

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Tuesday 1 July 1997**

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Associations Incorporation (Miscellaneous) Amendment, Casino,  
Friendly Societies (South Australia),  
Gaming Supervisory Authority (Administrative Restructuring) Amendment,  
Liquor Licensing (Administrative Restructuring) Amendment,  
Statutes Amendment (Pay-roll Tax and Taxation Administration),  
Statutes Amendment (References to Banks),  
Statutes Amendment (Water Resources),  
Tobacco Products Regulation (Miscellaneous) Amendment.

**SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

Petitions signed by 410 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 D.S. Baker, Brown, Meier and Olsen.

Petitions received.

**LICENSED CLUBS**

Petitions signed by 1 936 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 D.S. Baker, Becker, Brown, Clarke, Kerin, Meier and Rann and Ms White.

Petitions received.

**YANKALILLA SPEED LIMITS**

A petition signed by 264 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reduce the Yankalilla town speed limit to 60 km/h and to designate a 25 km/h school zone was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

**TENANTS ASSOCIATION**

A petition signed by 302 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to continue to provide financial assistance to the Tenants Association of South Australia was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME**

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the

current guidelines of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme and reduce the travelling distance qualification to 75 kilometres was presented by Mr Leggett.

Petition received.

**TELEPHONE TOWER, MAGILL**

A petition signed by 89 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to take action to prevent the erection of mobile phone towers on the Magill Campus of the University of South Australia was presented by Mr Scalzi.

Petition received.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

The **SPEAKER**: I lay on the table the forty-eighth report of the Public Works Committee on the Wallaroo to Port Wakefield Road upgrade (Wallaroo to Kadina section), which has been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act.

**PAPERS TABLED**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Electricity Corporations—Temporary Non-Commercial Provisions  
Waterworks—Revocation of Schedule 2

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Bills of Sale—Fees  
Criminal Assets Confiscation—Principal  
Gaming Machines—Fees  
Liquor Licensing—  
Long Term Dry Areas  
Revocation of Eighth Schedule  
Public Corporations—ETSA Corporation Board  
Real Property—  
Fees  
Land Division Fees  
Registration of Deeds—Fees  
Strata Titles—Fees to Registrar—General  
Tobacco Products Regulation—Principal  
Worker's Liens—Fees  
Summary Offences Act 1953—Dangerous Area  
Declarations—1 July 1996 to 31 March 1997  
Summary Offences Act 1953—Road Block Establishment  
Authorisations—1 July 1996 to 31 March 1997

By the Minister for Energy (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Electricity—General  
Gas—Principal

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Development Act—Regulations—Referrals and Concurrences

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Southern State Superannuation—Administrative Charge  
Superannuation (Benefit Scheme)—Administrative Charge

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

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Motor Vehicles—  
Exemptions and Reports

Expiation Fees—Substitution  
Road Traffic—  
Expiation Fees—Substitution  
Fees—Inspections

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

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Physiotherapists—Qualifications  
Public and Environmental Health—Disposal or Re-use  
of Water  
South Australian Health Commission—Medicare  
Patient Fees

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

Water Resources Act—Regulations—  
Penrice Exemption  
Principal  
Roxby Downs Exemption

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

Animal and Plant Control Commission—Report, 1996  
Soil Conservation Boards of South Australia—Report,  
1995-96  
Veterinary Surgeons Act—Regulations—Fees.

### TEXTILE, CLOTHING AND FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The South Australian Govern-  
ment successfully argued the case for tariff pause for the  
automotive industry post year 2000. Another important  
manufacturing sector—textiles, clothing and footwear—is  
now faced with a similar Commonwealth review of its  
assistance arrangements to apply after the year 2000.

The Government's position on TCF tariffs post 2000 is the  
same as it was for the automotive tariffs post 2000. We will  
be putting the same case for a tariff pause and putting the  
arguments for a policy decision in the national interest just  
as strongly to the Industry Commission, members of the  
Commonwealth Government, national opinion leaders and  
the media. The TCF industries are estimated to employ  
around 7 000 people in South Australia including outworkers,  
and provide significant employment opportunities for women  
and migrants.

While not as large as the automotive industry, TCF makes  
a valuable contribution to the South Australian economy.  
Commonwealth policy post 2000 is intended to ensure that  
Australia retains a viable prosperous and competitive TCF  
sector. The State Government will be working towards this  
objective. The Government has made its position clear in its  
first submission in February this year to the Industry  
Commission. Key recommendations were: a tariff pause post  
year 2000; continuation of the TCF import credit scheme  
which promotes exports or its replacement with a World  
Trade Organisation (WTO) legal scheme; provision of labour  
adjustment assistance for TCF workers; and action to increase  
access to export markets for TCF products.

The TCF inquiry reached an important stage yesterday  
with the release of the Industry Commission draft report on  
post 2000 assistance arrangements for TCF industries. In its  
draft report, the Industry Commission has applied its same  
tired, old formula to tariff reform which had some relevance  
in the high protection days of the 1970s and 1980s but is no

longer relevant to the low protection environment to be faced  
by Australian industry after year 2000.

The Commission has recommended in its draft that TCF  
tariffs be reduced to 5 per cent by 2008 and the import credit  
scheme be terminated in the year 2000. By 2000 Australia's  
TCF tariffs will have fallen to a range of between 15 per cent  
to 25 per cent—a massive reduction from the historically high  
levels of assistance received by those industries through  
quotas, bounties and tariffs, and quite modest levels of  
assistance in comparison with many of Australia's trading  
partners.

The State Government will be arguing that at these levels  
of assistance the traditional arguments for tariff cuts simply  
do not apply in the same way. Like the automotive industry,  
the industries will be subjected to more than sufficient  
competitive pressure at year 2000 tariff levels to improve  
their efficiency and performance and need to be provided  
with a national industry policy framework that enables them  
to continue to invest and improve their performance.

Also, like the automotive industry, the national economic  
gain from further tariff cuts post 2000 is likely to be so small  
that it is more than outweighed by the economic and social  
costs flowing from cuts to TCF production and employment.  
The Industry Commission has already foreshadowed this by  
suggesting that the Commonwealth Government will need to  
increase funding for adjustment assistance to help workers  
and regions affected by its recommendations.

The Government has a plan to ensure that the right  
decisions are made on TCF industry policy post 2000, and we  
will be putting the case that a tariff pause is in the national  
interest. The key elements of the case are:

- the debate is not about whether tariffs should be cut but  
at the pace and timing of those cuts;
  - Australian industry has been penalised in international  
markets as tariff reform has outpaced other micro-  
economic reforms needed to improve Australia's cost  
competitiveness;
  - a more balanced approach to economic reform must be  
followed and priority given to achieving reforms, such as  
taxation, that offer greater national economic gains than  
cuts to year 2000 tariff levels;
  - more pressure must be placed on Australia's trading  
partners to open their markets to Australian products; and
  - tariff policy should form an integral part of a long-term  
national reform and industry development policy which  
aims to ensure that Australia is an internationally competi-  
tive location for investment offering potential for sustain-  
able export-based job growth.
- As part of the South Australian plan, the Government will:
- assess the Industry Commission draft report and its use of  
economic modelling to ensure that the mistakes of the  
automotive inquiry are not repeated;
  - prepare a response to the Industry Commission recom-  
mendations which identifies any shortcomings in its  
analysis and its narrow focus on the tariff;
  - work closely with the TCF industries and workers to  
ensure that we understand the key issues and support their  
case;
  - talk to Commonwealth Ministers to put the case for a TCF  
tariff pause in the strongest possible terms.

The Government will continue to fight for South Aust-  
ralia's TCF industries and for an approach to national  
industry policy which delivers reform, together with econom-  
ic growth. The TCF inquiry provides an important opportuni-  
ty for the Government to again argue the case not only for a

tariff pause but also for getting the priorities right on the national microeconomic reform agenda and creating an industry policy framework that delivers investment, exports and job growth.

### TELECOMMUNICATIONS

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I would like to advise the House of the latest developments in relation to the regulation of telecommunications facilities. As members would be aware, the new Commonwealth Telecommunications Act 1997 comes into effect from today. Unfortunately, despite the importance of this new legislation and the very long lead-in period, the handling of this matter by the Federal Government has been extremely disappointing.

South Australia and the other States have repeatedly sought clarification from the Federal Government on exactly what powers would be transferred to the States in relation to the installation of telecommunications facilities, such as overhead cabling and mobile telecommunication towers, to enable us to have effective policies and regulations in place from 1 July. The crucial outstanding issues have been the Federal Government's determination of what constitutes 'low impact facilities' and, therefore, remains under Commonwealth control (that is, exempt from State and local control).

Earlier this year, the Commonwealth Minister instructed the national telecommunications authority, Austel, to recommend what should constitute low impact facilities. The recommendations of Austel, in its report of 13 May 1997, effectively excluded State and local authorities from a decision-making role. However, the Commonwealth did not accept these recommendations and issued a draft determination on low impact facilities which excluded both aerial cabling and mobile telecommunications towers, leaving these facilities, conditionally, under State control.

Yesterday, at the death knell, the Commonwealth finalised its position with a determination on low impact facilities. The effect of that determination is that the immunity from State and local laws provided to licensed telecommunications carriers under Commonwealth legislation has been substantially reduced. The determination means that new mobile telecommunications towers and overhead cables will now come under the control of State legislation, namely, the Development Act. However, under the determination, some elements of the cable and radio networks, such as antennae, equipment shelters and underground junction boxes, are deemed to be low impact facilities and, therefore, not subject to State legislation.

Now that we have the Federal Government determination, the State Government will prepare its own regulation to confirm that the installation of telecommunications infrastructure is building work under the Development Act. I must point out that specific transitional provisions of the new Federal Act allow the current active carriers—namely, Optus, Telstra and Vodafone—to continue the installation of those facilities already notified to councils under the 1996 Act. Cable works notified and commenced will be able to proceed until 30 September 1997 and, in the case of towers, will be able to continue until 31 December 1997. We understand that these provisions will cover much of the intended overhead cable networks.

Another factor complicating matters is the nature of any agreements between councils and Optus on the cable roll-out. Over the next few weeks, the State Government will hold discussions with the carriers and local government to help establish appropriate policies for handling new applications for telecommunications work. Key issues to be addressed in this process include, in relation to towers, the need, if any, for new towers (including the possibility of shared arrangements); locational sensitivities; and the height of towers. And, with respect to cables, sensitive areas including heritage areas and areas of environmental significance; new carriers; any negotiated agreements (duration and nature of those agreements); undergrounding; and land zoning.

The poor preparation and lack of direction from the Federal Government on this whole issue has left the States in a less than satisfactory position. There are still a number of grey areas, including the effect of national interest provisions on State legislation, which may impact on the future installation of telecommunications facilities. The State Government will work within the parameters finally laid down by the Federal Government to ensure the best outcome for the State.

### TAFE SCHOLARSHIP

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** In recent hours, we have witnessed one of the most important and historic events of modern times as power in Hong Kong was transferred from Great Britain to China. My department, and TAFE SA in particular, will mark this historic occasion with a \$10 000 12-month scholarship in information technology for a young Hong Kong student. The scholarship will be officially announced at the Hong Kong Business Association's 'Hong Kong—the New Era' dinner to be held tonight at the Hyatt Hotel. This function is expected to attract up to 400 people, including members from the Chinese communities, multinationals, professional firms, and individuals who are export-oriented and have an international presence.

In recognition of our relationship with Hong Kong and in looking to an even stronger future, we wanted to commemorate this start of a new era by offering a scholarship. The information technology scholarship will be donated by the Douglas Mawson Institute of TAFE—the centre of excellence for business studies, information technology and media design. The winner of the scholarship, which will be announced in September, will also receive a 10-week English language course at the Adelaide Institute of TAFE, which is renowned for its innovative technologies in learning. The combined scholarship exceeds \$10 000.

The offering of this scholarship acknowledges the cultural and economic contribution that students from Hong Kong make to TAFE and the community at large. Students from Hong Kong make up 25 per cent of TAFE SA's international student population, and TAFE SA is keen to maintain and strengthen this connection. I believe that this scholarship will do just that.

### CLERK ASSISTANT

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling for questions, I advise the House that Mr Peter Bennison, Clerk Assistant of the House

of Assembly in Tasmania, is on attachment to the House of Assembly for four weeks.

## QUESTION TIME

### TEXTILE, CLOTHING AND FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier following his ministerial statement. Given the critical importance of securing 5 500 jobs in South Australia's textile, clothing and footwear industry, will the Premier, despite his previous statements on TCF, agree to lead a delegation to the Prime Minister, Mr Howard, consisting of the Government, the Opposition, TCF employees and unions—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —to press the case for a freeze on TCF tariff reductions after the year 2000 and to call upon the Howard Government to review the composition and future of the Productivity Commission, given its commitment to shed jobs in Australia, and will he also set aside time this week for a bipartisan resolution of this House in support of a tariff freeze on TCF post 2000 to be conveyed to the Federal Government?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As usual, the Leader of the Opposition is a little late. Arrangements have already been made to meet the Prime Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** During the course of the next few weeks, I will have discussions with the Prime Minister on this issue. Last Friday at the Trade Ministers' meeting in Darwin I took the opportunity to discuss with the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for Trade the proposed TCF report. At that time, I was not aware of the recommendations contained in the report. Those discussions with Mr Fischer canvassed the impact on regional economies, including employment levels in a range of different companies in different locations throughout Australia. This was a very important policy decision. I reinforced to the Deputy Prime Minister the fact that, as has happened with the automotive industry, much has changed during the past decade relating to tariff and bounty protection.

