states:

The main has been designed with careful grading to ensure that any gas which potentially could be released from the sludge can be transported with the flow of sludge and discharged at the end of the pipeline or at manually operated gas relief valves which will be installed at all high points in the main to bleed of entrapped air during the charging operation or other gases should they pose an operational problem from time to time.

The committee report to the Parliament further stated:

The total area of the new [sludge drying] lagoon system will be 60 hectares. The system will operate with an effluent water cap and sludge will be discharged below the water surface through multiple inlets for improved sludge distribution.

Later, the report states:

At the start of a possessing cycle the lagoon will be filled with effluent supplied from a connection off the existing works effluent main. Sludge discharged below top water level will displace effluent which will gravitate to one of the empty lagoons nearby. The lagoons have been sized to operate on a six month filling cycle and a 13 month drying cycle assuming average rainfall and evaporation conditions. In addition, to allow for variations in weather conditions, an additional 25 per cent lagoon area over and above the requirements for average rainfall and evaporations has been included.

The report went on:

Some concerns have been expressed by residents near the Bolivar works and the Salisbury council regarding a possible increase in odours at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works due to the pumping of the additional sludge for disposal there.

That was about 12 000 tonnes of sludge by 1991. The report continues:

Departmental officers attended a council meeting and outlined the proposed measures for controlling odours. Following the meeting the council has indicated that it would raise no objections to the scheme. Nevertheless, the Minister for Environment and Planning has recognised these concerns and has imposed the following conditions on approval:

(1) The release to atmosphere from sludge discharge into the drying lagoons has a concentration of hydrogen sulphide of not more than 5 mg/m³.

(2) The sludge discharge is contained under a water cap.

(3) Sludge is passed via one of the existing digester tanks enabling removal of gases, should any be generated prior to the discharge of the lagoons.

The department is confident that condition 1 will be achieved by applying one or more special procedures to the sludge operation. Two of these procedures are actually contained in conditions 2 and 3 of the Minister's approval. A third procedure which can be used would be to chemically treat the sludge with chlorine to oxidise any hydrogen sulphide gas which might be present.

There we were in 1991, advised by the Public Works Committee—which was doing its job—that there may be a problem in establishing this pipeline and removing the sludge from where we were discharging it to the sea by bringing it back along a 37 kilometre pipeline on land. That was under the previous Labor Government of this State. A previous Labor Government got it wrong again, after spending \$13 million-plus.

In 1994 there were articles in the local paper. I have consistently complained of the obnoxious smells that we experience in the south-western suburbs which affect not only my electorate but also the new electorate. My experience with

the EWS management is that they never seem to tell the truth. I am sorry to say that, and also to recall that, ever since I have been in Parliament, I have complained about the loss of seagrass and sand along the beaches and the vibrations that were caused by the huge pumping machines at the Glenelg North treatment works. Every complaint was laughed off as if I did not know what I was talking about.

The Minister and the local member (the member for Morphett) are here. Since then we have proved that the effluent damaged the seagrasses, and we lost them. This Liberal Government was the first to admit the damage that was done and that we lost sand from the beach. There were alterations to the pumping station to stop the vibration that was affecting the houses opposite the pumping station, but now we have to grapple with the problem of which Lenehan was obviously aware but which she thought would go away—that is, the obnoxious smells.

The smells coming from the Glenelg North Sewage Treatment Works in the past five years have been atrocious. You cannot describe what it has been like or what we have had to put up with. I went there one night and the security was so lax that I walked straight in. I said, 'What the hell is going on?' They said, 'Well, it is pretty rough, because even the boss, who lives by the Patawalonga entrance, is complaining.' There have been problems and they have come up with a dozen different reasons. One was that a part missing from a particular area of the plant had to come from France.

The Premier of South Australia, who was then the Minister for Infrastructure, advised me in September 1995 that the source of the problem was the aeration of the sludge in the treatment works. I have sufficient faith in the current Minister for Infrastructure that he will solve the problem and we will not have to spend several million dollars to get it right. In the meantime, whilst the smell is not a health hazard, it is obnoxious and is inconveniencing everybody.

This also highlights the problem that we run into from time to time with the bureaucracy in this State. We spent \$13 million renovating Parliament House, and it is a wonderful job. It is a pleasure to work here now, and the staff must also be pleased with their working conditions following the renovations.

But there is one little problem: Centre Hall has not been completed. The Italian community in my area, my Italian friends, have offered to resurface the Centre Hall floor in marble. They feel so proud of their adopted country that they would like to resurface the floor in Centre Hall in marble as a gift to the State and to the people who have given them so much. It is just a matter of deciding on a suitable design, and I am sure the Italian community would meet that request. That gesture would make this Parliament and this State very proud of their workmanship and the skills they have brought to this country.

It is a gift they are prepared to give to the people through their Parliament House and, I hope, Mr Speaker, you will accept that offer from the Italian community to resurface the Centre Hall floor in marble. It would be a wonderful reminder to all South Australian people that we can work together for the benefit of the State and the community, yet do something that demonstrates the very proud skills these people have brought to us from other countries.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): The member for Peake has never before been so accurate when he talks about commitment to South Australia from multiculturalism. I remind this House of two recent commitments in my

electorate of Mawson: first, Steve Maglieri of Maglieri Wines came to South Australia at the age of 21 with only a few dollars in his pocket. He built up an empire in our region and has won a gold medal, with accompanying special awards, at a wine show in Italy. That shows what people who are committed to their country can do. Also, Darry Osborn of d'Arenberg Wines recently won a gold medal. He has been winning medals around the world but recently one of his wines won a gold medal in France, which shows the capabilities of the people of Mawson and South Australia.

Tonight I want to speak about the capabilities of getting on with the job or the lack of capability in comprehending why we are in the Parliament, but I will deal with that a little later. I want to place four specific issues on the record: first, sand replenishment under the 1997-98 budget; secondly, police; thirdly, disabilities; and, fourthly, capital works. I am delighted to see that the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, the Hon. David Wotton, has seen fit to allocate \$5 million of South Australian taxpayers' money to a sand replenishment program.

While on a study tour overseas, the primary purpose of which was to look at recycled water and the benefits thereof in relation to getting waste water from the sewerage works at Christies Beach into the Willunga Basin to create economic wealth and jobs for my electorate, I also inspected sand replenishment programs in places close to America that host millions of visitors. Guess what I discovered when I was inspecting that sand replenishment program? I discovered that the best way of replenishing sand in areas where tidal action results in a lack of sand on shore and which are high density tourism areas, which we are developing particularly in the regions surrounding my electorate on the South Coast in the Fleurieu Peninsula, is to establish sand replenishment programs, as we have done.

We desperately needed that \$5 million. Not enough had been spent in that area in the past. A lot of rock and stone was starting to appear on some of the great beaches around Moana, O'Sullivan Beach, Glenelg and Hallett Cove. It is fantastic to see that this Government has taken the bull by the horns on this issue and got on with the job.

The second issue relates to police. Clearly the Government alone cannot do the job on law and order. It is up to every member of the community to realise that they have a part to play in reminding people. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has just entered the Chamber and again I congratulate him on his magnificent job of ensuring that \$5 million was allocated so that the sand replenishment program can occur in our State and particularly in my region.

I return to the issue of police, which is a community matter. Every person must be involved: it is not just a matter that Government needs to address, and that is why in my electorate of Mawson over the past 3½ years we have seen the successful launch of eight Neighbourhood Watch programs. Some people had been waiting for a program for between five and eight years. We have got those programs up and running and I am delighted with the efforts and commitment of our community when it comes to Neighbourhood Watch programs and looking after the community.

We need police and it is fantastic to see that, following calls I made after September 1995, the Police Minister has more than rewarded our community by not only increasing one patrol with six officers but announcing that 26 additional police officers will be coming into the southern region, together with a \$2.7 million capital works upgrade. I am absolutely delighted to see another issue mentioned in this

budget and it is something very dear to me. I admit that I did not know a lot about people with disabilities before I entered politics but, after door knocking my electorate twice over the past five years, I was astounded to find how many families have a relation with a disability.

I commend the commitment of those families. I also commend those people who have a disability and who want to get on with the job of working with the community, enjoying life and contributing to our southern region. Even if we had magnificent financial scenarios for South Australia and Australia, which we do not have, I would suggest that it would be difficult to find enough money to put into the areas of respite care and equipment for people with disabilities. I will be political on this point, because the Labor Party has run around for years making out that it supports people with disabilities, but it has not put up.

We as a Liberal Government need to do more, but at least we have put up. Since 1987 there have been very few increases in funding for people with disabilities. However, I am pleased to say that, 3½ years into office, we have seen a net increase in real terms of \$16.8 million, including an additional specific budget line of \$5 million to support people with disabilities. I will continue to remind our Government and the Minister of the importance of this area, because respite care, especially, is an area that needs to be continually addressed. We did the right thing by freezing that area out of budget cuts and we need to continue to support those magnificent people.

I turn to the issue of capital works. A Government can enhance its State in only three ways, the first being to ensure that the State lives within its means. The Labor Party does not understand. It did not understand in the past and, at the moment, it is clearly showing that it has no understanding of the future responsibility of living within your means. You cannot go on spending \$1 million a day more than you are earning. It is absolutely impossible. If you are earning \$25 000 a year working hard on the production line and you are spending \$27 000 a year, I would suggest that you will have problems in the not too distant future, and that is exactly the situation in which the Labor Party left South Australia. It is fantastic to see that, in this budget, we are now paying our way. We will have a slight surplus. It is a surplus of only \$1 million but at least we will have a surplus by the end of this coming financial year, and South Australia again will be able to work towards sustainability. It is about spending within your means.

The second way of working to enhance the State is to ensure that laws and legislation are introduced that are not an impediment on business. We have worked very hard over the past 3½ years to remove a lot of red tape to free up opportunities for small business. I make no apology whatsoever for being a strong supporter of small business, and I make no apology whatsoever for people who make a good profit.

I want to see more people in small business and more people making a profit because in that way this State will prosper. That will also assist those people who are near and dear to me, apart from those people in the small business sector, namely, the disadvantaged. That is the only way we will give them a long-term opportunity and a sustainable and fair future. The third and final thing a Government can do to ensure that it enhances and supports the growth and direction of a State is to spend money on capital works. We have seen a record increase in capital works expenditure of about \$240 million to \$245 million.

The Leader of the Opposition, who was not able to get capital works programs up when he was in office and who does not want to work with us to repair the damage that he and his other colleagues created over those 11 years, said that it is a phoney capital works program. It is far from phoney. The slippage in this capital works budget over the last three years under a Olsen Government is about the same as but a bit less than under Labor. There will always be slippage when you spend hundreds of millions of dollars. The important thing is that we are committed to ensuring that there is additional expenditure in capital works. We are now prepared to put a structure in place. In fact, this structure is now in place because I have spoken in my office to representatives of DECS, where lots of money is being spent to rectify the neglect that occurred for many years in schools and so on regarding capital works. They know that they have to get these projects going. By spending these dollars, you create real jobs and ensure that brick layers and those people who make the bricks are in business. Opposition members may well laugh, but most of them have never had to run a business. Unless we run the South Australian Government in a similar fashion to that of a business, our future will continue as it was under Labor.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This morning I spent some time reading the speeches of members opposite in terms of their assessment of the State budget.

Mr Brokenshire: How long did it take you?

Mr OSWALD: It took me some time, because I re-read a few of them. I did this because I wanted to get some understanding of where they were coming from in terms of where this State is going. I say that because South Australia went through 10 years of pain under a Labor Government. Under the Liberal Government, the economy has been reconstructed. The economy has turned around from a debt position of some \$300 million to a surplus under the coming budget. I would have thought that, with the State's having gone through such pain over the last 10 years prior to the incoming new Liberal Government, we would have all united in this Chamber to try to create the perception in South Australia that the State is on the way to recovery in that people can spend, free up the purse strings and allow the economy to kick on. Nothing breeds success more than a perception that the economy is on the move again and that things will be better tomorrow.

The speeches presented to us over the past 12 hours in this Chamber from members opposite were the most negative, carping, snake oil speeches that I have read in many years. No-one attempted to say, 'We have had problems in the past and we now have an opportunity of getting things right; the State can go ahead and prosper.' Members of the Labor Party are concerned only with their political skins and necks and whether they can cause as much strife and mayhem in the community as possible so that they have a chance of being re-elected if not this year then four years hence.

I refer to the contribution of the member for Napier as an example of how off the track and out of touch with reality members of the Opposition are. If they are not, the way they are dealing with the economy, their assessment of it and the perception they are trying to create in the community is just sheer bastardry. I shall refer to a few of the points made by the member for Napier, which typify the thread that ran through all the speeches made by members opposite. She said:

Business people in this State to whom I have spoken are appalled by the trough into which the economy of South Australia has sunk.

Everyone who has any knowledge of the economy of the State knows that it bottomed in late November-December last year and has continued to come out of the trough ever since. Members would be well aware of some of the projects, developments and businesses that have started coming back to this State. I shall refer to a few. We all know that Westpac has returned and re-established itself in South Australia. In this respect, I also refer to Western Mining with its \$1.5 billion upgrade; Holden's \$1.4 billion investment in the new model Commodore and the production of the new Vectra; the \$180 million co-generation plant at Osborne to provide electricity to ETSA and steam to Penrice; and the construction of a second continuous caster for BHP at Whyalla.

I personally had a deal of involvement in bringing Woolworths to South Australia. I was happy for the Premier of the day to visit Sydney and talk to the management of the company, but behind the scenes I did an enormous amount of work to ensure that Woolworths came to South Australia. My point is that Woolworths would not have come to South Australia, it would not have made a major investment, unless it had confidence as to where this State was going. Since it has come to South Australia it has built a major redistribution centre at the sports park at Cavan. It is now developing new stores throughout the State. More than anything else, Woolworths has demonstrated that it has faith in South Australia and that it wants to come here. Yet the Opposition constantly carps and throws its snake oil over the budget by saying that the State is going nowhere.

The member for Napier referred to the Glenelg development. I thought that some of things to which she referred in this respect were interesting. She said:

The Glenelg development depends overwhelmingly on the injection of vast amounts of public money to get it going.

She also referred to other examples such as Wilpena, Wirrina and the wine centre. Further, she said:

I will not discuss the possible environmental problems associated with Glenelg.

In actual fact, the Labor Party walked away from Glenelg for 12 years and did nothing about the environmental clean-up.

Mr Bass: It was too hard.

Mr OSWALD: As the honourable member says, it was too hard. Yet the Liberal Government is cleaning up the waterways and the Glenelg area. It was always accepted by both sides of politics that you cannot get private sector investment unless you provide public infrastructure. Jubilee Point fell over because no-one provided any public infrastructure money and it was left to the private developers. We as a Government took the initiative, provided some public infrastructure money and it went ahead.

The member for Napier referred to Wilpena Pound. Of the investment in Wilpena—I think there is some \$6 million in total being spent up there—about \$2.5 million of private money is being provided through the ANZ Bank at the risk of the Flinders Rangers Tourist Service. This is the Rasheed family putting up their money. Once again, this is an example of the private sector coming in when the Government is prepared to provide infrastructure. The honourable member referred to the total cost of the project at Glenelg. She said that the Government is spending \$7 million upgrading the harbor, \$17 million on the Glenelg waste water treatment plant, and \$10 million on the offshore boat facility. In other words, \$34 million is being spent out of the \$85 million. The

honourable member does not even know what is going on. Clearly, the upgrade of the sewage treatment plant in Glenelg has nothing to do with the development there and should be taken out of the figures.

The point I am trying to make is that you cannot expect the private sector to come in and pick up all the costs. You have to provide infrastructure and confidence in terms of where the State is going. This budget will provide that confidence. Very shortly we would expect to see the State's credit rating rise because of the way the State is now able to balance its budget. That will promote more favourable interest rates and business confidence. With the enormous amount of public infrastructure in capital works programs that are being undertaken, it is only logical that the private sector will be able to move in and become partners in the development of the State.

The honourable member referred to the housing sector because she claims to know a lot about it. I put it to the House that, despite being the shadow Minister for Housing, the honourable member—and I know she probably asks two questions a year on the subject—

The Hon. E.S. Ashenden interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: As the Minister says, I would doubt that, but I give her credit: she has probably asked two questions a year on housing. She said:

Let us look at what is happening in the area of housing. The Government's projections show that housing starts will be low compared with what occurred under Labor.

She went on to talk about the number of new houses being started compared with the number started under her Administration. What she conveniently hides is that under the Keating Government, particularly when Brian Howe was the Minister for Housing, we saw an axe go through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. We saw the amount of money made available to housing in this State absolutely decimated. In fact, her own Government was in power here in South Australia at the time.

The honourable member would be well aware that the responsibility for the amount of housing being cut back rested solely with the Keating Government. That is why we have seen the decline in public housing new starts in this State—and the honourable member knows it—but, once again, she is trying to place new connotations and new perceptions on it to make it look as if times have changed. The honourable member says that there is a huge waiting list: around 40 000 people are waiting for public housing. When the honourable member's Party was in Government the waiting list was higher. From memory, it was over 42 000. It has dropped under the Liberal Government. The honourable member should stop playing perception politics.

The honourable member talks about the benefits to the poor in our community when they were in power and how it is not the same now. It was the Liberal Government—and I was the Minister—that got The Parks redevelopment under way. Politically we could say, 'We needn't have done anything at The Parks', but we took another point of view: that The Parks was an area that needed redevelopment. This Government got that project under way, and in the future the people will benefit.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): This evening I will speak on a matter of great importance to my electorate, that is, the clean-up of the Torrens River catchment, and particularly address the problems in Breakout Creek. Last week a newsletter was distributed throughout my electorate. It had

no address, no telephone number and no signature to indicate who the author was, and in my opinion it was one of the lowest pieces of gutter politics that I have ever seen in my life. I believe that it was deliberately written to support an issue for a particular candidate at the next election. I have spoken to the author of that letter, and from now on I hope he will work closely with me to try to achieve what is best for the electorate.

I believe that we can achieve absolutely nothing by confrontation. However, if the community and I as its local member work together we can achieve an enormous result. This is how the project involving the clean-up of the Patawalonga was so successful, because I simply listened and delivered. What I wish to make very clear is that the proposed clean-up of the entire Torrens River catchment has been driven by the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources. I intend to listen to all the comments of my constituents in the electorate and to put them very clearly to the Minister and to the Parliament. I have given my electorate an undertaking that I will not support any program unless it gives an ironclad guarantee, supported by scientific and engineering calculations, that there will be no danger of flooding in any area of the electorate.

I pride myself on being a politician who listens to what the electorate is saying. I work strongly on behalf of my constituents and express their concerns. One thing that the board must realise is that it cannot force people into accepting something that they do not want to accept. If the people in my electorate have a concern, we must go back to the community consultation process, and the Minister's responsibility is to tell them what is to happen. But, more importantly, the matter should involve not merely recommending one program of wetlands but supplying a range of alternatives so that the community can select what they believe will be in their best interests and what they believe they will be able to live with. A program should be implemented to beautify Breakout Creek making it a wonderful place not only for both interstate and overseas tourists but more importantly for the people living in the area.

It is important to realise that the time has come to stop abusing the Torrens River. We have a responsibility to ourselves, our children and to future generations to all work together as a community to achieve a result that stops the ongoing environmental abuse of our riverway, a riverway which extrudes some 800 tonnes of suspended solids, 80 tonnes of nitrogen and 4½ tonnes of phosphorous onto our beaches and into Gulf St Vincent annually, destroying the seagrasses and the breeding grounds of our marine life. I do not think that one constituent in my electorate would deny that we have to face this reality. We need to be able to give the children of the future a clean environment from Gumeracha to Henley South. The mess is evident not only upstream but also in the City of Adelaide where a complete silt-up of the Torrens River has occurred. It is a disgrace that people coming into this city have to look at the mess existing today.

What I am asking in my electorate is that we support each other and continue to negotiate with the Government to bring about the best result and to be environmentally responsible. I will continue to communicate with the electorate very strongly on this issue. I reiterate that it is only a draft concept that is out for comment: it is not a concrete proposal. It is not a proposal that people are being told will be implemented; it is an idea on which they are asked to comment. The 150 letters I have received have given me a very clear concept

regarding what they want. All those concerns will be addressed before anything concrete is considered.

Some four weeks ago I was in Sydney with Mr Ian Kiernan AO, the Chairman of Clean-Up Australia. Not only have I invited him to visit my electorate but to come with me on a tour travelling from Gumeracha to Sixth Creek to First Creek upstream, along the Torrens River through the City of Adelaide, through Hindmarsh, Thebarton, Lockleys and Henley South. I want to review with him the concept that has been put forward and also ask him to make suggestions regarding other alternatives. I will also ask him to comment on the concept plan. As the local member I would like the entire clean-up of the Torrens River to be known as the Clean-up 2001 Westpac Community Project, giving an Australian environmental focus on my electorate, with an acknowledgment from the Federal Government of the significance of the plan and attracting Federal moneys for the clean-up.

I emphasise again that at this stage the draft concept plan for Breakout Creek is only a draft. The draft plan is available for public comment until 20 June, but I have now asked the Minister to reconsider this whole matter. He has assured me that we will go back to the drawing board and provide alternatives and allow a greater consultation period with people in the community to allow them to say what they want and not what someone believes they ought to be getting. I will be forwarding the 150 letters from my constituents to the board and to the Minister. The Government has ensured that the Torrens Catchment Management Board must go through a process of community consultation in its charter. The board is acting responsibly by recognising the need to implement the world's best practice in managing water catchments.