The other point to bear in mind during the current debate on TCF industries is that I have been advised that America and the European Union are looking at increasing bounties as they relate to TCF products between their respective countries. That being the case, it adds further argument to the position that Australia, in the national interest, should tread cautiously in putting in place new industry policy as it relates to TCF. This Government has, over the past few years, shown regard for the TCF industry in South Australia in assisting and facilitating not only Clarks but also Actil in its location—securing the relocation out of Sydney, New South Wales—wholesale and warehousing, as it relates to Actil here into South Australia—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The track record of this Government over the past 3½ years has been supportive of

the TCF industries in that it has assisted with the consolidation of Clarks and, in addition, assisted in the consolidation in the shift from New South Wales to South Australia of functions as they relate to Actil. It is clear on our track record and performance and not on rhetoric—all that we get from the Leader of the Opposition—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —that we have actually put in place measures—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —to assist the TCF industry. I raised with the Prime Minister several weeks ago the importance of the industry to Australia and outlined what a national policy setting ought to be. This Government took a lead in Australia on the automotive industry as it relates to tariff and it won. We will also, with the same vigour, pursue the interests of others employed in the TCF industries in South Australia. We will be joined in that by the Premier of Victoria, who also shares South Australia's view in relation to the draft report of the Industry Commission.

We now have several months in which to take the battle, the argument and the merits of the case to Canberra, and indeed we will. Based on our track record and performance of the past, I am sure that the merits of the case will get a policy determination that is not an acceptance, as printed, of the draft commission report. As it relates to the throwaway line of the Leader of the Opposition as to the relevance of the Productivity Commission in future, I indicated yesterday that I will be taking up with the Federal Treasurer the fact that the Productivity Commission did not have the courtesy to give a copy of its draft report to State Governments, which have a direct and fundamental responsibility to the interests of the work force of their respective States, but released the draft report to selected media in Australia. That is not the way that a group such as the Productivity Commission should operate and it is a matter, as I indicated yesterday, that I will be taking up with the Federal Treasurer.

There is a fundamental point in all of this, as there was with the automotive industry: job security, job certainty for South Australians and rejuvenating the economy of South Australia are the fundamental requirements. That is the basis upon which we will be taking up the debate with Canberra and, as we did with the automotive tariff report, we will demonstrate that the economic modelling by the Productivity Commission on TCF—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —is, as it was with the automotive industry, fundamentally flawed. It is like some economic journalists in the eastern States newspapers, who are still living in the 1970s and not in 1997. This is an important issue for South Australia: this Government, as it has in the past, matching its past action with future action, will seek to secure the jobs of those people employed in South Australia.

### ADELAIDE TO DARWIN RAIL LINK

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** Will the Premier advise the House of any developments in the construction of the Adelaide to Darwin rail link following his visit to the Northern Territory?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thank the member for Norwood for his question. As he indicated, during the Trade Ministers' meeting and expo in Darwin over the past few days, I had the opportunity with Shane Stone to further progress our application to the Commonwealth Government for centenary Federation funding and for an allocation of funds to the Adelaide to Darwin rail link.

As all members of the House would know, this is a project of national significance, not just a project for South Australia or the Northern Territory, although we would be beneficiaries of that infrastructure. This is a project of national significance to complete the rail network in Australia to a port closest to the mass consumer market of the world, the port of Darwin. The Northern Territory Government is in the process of spending some \$80 million in the development of the first stage of the port of Darwin. It anticipates spending about \$250 million to position that container port to give access out of that port to what I now understand is the world's largest container hub, the port of Singapore.

The rail link, as proposed and surveyed, will go right to the wharf side, where it will be possible to unload containers off the train straight onto container vessels. The Northern Territory and South Australia maintain their commitment of \$100 million each in terms of capital input into the project. In addition, we prepared a business plan, under which the previous infrastructure bond status, which has now been cancelled by the Commonwealth Government, had an internal rate of return of 20.6 per cent. With the new infrastructure bond replacement scheme and the Centenary Federation Fund, and an appropriate allocation from the Commonwealth Government, that project can and will proceed to the benefit of South Australia and the Northern Territory. Given the national significance of the project, we were able to secure the Premier of Tasmania's support for the project. The Industry Minister from Victoria also has publicly supported the project and given the commitment of the Victorian Premier to this piece of national transport infrastructure.

At that trade Ministers meeting, the key component of the debate was the need to develop export culture in Australia going into the consumer markets. To achieve that successfully, the transport infrastructure must be in place to get goods and services to market. This remaining piece of infrastructure is important to Australia in the national interest. The Northern Territory Government is clearly serious with the expenditure on the port of Darwin, working 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to have it completed in December this year, operational from 1 January 1998. With the support of the other States, this will give us an opportunity and add further strength to our arm to argue the case for Commonwealth support at a meeting we will have with the Prime Minister later this month. I assure the House that, in South Australia's and Australia's interests, we will be relentless in seeking that support from the Commonwealth Government for this important infrastructure.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** How many jobs does the Premier estimate will need to be created on average each year in order to meet his pledge of a South Australian unemployment rate no greater than Australia's by the turn of the century, and is the Premier confident of meeting this target? A press report of 17 May stated the Premier's jobs target was to reduce our unemployment rate to the national average over the next two years. Today on

radio, the Premier pushed out by another year the deadline for achieving this target.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** This Government has—  
*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We know that the member for Hart wants to move up to the top position, but he will have to wait a few more months until after the election for that to happen.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member for Hart should be a little more patient, and he will get the job he wants. In relation to employment, unemployment and South Australia's position in relation to the rest of Australia, I did say that, as a goal and an objective, I wanted to get South Australia positioned equal to the national average. That surely is a reasonable goal and objective we ought to be pursuing, and it is why we have put in place a number of measures over the past 3½ years to lay the foundation for us to be able to achieve that. I will put it to the House in the following context: when you inherit a massive debt, as we did, when you get a flight of capital—and I well understand that there are not any—

**Mr CLARKE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 98. The Minister should answer the substantive question. The question is: what is his estimate of the number of jobs needed to meet his target?

**The SPEAKER:** That is an irrelevant point of order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I know that not many members opposite have actually had business dealings or have sat in a boardroom and made investment decisions, but the simple fact is that, with the collapse of the State Bank, we saw during the 1980s some 80 per cent of head offices shift out of South Australia. We saw investment shift out of South Australia—and why? It was because of the level of debt left to us by the former Labor Administration. Business did not want to invest in this State because it thought we would return to a high taxing State and therefore remove the competitive advantage of investment and operation in South Australia. The first thing we had to do was qualify that concern. We had to stabilise and reduce the debt so that we could go back to the boardrooms and convince them that investing in South Australia—in new plant, equipment, factories and creating jobs, which come from such investment—was an appropriate place for investment because of a conducive business climate.

You cannot create the conducive business climate unless you get the debt level and the finances of the State right to create confidence in the investing community to look at South Australia in the future. Some success has been achieved in that respect, although I will not say that we have achieved it all: of course, we have not, and there is still much further for us to go. There is a long way for us to go to rejuvenate and rebuild the economy of South Australia. I just remind the House of what we inherited 3½ years ago from the former discredited Labor Administration.

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

**The SPEAKER:** I can say to the Leader of the Opposition—

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I can tell the Leader of the Opposition which job he is not going to have. If we want to pick out one company and talk about this, it was the Leader of the Opposition who put out a press release and, with the Leader's usual capacity, there was not much accuracy in it,

because he referred to investment by companies external to South Australia coming into South Australia. He referred to Westpac and said it was important that where companies like Westpac did not meet their employment targets we ought to recoup the investment from them. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, they had a target of 800, and they now currently employ 1 200 people. Westpac has exceeded its target.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It has exceeded its target. Let me give the Leader of the Opposition another example. As to Bankers Trust, there was criticism from members opposite in relation to this—

**Mr CLARKE:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If Standing Orders are to mean anything, the Premier has to answer the substantive part of the question—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CLARKE:**—and the question is about—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CLARKE:**—job targets for the next three years.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader. The Chair does not have a particularly strong voice today and I will resort to other action very quickly. I have pointed out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on a number of occasions that Ministers have a lot more latitude in answering questions than members have in asking them. I refer the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to some of the answers the member for Giles used to give, and that will answer the Deputy Leader's question. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In response to the Deputy Leader, who wants to know about the next three years' jobs growth, I refer to Bankers Trust. It came to South Australia originally with 50 jobs, looking at employing perhaps more than 400 over four years. Because of the available skilled work force and the speed with which the Government of South Australia assisted in connection with its purpose-built office accommodation in South Australia and the cost of operating here, that enterprise will expand the number of job opportunities in South Australia to 560.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I know the Opposition does not want to acknowledge the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In Australis about 220 people are currently employed and, as I have mentioned before, the member for Hart keeps wanting Australis to fall over. Having asked questions for 3½ years hoping that it will, the member for Hart can see that it is still there. It is still employing South Australians, and it will continue to do so with the further relocation of people out of Western Australia to that building at Technology Park.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** They are decrying any sort of job opportunities. You cannot have it both ways with this Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In the defence and electronics sector in South Australia, for example, we have seen a 20 per cent growth each year for the past three years. There is now a dearth of software engineers meeting the available job opportunities in the defence and electronics industries in South Australia. We are also seeing major significant new capital investment in the wine, aquaculture and other

manufacturing industries. Indeed, I understand that Mitsubishi will be making a major announcement at 4 o'clock today and, as a result of that announcement, I am sure that we will have the Opposition getting up saying, 'Isn't that a great policy outcome for South Australia!' And it is the same with General Motor's and its investment, now that we have the automotive tariff decision out of the way, with 1 100 jobs being created at Elizabeth/Salisbury.

We are seeing a range of other automotive component supply firms looking at investing in South Australia. In relation to job generation and creation, our \$1 billion-plus worth of capital spending this year is up \$257 million over that in previous years, designed to give a stimulus to the economy in terms of job generation and creation. On all counts we have a long way to go, but you have to concede and acknowledge that, from where we have come and in terms of what we have inherited, there is a solid foundation on which this State can build in the future. Whether it is defence, electronics, wine, aquaculture or manufacturing industry, there are some positive signs on the horizon, albeit positive signs that the Opposition does not want to acknowledge.

Further consistent hard work will be done in individual sectors, and the mining sector is but another, where we have the \$1.5 billion investment by Western Mining in the Gawler Craton—and I ask the Opposition to go up there and meet some of these people there currently—employing 860 construction workers and expanding to 1 300. I refer members to the prefabrication taking place at Elizabeth and Port Augusta as a result of that contract in South Australia. Investment is starting to wind its way through the community. But what we had to do as a first step was stabilise the finances of South Australia. Only after doing that can we argue for the investment—and the investment equals the creation of jobs.

### BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Can the Deputy Premier inform the House of the progress in efforts to reduce the impact of odour on the Adelaide metropolitan area from Bolivar? What are the costs, and who bears the responsibility for these costs?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It has been fascinating in the past week to hear the vibes coming from the Opposition. We did a little research and found that back in 1978 the headline was 'Bolivar residents are turning up their noses at the smell from the sewage treatment plant.' That was 1978.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** In 1983 we had the same problem. Interestingly, we have had Premiers Dunstan, Bannon, Corcoran and Arnold all saying that we have a stink at Bolivar. We also had Rann, the Leader of the Opposition, saying back in 1990 that he and Arnold were very happy because they had received a 'thank you' letter saying that Mr Arnold and Mr Rann had done something to fix the smell at Bolivar. We will tell you now how we are going to do this properly. There have been about four major reports between 1977 and 1991 saying how it can be done.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I am fascinated by the shadow Minister for Infrastructure's comments about how things ought to be done. In 1989, the previous Minister, Susan Lenahan, said, 'This smell is a very difficult smell and

probably will take years to go away.' It is fascinating, is it not? At the very time she said that she received a report that recommended that in excess of \$25 million be spent at Bolivar to fix up the problem. What did the Labor Government do? What did Susan Lenehan do? She implemented a chlorination plant in 1991 which was dismantled in 1993 because it did not work. From 1977 until now, under 20 years of Labor, despite all the comments from Arnold and Rann and everyone living in the Salisbury and Elizabeth area, not a single thing was done about the problem at Bolivar. So, Labor can say nothing about how it will fix it. But we are going to fix the problem.

Before we do that, we must determine what has caused the current smell at Bolivar. The problem at Bolivar, as everyone knows, is that the lagoons went foul and went off. It is a rotten egg smell that, clearly, everyone in Adelaide has smelt. Interestingly, it was exactly the same issue right through 1983.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As a matter of fact, in 1983 it was reported at Hallett Cove. We had the same Labor stink right through to Hallett Cove in 1983. What has been done at Bolivar is a chemical fix; it is no more and no less than that to get it to this stage. Some 100 tonnes of calcium nitrate has been put into lagoons one and two and 100 tonnes of soda ash has been put into lagoons one and four, and we have introduced a whole lot of polyelectrolytes to reduce the turbidity in the pools. To date that has cost \$350 000.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Do you want me to tell you how to use it? You have not bothered to go out there. That is how much you care about the smell—you have not bothered to go out there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** All the costs will be looked at once the Hartley report is brought down. We expect that report to be finalised within the next week and to clearly set out major costs to be apportioned and between whom. There is absolutely no doubt that there is a provision under the contract for any blame and cost to be apportioned, and that will be done when the report comes down next week.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he might be leaving the Chamber.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Given reports that SA Water, United Water and the EPA will all be given the opportunity to amend Professor Hartley's report on the process failure at Bolivar, will the Premier give an undertaking to this Parliament to release without amendment the full report being given to the EPA by Professor Hartley today? On 19 June this year, the Minister for Infrastructure told the Estimates Committee that he expected to receive 'a formal report from Professor Hartley on 30 June'. A media report today states that the EPA will now receive a draft report from Professor Hartley and that the Chairman of the EPA will allow both SA Water and United Water to comment before a final draft report is prepared. The Chairman of the EPA is reported as saying that this final draft report will then be further reviewed by the EPA prior to release.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As I reported to the House during Estimates, I expected to receive the report of Ken Hartley from the EPA. The Minister for Infrastructure did not employ Mr Hartley—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I did not say that I employed him; I said that I was going to get the report. After receiving the report, the EPA, as it does with any report, will give the people who have been commented on the right to respond. It does not give them the opportunity to amend the report but only the ability to comment. It is standard practice in the formation of any report that that occur. That report will then be given to both the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and me when it is completed as a full report. Any documentation that is given to me will be made public. There is absolutely no question of a cover—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is standard EPA procedure, and it is managing it. The fundamental reason why the Government asked the EPA to carry out this report was exactly for the reason that the Opposition is now trying to play up. There will be no cover up. It will be done independently of Government and the report will be made public.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I have not got the report so how can I release it today?