I will not accept any recommendations unless they contain substantiated and calculated evidence that no problems will be caused in the future and, most importantly, ironclad guarantees on flood prevention. The letter was scurrilous in that much of the content was absolute lies. It said that there were no mosquitoes in that area. I doorknocked all day Sunday and everyone to whom I spoke told me that there are millions of mosquitoes at Breakout Creek. What the board wants to do is act responsibly in eliminating those mosquitoes. Bugs such as backswimmers, tadpoles and frogs will not exist in pure filth, and something must be done about our waterway.

The author of the letter in question said that the problem is upstream: no-one will deny that. What is happening upstream is that currently the board is working with officers involved with the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment program, Landcare groups and rural landowners in developing land management programs for their properties which includes the removal of stock from waterways and revegetation of the area.

The Department for the Environment and Natural Resources, through the board, has already removed more than 5 000 exotic trees, such as willows and ash, that destabilise the river system and discourage the growth of native plant and animal life. The tree removal will continue until all the exotics are removed from the river system. Following the removal of these exotic trees, the Australian Conservation Foundation and Trees for Life have assisted in a native revegetation of all these areas. All these groups are acting responsibly for the future of all South Australians, especially children.

As a community, if we want to be responsible, there is only one way of returning the Torrens River to its pristine

condition, and that is by working together, and that is what we should be doing, not putting out letters of fear that do not tell the truth simply to scare people, many of them elderly, in the community. That is gutter politics—absolute garbage—and that is where it deserves to be: in the gutter, down the drain.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): It is always pleasing to hear a member talk with great passion about his or her electorate, and I acknowledge the member for Colton's passion concerning the Torrens River in his electorate. One of the things that is of growing annoyance to me is that I am sick and tired of hearing about the desire and need to clean up the Patawalonga and the Torrens River when the State's great river, the Port River, forms the border of my electorate. We never hear anything from Government about programs or endeavours to clean up the main waterway in our city of Adelaide, that being the Port River. For many years it has been treated by Governments of all persuasions as an industrial river, as an industrial sewer, as a backwater, but the Port River system with its various reaches and mangroves, its enormous biodiversity, is a very important—

Mr Condous: All our waterways are important.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Colton is right because all our waterways are important. I ask the House to indulge me on this issue because, while I accept that the Torrens River and the Patawalonga are high profile waterways that mean much to many people, we should not forget about the Port. It is time that Governments realised that Port Adelaide deserves the same attention and the same commitment to cleaning up its waterways as are given to the Patawalonga and the Torrens.

Mr Brindal: Some valuable real estate investments are being made down there at present.

Mr Condous: It's a sleeping giant.

Mr FOLEY: Exactly, the waterfront of the Port River is a sleeping giant. Were we in any other city, instead of building homes near the foreshore we would be building them along the river, but at present the river is not an inviting place for real estate redevelopment to occur. It is only 20 minutes from the city and obviously a very important place. For the ecosystem of the Port River, I urge the Government to put that river on its agenda and not talk only about the Torrens River or the Patawalonga.

Last night I gave a very measured and detailed response to the budget in my capacity as shadow Treasurer, but tonight I would like to be a little more pointed in looking at a couple of key issues. For some time the Premier and Treasurer have talked about this being a Government that does not increase taxes. As we well know, by any decent assessment the phoney budget surplus is a structural deficit. The only way those numbers look good is through a significant increase over the years in key taxation areas.

Pokies tax has increased year after year. We have seen a massive increase in fines attributed to speed cameras, and not in any small measure have we seen the long arm of the Treasurer reach into the pockets of ETSA, SA Water, Ports Corporation and other publicly owned entities to reap taxes to prop up the Government's budget. For once, let us put an end to the lie that this is a budget of surplus, a budget of no tax increase and a budget of fiscal responsibility. It is none of that. It is a poor budget, a budget with a structural deficit and a budget like those over recent years which have relied on significant taxation revenue as well as one-off contributions from asset sales together with quite irresponsible takes

from the likes of ETSA and other publicly owned corporations.

Let me touch briefly on the cynical exercise that the Government has put in place in the past few days with its phoney election campaign. I admit that I am yet to see the promotion, although I have watched a bit of television this week, but I am told by others and I understand from what I saw on the news on Sunday evening that it is the first salvo of Premier John Olsen. He claims that we have got the State moving and that the State is open to massive inflows of private investment. 'Action John' has got the State moving. What does 'Action John' hold up as these great symbols of massive private investment flowing into South Australia under this clever and dynamic Liberal Government?

He is pictured standing in front of the Adelaide Airport. As important and necessary as that is, let us remember one point: it is funded by the taxpayer. It is a taxpayer development. It is not some massive private sector infusion of capital: it is public money. Let us look at the Patawalonga. As important and necessary as that redevelopment is, it has been substantially underwritten by the taxpayer. It is not the massive inflow of private investment that the Premier, or 'Action John', would like us to believe. Let us look at the Mount Lofty development. Again, as important, appropriate and necessary as that development is, it is taxpayer funded.

The point I make is that, while these developments are to be applauded—and I acknowledge the Government's work in pulling these things together—the measure of a State's economic strength is not how much pump priming or how much taxpayer-funded development can be put in place: rather, it is measured by the attractiveness of the economy and the State to private capital.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The point is that private capital is not coming into this State, and the member for Colton as a former Lord Mayor of Adelaide and somebody with business interests knows full well what I am saying. The CBD of Adelaide is not flowing with private investment. The foreshore of our State is not being developed by a massive infusion of private investment: it is reliant upon significant taxpayer-funded development. Be it Wirrina or any other development, there is barely a development under way at the moment that does not require substantial infusion or underpinning of taxpayer money. There is no better monolith to this Government's reliance on the pump priming of this economy than the soon to be constructed development on North Terrace which is commonly known as the EDS building. It is widely acknowledged privately within the Government that it is a lemon that will cost us \$40 million.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Unley asks how much the Myer-Remm and ASER projects cost the State. That is my argument exactly. Those mistakes were made and the Labor Party has taken that responsibility fair and square on the chin. That is why—

Mr Brindal: Are you apologising?

Mr FOLEY: Absolutely. The former Labor Government made errors of judgment for which it has paid dearly. That is why there are only 11 of us on this side of the House, but that does not excuse this Government for repeating those mistakes and simply squandering tens of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on disgraceful exercises such as the EDS/Hansen Yuncken deal on North Terrace.

However, I have spoken at length about that. The point I am trying to make is that our economy is in a fragile state,

and it is as important as the airport, the Patawalonga and the Mount Lofty development. It is as important as all those developments to our State, and the Government is to be applauded for pulling off those deals. We desperately need private capital to come into this State under its own free will to inject real life, real confidence and a real dynamic focus into our State. It is simply not happening. After 3½ years of lacklustre, incompetent, divided and quite inept government, we are yet to see the economy recover. The Government will blame the bank and SGIC. It will do much to recast the past; that is the obvious tactic that it will use. However, members opposite cannot run away from the fact that, after 3½ years, they are still fighting amongst themselves. They have divided themselves and the State, and they have offered no leadership. Members opposite have a bankrupt Government that does not deserve to succeed.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): It is always a great pleasure to follow the Leader in waiting on the Opposition benches. His arguments are so transparent they are always easy to demolish. Let us start with the Premier's rightful communication with South Australia in respect of the state of the economy and the budget. Yes, he was photographed at Adelaide Airport, at Mount Lofty and in front of some developments in which the State has a substantial financial interest. I ask all members opposite, had we outsourced the Mount Lofty Summit and allowed somebody to build privately in what is part of the State's national park—

Mr Foley: Why not?

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hart asks, 'Why not?' He is an economic pragmatist. Members opposite would have run to the Conservation Council and bleated about selling our national parks, about the encroachment of private enterprise and about selling the State's heritage, and the same thing would have applied in respect of the airport. While the airport is under the Airports Corporation, there is no choice: they will be largely Government sponsored projects. However, the Premier—and this is what puts the lie to the member for Hart's argument—could have stood in front of Westfield at Marion. The sum of \$500 million was involved in that, and not one brass razoo was contributed by the Government of South Australia. The Premier could have stood in front of Westfield at Tea Tree Plaza, which involved \$40 million, with not one brass razoo being invested by the people of South Australia. The Premier could have stood in front of Sola Optical or the Westpac Bank Centre.

Mr Foley: You know what we paid for that.

Mr BRINDAL: There may have been some incentive. As the Premiers of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland are wont to do, there may well have been an incentive, but we did not pay for 1 000 jobs. Sola Optical is another case in question, as is the redevelopment of the Konicca Centre. We did not hear about that, but the investment was \$500 000.

Mr Foley: I haven't even heard of it

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hart says he hasn't heard of it, but that is because he only wants to hear about the bad news.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I must tell the member for Hart that my mortgage is less than half \$500 000. If Konicca wants to give me that money, I will be most grateful. In the past eight or nine years, the member for Hart has been so busy losing

government money, in sums that we cannot even comprehend, that he had the audacity—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the inappropriateness of the honourable member's reflecting on another member of Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member was generalising. He said the member for Hart's former Government. I do not think there is any dispute about that.

Mr BRINDAL: I would never suggest that the member for Hart personally lost it. He was far too busy advising others how to lose it. With regard to the Motorola Corporation, again the member for Hart will probably bleat that the Government provided some inducement. Unfortunately, while we have a business culture in South Australia that has State Government competing against State Government to encourage business to come in, there is not much choice. Nevertheless, those inducements are built largely on contributions from private enterprise.

I turn now to the subject of council amalgamations. Before the member for Colton leaves, I indicate that I was so impressed with his speech that, had I not been such a good local member representing myself, I could choose no-one better than he to be my local member. I wish I had a local member half as good as the member for Colton is at sticking up for his electorate on a number of issues.

I want to address briefly the subject of council amalgamations. I note the Mayor of Unley today in the *Eastern Courier Messenger* is again out for my blood. He basically said that, if there is any amalgamation, he will come for me in a big way. I am quaking. I am terrified at this threat, because he basically says that, if there is any change at all to Unley, it will be all my fault. I am a bit nonplussed, because local government—and most members will identify with this—is keen on seeing itself at a level whereby the local member does not count for much and it taps straight into Premiers, Ministers, Deputy Premiers and Treasurers. They rush off to have audiences with them with great alacrity. When they are not competent to debate or to get what they want from a Minister, a Premier or the Government, they come running back to the local member, saying, 'Fix it for us; this is what we need.' They cannot have it both ways.

If they are this competent level of government, capable of dealing with the Executive Government which is answerable to this House, then let them sort out their amalgamation problems. If they are not and they need my help, they know my telephone number (and, in case they do not, it is 8373 4846)—all they have to do is ring me, ask for my help, and I will help them on the problem of amalgamations. What I will not do is take responsibility or the blame for their own mistakes.

I do not favour any amalgamation which disadvantages me, either as a ratepayer or any of my electors who are concurrently ratepayers of the City of Unley. For that reason, I remain to be convinced that any suggested amalgamation between Mitcham and Unley is a good thing. I have discussed with my colleague the member for Davenport reasons why the City of Mitcham does not see itself as being able to divide the Mitcham hills from the Mitcham plains. Its reasons for not being able to divide them in what I see as a logical fashion represents the problem for Unley, and I can see no real benefit to my ratepayers in such an amalgamation. Therefore, unless I can be convinced otherwise, I will oppose such an amalgamation. However—

Mr Condous: It is only because Keenan and Green want to monopolise the show.