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is under the control of the EPA, which is an independent body.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** As I said, every single document the EPA receives in relation to this issue will be released by me as Minister.

## EMPLOYMENT

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House of some of the special initiatives that she has undertaken to promote the Government's employment programs in this State at this time?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Certainly, I am pleased to advise that, as part of the Government's commitment to providing employment opportunities for young South Australians, I have initiated a series of employment partnership forums entitled 'Working Together to make a Difference' to be held around South Australia.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr Brindal:** Shut up!

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

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I thank the member for Chaffey for his support in setting up the Berri forum which over 120 people attended to support job creation by this Government. I have been concerned about the lack of awareness throughout industry and the community of the full range of the Government's employment and training programs. It is for this reason that I consider it necessary to give a first-hand account of our programs in both regional and metropolitan areas of the State, so that employers may take advantage of them and employ more young people. These forums will also provide an opportunity for employers to meet with me and commit support in a partnership for the benefit of all South Australians and for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, who last week claimed credit for the initiation of these forums and also suggested that they were job summits. I

suggest that the Leader is wrong. The time for talking about jobs is over. We are now creating jobs, not talking about it. Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition will have to look elsewhere to claim credit.

The forums emphasise that the Government's employment programs are aimed at making it easier and cheaper to recruit young people and remove the burdensome paperwork and red tape while providing a convenient and flexible work force. Again, I notice that the Leader of the Opposition has declared that the new policy of the Labor Party will be to remove this type of burden from small business. So, being an also-ran must be a burden for the Leader of the Opposition. But he may not have noticed that this is, indeed, the policy of this Government and action by this Government has already happened in removing the red tape.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader for the second time. The Deputy Leader has had more than a fair go. He seems to take it upon himself to give some sort of running commentary on what is taking place. If he keeps it up, he knows what the result will be.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** This Government has already taken the action which the Leader of the Opposition, apparently, has not noticed. Two forums have been held to date, one at Mount Gambier and one at Berri, with over 200 people attending at each. The high attendance demonstrates the commitment that the regional community and employers in particular have for job creation in South Australia. As members would be aware, the State Government's \$30 million youth employment strategy has a strong regional focus and has created more than 1 000 jobs since being implemented in February this year.

Last week the Leader of the Opposition once again suggested that the new Labor policy would ensure job outcomes if he had \$30 million to spend. Well, he has done it again. Liberal policy has been plagiarised by the visionless Opposition. All our programs have job outcomes. All Government programs have a guarantee that job outcomes are part of that program. So this is nothing new for this Government, but it is obviously something new for the Leader of the Opposition.

We are not into training for training's sake in these programs, as was undertaken by the Leader of the Opposition. I would only suggest that the leader should stand up and announce his support for Liberal policy and initiative, and then he would not have to surreptitiously claim credit for another's achievements.

#### WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACT

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** As I said, my question is directed to the bumbling Minister—no, sorry, the Minister for Infrastructure—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member will resume his seat.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I do not need any assistance from members on my right. The member for Hart knows full well that that comment was out of order. He is entitled to ask his question but, if he makes another comment of that nature, leave will be withdrawn.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise, Sir. Given that the findings in the report by Professor Hartley will determine whether the Minister can honour the Government's pledge to take action against United Water if there has been any failure to perform under the water contract, why has United Water been given the opportunity to review a draft of the report before it is presented to the Government, and will this decision of Government prejudice the Government's ability to penalise or sue United Water if it has failed under the contract?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** For a person who has supposedly read the contract, I thought he would have understood it. There are certain clauses within the contract that will enable action to take place. As the member for Hart knows full well, the EPA is managing this project. The EPA decides, independently of Government, whether it will ask SA Water or United Water to comment. I would have thought that, as the independent watchdog, it is in a much better position to control it. I would have thought that the member for Hart would like it to be an independent body, instead of accusing me, as the Minister, of interfering.

#### CLEARVIEW SHOOTING

**Mr BASS (Florey):** My question is directed to the Minister for Police.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart and the member for Gordon.

**Mr BASS:** Will the Minister inform the House of the response times for the South Australian Police Department's attendance at the scene of a fatal shooting in Clearview on 15 June 1997?

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

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Unfortunately we have not yet, but we might get one—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** This is the second instance in which the Deputy Leader, as the shadow Minister for Police, has got it so totally wrong that we need to put it on the public record for everybody to see what happened. As to the letter from the constituent in which it was claimed that the police did not arrive at the scene of a fatal shooting at Clearview on 15 June until 25 minutes after being called, I have been informed by the Deputy Police Commissioner that this claim is simply wrong.

**Mr Clarke:** A human mistake.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Well, when will the Deputy Leader apologise to the police? I have full confidence in the South Australian Police and in the Deputy Commissioner's judgment in this matter. I set the record straight at the Estimates Committee as soon as I was able to do so in the hope that we might have changed fairly quickly the damage to some reputations.

For the record, the police were called to the scene of the shooting at 1.14 a.m. The first patrol arrived at 1.19 a.m. The patrols took five minutes to arrive, not 25 minutes. Five telephone calls were received at the police communications centre concerning the incident and were all logged and acted upon. I do not intend to go further into the detail in relation to this matter except to place on the public record the Government's appreciation of the work of the team of four from Holden Hill and acknowledge the work of the team leader, Sergeant Andy Barkwell.



It is a pity that this sort of thing is raised and abused. It is the second time the shadow Minister for Police has done this. The Deputy Leader took time out to ring a lawyer to find out what the legal ramifications were for him reading it out, but he admitted that he did not bother to ring either the Police Commissioner or me to find out whether there was any major—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** It is an absolute disgrace when personal tragedy like this is used as a political stunt by the Deputy Leader, because he did not bother to check it out. If he had done his homework, instead of going outside of this place and grandstanding in front of the media half an hour later, if he had bothered to come and check once we had checked it out with the Deputy Commissioner, this would not have happened. It is a disgrace, and I hope that the Deputy Leader will have enough gumption to personally apologise to all of the police involved and to publicly apologise to the South Australian Police Force.

### TELEPHONE TOWER, COBBLERS CREEK

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Has the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources signed a lease giving Vodafone access to a section of Cobblers Creek recreation reserve cleared by heavy machinery last weekend? If not, given that no substantial construction has commenced, will he now refuse permission for this tower to be erected? While no construction has commenced on a tower at the Cobblers Creek recreation reserve, the Minister told a public meeting on 24 June this year that the Vodafone tower had advanced to such a stage that it had to proceed under Federal legislation which expired yesterday. The office of the Federal Minister for Communications has provided advice that any project proceeding under the now expired Federal legislation would need to have included substantial physical construction to avoid State regulations after 1 July.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Yes, I signed the lease last Friday to enable the construction of the tower to proceed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for the Environment has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister for Housing and Urban Development has already explained the situation in a ministerial statement today which indicates that what the honourable member said in the latter part of her question is correct. The fact is that my office was contacted on a number of occasions last week by a senior representative of Vodafone who indicated that, if the agreement was not forthcoming for the Cobblers Creek location with enough time for physical work to commence prior to 30 June, a tower would be constructed at the Golden Grove Arts and Recreation Centre prior to 1 July.

*The Hon. E.S. Ashenden interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I agree with my colleague. It was quite obvious that the Labor candidate for Wright—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** —was not anxious to see the tower in the park, and I might say I was not pleased to see the tower in the park either, but the fact is that we had no alternative. If both the Labor and Democrat candidates wanted us to look at the alternative, which in fact was to have the tower built at the arts and recreation centre, located in the

heart of Golden Grove adjacent to 3 schools with 3 000 students, I certainly was not going to enable that to happen because it was the only alternative to the tower's being built in the park. I am generally opposed, in principle, to the erection of towers in the park, with the preservation of environmental values and scenic amenities a prime consideration that we all need to take into account. But I could not disallow it, knowing that Vodafone would then revert to a site that the community had rejected totally.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I believe that the honourable member needs to reconsider the position of the Opposition in this area. I can only presume that, if they continue to make the point that they did not want the tower in the park, they would have gone to the other alternative. The ramifications of that, regarding other issues relating to 3 000 students at three schools in the location of where the tower might have been, would have been very difficult for anyone to accept. So, I believe that I am quite justified in the decision that I made.

### STATE DEBT

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Will the Treasurer advise the House of the details of the Government's progress towards reducing the State debt, given that the 1996-97 financial year has just ended? The new financial year of 1997-98 will mark the completion of the Government's plans to eliminate the practice of running up debt to pay for the day-to-day work of Government.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I believe that it is important to understand not only the progress that we have made but why that progress had to be made. A lot has been said by the Opposition. People like Don Dunstan have said, 'Debt is beautiful.' I have heard Don Dunstan say that it does not matter how much you borrow, it is all for a good cause—although he never answered the question whether a State Bank debt and an SGIC debt was very good business. But I note that he is very critical about Governments doing something substantial to save this State from financial ruin.

I point out, just in case the debate rages again and the Opposition is involved in that debate that, at 30 June 1990, the State debt was \$4 682 million. That was just prior to the first bail-out of the State Bank. Four years later, at 30 June 1994, the figure was \$8 440 million—a difference of \$3 758 million. So, people can judge the contribution of the Labor Government to this State over that four year period, namely, an increase in debt of \$3 758 million. If one looks at the burdens that accrue under such a horrific debt explosion, in 1990 we were paying 14.3 per cent of our total revenue from all sources in the payment of interest. It went up to 17.4 per cent in 1992, and currently it is 12.9 per cent. So, you can see that the interest burden as a percentage of the budget has reduced, as a result of our action.

Again referring back to 1990, State debt at \$4 682 million represented 16.74 per cent as a ratio to gross State product. That was before the debacle. By 30 June 1992, the then \$8 055 million represented 28.09 per cent of GSP. So, there is almost a doubling of the relative impact of the State debt as a result of the fiasco of the State Bank and SGIC. Today, at 1 July 1997, it represents 20.31 per cent of GSP.

It is interesting to note that claims are made of past practice. Back in the days when the Hon. David Tonkin was Premier the interest burden, for example, on the budget was

9.4 per cent—in 1980. So, I suggest that some of these Labor—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson has been spoken to for the second time.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:**—researchers look at the figures and see what the relative burden was going back in time, because there is a lot of rhetoric and not a great deal of substance.

The picture is not very pretty, in terms of the massive—nearly \$4 billion—fall-out in debt as a result of Labor mismanagement over that period. Whilst those numbers will remain large, we are working on the containment of that debt and the financial stability of this State. To that extent, we are very pleased with the progress. But never let anyone forget the damage that has been done by that lot over there.

### CIRCUS ACCIDENT

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs inform the House whether the report into the accident at Cleve, where a circus stand collapsed, injuring over 80 people, has been completed? If the report has been completed, when was it completed, where is the report now and when will the findings be made public?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have not seen the report. I will obtain a report for the honourable member in terms of how close to completion it is and when it is likely to be made public.

### FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES BUDGET

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Minister for Family and Community Services explain the commitment in dollar terms to Family and Community Services over the past four Liberal budgets?

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** A number of issues need to be clarified following a statement made by the member for Elizabeth last week during the parliamentary Estimates Committees when the claim was made that appropriation to FACS from the Consolidated Account over four Liberal budgets had suffered a total cumulative cut of \$27.9 million in real terms. I believe it is necessary to clarify that situation. I assure the member for Reynell and other members in this House that this Government's commitment to the 404 700 families in South Australia and to those in need in our community has never been stronger. If the claim of the member for Elizabeth is any example of the simple arithmetic skills of her Party, it is little wonder that the people of this State were plunged \$4 billion in debt by the collapse of the State Bank when it had control of the purse strings.

The budget papers clearly show that \$250.15 million has been appropriated for recurrent expenditure in the FACS arena in 1997-98. That means that it will lift expenditure in the past four budget years to \$949.46 million. In the last four Labor budgets from 1991 to 1993-94, recurrent expenditure in FACS totalled \$811.67 million. So, in real terms, this represents growth of 8 per cent, not a cut, as the member for Elizabeth claimed. Comparing the quarter of a billion allocated in this year's budget with the actual expenditure of around \$220 million in the last year of the Labor Government also shows real growth of 6 per cent, not a cut, as the member for Elizabeth has claimed. The fact is that, since bringing down our first budget, this Government's commitment to the family and those in need has grown, and that growth has each year exceeded inflation. Nearly \$1 billion in four budgets is

a fact, not simple whiteboard doodling, in which the members opposite seem to indulge.