Mr BRINDAL: That may well be for the member for Colton and others to decide. I do not want to so sour my relationship with local government by suggesting improper motives, but many other people certainly have. There are, however, other avenues which I believe should be investigated, and one of them is the current brief given to the City of Adelaide Boundary Review Group, which has among its terms of reference the boundary of the City of Adelaide. When the member for Colton was Lord Mayor, a report was prepared which basically said that the city should extend to Cross Road in the south, further out to the east and further out to the west—a largely expanded city.

I do not propose that, because that is the business of the member for Norwood; and, in the case of Walkerville, it is the business of the member for Adelaide. However, in respect of Unley, I can see great benefits in extending the boundaries of the city southwards to Cross Road, and so looking at an amalgamation between the City of Unley and the City of Adelaide. I know of a house in Frederick Street in Unley where, based on the current rental value—and the member for Colton will know that the rating system in the City of Adelaide is different from the rating system in nearly every other metropolitan council area—using the current Adelaide rating system, including the rebate given to North Adelaide residents as we speak, the rates payable in the City of Unley for modest dwellings would drop by \$200 a house, which is about a third.

I know of few ratepayers in the City of Unley who, if they could be guaranteed the same, if not a better, level of service at two-thirds of the cost, would not opt for it. That is just one argument. The Works Depot of the City of Adelaide—arguably the finest, I believe, in Australia and one of the finest in the southern hemisphere—will cope with six councils the size of the City of Adelaide. So, it is under-utilised. In the meantime, there is a very valuable works depot sitting adjacent to King William Road, which would then be a fine asset for the people of Unley.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I commend and applaud the Government on its 1997-98 budget, delivered last Thursday. It is a balanced budget. There are no new taxes. There is a real increase in expenditure on health, education, police and capital works programs, and there is no doubt that it is good news for South Australia and in particular—

Mr Condous: Record exports.

Mr ANDREW: Record exports, as the member for Colton rightly interjects, and good news for the economy of the Riverland and the residents in my electorate of Chaffey. This will be the first budget in many years where State expenditure does not exceed income, and I am pleased that this commitment made by the State Government 3½ years ago has now been met. The debt reduction strategy has been successful in reducing the total daily interest bill from around \$3 million a day back to in the order of \$1.6 million a day.

The State debt which the Government inherited has been reduced from nearly \$9 billion to about \$7.5 billion, and the reduced interest bill has allowed the Government to lift expenditure in crucial areas. The capital works program of \$1.291 billion is up 22 per cent in real terms, and I am particularly pleased that this is planned to support 21 500 jobs, while at the same time creating essential social and economic infrastructure. Added to this is the \$145 million priority package, with a number of one-off non-capital

incentives to further stimulate growth. In addition, I highlight that the program is on track to extinguish the \$4 billion superannuation black hole. There is also a strong surplus on the current account of \$463 million—certainly, as the Treasurer indicated, sufficient to meet all social capital costs for 1997-98—and more moneys have been committed to service delivery with real terms outlay increases of \$46 million for education, \$16 million for health and \$10 million for police.

This is undoubtedly a responsible budget which consolidates the hard work that the Treasurer and Cabinet have delivered over the past 3½ years. The budget very strongly remains on the course set by the Government in its original May 1994 Financial Statement. Three years ago, interest costs were consuming nearly 29 per cent of our own source of revenue; whereas in the coming year this will be down to closer to 19 per cent. This means that more revenue is available for the services which are indicated in the budget this year. The fourth State budget of this Liberal Government certainly builds on the performance of last year's budget, and the key economic indicators for South Australia are all moving strongly in the right direction.

With a rise in gross State product of 2.8 per cent, the South Australian economy is now only slightly behind the national economy. Investment is up significantly—arguably over 43 per cent—with significant new capital investments by business in the past six months which are substantially higher than the national figure of around 16 per cent. Employment growth for the March quarter of this year is between .7 and .5 per cent up on national growth, and exports rose significantly—three times more than the national increase. As the Government has said on many occasions, we must get the fundamentals right in the main areas of stabilising debt, being competitive with State taxes and providing low infrastructure costs. In 1996-97 the figures to which I have referred reflect the increased confidence and certainty in our State, and this is reflected by the increase in investment and the support and recognition of this by the residents of the State at large.

I commend the Government for its outlays in health and education. The Treasurer in his budget speech said that 20 per cent of total outlays were on health when he first became Treasurer and 18 per cent on education. In this budget they have been increased to 23 per cent on health and 20 per cent on education, with \$40 million more going into hospitals alone and an extra \$72 million into the education budget. This is a significant improvement on the level of essential services to the people of South Australia, and the efficiency gains across the public sector have undoubtedly been a major factor in more funds being available for the appropriate sectors.

I want to mention how this budget will impact very positively on the Riverland, in my electorate of Chaffey, recognising of course that these plans have been in place over the past 3½ years and have not been dreamt up just over the past 12 months. There has been a 22 per cent lift in capital works, as I mentioned, of \$1.291 billion. The most significant and visible examples that are either currently under construction or will commence this year include the water filtration plants, which will commence in the Riverland this year. The total project for the State is worth \$110 million. So for the five plants—three of which will commence this financial year at Wakerie, Barmera and Berri—it will be in the order of \$50 million. The other two, for Renmark and Loxton, will be built the following financial year—a worthy delivery of

quality, clean water that for many years was held back from the Riverland area by the previous Labor Government.

With the upgrade of the Cadell Training Centre, a further \$840 000 will go into Cadell this year, following the \$760 000 last year to enhance and maintain a secure future for the Cadell Training Centre for the western end of the Riverland region. A further \$7 million is being spent on the Morgan to Renmark road through the Burra to Morgan region, building on the significant expenditure of nearly that order in the past 12 months in respect of this \$17 million project.

I hardly need mention the Berri Bridge, which will be completed three months ahead of schedule. This forms part of the continuing improvement in major road transport routes and networks that links the Riverland with other regions and the nation at large, and it builds on the work of the Federal Government, which the State Government supports, in relation to the Sturt Highway upgrade. A further \$8 million will be spent on Adelaide Airport this year, further enhancing export opportunities for Riverland primary producers, reducing their costs and improving the quality of the product in terms of its delivery to the end market in Asia.

As to education, in South Australia we spend more out of this budget per capita per student than any other State in this nation. I welcome the continued computer subsidy program to the level of \$60 million over the next four years. DECSTech 2001 is a great strategy; it has received a tremendous response and is being readily and keenly taken up by Riverland schools. In education there will be extra funding—up by a third—for students with learning difficulties. In the Riverland already high schools are getting into the 'Ready, Set, Go' program, and I am pleased that DECS will support the program with a further \$3.7 million in this year's budget. I reinforce the fact that this is part of the total increase in health expenditure in the Riverland. The \$6.1 million that goes into the rural enhancement package is keenly appreciated in the Riverland and will help to maintain additional doctor services, particularly in obstetrics and paediatrics. This is part of the extra \$10 million allocation to country health services.

Over and above this, the horticulture arena, which is rapidly expanding, with significant new horticulture and irrigation development in the Riverland, is also being enhanced by a further \$2 million allocation to the new Central Irrigation Trust which will commence on 1 July this year and which will build on the significant contribution—about \$10 million—that this Government has already provided for the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas. The National Wine Centre will enhance the Riverland as a leading development area. The region produces 30 per cent of Australia's wine grapes and 60 per cent of Australian exports. With tourism numbers to the Riverland increasing, based partly on wine expansion, the Riverland will further capitalise on this growth. The upgrade of the Glossop High School at a cost of more than \$5.3 million will happen. All this enhances the very strong budget support for my electorate this financial year.

Mr De LAINE (Price): This evening I refer to the budget in terms of the capital works program and what is in it for my electorate of Price. Over the years my political opponents would argue that, because Price was a safe Labor seat, the electorate and its people were ignored by successive Labor Governments. This argument was used particularly by my Liberal opponents during the 1989 and 1993 election

campaigns. This assertion was completely false, because there were many initiatives in each Labor budget and a lot of money was put into Price and other Labor-held western suburbs seats to help redress the many problems that existed in these areas. This situation has changed dramatically since this Liberal Government has been in office during the past 3½ years. The current budget is the fourth Liberal budget to be presented to this Parliament since then, and each one has progressively cut back on capital works in the electorate of Price—so much so that this 1997-98 budget sees almost no capital works expenditure in Price.

In the entire 66 pages of the capital works programs only two capital works are specific to Price. One is the Woodville High School redevelopment. That is the one remaining high school in Price after the other two have been closed by this Government. Two years ago there were three; now there is one left. This school is badly in need of an upgrade, and this budget has allocated the magnificent sum of \$300 000 to upgrade this school. The school really needs to be demolished and rebuilt. A total of \$3 million has been allocated for the whole program, but only \$300 000 for this year.

The other budget line relates to The Parks urban renewal project which was announced by this Government back in 1994 and which has been re-announced several times. It is still subject to Cabinet approval, and no monetary budget allocation has been made for this project, which will extend over about 15 years. The Government has announced this through a succession of Ministers: first it was announced through the member for Morphett when he was Minister for Housing and Urban Development; then it was taken over by the member for Wright; and now the Treasurer has responsibility for the housing portfolio. But still this major project has not been approved by Cabinet. All that has happened is that it has been around for a long time—more than three years now—and caused all sorts of problems in the community with people fearing that they will be evicted from their homes and shifted around. People who have lived in The Parks area for 35 or 40 years, who have got to know their neighbours and who like living in the area are fearful that they will be evicted or shifted to another area.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr De LAINE: Yes; it is a very exciting project, but the whole thing has been done in a very haphazard way. The project was announced with obviously no thought put into the implications and fine details. Naturally, when a project is announced without any of those details, people are fearful. Many public meetings have been held in the electorate, and people fear that they will be moved out of their homes and shifted into other areas. That has already happened in some cases, and people are fearful.

The thing that worries me is that, in The Parks area at the moment, 57 per cent of housing tenants are public tenants, the other 43 per cent being private tenants or owner occupiers. Under the policy that this Government has espoused, this percentage of public tenants will be reduced from 57 per cent to 25 per cent. On several occasions I asked how this would be achieved. I had a briefing with Pioneer Homes and Housing Trust people only a few months ago, and once again I asked how this 25 per cent public tenant component would be achieved if more than 25 per cent wished to stay in their homes—and I am absolutely sure that people will want to stay in the area. After dodging the question for some time, finally the answer was, 'Well, we have powers of eviction.' This is what I am afraid of, and I certainly will not remain

silent if people are forcibly evicted from their homes to achieve the 25 per cent

The Hon. S.J. Baker: It's a very sensitive issue.