In a scurrilous claim regarding young people in residential care last week following the Estimates Committees, the member for Elizabeth said:

The Minister has announced an extra \$400 000 to deal with these children's problems—

but not much recognition of what that would mean for those children—

yet, in the past four Liberal budgets funding for Family and Community Services has received a cumulative cut of \$27.9 million in real terms.

I point out to the member for Elizabeth that the facts are: first, this Government is committed to finding solutions to the social problems faced by people in our community, and that is a hell of a lot more than the previous Government did; and, secondly, this Government has committed almost \$1 billion to Family and Community Services over the past four budgets, representing real growth of 8 per cent over the amount which the Labor Government committed in its final four budgets.

In conclusion, I suggest that the people of South Australia are not fools. They are tired of the constant whingeing, carping and headline seeking actions of the Opposition. It is important that the facts be understood and that the recognition that is being given to families and those in need be understood clearly by the people of this State.

### ABORIGINAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Will the Minister for Correctional Services list the specific partnership agreements which have been entered into by Aboriginal communities in the Pitjantjatjara lands? In referring to changes in Correctional Services staff at Marla, the Minister stated that the local Aboriginal community is now involved in the management of local offenders by means of specific partnership agreements.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** This is a very important question, because it reaches across an area of great concern of the Liberal Government and the department for which I have responsibility. This area has been looked at for some time to see what improvements can be made on the situation left by the Labor Administration. It left a great many areas floundering without any sense of direction, particularly regarding the issue of Aboriginal support in the Marla communities.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I think it is also important to talk about—

**An honourable member:** The context.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:**—not only the context but the background as to what the department intends to do in terms of change that will be most welcomed right across the board. Services that were provided in the past in each of the remote area locations were based on a traditional one-to-one social case work model of intervention using a complement of probation and parole officers, social workers, community service officers, and casual work supervisors. Minimal opportunities were provided under that model to involve Aboriginal communities in which many of the offenders resided.

The effectiveness of that approach in terms of service outcomes or the successful completion of orders or diversions from custody has over the past year or two been increasingly questioned by various jurisdictions throughout Australia.

Western Australia's experience of negotiating with selected Aboriginal communities to co-manage local offenders by way of community supervision agreements is consistent with the thrust of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, and that has certainly influenced developments in South Australia.

In July 1996, departmental representatives attended an inter-jurisdictional Community Corrections workshop in Alice Springs to share information on a range of offender management initiatives, including community supervision. The response in a verbal briefing to the department's executive following the Alice Springs' workshop was one of strong support paving the way for the development of a revised approach to the provision of community-based correctional programs in the State's remote areas. That approach, which was explained when the question was raised during Estimates Committees, is consistent with restorative justice principles and the recommendations of the royal commission.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Taylor has had more than a fair go.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** As far as the specific agreements are concerned, I am happy to provide the honourable member with that information, and I will arrange to have a list of the agreements provided to her in due course.

#### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**Mr WADE (Elder):** Will the Minister for Information and Contract Services advise the House of the direction and future growth of the information technology industry in South Australia?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** When one thinks about information technology in South Australia 3½ years ago, one would have to conclude that it was not even a speck on the landscape of South Australia.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** We laid down a strategy 3½ years ago, our IT 2000 vision, which is now recognised internationally and, most importantly of all, it has become a reality in this State. Centrepieces were put in place to make sure that job opportunities grew substantially within information technology to the point where a recent survey has shown that 10 500 people are now employed in that industry in South Australia. This industry is two-thirds the size of the car industry already, and it is growing at the fastest rate of any State of Australia (20 per cent a year). Exports in this area have increased substantially over the past couple of years from \$22 million two years ago to \$51 million a year—a growth of more than 100 per cent in the past two years alone. Two years ago, the total worth of this industry was \$215 million. Today, it contributes \$326 million to the South Australian economy.

We know of some of the big companies that have been brought in. However, the important ones are the smaller companies. Of about 700 companies involved in this industry, the vast majority are South Australian-owned smaller companies. That shows that in a very short space of time we have taken this opportunity for South Australia and turned it into real jobs and real exports. We have in place a major health information technology strategy to which the Government has committed \$65 million. We now have telemedicine between South Australia and the Northern Territory. Coun-

tries such as Malaysia and Indonesia are interested in linking into telemedicine.

We have introduced DECSTech 2001 into schools as part of their curriculum and training, and we have started to place in schools computers, which until now schools had to purchase. In the space of just 3½ years with a clear vision of what we wanted to achieve, we have started to establish a substantial information technology industry in South Australia. The most important feature of all is that in the past two years we have created 2 400 new jobs in the information technology industry. According to Morgan & Banks and Drake (independently of the Government), this State has the best job prospects in IT and the fastest growth rate of any State of Australia. Information technology is now a substantial industry in South Australia, and it will grow even more substantially over the next few years.

#### BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Bearing in mind the questions that have been asked this afternoon relating to the independent auditor's report on Bolivar sewerage treatment works, and recognising the independence of the Environment Protection Authority, I would like to read a press release issued by the Chairman of the authority today, and I quote:

Mr Ken Hartley, the independent auditor engaged by the Environment Protection Authority, will present a report on the Bolivar sewerage treatment works to the authority this afternoon. The authority will give SA Water and United Water the opportunity to comment before it is made public.

EPA chairman, Mr Stephen Walsh QC, said natural justice required that both agencies have the opportunity to comment to the Environment Protection Authority. However, due process must be adhered to. Only two reasons would justify any amendment. They are: if there is a factual error in the report or if there is an unsubstantiated statement in the report. It would be for Mr Hartley to decide.

Mr Walsh said the process of comment will be by written request from either SA or United Water to the Chair of the EPA. He said comments will be received up until 3 p.m. on Thursday 3 July 1997. The Chair of the EPA will consider any comment and, if seen to be valid, then will advise the auditor to consider the comments and report accordingly. SA and United Water will be advised in writing of the outcome.

'Until the EPA has received and considered all of the information, it is inappropriate to comment further,' Mr Walsh said. The final report will be released by the end of next week.

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** In the years of the Tonkin Government it was decided as an innovation—an innovation which I believe serves this House well—to take the House into a series of Committees hearings after the budget, which we now know as the Estimates Committees. Since that Liberal Government's initiative, every year traditionally the House has had the budget presented and divided into two Estimates Committees—A and B. It is a great pity that, probably for the first year, members of this House and

members of the media are now openly questioning the value of the Estimates Committees, and the blame may well be laid at the quality of the Opposition and the Opposition's handling of the process of Estimates Committees.

Quite frankly, the Opposition is letting down this place. We on this side of the House can speak with some authority. We had many years in Opposition to practise and to know how valuable the Estimates Committees are and how they can be used to truly probe and search a Government for its weak points and to make a Government live up to the expectations of the people of South Australia. But in the Estimates Committees what did we have? We got people, in the context of the JPSC, asking whether lamb's fry could be added to the menu. What a good use of parliamentary time, to ask the question in this Parliament of an Estimates Committee whether lamb's fry could be added to the menu.

**Mr Brokenshire:** Who said it?

**Mr BRINDAL:** I will not bother to say because, if you look in *Hansard*, you cannot find who said it, because it has conveniently not been added to the *Hansard*. In the education estimates, on which I can be much more specific, the Opposition lead person in her opening statement could not even get the figures right. She had a budget line, the budget line was quoted, and she made a mistake of something like \$300 000 in a \$1.3 billion budget. As the Minister for Education commented, when you can lose billions of dollars in the State Bank I suppose it is not beyond question that you cannot read a financial statement, to even read the line correctly.

**Ms White:** Crap!

**Mr BRINDAL:** Well, the member for Taylor says, 'Crap', and that is not very parliamentary, but as the member for Taylor was the person in question I do not blame her for saying so. She was embarrassed for at least two hours because of it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Taylor is interjecting out of her seat.

**Mr QUIRKE:** On a point of order, Sir, I just wonder if the member who is now speaking got his trip to Nauru or whether he got duded on that as well.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Playford should concentrate on his lamb's fry. After the estimates in relation to education, five stories appeared in the *Advertiser*. Four were the result of Government questioning and only one was the result of Opposition questioning. This is in stark contrast to years when, by pertinent questioning, the Opposition could generally look forward day after day to lead stories in the newspapers and on the television. At best the Opposition presented a superficial analysis of the budget. It is disappointing that with three years of practice they still are not effective enough to be able to question the Government in a way that is pertinent and relevant and in a way the Government deserves and the people of South Australia deserve.

The Government in many ways can only be as good as its Opposition. This is an appalling Opposition and it makes it difficult for the Government to perform at its best when there is an Opposition that is so ineffective. The best they could do in health was ask the Minister for Health about his advisory staff. He brought in his advisory staff so that questions could be asked, and the best the Opposition could do was to ask how much the advisory staff were costing.

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

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I refer to the recycling of non-toxic and toxic waste. This is an important issue for Governments, corporate bodies and the public to consider intelligently. I draw the attention of honourable members to the magnificent job currently being done by the Overseas Pharmaceutical Aid For Life (OPAL) group and its Pharmaceutical Collection and Recycling Project Overview. Over the past two years OPAL has played an essential role in the collection of pharmaceutical waste in South Australia. To date, OPAL has collected and processed in excess of 44 tonnes of pharmaceuticals, valued at in excess of \$9 million wholesale. OPAL has collected the same amount in the first five months of this year, as compared for the whole of 1996. This will mean that OPAL will collect some 45 to 50 tonnes for 1997, doubling last year's figures. This does not take into account the 500 to 600 tonnes of pharmaceuticals that are unused or hoarded within the community. These figures show that the sheer volume and growth of pharmaceutical waste in South Australia is a major problem, with a potential to create major environmental damage to the watertable.

If OPAL was not in operation, approximately 85 per cent of all pharmaceutical waste would end up in landfill, causing a major toxic cocktail leaching into our watertable. Case studies on environmental damage in Australia to the watertable, caused by the leaching of highly toxic substances from landfill sites, from dumped pharmaceuticals, are not available or have not been recorded. OPAL, however, has been able to obtain two case studies from overseas, including one from the USA and a 1995 case study from Denmark, showing high toxicity levels in the watertable near dump sites.

In the case study from the USA the results were alarming. In shallow water and in a well which has run off into a major river, approximately 300 metres from a landfill site in Florida, contaminated groundwater collected indicated the presence of the addictive sedative pentobarbital amongst many other compounds. This sedative is still being found in these locations 21 years after it was first discovered. The persistence over 21 years of a supposedly unstable drug in groundwater raises the possibility that the other pharmacologically active compounds may be found in plumes coming from landfills that have accepted medical wastes.

OPAL not only plays an important role in waste collection, but also in the collection, donation and distribution of unused pharmaceuticals to developing nation States. From May 1992 until today, OPAL has collected and shipped, via World Vision Australia, in excess of \$2 million worth of life-saving medicines. Some of the recipient countries are Rwanda, Lebanon, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Liberia and the Ukraine. I understand that OPAL has no substantial funding from the State Government and needs seed capital to develop its business operations, and that OPAL has a business plan before both the State and Federal Governments. Apparently, responses back from the State Government appear to be that the funding issue is really a Federal matter.

This is a particularly short-sighted approach, as OPAL's project has the capacity to provide jobs and valuable export dollars, as well as providing a national recycling strategy regarding the collection, disposal, distribution and donation of used and unused pharmaceutical products. Importantly, seed funding could end up providing over 100 jobs. It has been identified that this is one area where this Government would not have to look overseas for a worthwhile business venture to assist, because the business in question is actually right here in Adelaide.

OPAL is a non-profit organisation which survives due to the support given by the many volunteers, and no salaries have been paid in over two years of its operations. If OPAL were to receive seed funding, it could expand and become quite self-sufficient and self-funding in two years. This is a valuable and golden opportunity, where South Australians have been enterprising and have rolled up their sleeves and committed themselves to a project that will benefit our South Australian community in every way. I support and commend this very worthwhile project, and I urge the State Government to consider providing seed funding for it. I thank Rachel Homburg from my electorate who brought the matter to my attention.

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

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** I would like to raise a topic which is very close to my heart, that is, the delivery of services to people with mental illnesses. Mental illness affects one in five South Australians. I know many people with a mental illness and understand how such an illness can completely dominate their life. However, fortunately for South Australians, I was not the only person to understand this immense problem. Our collective Government made the mental health sector a priority when it won office in 1993. We embarked upon a process of massive change within the sector, because that was exactly what was needed. For too long, mental health care had been institutionalised, rigid and cold. People were not given enough of a chance to live within the community like people without mental illness. However, through a process of realignment, our Government set about changing this.

Diverse change was made as part of a dynamic plan aimed at humanising the delivery of mental health services and to destroy the stigmas attached to mental illness. There are many tangible examples of the Government's resolve to provide community services. Mobile ACIS and MACS teams operate throughout Adelaide, delivering acute and supportive care to people who need help within their home. If further care is needed, these teams take the person to a designated mental health unit. These services in particular are far more discreet than those to which people had become accustomed in the bad old days, when ambulances and police cars would often arrive at a person's house to respond to an 'emergency' when, in fact, all that was needed to avert a scene was appropriate and compassionate mental health care. On top of this, a whole host of community supports are now available throughout the State to help those with mental illness.