Mr De LAINE: Yes, it is a very sensitive issue, as the Treasurer says. It was announced that work would start on 1 January 1995, then it was extended to 1 July 1995, likewise 1996, and now here it is 1997-98 and the project has still not been approved by Cabinet. I wish this Government would get its act together. I applaud the Government in principle, because it is a very exciting project, which will upgrade an area that badly needs upgrading. However, it is a very sensitive area, as the Treasurer says, and people need to be treated with respect. People have lived in homes and done extensive improvements over the years, and they have many memories there. Perhaps their partner has died, and their children have grown up, moved out and got married. People want to know what will happen. They live next to neighbours whom they know, they know the area and they feel familiar there; they are too old to shift and they have these memories and infrastructure in their homes that they do not want to lose. That is understandable. This has not been thought through, so it is not known how they will be compensated for the improvements which they have done themselves over many years.

Only five other areas in this capital works budget pertain to Price in any way, and we will get only a small share of quite small amounts. The first is the continuation of the successful back-to-school program, with an allocation of \$12.5 million towards maintenance and minor works in schools. There is no doubt that some of the schools in my electorate will get a small portion of this—I certainly hope so—but it will not be very much. The next item is the continuation of the DECSTech 2001 information technology plan, which is great. It is a further allocation of \$15 million during this coming financial year to ensure that computers are made available for children in schools. Once again, hopefully, Price schools will get some of this money, but it certainly will not be very much.

The capital works program also includes the construction of 75 new dwellings. As my colleague the member for Napier and shadow Minister for Housing said, the construction of 75 new dwellings is a fairly poor performance. When we remember that about 40 000 families are on the waiting list for Housing Trust homes, 75 is absolute peanuts and pales into insignificance when compared with the Labor Government's building up to 1 000 homes in each financial year.

An estimated \$11.3 million has been allocated for major ongoing redevelopment programs for ageing housing stock and that involves six areas in the State, one of which is The Parks in my electorate. The redevelopment programs include two country areas, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie, so that figure of \$11.3 million is for work covering the whole State. I do not think that The Parks area in my electorate will see much of that money. Capital grants totalling \$24.2 million have been allocated to the South Australian Cooperative Housing Association. That figure covers 300 items, including the upgrade of 150 former South Australian Housing Trust houses which are included in the housing cooperative plan. That is a help but it means only 375 new homes with a waiting list of over 40 000 people, and that is not a very good performance.

As I outlined, the Government is not intending to undertake much in the way of capital works in my electorate of Price. We have seen cuts in recent times such as the closure of the Port Adelaide Girls High School, which was an

absolutely outrageous decision. That school closed at the end of 1995.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): I want to raise two issues: one positive and one not so positive. First, I raise a good news story. It is a delight to represent an area that is performing as well as the Barossa and its regions. The previous Government chose to ignore this region to its great peril. It spent nothing in the area; it gave it no priority. This Government has been spending money in the Barossa, and the Barossa is returning those favours tenfold. Tonight I want to relate to the House a very good news story. Last weekend I was part of a team effort to bring 20 car and trailer loads of historic horse carriages from Echuca to Old Anlaby north of Kapunda.

Last year Old Anlaby, a historic home formerly owned by the Dutton family, was sold and bought by Mr Hans Albers and his wife Gillian. History reveals that Mr Albers was a very successful tourism operator at Echuca, Victoria. Mr Albers decided to sell his interests in Victoria, move to South Australia and set up at Old Anlaby. This is a magnificent story. Victoria's loss: South Australia's gain. Mr Albers has indisputably the best carriage collection in the southern hemisphere if not the world. Most South Australians would not be aware of the extent of this magnificent private collection.

Mr Albers brought to South Australia 14 carriages by himself, but I could see a problem with Mr Albers having to travel all those kilometres bringing one carriage at a time. We organised a team effort whereby people in the community took their own cars and hired trailers—20 cars and 20 trailers—to travel to Echuca to collect the extra 30 carriages and bring them back to South Australia. The task was difficult but it was made much easier by a grant of \$5 000 from the Minister for Tourism, which amount paid for the accommodation of the volunteer drivers and only some of the fuel.

I have not been involved with such a good news story in a long time. I met the drivers at Eudunda as they returned from Victoria. To see these magnificent carriages coming from Victoria to South Australia gave me a tremendous flip. The carriages travelled down and fully filled the main street of Kapunda. It was a magnificent sight and I want to congratulate and thank Hans and Gill Albers for coming to South Australia. Most members would be aware of the name 'Old Anlaby', but it is now owned by a person who appreciates the property and who has the private collection to make Anlaby South Australia's tourist jewel.

I have been to Martindale Hall, and we know what Martindale Hall means to South Australia. I want to tell the House that I believe that Old Anlaby more than compares with Martindale Hall. Martindale Hall is in my electorate, so I must be careful making such comments. The Albers brought with them their own furniture and their own expertise, as well as this magnificent carriage collection, which fits the mews at Old Anlaby to a T. When one sees Mr Albers' carriages, when all the horse harnesses are in place on the pegs, one would think the Anlaby harness room and mews were made for the collection. I was tickled pink to think that Mr Albers had chosen to leave Echuca, which undoubtedly is a tourism hub of Victoria, and come to Kapunda in South Australia, Kidman country, to set up this magnificent collection in the bush north of Kapunda.

It is a fantastic story. Mr Albers needs to be congratulated. He is certainly taking a gamble. I will make sure that that risk is minimised, and I want to make sure that every member of this House knows just what a fantastic jewel this State now has. For many years Anlaby was owned by the Duttons, then the Shannon family until it was sold. The reason why Anlaby is so valuable is that in the 1940s and 1950s it was never upgraded. It was left in its original condition. Admittedly, it ran down into a very dilapidated state but it was never ruined by our modernisers and architects. It was left as it was and it gradually decayed.

When one visits Anlaby today to see what the Albers have done in four or five months, one sees an absolutely magnificent homestead and a magnificent asset for the State. Hopefully the Deputy Premier will be our guest in September. I have invited him to be our guest at Old Anlaby just to marvel how lucky South Australia is in this regard. We have a magnificent asset with magnificent new owners and we in South Australia have much about which to be pleased and proud. I thank the Minister for Tourism for the grant of \$5 000, which was certainly the catalyst that enabled us to get the last of these carriages to South Australia. I am sure Mr Albers was running short of enthusiasm at the thought of making many trips to Echuca, which is hundreds of kilometres away, to pick up these carriages.

When one sees this collection of genuine Cobb & Co. coaches and genuine Australian and English coaches in this country, you just wonder, first, how Mr Albers got these out of England and, secondly, why South Australia is so lucky to have them.

Mr Andrew: What about the hearse?

Mr VENNING: As the member for Chaffey reminds me, I decided to lie down in one of these carriages on Sunday afternoon and it happened to be a beautiful historic hearse. I should be very careful because it may come back to haunt me, but I had my photograph taken lying in this beautiful, black, horse-drawn hearse. I am very pleased, because Anlaby was a decaying South Australian historic relic. It will now take its true place in South Australia's history. It is an absolute landmark and the former home of the Duttons. I have invited the Governor to visit Old Anlaby and I am absolutely overcome when I think about this asset.

I ask all members to visit Old Anlaby at the first opportunity, because they will be very surprised when they see this building and wonder where it has been all these years. Thank goodness a Victorian who fell out with Jeff—and he owns plenty of assets—decided to come to our State.

I wish the Albers all the best in South Australia. I also wish to congratulate BREDA (Barossa Regional Development Association) and Mr Brian Simcock on their involvement, as well as the Government on providing that extra money. Also, I congratulate the District Council of Barossa-Light and its CEO, Mr Geof Sheridan.

The short negative story I mention this evening involves the community of Riverton. It has been unlucky enough to cop more than most communities some of the stings of our Government. I want to tell the House, as I have told Ministers of the Government, that I am very concerned about the community of Riverton. First, under the ETSA cutbacks the ETSA depot was closed. Admittedly, we fought the decision and were able to keep the jobs in the town, but the depot did close.

Secondly, it looked as though the SA Water depot would close. By this stage the community was getting pretty upset. Thirdly—and I have spoken to the Minister about this—we

looked to change the police station from a two to a one person arrangement. But the real problem is that the Riverton Hospital has been unable to attract doctors. I have had discussions this evening and am sure that we have turned the corner in relation to breaking down a few barriers and helping the hospital attract a new doctor. I feel for the community of Riverton, because it has certainly copped it. The Government did not do this deliberately, but I am very concerned about what has happened. I understand the impact it has had and why these people feel so tender about it. Meetings are being held tomorrow, and the member for Frome and I will do all we can to reverse some of these things so that the people of the Riverton community have some future. This Government is not targeting them. They have been jolly unlucky to be caught in this situation, and I certainly support them in relation to their concerns.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is a pleasure to contribute to a grievance debate such as this where one can exhibit shades of statesmanlike behaviour and contributions.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Already the jackals are at me. I shall revert to type. I refer to a number of the budget items canvassed over the past few days since the budget was handed down. I watched with interest the Channel 10 news report this evening and the expert that the Minister for Infrastructure called in to try to rescue him from the Bolivar situation which has caused this city to be enveloped in a foul-smelling stench. It is almost the same stench one smelt over the Parliament at the time of the leadership change on 26 November last year. Anyway, in reverting to my statesmanlike approach I note with interest that this expert brought in by the Minister for Infrastructure said in part in his interview that the problem at Bolivar was probably caused by the loss of experience and expertise when EWS outsourced its work to United Water. I thought that that was particularly interesting.

Of course, I heard Mr Geoff Anderson, for United Water, and the Minister for Infrastructure discuss the issue to the effect that it is not just Bolivar that causes the stench over the City of Adelaide but the city itself and the air inversion layers. We all have heard about the air inversion layer—hot air and cold air and how the hot air is trapped in, and so on (it is particularly prevalent over this House), but the Bureau of Meteorology expert who also was interviewed on Channel 10 tonight basically said that the Minister's argument was bollocks, did not stand up to the test of science and that the stench through Adelaide today was not due to air inversion. In fact, the weather pattern in Adelaide today was totally windy and absolutely out of sync. It could have been only Bolivar causing the stench, and not the air inversion and all the other chemical-type catastrophes to which the Minister for Infrastructure referred. We also heard today the first admission by a Liberal Minister for Police as to the true state of the Police Force in this State.

Mr Foley: Which Minister was it?

Mr CLARKE: The current Minister. We have had so many Ministers for Police under the Liberal Government in the past 3½ years that it is hard to keep pace.

Mr Foley: Which one is the Minister?

Mr CLARKE: The current Minister, the member for Bragg, the current Deputy Premier—I think he still is. There has not been a meeting—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It is not 3 a.m. yet. At 3 a.m. they usually have leadership coups. It is not quite nine months yet; that is when he usually goes. The Minister for Infrastructure, the Deputy Premier, has about four months to go before he is toppled by the Treasurer. What it boils down to is this: the Minister for Police said today that I was wrong in my question when I said, 'Despite your recruitment of 100 extra police officers this financial year, that is still 150 short of the number of police officers that were in place when you took office in December 1993.' The Minister for Police corrected me, emphatically saying, 'You're a nong. It's not 150 we have got rid of; it's 185 or 190.' Well, I defer to the Minister for Police. He knows the figures; he has the department behind him.