Not that long ago, the Minister for Health and my parliamentary colleague the member for Kaurua (Mrs Lorraine Rosenberg) opened a new support centre at Christies Beach. The new Schizophrenia Fellowship Southern Activity Centre, otherwise known as Pannanga, is a consumer-driven drop-in centre, which has moved from a smaller venue to this larger site in Elgin Ave, thanks in the main to considerable Government financial assistance—\$90 000 to buy the building, \$30 000 to refurbish it and \$52 000 State/Commonwealth money to run it. The fellowship also gets an annual South Australian Health Commission allocation, and it is being charged nominal rent for the new centre. Pannanga is a fine example of the success of realignment. It delivers quality, caring and appropriate supports to people with mental illnesses in a comfortable community setting.

I understand the praise and support for this centre. The Government's plan for mental health services was clearly evident, and it is a credit to all those involved within the sector that realignment has taken place with such superb results. In addition to Pannanga, other impressive community services have been fostered by this Government; for example, Club House, which opened in May 1996 and which has since operated successfully in Adelaide's west. Last year, the Government entered into a \$1.8 million arrangement with the Port Adelaide Central Mission to provide accommodation for the mentally ill. The Government showed how much importance it placed on the delivery of appropriate mental health services by creating a Mental Health Nursing Research and Education Unit. In fact, 40 places for the Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing course have been offered from Glenside for 1997, while the University of South Australia, University of Adelaide and Flinders University will also each offer 10 new places for the Graduate Diploma in Community Mental Health Nursing.

Realignment has seen the breakdown of the old notion of institutionalised care as being the sole form of care for people with mental illnesses. It has seen a major cultural shift aimed at providing more options for these people to live within the broader community. I am proud to detail now a further development in this policy with the creation of three innovative support services for people with mental illnesses. These services will operate in Adelaide's southern and northern suburbs, as well as in the Murray Mallee region. The sum of \$300 000 has been committed to run three neighbourhood network services, which will provide community supports and advice for people with mental illness.

People will be offered more community support and, importantly, assistance to access mainstream services such as health, education and transport. One will be established in the south in my own electorate at Hackham West and will be run by Centacare Catholic Family Services. It will cover the local government area of Willunga, Happy Valley and Noarlunga. The northern service will be operated by the Port Adelaide Central Mission, delivering services to areas such as Tea Tree Gully, Salisbury, Gawler, Munno Para and Elizabeth. The third service will be run in the Murray Mallee region by the Edwards Crossing Community House. Our Government has led Australia in its delivery of mental health services, mainly thanks to the realignment process. People with mental illnesses deserve every opportunity to live in the community: that is what the realignment process is about.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I would like to take this opportunity to outline briefly some of the key points of my recent visit to South Africa. I should point out at the outset that I have already submitted the report. Having returned last Wednesday evening, I have already handed the report to the Speaker—and I hope it passes his test. Once again, I had the privilege of meeting with the Minister for Education in South Africa (Professor Bengu), who made time available to talk about a range of mutual interests involving, of course, education and training at all levels. As a nation, South Africa now has about 44 million people and needs to build a school a day just to keep up with the demand. That country has witnessed tremendous developments in recent times, with the breaking down of apartheid, and we are seeing Mr Mandela and other members of the ANC providing leadership to that country.

One of the outstanding things about Mr Mandela—and I would regard him as the greatest living statesman—is that,

on the eve of his eightieth birthday, he shows no sign of bitterness towards the people who incarcerated him for nearly 28 years. In fact, he invited his warder from the prison to attend his inauguration, and they are still good friends. That is one of the outstanding characteristics of that man—that, despite the treatment he received, he has shown forgiveness to those who have done some horrendous things to him.

I met with other significant people in South Africa, including Professor Mzamane, who is the Vice Chancellor of the Fort Hare University. For those who do not know, that was an all-black university until recently, and it is still predominantly attended by black students. It is where most of the ANC leadership people receive their tertiary education, and Professor Mzamane is an example of that. That university has close ties with the University of South Australia. It was interesting to drive to that university and to meet not only with the Vice Chancellor but with the Deputy Vice Chancellor also, and I was struck by their honesty in their assessment of developments in South Africa. It was pleasing to find that the car I hired in East London to drive out the 110 kilometres was an Australian made Ford Falcon, a car manufactured by a company that is increasingly making inroads into the car market in South Africa. I met with people at various other institutions, including Professor Brunyee, the Vice Chancellor of Border Technikon, which is out from East London. Their Technikon establishments are a cross between our TAFE and university systems. I was very impressed with the standard of facilities there.

Once again, this institution is predominantly attended by black students. I also had the opportunity to visit East London College, which is similar to many of our TAFE institutes and offers training in business/technology areas. The opportunity was afforded for me to meet with the Chief Executive of the National Youth Commission in South Africa. Coincidentally, they hosted the South African Youth Parliament while I was there and also arranged other specific meetings in Cape Town.

As to observations from my visit, the Afrikaners, particularly the hard core through their paper *The Citizen*, love Pauline Hanson. They see Pauline Hanson as a vindication of what they have seen over many years and accuse Australia of having a double standard toward them. I am not justifying their position, but they believe that Pauline Hanson is fantastic because, to them, it shows that Australians are really racist and have been racist all along. They run Pauline Hanson big in the Afrikaner papers. That is sad, because it gives a false slant to what the majority of Australians are committed to, which is a fair go in respect of race relations and other matters. The South Africans are watching us closely in relation to the Wik and Marbo issues because they face similar problems with a return of land to black people.

South Africa has a VAT system which works well. It refunds VAT payments at the time of departure to tourists who purchase goods; South Africa has a high unemployment rate in excess of 40 per cent; people can take their firearms on planes when they travel as long as they check them in at the airport; 50 per cent of white adult males carry pistols; South Africa has a high crime rate in cities like Johannesburg; South Africa had 23 000 murders last year; and 10 000 people were killed on the roads. They have a few challenges over there. They are some of the negatives, but there are many positives happening in new developments which I am pleased to report.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I do not know whether it is a function of age or whether or not I am in a cranky mood today, but I must say that the member for Unley did get under my skin earlier. I do not know why that is. I do not know why I let this happen, but I must say he came in here rather unctuous, telling us about how we were a lousy Opposition and how we did not know how to question his Government and lift up every piece of carpet and pull out the dirt from underneath it. He used as an example a small question I asked of the catering staff but, if he had checked with his Premier, he would have found out that the Premier and I had some discussions beforehand about the nervousness of those officers before the Estimates Committee. It was intended as a light-hearted remark about the menu, as the member said. I find it surprising that the member for Unley, who spent most of the last couple of days of last week trying to get himself a trip to Nauru—lobbying around the corridors for a trip to Nauru—wants to come in here and be the first to start chucking rocks.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Yes, Nauru. I must tell the member for Peake that I understand that a trip to Nauru is on, representing the Speaker and all that stuff. I understand that this member, who was concerned for about one or two minutes about the state of the menu here, spent his time going around lobbying for this trip. I do not want to tell him how to do things, but I will say this about the whole Estimates system: when you have a system where there is a fixed number of hours and where both sides of the House meet over those hours, obviously in an election year the Government will spend all its time on inanities. The one group of people who did not get any publicity out of the Estimates Committees were all the Government members, who asked one question after another and all of which were generally covered by the Minister's opening statement.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** The member for Unley wants to pick on me, but he has to take what is coming back to him—and there is more if he wants it. However, at the end of the day I am a bit thin-skinned about this and I want to say that, in view of all the hours that I sat here last week and the week before listening to all the Government inanity, I then got this unctuous approach from him for asking a question about the menu in the catering area. Did he say that I fixed up his good friend Dr Webber? No, he did not say a word about that. Did he say anything about some of the other things that came up? No, he did not say anything about that. He wanted to illustrate his point that we do not do our job.

I want to tell the House that the Government certainly did its job over the past two weeks. It had three members asking question after question, merely playing for time. If anyone wants to reform the system, all they need do is remove the time limit. If we take off the time limit and reconfigure the committees, we might eventually get somewhere. That is the suggestion I make. If members are interested in reforming the system, that is what we must do. We should remove the time limit and allow members to keep asking questions until everyone is satisfied. That is how it is done in other Parliaments, but not this lot who are quite happy to keep the carpet nailed to the floor so that the dirt remains under it. I was not going to offer my advice—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Talking about dirt under the carpet, the honourable member will get his shortly. I could make a few comments, but one thing I will say is that he will not be back

here in the next Parliament—unfortunately I will not be here to see it. That is unfortunate. I must say that my question on lamb's fry was enjoyed by at least 10 members two days later—at least 10 members—so at least something came out of the Estimates, even if it was nothing more than lamb's fry on the Thursday menu. I congratulate the catering staff for it, because I think they did a good job.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Today I wish to discuss a letter I received from a constituent who lives in Salisbury East—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** He is a voter in South Australia and hopefully a Liberal voter. This person has criticised judges and the sentences they hand out, and I refer to the following portion of his letter:

I rang your office today because I know you can be outspoken occasionally and maybe you may care to consider some ideas of mine seeing we now live in a state of recession as per *Advertiser* Friday 27 June.

He then goes on:

The Parliament could put a list of judges: 10 positions, 20 judges to be nominated. I know you would say this leads to corruption and bribery, but it would be easier to bribe some politicians than the population. No disrespect meant but fact. Attached to your list of judges could be the cases of the last four years that these judges have heard. The above idea would mean judges, no longer appointed for life, the people are judged by their peers and not a judge whom they know nothing about.

Secondly, we should have set sentences for crimes. I know that today the Attorney-General of the State and Federal Governments targeted house break-ins in South Australia. One fact remains, if they are in prison they cannot break into people's homes. No excuse for invading or damaging other people's property. Even the latest case where a man was shot, those people had no right to be there at that hour of the night and deserved all they got. I am not defending the person from growing or dealing in drugs but I will defend that person's right to feel safe in his home and surrounding property.

This person from Salisbury East is referring to the changes in the law which the Attorney-General has proposed in relation to someone who shoots people who trespass on their property at night. In the surveys that I have done in the electorate of Lee, I have found that there is a bit of disgust towards the judges' lenient sentences for crimes committed by people who repeatedly do the wrong thing. I feel that the constituent's idea is valid to some extent. I understand that judges are elected by counties in the United States, and I also understand, from investigations I have carried out since receiving this letter on 20 June, that some of those judges can be corrupted by firms and organisations which normally sponsor elections. Therefore, there is no way that one can make the legal system as perfect as one would like. I believe that we have made our legal system in South Australia and Australia the best possible with what we have.

I respond, of course, to the Labor members of Parliament who have criticised the Liberal Party in relation to unemployment. I understand that my predecessor, Kevin Hamilton, said in 1982 that unemployment was 11 per cent in this State. I also understand that even after 13 years in Government the Labor Party left this State with 11 per cent unemployment. My argument is that Labor Party members have no right to criticise the Liberal Party for not being able to turn around some of the damage inflicted by their Party.

## MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BRINDAL:** During the grievance debate today, the member for Playford referred to a trip to Nauru. I am given to understand that Mr Speaker Gunn may have appointed someone to go on a trip to Nauru. I absolutely and categorically assure the House that I did not do any lobbying and I do not consider that I would have been high on Mr Speaker Gunn's list had I chosen to approach him on this matter. The member for Playford is entirely wrong and malicious in his assertion.

I also wish to draw to the House's attention that the member for Playford referred to Dr Ian Webber as a 'good friend' of mine. Like most members of this House, I have met Dr Webber on a number of occasions. However, I have not met him often enough to describe him as a friend, let alone a good friend. As the House would know, I am one who has never been ashamed to admit who my friends are—if in fact he was.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 1387.)

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** This Bill brings in a number of amendments, but I will deal with only the principal ones. I would first like to touch on the 'limitations on general rates' provision. This deals with a problem that has become very evident. Some councils, particularly councils with high growth areas, are running into problems in determining their rates and fitting into the limitations on rates which were imposed for the financial years 1996-97 and 1997-98. The problem for councils in strongly growing areas is that as new areas of land are opened for development it becomes nearly impossible for them to keep under the rate cap that was set by—

*Mr Oswald interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Yes, I am about to come to that. The effect of the amendment is that, where development growth occurs (which potentially increases the costs incurred by councils in respect of services and so on), the revenue as a result of that growth will not be included in the maximum revenue permitted from general rates.

As an honourable member opposite reminded me, at the time that the Local Government Boundary Reform Bill passed we had long sessions in conference arguing over several points, one of which was that councils in the northern and southern suburbs that were rapidly growing would find great difficulty in keeping their rates under the rate cap. This issue was fought long and hard, and Labor members warned the Government that this would create great difficulties for councils and would make it nearly impossible for them. The Government, which wanted to maintain a hard line, included those councils which did not amalgamate (including Salisbury) and suggested that these councils should cut services in order to cut rates.

The Labor Party is always keen to cooperate and to ensure, where possible, that ordinary householders pay less for any form of rates and taxes, including council rates. We eventually reached agreement with the Government that the

Minister would have the power to exempt certain councils from the rate cap if those councils could prove to the Minister that there was good reason to do so. The Minister has chosen not to use that provision in the Local Government Act and instead has come back to the Parliament with this change in the same land phrase in the Act.

Another difficulty with this provision is that for some months councils have been considering their budgets and are already well down the track of determining their budgets—and many have passed their budgets. They have been forced to hope and assume that Parliament will pass this Bill in order that they do not have to go back and look at their entire budget process again. The Government has been remiss because, if it did not want to use the provisions of the current Act, it should have introduced this amendment much earlier in order to give those councils comfort in the knowledge that they were working under existing legislation.

It illustrates the dangers of the State Government interfering with local government in the setting of council rates. In the past, local government has argued very strongly that it is a valid third tier of government and that the State Government has no right to stick its finger into the process of local councils' setting their own rates. It is a view with which the Opposition agrees. However, it is a large subject and I simply say in conclusion that the Opposition supports this provision in order that councils can implement their budgets.