If the Minister for Police says that the Government has sacked 190 extra police officers over the last 3½ years—and, as I say, that is factoring in these extra 100 police officers who will be recruited and who in effect will not be on the beat until some time in the next 12 to 18 months—we find that what the Opposition has consistently said for the last 3½ years has been totally validated by the Minister. We have nearly 300 sworn police officers fewer today than when the Labor Party was in Government in December 1993. I thank the Minister for Police for his frankness and honesty in saying, 'For every dollar we paid as a pay rise to the police officers we cut police officers on the beat.' That is what the Minister for Police said today.

The immediate past Minister for Police, that is, the current Treasurer, would never have been so foolish as to be as honest as that. The former Minister for Police, the current Treasurer, constantly ducked, dived, weaved and performed every other act of contortion—which would have done the Karma Sutra proud—to dodge that issue, but I thank the current Minister for Police for his honesty on that point. I also raised this issue with respect to the current Treasurer, who was laughing when the current Minister for Police, the Deputy Premier, was giving his answer and dobed himself in on the Government's policy for the past 3½ years of cutbacks to the police. When the Treasurer got up to make his *mea culpa* with respect to the Mount Gambier police station I did not see the current Minister for Police laughing and rollicking in his chair. No, I saw anguish on his face. It was that same look of anguish he had when he shafted the Treasurer for the deputy leadership in November last year. When the Treasurer gave his *mea culpa* tonight he poured a bucket on the Police Force of this State and, more particularly, a giant bucket on the police officers of Mount Gambier.

Mr Foley: Or Sergeant Modra.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The reference was to a particular police officer in Mount Gambier, Sergeant Modra; let us get it right.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: And he continues to do it. He pours a bucket on the senior police officer of the Mount Gambier police station, Sergeant Modra. When the Treasurer said that Sergeant Modra could not be trusted, that he would leak details of communications from Group 4 (which ran the prison service in Mount Gambier) to the media, he poured a bucket not only on Sergeant Modra but on the integrity and honesty of every police officer in this State. He will have that compliment returned in spades, as the current Minister for Police knows only too well. Mr Deputy Speaker, as the member for Gordon, the representative of those fine police

officers in Mount Gambier, the call is on you: do you support your Treasurer in slagging off the police officers of Mount Gambier, and in particular Sergeant Modra, or do you stand firmly behind them as persons of integrity who are carrying out their task?

At the same time, the Treasurer alluded to Mr Alan Scott in his reply today. Mr Alan Scott is a respected business man whose only fault is that he is a supporter of John Olsen and not the Treasurer or the former Premier.

Mr BASS (Florey): It is appropriate that I speak about the Police Force in my contribution tonight. I will speak about Focus 21 and its implementation by the new Commissioner. I offer my congratulations to the Commissioner, Malcolm Hyde, on his appointment as Commissioner of the best Police Force in Australia and also to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Neil McKenzie, and the recently appointed Assistant Commissioner, John White. There is no doubt that the combination of Mal Hyde as the Commissioner and Neil McKenzie as Deputy Commissioner will take the South Australian Police Force into the next century and will deliver the service that the South Australian public wants.

I have been asked by several people why there needs to be a change and why Focus 21 needs to be implemented. If members consider the Police Force over the past 30 to 40 years it is easy to see. I joined the Police Force in 1961, and it was 1964 when I was first sworn in and began working on patrols in the city. On night shift there were six general patrols for all the suburbs. In Adelaide there were three patrols if we were lucky—usually two, but sometimes three. There was one supervision car and, if we were lucky, there was a commissioned officer. The CIB had one night shift and the AIS (Accident Investigation Squad) also had a patrol. That was all that was on patrol. We were controlled by one channel and one operator in the police radio room. At the time, CIB personnel worked out of squads in the city, and there were small units of CIB officers in some of the outer stations.

As members can see, in the 1950s and 1960s it was a small Police Force. In the 1990s, when I was still in the police environment, in the police union, there were six channels and six operators in the new communications room. There were approximately 12 regions throughout Adelaide, each region providing two to three patrol cars. Therefore, at any one time there were 36 patrol cars operating in the metropolitan area. There were police stations throughout the suburbs and in each region, and patrols worked from the regions. But in modern society we have to look at what the public wants. I can tell members that when 90 per cent of the public of South Australia want a police officer they do not go to a police station: they want a police officer to come to them. For example, they have had an accident, they have come home and their house has been broken into, or they have been assaulted.

The police officer who is sitting in the police station at Payneham, Tea Tree Gully or Elizabeth is not the person who goes out and attends to them. That officer, whoever he or she may be, waits for the public to come into the police station. During the time that I was a member of the Police Force, some of these police stations would not have a visitor from 9 p.m. to 9 a.m. The officers were bored with just sitting in the police station. The action is out in the street. The officers on patrol are the ones who are called upon to attend the accidents, the assaults and the break-ins. In today's modern society we need to have police officers on patrol on the

streets, where they can service the public's needs. The Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner have recognised this fact. They know that they need to change the way in which we deliver the service, and Focus 21 will address that.

We will not close police stations, as we hear so much about from the Opposition, but we will review the operation of police stations. For instance, the Plympton and Glenelg Police Stations may well be moved. A new patrol base will combine all those officers and they will work out of one area. Immediately upon doing that we reduce the infrastructure. We reduce the need to have a supervisor at Glenelg and Plympton, only one being required. Therefore, by re-engineering the way in which we deliver the service we free up officers, who can therefore be on the street servicing the public. This is what Commissioner Hyde and Deputy Commissioner McKenzie are doing in connection with Focus 21.

Let me say that the addition of 100 police officers is welcome, as is the addition of 25 more public servants. The other night I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, after the announcement of Focus 21, bleating on TV that these shopfront police stations will be manned by public servants and, if someone goes to a police station, they want to speak to a police officer. Let me tell the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that for the past 25 to 30 years the majority of these police stations, whether they be shopfronts or major police stations, have been manned predominantly by public servants—public servants who do a great job and who know more about the police industry than some young police officers. To say that members of the public would not want to speak to a public servant when they attend a police station is an insult to those people who have provided the police in question with a loyal service for years.

We must look not just at the sworn police officers in the Police Force but at the Police Department as a whole; that is, the sworn police who have the interaction with the public and the public servants who support these people. As a result of the re-engineering of the Police Force, approximately 60 more police officers will be available on the road to answer calls from the public.

The police union has come out in support of what the Government will do. It is a change to see an honest union that does not carp or carry on when it sees something good. I say of the police union that it is apolitical and, if it sees something good, it will support it. I congratulate Peter Alexander and the committee of the Police Association for doing that. I consider that the Police Association will have to stop being a craft union. It needs to look at taking in all the employees of the Commissioner of Police and, as much as I always wanted to have a craft union and I know that Peter Alexander does, the time has come when it has to become a union that covers everybody.

In closing, I must comment about the recent tactics of the Opposition, including today's disgraceful farce. The Labor Party is deliberately trying to create chaos in Parliament by casting reflections upon the Speaker, simply to hide the fact that it has no policies. It has no idea for the future of South Australia and it has not learnt anything from the past. Opposition members can continue to carry on like that in this House but this Government, under the leadership of John Olsen, will continue to keep its eye on the ball. We will continue to ensure that South Australia has a future and that South Australians will be able to find work here, notwithstanding the decade of Labor mismanagement.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I take this opportunity to reflect on a number of statements made by the Opposition on a number of issues in relation to me. The first statement that I want to reflect on was made by the member for Elizabeth. I must have touched a sore point for the honourable member when, on Thursday in this House, I criticised Labor Party members for their hypocrisy over the Public Works Standing Committee report on the Wilpena Pound redevelopment. The member for Elizabeth and the member for Taylor made statements later that day, and the member for Elizabeth made a further statement today.

In her statement today, the member for Elizabeth said that she had neither abstained nor had not read the draft release or the draft report and that that was a completely false misrepresentation by me. I do not think that it is proper that I should release the minutes of the Public Works Committee, but let it be said that members of the Public Works Standing Committee know the correct situation in relation to this matter and, at the next meeting of that committee, a copy of the minutes will be given to the member for Elizabeth so that she can reflect on the statements that she made in the House.

At no stage in her statement either last Thursday or today did the member for Elizabeth refute the fact that Labor Party members requested freedom of information reports on Wilpena Pound and all the documentation. Nor did she refute the fact that she failed to advise the Public Works Standing Committee that this had occurred, and I think that her actions are grossly improper.

The other matter that I want to address concerns statements attributed to the Hon. Terry Cameron in another place. I understand that Mr Cameron said:

Mr Hall advised our office—

and I assume that he meant his office, not just the Opposition's—

that he had taken his complaint to Colin Caudell, the member for Mitchell, who did absolutely nothing.

I say here—and I will also say it outside the House—that, if the Hon. Terry Cameron made that remark, that is a deliberately misleading, malicious statement by the honourable member. When I heard what Mr Cameron said, I rang Mr Hall, who confirmed that he had spoken to Mr Cameron's office but that he had not advised him that I had been advised of the problem or had done absolutely nothing. He advised Mr Cameron that he contacted me in February this year over a dust problem and that I had advised Mr Hall to contact me on my pager at any stage that the dust was a problem and I would come out. He paged me and I was there within a quarter of an hour, and we sorted out his problem. We also agreed that we would address the situation with regard to dust and cracking at the end of the blasting. When confirming that with Mr Hall yesterday evening, he advised me that he has just about had enough of people such as the Hon. Terry Cameron using this issue as a political football.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 127 which provides that it is inappropriate for an honourable member to make personal reflections on another member of this Parliament. If the honourable member has an issue that concerns the Hon. Terry Cameron, I suggest that he raise it by way of substantive motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Was the honourable member referring to debate in another place?

Mr CAUDELL: No, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is inappropriate to reflect on sitting members. Members who have left the Parliament are open game, but reflecting on sitting members is not appropriate.

Mr CAUDELL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is a pity that the same rules do not apply elsewhere. I received a letter from Mr Hall dated 29 May in relation to a problem. I have spoken to Mr Hall and he is aware of the situation. I can only say of the comments made by other people that they do not know what they are talking about.

Mr Foley: I rattled you, didn't I?

Mr CAUDELL: No, you did not rattle me. The person who is rattled is the person who can make a totally misleading, malicious statement and look people in the eye and pretend that it is the truth when he knows that it is not.

The other issue to which I refer concerns Bowker Street reserve. The *Messenger Guardian* of Tuesday 3 June contains an article about this issue, and I should like to confirm the fact that the Government has decided to retain Bowker Street reserve as open space. The Government has decided to ensure that this piece of open space remains in the hands of the State Government so that its future is assured. A rally that was held about this matter in 1996 drew a crowd of up to 2 000 people. This piece of open space is used by many people in Adelaide for Little Athletics, for kick-a-ball, for basketball and for tennis.

It is used by a number of the local private and public schools in the electorates of Mitchell, Morphett and Bright. This reserve borders all three electorates and is in the old city of Brighton and the new city of Holdfast Bay, and it is also on the border of the Marion council. It is pleasing that the Government has made that decision to ensure the retention of the Baker Street reserve. The members for Bright and Morphett and I applaud the Government on that decision. I have two minutes to advise the House that the member for Light flew the house colours in distress this afternoon when he wore a bow tie for Prince Alfred College upside down. Obviously the red men are in strife and are about to be beaten by the men in blue and white!

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I would like to add to the speech I gave last night on the budget by speaking to some key issues. At the moment, so much is happening in the electorate of Kaurna that I cannot possibly fit it into 20 minutes, so I have had to take an extra 10 minutes. The Minister for Education and Children's Services, Rob Lucas, recently announced a new concept for school security, which is about to be trialled in the Seaford area. The trial is a joint initiative between the Department of Education and Children's Services, the Noarlunga council and business operators in the area. It is aimed at providing a visible security presence and improved alarm response times for six schools and children's centres, and council and business sites within the electorate. The six schools and children's centres around Seaford have been an open target for vandalism and theft, and they have suffered about \$14 000 worth of damage or loss in the previous 12 months, despite the fact that four of the sites were equipped with security monitoring alarms. The new trial will see a multiple security patrol during the night, seven nights a week, plus daylight patrols on Saturdays and Sundays; an improved security presence on-site; and an improved alarm response time, which will help reduce theft and vandalism costs.

The use of security patrols just for the DECS sites would have been a very expensive proposition, but uniting those

with the council and private businesses in the area has significantly reduced the cost to all parties involved in the project. This combined program will have the added benefit of providing a greater sense of community security in the area, and it will help curb the vandalism and anti-social behaviour that has been happening over the past 12 months.

The Liberal Government also has recently announced \$40 000 for the Southern Development Board as part of its statewide grants to all regional development boards. This grant reflects the Government's commitment to regional development and highlights the importance of development boards in all areas. In the south, the Southern Development Board has had an outstanding result in achieving positive work and business outcomes for all its community.

The Government's computer subsidy scheme has been successful in the electorate. Nine schools in Kaurna have already placed orders for a total of 147 computers, and many of these computers are already installed and up and running in the local classrooms. Across the State, 6 479 computers have been ordered since the scheme was announced in mid February. It shows that we are well on track for the statewide target of 10 700 new computers in South Australian schools by early 1998. Five local sporting clubs have been rewarded for their commitment to the Sun Smart health message through sponsorship from Living Health, the State's sports promotion and cultural and health advancement trust.

I am very pleased that, as part of the club sponsorship pilot program, the Aldinga Bay Bowling Club, Micrograms Surf Club at Seaford, the Noarlunga Little Athletics Club, Port Noarlunga Surf Lifesaving Club and Port Noarlunga Soldiers Memorial Bowling Club have all received sponsorship towards implementing Sun Smart projects. The sponsorship program is an initiative of Living Health and the Anticancer Foundation and aims to significantly increase the adoption of Sun Smart policies amongst sporting and recreational organisations.

For some time now a small group of people has been working hard towards the establishment of premier league soccer in the southern area, and naturally the Southern Sports Complex will be an appropriate location when it is built to handle premier league soccer in the south. However, the Government has commissioned a study into the feasibility and costings associated with the construction of a first grade standard soccer pitch and car parking, lights and change rooms at the Southern Sports Complex. This feasibility study is about to be presented to the Minister for his consideration. I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating the South Adelaide Football Club, which I believe has worked very cooperatively with the group which aims to set up premier league soccer. In a very short time, we will be able to give a guarantee to the federation that a building will go ahead at the Southern Sports Complex to house premier league soccer.

Also I would like to thank the Minister for Transport for reacting very quickly to the requirement for traffic lights at the intersection of Seaford and Commercial Roads at Seaford. This has become an extremely busy and dangerous black spot. On Commercial Road, there were eight collisions with no fatalities—luckily—in the past 12 months, involving 17 vehicles in those accidents on one corner. The Minister undertook to look at that intersection following a considerable amount of lobbying by me in the local community, and I am pleased to say that that intersection now has fully operational lights to protect the community. It is also important to say that it is part of the overall strategy for the upgrade of the

whole of Commercial Road, and in particular this corner is important, because it has been chosen to feed the community off Commercial Road on to the new Southern Expressway when it reaches Old Noarlunga at South Road.

I would like to pay particular tribute to the efforts of councillor Jack Holder who will be retiring from the Noarlunga City Council this year at the election. He has worked tirelessly with me and other members of the community to get those lights on that corner. I would also like to thank the Moana and Seaford Residents' Association and, in particular, Richard Peat, who has worked on behalf of the Seaford 6 to 12 school and many local residents who have supported my efforts. That support has been invaluable in getting those lights there in the time it has taken.

We recently saw the closure of a skateboard rink at Seaford Rise. It was located in a poor position on Cambourne Crescent, very close to residents. The closing of that facility was supported by residents within the local area. However, it has left a large black hole for the youth of the area who were using that day and night. It was a popular skateboard rink. I have put forward an idea to the community that we ought to locate the skateboard rink at the recreation centre that is being built on Main Street at Seaford Rise. Locating it at the recreation centre will offer adequate car parking and some sort of security for parents whose children go there, because there will be some supervision as the YMCA will run the recreation centre. I have had a great deal of support from local residents for this initiative. I understand a petition is going around the community to the council to encourage it to consider that relocation to the recreation centre.

The Seaford area is also working on a safe routes to school program, which is a community program to improve road safety for children travelling in their local areas between school and home. I understand that, because of some lobbying from a committee set up at the Seaford 6 to 12 school, the Department of Transport recently decided to extend the project into schools in the high school area. Previous to that, it was considered only for primary school age groups. It has now been expanded into high schools, and the program will include the Seaford 6 to 12 school in its research and development stage, and that research and development is expected to commence during July 1997.

The formation of the committee that consisted of the Seaford Catholic Primary School and Seaford 6 to 12 school, the council and the Seaford joint venturers, in terms of their lobbying, was important in getting that extra commitment from the Department of Transport. I would like to extend my gratitude to the Noarlunga City Council, because the Noarlunga City Council has been extremely supportive in working with the committee to get that commitment.

The Minister for Emergency Services and Deputy Premier (Graham Ingerson) and Ray Gilbert, the Mayor of Noarlunga City Council, recently opened a new Port Noarlunga CFS station at Seaford which was a joint celebration, because they also launched the new vehicle for Port Noarlunga CFS. The movement of the Port Noarlunga CFS to this new station at Seaford was extremely important, because the old Port Noarlunga site was dangerous because of the egress of vehicles on to a busy and dangerous road.

Lastly, I would like to congratulate those clubs within my area who have received grants from the State Government's Gaming Machines (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act, which involved \$2.5 million being given to sport and recreation throughout the State. Those that were successful included the Christies Beach Sailing Club, Noarlunga and Districts Junior

Soccer Club, Port Noarlunga Dive Club, Port Noarlunga Football Club, Southern Districts Cricket Club and the Southern Women's Bowling Association. I would like to congratulate all of them.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Given the track record of the former Labor Government—in particular, that of the now Leader of the Opposition—I find it amazing that members of the Opposition can stand in this House and make speeches denigrating the considerable efforts of the Liberal Government and the people of South Australia to clean up the mess that their Government left behind. It would be nice if they admitted that the economy of the State was left in an awful mess as a result of mismanagement and that much has been done to put the economy back on track. In his speech the Opposition Leader stated that at the next election his Party will be spelling out its own spending package and how it will be funded. The people of South Australia and Australia know how Labor Governments fund their packages—more debt, more debt and more debt. That is the only way they seem to know. The people, fortunately, do not want more debt.

In contrast, the Liberal State Government has achieved its target of a balanced budget in 1997-98. When I first came into this House, the debt was spiralling at over \$9 billion. The former Government had been living off the credit card. Worse, it was not making provision to cover its future liabilities, such as superannuation, seemingly being content to leave this problem for future generations to deal with. This Government has achieved its target of stabilising the debt without the burden of new taxes and also of controlling the past superannuation liabilities of \$4 billion. The State Government can at last cut the credit card in half.

Despite what the member for Giles said in his budget swan song, part of this new budget is an increased allocation to the country regions of the State. Cheques have already been received for the two development boards in my electorate—funds which the boards will put to extremely good use to stimulate further regional development. On Eyre Peninsula, this may mean the faster implementation of the Better Business Centres concept in all 10 of the council areas that this board covers. In addition, the research centre at Minnipa will receive substantial funding that will help to make it a world-class centre of excellence in dry land farming, as I proposed it should be in my maiden speech 3½ years ago. The Rural Health Enhancement Package is another funding strategy designed specifically to assist the remote, sparsely populated regions. The \$6.5 million package will help to attract and retain medical professionals in rural and remote South Australia, where an oversupply of doctors is not a problem: 10 jobs are available in the electorate of Flinders starting immediately.

I have referred previously to the importance of sealed roads between rural centres and how the Romans got it right thousands of years ago. As was the case with Rome, I fully expect that much more social and economic activity will take place between these centres once the roads are completed. Under a Liberal Government, the Cleve to Kimba road will be completely sealed in 1999-2000, with the completion of the Elliston to Lock road set for 2003-2004, and possibly sooner. The South Coast Road on Kangaroo Island will also be completed. Under Labor, these roads would never have been sealed—and that is by the admission of a former Minister for Transport. The member for Giles said in this place only last week that, when he was Minister for Transport, one of the first things he did was to have an examination

carried out as to the level of traffic that used the Lock to Elliston road and where it would fit into priorities. He said that the Department of Transport was not at all keen on upgrading this road, the reason for this being, essentially, that there was very little traffic using it and that sometimes four hours could pass without a car going along the road. So, it got a fairly low priority.

Surprise, surprise! I lived on this road, and I would not be surprised that on some days nobody used the road at all. It was so rough and damaging to motor vehicles that people went to extreme lengths not to have to use it. I believe it was due to the state of this road that I was born at Cleve and not in the Elliston Hospital. Whole communities became isolated because use of the road was so dangerous and damaging to life and limb. I assure the member for Giles that, once the road is fully sealed, he need have no concerns about the number of people using it. Sealing will lead to better contact between communities that live in the region and will lead to an even greater number of tourists travelling into the region. It will increase the economic activity and, therefore, the number of jobs in the region considerably, without artificially inflating the numbers in Government services, as suggested by the member for Giles.