The other contentious issue is the extension of the Local Government Boundary Reform Board. When we considered the Local Government (Boundary Reform) Bill, the board was given only a short life—roughly a year—in which to bring about the amalgamations that the Government sought. Most of those amalgamations have been voluntary under the direction of the board. There have been several board initiated amalgamations and there are a number still outstanding. The extension of the Local Government Boundary Reform Board for another year is, I understand, to facilitate further voluntary amalgamations and those which have already begun—

*The Hon. E.S. Ashenden interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Boundary changes, yes. And the board will not initiate any further amalgamations. The question becomes, when the board ceases to be able to do that on 30 September this year: at what stage are the current proposals cut off? The board has left its run a little late with a number of proposals. The current Bill provides that the cut-off time for 30 September is that period where public notification occurs: that is, the board has publicly stated that it is looking at a board initiated amalgamation.

This will cause problems for a number of councils, in particular, Lucindale council, from which we have had representations. The Lucindale council is very concerned by what it understands as the current board initiated amalgamation which involves Robe, Lucindale and Lacedpede councils. It is concerned for a number of reasons, one of which is that the current council appears to be leaning more towards amalgamating with Naracoorte and it feels that this does not give it enough time to explore that option.

Its second concern, and one that also concerns me, is the question whether its council office will close and council workers will leave the area of Lucindale. Employment in the country is a matter that has concerned the Opposition greatly. A number of steps that both the State and Federal Liberal Governments have taken have severely reduced job opportunities in country areas. Many country towns have seen Government officers leave, along with their families. It has

caused additional hardship for those country areas that have already been hard hit. It may be that Lucindale is one of them.

During the budget Estimates Committee hearing, I asked the Minister what employment had been lost in local councils by amalgamations, both in the metropolitan area and the country, and the Minister's reply was that I should go off to the Local Government Boundary Reform Board, look through all the reports of amalgamations and work it out for myself. So, the Minister neither knows nor cares about reduction in jobs as a result of council amalgamations. I would have thought that, given the support for the current Liberal Government in the country areas, Cabinet Ministers might have been a little more concerned about the loss of employment in country areas.

It has been said over and over again that the loss of one, two, three or four jobs in a country town impacts not only on employment but also on retail businesses in that town, as well as schools and hospitals. The more population that these country towns lose, the more services they lose. It is a significant matter and one which I would urge the Government to devote a little more attention to if the State of South Australia is not simply to become Adelaide and a few of the major country towns such as Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Port Augusta.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Rural South Australia has very little for which to thank this Government. The Labor Opposition has always been very constructive in facilitating boundary reform and reform of local government along responsible lines. We do not want in any way to hold up the work of the boundary reform board, so we will support this provision in this House. But I would certainly hope that the Liberal members who are responsible for the south-eastern area, and the Government as a whole, will look back over this and talk to the District Council of Lucindale and the other councils involved and achieve a decent resolution to this problem that is facing Lucindale, Robe and Lacedpede.

I hope to see some manifestation of that before this Bill reaches the other place, when we will have another opportunity to consider it and perhaps move amendments if that is necessary. Partly because this legislation is long delayed and councils are waiting for it, at this stage we will support this Bill in this House and look with great interest to see what happens in the South-East.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Local Government):** I want to address some of the points raised by the honourable member. I am pleased to note that, in general, the Bill is to be supported by the Opposition. I certainly hope that, by the time the matter is considered in another place, the Opposition will have been convinced of the worth of all the amendments I have put forward. I would remind the honourable member that all my amendments do have the complete agreement of the Local Government Association. That is something which is important to be borne in mind.

I remind the Opposition of its statement that it believes that local government should be a more independent level of government. I do remind the honourable member that the Local Government Association, on behalf of local government—and I notice that the honourable member is not listening to this key point, or maybe she does not want to hear the point I am trying to make—is in full agreement with the amendments that are before the House. I therefore would urge the Opposition, if it does respect local government as a separate level of government, to respect the wishes of the



association and ensure that the Bill is passed as it is before the House.

The honourable member also spoke about rate capping and the impact on developing areas. As the honourable member knows, one of the key amendments in this Bill is to clarify the definition of the term 'same land'. I have spoken with my colleague who has assured me that, when this matter was going through the House, it was never intended that developing land would be caught in the net of rate capping. So, the Government is introducing legislation that makes it quite clear that, where land is being developed, so that it goes from broad acre property to subdivided land and land that is built on, the increase in the value of that land will be excluded from the rate capping provisions and therefore councils in developing areas will be able to recoup the rates that they rightly should be able to recoup because of the change in that land use.

I am sure the Deputy Speaker will be pleased to know—although I do not know that he has many vineyards in his area—that we have ensured that in rural areas where there is a change of land use, say, from open grazing land to land used for vineyards, which is a much more intensive land use, the land value increases and councils will be able to recoup the rates accordingly.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I thank the honourable member for his support, because I know that this move has been very much appreciated by rural councils. The honourable member pointed out that, as Minister, I do have the power to recommend to the Governor in Executive Council that a council should be exempt from the rate capping provisions. However, the honourable member said I had not done this. I point out to the honourable member that in fact I have used my powers and recommended to the Governor in Executive Council that the Flinders Ranges Council should be exempt from the rate capping provisions. That has been agreed to by the Governor in Executive Council, and the Flinders Ranges Council has been exempted from the rate capping provisions for a very good reason. That is exactly what the amendment that was moved by my colleague was intended to do. In the Bill that was originally put forward by my colleague, it was his intention that the Minister be given the power, where there was an extenuating circumstance, to grant an exemption.

Members may be aware that the Hawker council (one of the councils which was amalgamated to form the Flinders Ranges Council) generated its own electricity, but it was at considerable cost. The Government has now agreed for ETSA power to be provided to this area of Hawker, which means that power is much cheaper for the residents. However, it also means that the Hawker council has lost a lot of income. Therefore, I have agreed to the removal of the rate capping provision, so that the rates can be increased by the council to recoup the losses that it is incurring because it is no longer receiving income from the power which is generated in Hawker. So, I have used that power, and I will use that power whenever a council is able to indicate to me that there are extenuating circumstances.

At the same time, I would agree with the honourable member that I have rejected a number of applications from other councils because I did not believe that there were extenuating circumstances. All they were trying to do was to increase the rates. As far as I could see, they were facing only the same sorts of situations as all other councils. The honourable member was very proud to indicate that her Party

is opposed to the rate capping provisions which are presently requiring—

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I will re-read the honourable member's speech this afternoon, but my interpretation of her speech was that she was indicating that she supported the fact that councils should be able to set their own rates, with no interference from—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** The honourable member agrees that I am right and that what the honourable member said was that she believes that councils should have the right to set their rates with no interference by the Government. I am very happy for the Government to run at the next election on this one, because the Government has introduced rate capping to ensure that all ratepayers are able to benefit from the reform program that we have put in place. What the honourable member opposite is saying is that, if her Party were in power, the ratepayers of this State could expect a hefty increase in their rates. As I said, the Government is quite proud of what it has done. I also point out to the honourable member that a number of the amalgamated councils have struck a rate which is even below that of rate capping. I believe that proves conclusively that what the Government has set out to do is something which is appreciated by the residents of South Australia.

In relation to the extension of the Boundary Reform Board, I acknowledge the concerns which the honourable member has put forward. In fact, I almost have to declare a conflict of interest as far as Lucindale is concerned, because my brother-in-law is on the land at Lucindale, and he keeps me fully informed of developments that are occurring in that town. There are some concerns in Lucindale about the reform process. The board has met with that council on many occasions, and I am advised by the Chairman of the board that she will be continuing to work with the Lucindale council and the ratepayers of Lucindale.

I certainly hope that, by the time this matter is considered in another place, the Opposition will ensure that the amendment which we wish to put forward and, I repeat, which is fully supported by the Local Government Association is passed as it stands, because it is absolutely imperative that the board be able to complete its deliberations. Originally, it had been my intention to have a new Local Government Act in place by 30 September. I am consulting very widely and trying to reach substantial agreement with the Local Government Association prior to the Bill being introduced. As it now appears that that probably will not occur by 30 September, I am moving the amendment.

I also point out to the honourable member opposite that, as far as the ratepayers of Lucindale are concerned, the whole idea of the Boundary Reform Board having the power to initiate a proposal has very much been made totally democratic in that the board cannot require a council to proceed with an amalgamation. The final decision will be that of the ratepayers: they will vote as to whether or not they wish to amalgamate. I ask members opposite to ensure that they give the ratepayers of Lucindale a choice. I know that the honourable member has had a lot of contact from Lucindale. I would suggest that during her deliberations she might like to go to Lucindale, because she will find that the town is very divided in relation to amalgamation. Approximately 50 per cent feel very strongly that they want an amalgamation, and about 50 per cent feel very strongly that they would prefer to go to Naracoorte rather than to the

west—which surprises my wife considerably, given that the feeling between Lucindale and Naracoorte in football is like that between Port Adelaide and Norwood. Anyway, politics does make strange bedfellows.

The honourable member also referred to jobs. Let me assure the House that this Government regards as very important the generation of jobs in rural and regional areas. In relation to her concern about Lucindale and the closure of the council offices and the loss of employees, in every amalgamation that has occurred in rural areas—and, for that matter, in the metropolitan area—the council buildings and properties have been retained in the towns where the closures have occurred and have been used as an extension to the new council, being connected by computer modem to the new main council chamber. So, I am sure that in Lucindale the council offices would be retained and employees would be retained in Lucindale, connected by computer modem to wherever the main point of local government may be for that area.

Also, in all other country towns, the outside workers have been retained in the towns when the town has amalgamated with another. For example, when work needs to be done in the Lucindale area, instead of having to send employees from Kingston to Lucindale, which would be a waste of a good three-quarters of an hour each way—or an hour and a half in the day's program—the employees and equipment would be kept in Lucindale and the work would proceed. I have seen that work very well in other rural areas, and I know that my colleague immediately behind me has seen that work very well within his electorate.

Further, under the amalgamation agreements, there is the condition that no employee will be forcibly separated from his or her employment. Therefore, the jobs will be retained. I emphasise that the record of this Government shows quite clearly the importance it places upon jobs in regional areas.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

**Ms HURLEY:** The Minister addressed many of my concerns in his reply but clause 3 refers to the sorts of proposals that are not affected and new section 21(18)(a) refers to a proposal that 'is the subject of a public notice under subsection (5) on or before 30 September 1997'. Will the Minister clarify whether public notice occurs where the Local Government Reform Board, after talking to the councils and ascertaining that one or more does not wish to amalgamate, gives public notice that there will be a board initiated amalgamation and that that process occurs before putting out a proposal to public notification for the six weeks?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I confirm that it means that public notification must be given before 30 September. If public notification has not occurred by that date, the board will have no power subsequently to initiate a proposal. By the time the public notice is issued, the board must have satisfied itself that the council or the councils concerned will not engage in structural reform on their own motion. That could address the honourable member's concern that the council is perhaps looking towards a voluntary amalgamation with Naracoorte. Secondly, it means that the performance of the council or councils on publicly known criteria must warrant consideration of structural reform. That means that any investigation conducted by the board must show that there will be benefits, usually financial benefits, as a result of the amalgamation. Thirdly, it must be shown that the likely

outcome of the merger would be better and more efficient use of resources, and the board must have consulted at all points of the process with the council or councils concerned. So, the process that would need to be gone through before the board gives public notice is quite detailed, but the public notice would have to be given before 30 September.

**Ms HURLEY:** Does the Minister believe that it is fair that 30 September should be the cut-off point when, after the public notice has been given and the board has formulated a proposal which will be taken for public consultation for six weeks, the proposal might be amended or dropped by the board? Would it not be better to make the cut-off point after the public consultation period has been held?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I see the point the honourable member makes. As the honourable member will consider this matter before it goes before the other place, I will also consider it. I can reassure the honourable member that the board's record indicates there is no way in the world that it would proceed down the track of instigating an amalgamation whilst there was any hope of a voluntary amalgamation. I am happy to consider the point that the honourable member raises in her question.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 11 passed.

Clause 12.

**Ms HURLEY:** This clause provides that objections to valuations 'must be made within 60 days after the date of service of the notice of the valuation to which the objection relates'. I understand that the Adelaide City Council, which currently allows only 20 days after the notice for residents to lodge objections, has no problem with extending that period to 60 days but would prefer that it be 60 days after the date on the notice of the valuation in order to overcome any confusion about the date of service. Given that the council has made some considerable concessions in respect of this provision, will the Minister say whether he agrees that the date should be changed to the date stated on the notice?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I am not prepared to reconsider this matter. I will provide an explanation for the honourable member. The clause to which the honourable member refers allows the same time limit for objections to valuations by council valuers as that which is presently being introduced for Valuer-General's valuations. I am trying to bring the Local Government Act into line with the Act which covers valuations prepared by the Valuer-General. I cannot see any point in having one set of valuations with one set of criteria and another set of valuations with another set of criteria.

It is also fair to point out that of the now 69 councils in South Australia only the City of Adelaide is seeking the amendment to which the honourable member refers. We have undertaken detailed consultation with the Local Government Association on this matter, and it agrees with the amendment as proposed. As I said, I want the amendment as proposed to be carried so that we have consistency with regard to valuations.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 passed.

Clause 15.