This Government has insisted that SA Water, ETSA, the Department of Transport and many other Government agencies restructure their operations so that they become more efficient. This has not been a deliberate policy to reduce the number of people living in rural South Australia but has been a strategy to provide services such as power, water and roads at competitive prices similar to those in other States and cities. This has all been made possible by service providers using improved technology and introducing progressive and innovative ideas—to such an extent that ETSA, while reducing prices to business, has, I understand, made a record profit. Providing cost-competitive services and roads to rural South Australia will do more to encourage people to live and work in the community than will the provision of artificially high water or power services; that is basic economics.

A Government has a responsibility to ensure that the cost of anyone doing business is kept to a minimum. Every farmer is a businessman. He or she should be entitled to power and services at the best possible prices, not at an inflated figure so that extra persons can be employed in a Government department. To follow that course would see the decline of rural communities in terms of setting up small factories and businesses. Almost every town has one, and they range from manufacturing plants producing farm machinery for the world to nurseries supplying Australia with the Sturt's desert pea. The member for Giles should be aware of the success of that enterprise, as it is being conducted in his electorate. With the sealing of the Cleve to Kimba road this enterprise will deliver more product to more people more cost competitively.

I also wish to highlight the \$3.2 million allocated for the Eyre Highway between Penong and Lincoln Gap. This \$80 million maintenance program will ensure the widening of the Eyre Highway to 8 metres in width and also lead to improvements in the alignment of the road. Members of the Opposition expressed concern in relation to speed cameras, but I heard no mention of the considerable amount of grief that has been prevented as a result of better roads and tougher road rules, including the use of speed cameras. This has resulted, as at the end of last month, in the lowest number of deaths on South Australian roads on record for the 12 month period. It is at least 29 years since the records were computerised. The Minister is surely to be commended for her efforts.

I record my appreciation for the funds allocated to the Wudinna Area School. I had the pleasure of taking the Premier to visit this school following my election to the Parliament. The state of this facility was a monument to the neglect that the former Labor Government had shown to Eyre Peninsula. At the Port Lincoln High School, maintenance was so neglected that the stairs were in danger of collapsing under the weight of the students. A similar situation existed at a school on Kangaroo Island. I also had the opportunity to inspect the Port Lincoln and Kingscote hospitals before renovations had started. Both provide even more evidence of the neglect of country regions by the previous Government which the member for Giles had conveniently forgotten. In spite of the difficult situation left as a result of the State Bank debt, funds have been provided for an ongoing upgrade of the Port Lincoln Hospital. The completed development will provide the whole of Lower Eyre Peninsula with improved health services. I add my support to that of my colleagues for the upgrade of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This will be welcomed by country people, as many are compelled to make the journey to access the specialised services offered by this great hospital.

I note the \$8 million for the continuation of diversion works associated with the extension of Adelaide Airport. This matter is extremely important to the whole of South Australia but it is very important to the fishing and aquaculture industries based on Lower Eyre Peninsula. Just from one fishing sector alone, the value of exports from Port Lincoln to South-East Asian destinations totals \$20 million. I refer to the live rock lobster trade. These lobsters are flown from Port Lincoln to Adelaide Airport in the early hours for shipment to Asia aboard international flights. When one adds on products such as tuna, abalone and others, the trade will be of huge benefit to the economies of both the Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island. The member for Giles says that the Farmers Federation is disappointed. It is not the Farmers Federation but one representative who has already, apparently, forgotten regional neglect under Labor and the huge debt, which is the reason why this Government could not have done even more for the regions. I am proud of our record in government and I congratulate the Treasurer for putting forward a budget which will once again assist South Australia towards greater prosperity in the future.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I support the budget and what the Liberal Government has done for the State in achieving a balanced budget for the next financial year and in cutting back the debt. I would also like to make some comments in regard to the speech of the member for Hart today, when he said that the budget had a phoney surplus and that the Liberal Government has done nothing in regard to redevelopment of the State but that it is funded by the taxpayers.

I remind the member for Hart that the Labor Government, under which he was adviser to former Premier Bannon, put this State in financial difficulty, yet it did not produce any real development in this State at all in its 13 years in office. In 1989 my predecessor, the then member for Albert Park, Kevin Hamilton, said, as recorded in *Hansard*, 'Unfortunately, one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.' That is very true, when applied to Labor Party and Liberal Party members: you cannot make cooks from waitresses. The State has eaten the economic cake and thrown away the crumbs under Labor. Labor Party members are waitresses; they are not cooks. They do not know how to make cake, and they do not know how to organise people to make a cake, no matter

how small. Only Liberals and a Liberal Government can make this State progress, as it did in the 1950s and 1960s, when we had such firms as GMH, Chrysler, Simpson, Pope, AWA, and, of course, ship building in Whyalla. But, under Labor Governments, under Don Dunstan, most of those firms closed down. Simpson Pope amalgamated and became GEC, AWA is not heard of and the ship building in Whyalla was closed down. I can remember that in the 1980s there were News Limited, Messenger Press and the *Advertiser*—three competitive papers in this State. Under Labor Governments there is now only one paper, and that is the *Advertiser*, the Messenger Press of course being part of the *Advertiser*. So much for keeping competition in this State.

I would make another point about Labor Party politicians and their leaders. Victoria had John Cain and Joan Kirner, and what happened there? The economy of that State went downhill. New South Wales had Neville Wran and Barry Unsworth, and what happened to that State's financial situation? That went downhill, in the red. Western Australia had Brian Burke, Peter Dowding, Carmen Lawrence, Ian Taylor and Jim McGinty. What happened to Western Australia under a Labor Government? It went nearly bankrupt. So, to me there is only consistency in what my predecessor Kevin Hamilton would say in 1989 that, unfortunately, one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. The Labor Party cannot run the States. It cannot run its own household, it cannot run its own business, so how can it run a State?

Premier Don Dunstan, whom apparently the member for Ramsay idealises, started selling off State assets to the Federal Government, and I refer to the State railways. Don Dunstan and Labor started threatening the shareholders of big companies such as SANTOS to sell their quota of shares or face Government action, just like real bully boys. Don Dunstan and Labor preached to workers about participation in the workplace without the workers having any responsibilities. What happened to firms which had worker participation forced upon them? The owners sold their business to multinational companies. Don Dunstan and Labor gave children the right to do what they liked, provided they did not get caught and, if they did, they should have expected to suffer the consequences, whatever the consequences meant. Don Dunstan and Labor protested against the Vietnam war, and I can remember then walking down King William Street. In those days, when Don Dunstan protested against the Vietnam war it made me and many soldiers in uniform feel ashamed. We were only doing what the Federal Government in this country was telling us.

Labor began to build up a list of union members who could have preference in promotion in the Public Service instead of the most honest, most suited and most qualified person getting the job on merit. Yet this week the member for Spence has accused the Liberal Government of forming a discriminatory list of employees in the Public Service. I think it is something that the Labor Party has always implemented, has always believed in and has actually practised. How dare Labor members criticise this Government for doing something which they themselves normally do? The Labor push for uncontrolled wages forced small businesses to the wall. Many closed their doors, others sold their small proprietary companies to overseas investors while others simply stopped working and went on the dole. This week the member for Ramsay, the Leader of the Opposition, said he went to Japan and over there he was told by multi-national companies that if they were pushed too far they would invest their money in other countries. It is only now that the member for Ramsay

bothers to listen to what big business people have to say, namely, that you cannot push big business around: you have to actually encourage big business to invest in this State and this country, and in that way the unemployment rate will drop.

I remember a comment by my predecessor Kevin Hamilton, who in 1982 said that unemployment under the Liberal Government was 11 per cent and that if Labor got in it would reduce that. I bring to the attention of this House that at the election at the end of 1993 the unemployment rate in this State was 11 per cent. So, in Labor's term of office of more than 11 years, unemployment in this State did not improve a part of a percentage point, yet members opposite criticise us for lowering the unemployment rate from 11 per cent to less than 9 per cent. Why, may we ask? There is an old wives' tale: manners start at home and habits start at home. Small business has sold out to big business. The big businesses were too big for the Federal Government to stop them transferring assets and technology overseas. I refer to the Keating Federal Labor Government, which again tried to bully investment in this country. What did these big businesses do? They transferred their businesses to Asian countries and their profits went overseas. Why was that? Again, it was because of the bullying tactics of the Labor Party and its union members.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by 1 July 1997, in accordance with the timetables as follows:

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Tuesday 17 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Premier, Minister for State Development and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

House of Assembly

Joint Parliamentary Services

Legislative Council

State Governor's Establishment

Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Auditor-General's Department

Economic Development Authority

Premier—Other Payments

Minister for State Development—Other Payments

Information Technology Workforce Strategy Office

Office for the Commissioner for Public Employment

Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

Wednesday 18 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Treasurer, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Energy, Minister for Finance and Minister for Mines

Department of Mines and Energy Resources

Office of Energy Policy

Minister for Finance—Other Payments

Department of Treasury and Finance

Department for Housing and Urban Development

Treasurer—Other Payments

Thursday 19 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Police,

Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Racing

Police Department

Minister for Police—Other Payments

Country Fire Service

South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service

State Emergency Service SA

Minister for Emergency Services—Other Payments

Minister for Infrastructure—Other Payments

Minister for Racing—Other Payments

Tuesday 24 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Primary Industries, Minister Assisting for Regional Development and Small Business

Department of Primary Industries

South Australian Research and Development Institute

Minister for Primary Industries—Other Payments

Minister Assisting for Regional Development and Small Business—
Other Payments

Wednesday 25 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Tourism, Minister for Local Government and Minister
for Recreation and Sport

South Australian Tourism Commission

Minister for Tourism—Other Payments

Department of Recreation and Sport

Office of Local Government

Minister for Local Government—Other Payments

Thursday 26 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Health and Minister for Disability Services

South Australian Health Commission

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Tuesday 17 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Education and Children's Services

Department for Education and Children's Services

Minister for Education and Children's Services—Other Payments

Wednesday 18 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs

Courts Administration Authority

State Electoral Office

Attorney-General's Department

Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs—Other
Payments

Thursday 19 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the
Status of Women

Department of Transport

Passenger Transport Board

TransAdelaide

Department for the Arts and Cultural Development

Minister for Transport—Other Payments

Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Status of Women—Other
Payments

Tuesday 24 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

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

Department for Correctional Services

Department for Employment, Training and Further Education

Wednesday 25 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

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

Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources—Other
Payments

Department of Family and Community Services

Minister for Family and Community Services—Other Payments

Thursday 26 June 1997 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Industrial Affairs, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and

Minister for Information and Contract Services

Department for Industrial Affairs

Minister for Industrial Affairs—Other Payments

Department of State Aboriginal Affairs

Department of Information Technology Services

Department for State Government Services

Minister for Information and Contract Services—Other Payments

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Messrs
Allison, Andrew, Blevins and Evans, Mrs Penfold and Messrs Quirk
and Rann.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That Estimates Committees B be appointed, consisting of Messrs
Brindal, De Laine, Matthew and Scalzi, Ms Stevens, Mr Venning
and Ms White.

Motion carried.

DENTISTS (CLINICAL DENTAL TECHNICIANS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first
time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 5 June
at 10.30 a.m.