**Ms HURLEY:** This clause allows the Minister to recover costs of councils if a difference between councils is brought to the Minister. I understand that the Government is keen to act as an authority over local government. As I pointed out regarding the rates section, the Government has the power and the authority to direct local government in a number of

areas, but it seems to be reluctant to act as an arbitrator if there are any differences between councils or if a decision that a council wants to make is involved. I wonder whether this provision is designed to discourage councils from coming to the Minister for arbitration on these matters.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** I am sure that the honourable member is aware that section 721 of the Act has hardly ever been used, if ever. It is certainly not a section which councils will want to use every day of the week. We have brought in this amendment because if a council wishes to utilise section 721 it should take into account the fact that it can choose to go before a court of law. This matter arose because of the dispute between Tea Tree Gully and Campbelltown. That choice belongs to councils. They can either go immediately to the Supreme Court to have the matter resolved or, as has been done in this case, they can petition the Minister to make a determination. That determination is binding, although I understand it can be appealed to the Supreme Court.

If a council wants to petition the Minister for a determination of a dispute in which it is involved, it ought to take into account that, in doing so, just as if it were using a court of law, it would be required to pay costs. If the dispute is between two councils, the costs could end up being split between the two councils. That matter would need to be determined. The honourable member may not be aware that it was my original intention to bring in this amendment so that the councils involved in this current dispute, which I have delegated for determination to former Justice Iris Stevens, would be required to pay. However, following discussions with the Local Government Association, I agreed with its point of view that the action was commenced under a set of rules and that, therefore, in all fairness, as that set of rules exists, they should be used.

The Government will therefore pick up the costs in this case, but I do not believe the taxpayers of South Australia should have to pay for a dispute between two councils. If a council wants to have a dispute, it should make sure that it justifies to its ratepayers why they are involved in the expense. All we are doing is setting the ground rules regarding any future use of section 721 and, based on the use of section 721 in the past, it will probably be another 30 years before it is used again. So it is not as though this is an amendment which will have an impact on councils and on the ratepayers of those councils. It will only mean that if a council chooses to use section 721 and petitions the Minister it will, just as though they were going to a court of law, be required to pay the costs.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (16 and 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEE REPORTING

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr QUIRKE:** Earlier in the grievance debate the member for Unley made a number of remarks, which in fact I heard while I was in the bar reading the newspaper, and I thought that these were some more flippant comments. As I say, I was reading the newspaper and I did not hear the full content of his remarks. When in fact I found out after my speech that there was an allegation running around here that *Hansard* had been doctored and that a question that I had asked had been

removed from *Hansard*—and in fact there was an allegation that a further question that I asked on day three had also been removed—I was very concerned. In fact, I made it crystal clear to anyone who raised it with me that I had not spoken to *Hansard* and nor had I even mentioned *Hansard* to any person during the entire estimates procedure.

I consulted with Mr Simms, the head of the *Hansard* group, who told me that he would investigate the matter, which he did. The second question that was meant to have been eliminated was actually found in *Hansard*; it was in its appropriate place. However, the question that I asked on the Premier's line had indeed been totally removed. I want to make it crystal clear to the House that I knew nothing of that, and any time I make a statement in this House, regardless of what it is on, whether it is on a small frivolous issue or something major, I stand by that and I take it as a matter of honesty and integrity.

I also want to say, Mr Deputy Speaker, that I am well aware of the rules of *Hansard*. I have been here long enough to know now that any editing of *Hansard* by a member who makes remarks is simply for syntax and to complete the last sentence. Mr Simms has apologised to me. He says that it was a procedure, an error within the *Hansard* group that this was removed. He says that he has investigated and he is satisfied with that, that nobody spoke to the *Hansard* group about this particular matter, and indeed I told him that I was going to come down here and make a personal explanation and get the record straight. I have not and I never will alter *Hansard* in any such way. It is against every principle of integrity and honesty. Quite frankly, I am embarrassed, and I am embarrassed because of a mistake that was made within *Hansard*, which I hope, for any other member, does not happen again.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It seems the matter was considered to be small fry by someone!

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

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

That it be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That it be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr VENNING:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:

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

Motion carried.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Industrial Affairs):** I move:

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

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** The budget estimates that I attended were disappointing, and this has already been

alluded to by the member for Unley. I felt that the Opposition missed a wonderful opportunity to obtain much information and the opportunity to be briefed on a wide range of topics in relation to the Premier's portfolio and that of the Minister for Industrial Affairs, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister for Information and Contract Services. This is where I feel the system appears to be falling down. I canvassed way back in the mid 1970s for budget estimates during my period as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee from 1979-82. I campaigned the then Premier David Tonkin to establish a budget estimates system based on the estimates in Canberra, and when we established that in 1981 I felt that we were doing a pretty good job.

During the time that I served in Opposition I used the budget estimates, as did many of my colleagues, to obtain the most important and valuable information we could. Certainly, it makes it very easy when you have the Auditor-General's Report at the same time. I have always felt and believed very strongly that the budget of the State should be brought down earlier in the calendar year so that its debate in Parliament is completed well before 30 June, and so that, on 1 July, the Public Service and the administrators, the Ministers of the State, know exactly where they stand and so that the financial arrangements of the State start off from day one. The Public Accounts Committee, under my chairmanship, always believed in accrual accounting, because it gives us a true up-to-date picture of the State's finances. I am pleased that the Treasurer has now brought accrual accounting into Government departments.

I refer to the attitude of some members when questioning the Minister to gain information. It was an aggressive and, at times, unsavoury approach. It was an exercise not in point scoring but in trying to belittle the Minister and to then get some information. However, the emphasis seemed to be on discrediting the Minister. I warn all members that the public perception of Parliament, politics and politicians has never been so low. By supporting that type of approach, all we are doing is rapidly bringing forward the date when there will have to be a dramatic change to the parliamentary system.

The public today believe that they are over governed, that politicians are over paid and that politicians are not achieving much for the benefit of the people. That is a sad state of affairs. If that is the public perception, it is a reflection on all of us. Mind you, I have always been critical of the media. They have a lot to answer for in this country and in the western system in relation to the continual nit-picking of politicians and their political leaders. The negative criticism of politicians and Parliament in general is something that should not be tolerated in any modern western society. It is certainly not tolerated in eastern society, nor in socialist and other countries in the world.

The Murdoch Press has the most to answer for. I knew Rupert Murdoch in the early 1960s, and I knew him before he became a millionaire, when he borrowed his first £1 million to try to buy the *Advertiser*. In those days, it was never his perception to produce newspaper publications of the like we have seen recently, and that includes the Adelaide *Advertiser*. If ever there is a paper that is putting itself out backwards, it would have to be the *Advertiser* at present. The photo on the front page of the *Advertiser* of the boxer who was bitten on the ears by Tyson was disgraceful. I would be very interested to know how many complaints the *Advertiser* received about that. Then there was this morning's photo of the Chinese army, which is simply going into Hong Kong to replace the existing British army. I see no great threat there,

but it is a frightening picture, and the *Advertiser* has to do a lot better than that. The way that it plays around with the politics of the State and tries to manipulate the political Parties and the political system needs to be looked at carefully. It is very dangerous.

Those of us who have been around for a long time know what goes on. We know what happens with the *Advertiser* staff and some of the journalists. If they see politicians back down, they snigger and laugh at us, and they go away and have a drink down at the local and say, 'We beat them again.' It is time we showed some leadership and some management in getting on with the running of the State and attending to the problems that need to be attended to and which we inherited at the change of Government in December 1993. There have been a lot of changes for the good and, in general, the industrial and rural community sectors of the State are starting to look up and will improve slowly but positively. That will continue if we have the right economic climate.

The budget Estimates of the Parliament must continue. The system must be persevered with, and it is up to each and every member to make sure the system works. It is up to the Minister and the ministerial advisers to ensure that the system works. I cannot understand why some Ministers insist on answering all the questions. They should allow their advisers, their public servants, to answer the questions. The political questions should be answered by the Minister, but the nuts and bolts questions—the administration of daily affairs—should be answered by the public servants, because this is the only opportunity that the average member of Parliament gets to address the public servants and to find out exactly what is going on.

If you look at most Parliaments in this country, State and Federal, and in other countries of the world, such as America, you see that it is the public servants who answer the questions. That is what they are there for—they are our servants. They are there to advise the Minister, but they are also answerable to the Parliament. It is high time that our approach was changed. Ministers should not be frightened to allow public servants to provide information. We had an example of that in the line relating to the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. I will not go into what happened, but it involved a pretty unsavoury effort whereby a document was supposed to have been prepared by somebody. However, it was a false document, and it was leaked to the Opposition. The Opposition used it, but really there was nothing in it. I did not like the whole tenure of the treatment of the head of that department, but at the same time these things should not happen. More responsibility should be placed on people. If people obtain leaked documents from Government departments, they should be a little more careful when handling them.

The areas that I am most concerned about in South Australia are job creation and employment opportunities for South Australian business to develop and expand and assistance to industry. We have done a pretty good job in South Australia. We have not had too many failures as such, if you could even say that we have had any failures. In fact, a lot of jobs are on the horizon. The Industries Development Committee and the Economic Development Authority have attracted industries to South Australia. At present there is only a few jobs—between 30 and 60. However, in the next two years, they could lead to many hundreds of jobs. That is what we are on about. It is the planning now and the development now and, unfortunately, there is a long lead time until we see the real benefits come through.

I refer to the magazine distributed by the Royal Automobile Association, which has the slogan, 'There for you.' The RAA does a pretty good job, and it has served the State over many decades. However, I get particularly annoyed when I pick up its monthly magazine, *SA Motor*, and find that it is printed by Hanna Print Victoria. The magazine carries this caption:

*SA Motor* is the RAA's official magazine. It has the largest circulation of any magazine or newspaper in South Australia. The Circulation Audit Board reports a circulation of 353 037 copies.

I understand that the contract to print, publish and distribute the magazine is worth about \$1.6 million. It has anything up to 46 pages and carries quite a lot of advertising. It is well done, it is well printed, and I have no criticism of that. However, I cannot understand why it is not printed in South Australia. I have had long running correspondence with the RAA and the printing industry to determine why this magazine is not printed in South Australia. Its circulation is over 353 000 copies, yet it is cheaper to print it in Victoria. I just cannot believe it.

I was advised this afternoon that the contract for the printing of *SA Motor* expired on 30 June. Tenders were called and there were seven tenderers, including one from South Australia but, would you believe, Wilk Colour—which, like Hannaprint is also from Victoria—has won the contract. How will South Australian companies ever obtain the expertise or be given the opportunity to print something the size of *SA Motor* if they are not given that opportunity? I do not know what the savings are. If it is 1¢, 2¢ or 3¢ a copy, it is time that *SA Motor* and the RAA looked at the loyal South Australian members of that organisation—there are many hundreds of thousands, bearing in mind that 353 000 magazines are produced—and gave some thought to giving the contract to a South Australian company.

I believe there are many South Australian companies that could print that magazine. On 13 June a fax was sent to my office from the RAA's Director of Public Affairs, I.C. Pearce, as follows:

Dear Mr Becker,

The RAA has recently assessed tenders for a new printing and packaging contract for the *SA Motor* magazine. As you have previously made a number of public statements regarding contractual arrangements for the magazine's production, we would be prepared to advise you of the tender details on a confidential basis. We would require you to sign a confidentiality agreement for this purpose. If you would like to accept this invitation, could you please contact me (phone 8202 4529) to arrange a mutually convenient time for a meeting.

Yours sincerely, I.C. Pearce, Director of Public Affairs.

On 20 June I wrote to Mr John Fotheringham, Chief Executive, RAA, as follows:

Dear Mr Fotheringham,

Enclosed for your information is a copy of a letter I received via facsimile transmission from Mr I.C. Pearce, Director of Public Affairs, dated 13 June 1997. I take offence at the contents of that letter and its implied meaning that any information that I may be given on a confidential basis by the RAA (without a confidentiality agreement being signed) would not be kept confidential. Mr Fotheringham, I was employed by the Bank of Adelaide for 19 years, with just over three years as a branch manager. Upon joining the bank, I had to sign a confidentiality agreement which in fact all staff were required to sign. Never, in my 19 years as a senior banker, and five years as President of the Bank Officials Association [the union], was my integrity ever called into question.

As a member of Parliament who has just completed 27 years, and currently the longest serving member of Parliament in the metropolitan area, can anyone say that my confidentiality has not been respected? I have been a member of the Industries Development Committee for eight years, the last three as Chairman, dealing with

the balance sheets of some of Australia's [as well as overseas private and public] largest and most successful companies. I consider my integrity has been impugned by the inference of requiring me to sign a confidentiality agreement and therefore confirm my secretary's advice to Mr Pearce's secretary 'Thank you, but no thank you.'

... Heini Becker MP, Member for Peake.

On the council of the RAA are two people well known to me—Stuart Patterson, who was an employee of the Bank of Adelaide and who rose to senior management level, and a school friend of mine, Michael Shanahan, who was recently recognised by Her Majesty the Queen in her birthday honours.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** The member for Hart is quite right: Michael Shanahan is a lovely man. He is an excellent person, and I have known the Shanahan family from Freeling all my life. They have made an outstanding contribution to the community as well as being first class farmers and administrators. In my opinion the RAA in South Australia should show some loyalty to the people of South Australia. I do not really care what the deal is, but I believe we should be told publicly by how much the South Australian tenderer missed out. I would like to go to the Premier and the Ministers of the Government and say, 'Listen, we have missed out on printing the biggest magazine in South Australia by a few cents or dollars or whatever it is. We have to find out what the problem is in South Australia if we cannot compete with other States.' How will we ever develop the State in any area—manufacturing, commerce, industry, information technology or the like—unless we know what the problems are, unless we are told what the problems are so that we can address those problems?

I get very annoyed about the fact that 353 000 copies of this magazine are printed interstate and South Australian printers are not given the opportunity to do the work. Therefore, I call on all members of the RAA—and there are hundreds of thousands of them—to telephone and write to RAA management and demand that its printing needs be met by a South Australian company. The printing industry in South Australia should also get its act together to do whatever it can to canvass the Government and the community to keep printing in South Australia. Many years ago we had a long campaign to keep printing in Australia; we had the same problem with tariffs on motor cars; and we now face the same problem with tariffs affecting the textile, clothing and footwear industries. We should be fighting for our people and businesses, and we should be fighting for our local industries.

When I went to the Parliamentary Library to look at the latest *SA Motor* magazine I came across the *Motor Trade Journal*, which is printed by Bowden Printing, Hindmarsh Avenue, Welland, which is in my electorate. That fact is highlighted on the front page—well done. Many other publications are printed in South Australia to a high standard and probably as good a standard as the *SA Motor* magazine. It is high time that we did all we can to help South Australian industry create more job opportunities for South Australians.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I acknowledge that the Leader of the Opposition has taken great risk in allowing me to be lead speaker for the Opposition and have unlimited time. I have not had the opportunity to have unlimited time since my maiden speech, when I was but a naive, young and somewhat excited member of Parliament. Now I am still probably young, naive and excited and mindful that I might rabbit on

for many hours, but then again I may not, because I would probably suffer the wrath of my colleagues more than that of members opposite if I tended to go for too long.

I enjoyed listening to the member for Peake's address because, as we wind down in these last few weeks, it is sad to recall that the member for Peake will no longer be with us. I reserve the opportunity later to make a contribution in respect of all retiring members. There is no doubting the wisdom of the member for Peake, who is someone I respect. If the member for Peake's integrity has been called into question by anyone, I pity that organisation because the member for Peake would be the last person whose integrity I would wish to question. The member for Peake has had to put up with me, and I have not been the easiest person to work with on the Economic and Finance Committee, but I will be a better MP for having served under him.

The opportunity is now here to reflect on the Estimates Committee process and the budget before it leaves this House. I begin by making brief comments on the Estimates process in particular because the Estimates confirmed what I have seen for the past 3½ years—a stark fall in the standards of ministerial accountability and, dare I say, ministerial competence. The Opposition asked hundreds of questions to receive only a handful of correct and useful answers. There is no doubt that so guilty is the conscience of the member for Unley that today he tried to blame the Opposition for the quality of his Ministers' poor performances during the Estimates.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** As the member for Unley is so quick to remind me about my role as an adviser to former Industry Minister, Lynn Arnold, I sat through six or seven Estimates Committees in this Parliament. If members want to hear something about incompetence and lack of performance in Estimates, I have a few instances I can picture in my mind. It is a pity the member for Goyder is not here, because I can remember that day with great glee when he was the shadow Minister for Agriculture. We had a good set to and we snared him that day. I do not think the member for Unley could honestly and with any credibility offer criticism about the quality of the Opposition's Estimates performance having seen the pitiful display of his Party. I know of one Minister who would ask the Opposition to provide him with questions so bereft was he of ability to prepare his own questions. Let us just leave that one alone, member for Unley.

I can reflect on a number of Committees I was on. I was not on the Committee, but a couple of days ago I walked in on the Minister for Health's portfolio examination. I was absolutely stunned to see the Minister for Health and his advisers. On that day I thought it was a normal Question Time because so many people were in the Chamber. I just stood there and counted 23 advisers. I must say that, if ever a Minister has displayed a lack of confidence and insecurity in the handling of his own portfolio—to feel so insecure that he must have 23 advisers—says as much about the Minister as it does about anything else during the Estimates Committee. I would simply offer a suggestion to the Minister for Health: even if you are insecure and not confident, do not show the Opposition that that is your feeling. It did give us a good insight into the Minister and I think it is quite comical.

I dealt with the SA Water portfolio and I think I counted upwards of 17 advisers at one stage, but clearly that is an agency that has been feeling the heat over recent years in respect of the United Water contract. I was not on the Committee, but I am told that the Minister for Employment,

Training and Further Education showed how little she understands about her own portfolio and, in the process, showed how little this Government cares about our unemployed.

Important issues were scheduled late at night to prevent media coverage. Initially, regarding the United Water contract, the Minister's office faxed to me as shadow Minister a schedule which showed that SA Water would be dealt with at 11 a.m. until the Minister saw that and thought that they had better not chance their arm with the media and subsequently rescheduled SA Water for 7.30 at night. Indeed, the EDS contract was also put on late at night. However, I accept the Minister's point when he said that I did not query him over that; it was a pity that I did not query him about that. I will take him on face value that, had I queried the late appointment of that line, he would have changed it. Nonetheless, it was also put on late at night.

**Mr Brindal:** By agreement with you.

**Mr FOLEY:** I have just acknowledged that. I would like now, in my capacity as shadow Treasurer, to turn to the economy and to jobs. But before I do that, I should make quick mention of an interesting exchange between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier over a leaked copy of the water contract that I have in my possession. I might say that the Premier gave an extraordinary response when questioned over how we might have got hold of the leaked water contract. He actually blamed a sporting club at Adelaide University as a potential source of the leaked water contract. After a question from Mike Rann about whether he knew who gave us the water contract, the Premier said:

But I also know that the full contract, which was supposed to be faxed to a particular company by a firm of solicitors, was inadvertently diverted to a sporting organisation at the University of Adelaide. The Leader can say that it was a Liberal, but the person responsible for supplying this information to the Leader of the Opposition could have been a member of that sporting organisation.

I have in my possession the entire water contract, and the Premier's explanation is that I might have got it from the Adelaide University Soccer Club. It is beyond belief, but it got better. Not content with that, the Premier went on to say:

I am simply making the point that I understand this contract was faxed in all directions and was not at all held confidentially.

This is the same Premier who has accused me of putting at great risk our commercial credibility because I simply said, 'I have the contract. Here it is. You cannot see it, I am putting it back in the vault, but I am just letting you know that I have it.' He accused me of a great vandal attack on our State's credibility, yet here he is admitting that it was not held confidentially, that it was faxed all over the place, that it arrived at the Adelaide University Soccer Club, and that the Adelaide University Soccer Club had a copy of the country's biggest outsourcing contract. I must say to the Minister for Information and Contract Services: why could you not have been so sloppy and I might have got the EDS contract? If you had faxed that all over Adelaide, perhaps I might have got a copy of that as well.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** That is a good point: the Minister says that it was not allowed to be faxed. In the end, it was 23 pages, although the Premier said it was the full contract.

*Mr Bass interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** It came from a firm of solicitors. As the Minister for Information and Contract Services just said, the EDS contract was not allowed to be faxed. I will let the member for Florey into a little secret: when you sign a

contract with one of the world's major organisations, particularly a contract that involves a billion dollars of public expenditure—and this is just a tip—you should not fax it around Adelaide. I reckon that is a little bit comical and a little bit less than professional and quite silly, to be perfectly honest. What is even more silly is for the Premier to come in here and admit—and I quote Premier Olsen—that the contract was not held at all confidentially. I have my blues with United Water and my old mate, Geoff Anderson, but I feel some sympathy for United Water when an incompetent Government has to admit that it does not hold the contract confidentially, that it does not hold the contract confidential.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I have stated my view many times on the loss of \$3.15 billion—totally unacceptable, totally inappropriate, and it was wrong.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** No, I never advised on the bank. I was an adviser to the Minister for Industry. As I said once before, I tried to get a job with John Bannon and did not get it. I obviously was not held in high enough regard for my advising abilities.

I am simply saying that I have some sympathy for United Water for having to put up with these sorts of statements from the Government. It was an extraordinary admission and I think did as much damage to the Premier's credibility as it did to the State's credibility and only reinforces my view that SA Water has incompetently put at risk this State's reputation, has incompetently put at risk our State's water and sewerage systems, has very many questions to answer, and will continue to receive the fullest scrutiny by this Opposition.

How can we ever believe there could be no information provided to any of the tenderers outside the confines of the SA Water negotiating process, as they have alleged? As I have said previously, on 4 October when the bids were finally coming in, two bids arrived on time—one might have been five minutes late—the Probity Auditor knocked off for the night before the last contract came in, senior management went out for dinner and did not come back, and the two bids that came in first were opened and distributed to 30 or 40 people, half of whom were not authorised to see the contract—they were like little kiddies around the Christmas tree. The video tape that was in the secure room ran out of tape so we had no vision of who might have been looking at these documents.

Then we hear the Premier admit that the contract was not held confidentially. It was faxed all over Adelaide. It arrived at the Adelaide University Soccer Club, but there was no possible way that any information could have been transmitted from SA Water to any of the bidders because their security was so good. Their security was so impeccable there was no way that any information could have got out of SA Water. As we know, the United Water bid arrived more than three hours later. Even if there was no corruption—and I make no allegations except to say the following—even for the benefit of United Water, these processes must be seen to be beyond reproach so questions cannot be asked, allegations cannot be laid and innuendo cannot be entered into. These things have to be watertight.

I think it is a joke of the highest order for SA Water to have the audacity to somehow try to say that it was so professional, so secure in its dealings, that none of this information could have found its way outside the confines of SA Water. It was very sloppy government indeed.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** To leap from SA Water to the Government is a quantum leap? SA Water is the Government: the Minister for Infrastructure is the Minister responsible for SA Water. That makes it government. Every mistake, every issue and every fault of the United Water contract comes straight back to the Minister for Infrastructure, straight back to the Deputy Premier, and I will have great pleasure in serving it up.

*The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Here we go: old grumpy Graham. He has had a bad couple of weeks.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will be addressed by district or portfolio.

**Mr FOLEY:** Sorry, Sir, the grumpy Deputy Premier. Just take a deep breath and sit back.

*The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I will tell the Deputy Premier what is new: this Opposition will hold you accountable for all failures to do with the water contract, the EDS contract and any other contract—and that is our job. If it is a broken record, it is a broken record that I will keep running over and over again.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, it served us well, and I see the member for Reynell at the back. I bet she wishes she had never had to deal with the water contract in her electorate. I bet she wishes she did not have to answer negative responses about the water contract. As we have said, I suspect that the water contract has shaved two points off your polling, and some suggest it may be more. It is the hardest \$10 million that any Government has ever earned in the history of this State. For \$10 million per year recurrent savings, you have bled and bled. And just when you thought you were getting over it, then came the pong.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I notice that the member for Unley has started doorknocking, so he must be feeling a bit sensitive about his seat.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** If the member for Unley feels so insecure in his seat that he has to doorknock, good luck to him.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** He may be feeling vulnerable in Unley. I did not think our polling was looking that good. If he has information that Unley is in a bit of danger, we are doing well.

*Mr Rossi interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** As to the electorate of Lee, we have that one in the bag. Michael Wright is already selecting his electorate office. We are moving on from Lee. The member for Lee should just enjoy his last month or so in this place.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you members; the member for Unley has the opportunity to speak a little later.

*Mr Rossi interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** What did you say, Joe? I have what?

**Mr Rossi:** Verbal diarrhoea.

**Mr FOLEY:** We will miss those inane interjections in the next Parliament. Never mind. Let us turn to the economy.

**The Hon. G.A. Ingerson:** Here we go.

**Mr FOLEY:** The Deputy Premier can say, 'Here we go', and walk out. If he is not concerned about jobs, if the second most senior politician in this State cares little about jobs, so be it. I can tell members that this Opposition is concerned about jobs and, come the election, we will fight it on jobs.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** We will fight an election on your inability to create jobs and your total disregard for the unemployed. You have presided over this economy for 3½ years and nothing has happened. We have GDP growth of minus 1.6 per cent in the last quarter, with 1 per cent for the previous 12 months. We are over 2 points behind the national economy. We have a Government that is incapable of focusing on creating jobs. The only thing—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** There is a distinct difference. The national economy has been growing over the past three years, but this Government has been incapable of focusing on jobs, because you have been intent on fighting yourselves, fighting amongst yourselves, defeating your Leader, defeating your Deputy Leader, brawling amongst yourselves, as the ship of this State, this economy, has gone down the gurgler. You have abrogated your responsibility to government by failing to show decisive leadership and good governance for the past 3¾ years. You have been intent upon fighting each other and upon internal disputation, and you have not focused on the core problems of this State, and that is about creating jobs.

You have had nearly four years and you have done nothing. The former Premier said 20 000 jobs a year. You have not created 20 000 in nearly four years. Factories are closing, companies are going out of business. People are shifting interstate, moving to Queensland and Melbourne. People are leaving this State because there is no hope, and we look forward with great relish to fighting this election campaign about the core issue of jobs.

We will fight you on jobs, and we will win on jobs, because it is in the electorates of Lee, Hanson, Reynell and Florey where the voters will have a distinct choice between a Government incapable of creating jobs and an Opposition which, in government, will be focused on creating jobs and putting real heart and soul into good governance in this State. I can tell members now that the residents of Lee and Hanson are coming back to Labor, because they know that the answer is not Liberal. They know that the Liberal Government does not care for jobs in the working class suburbs of Adelaide. It has deserted the south, the west, and the inner city seat of Hanson. Make no mistake about it: we look forward to this election and defeating this Government on the core issue of jobs.

Even the employment growth forecast of this discredited Government in its budget was only 1.5 per cent. It forecasts economic growth for the next three years to the year 2000, the millennium, of 3 per cent. We know that 3 per cent will not erode unemployment. It would barely hold the line. We have an unemployment rate of 9.8 per cent, and we are unable to get below that. Quite probably it will reach 10 per cent, because this Government is incapable of producing jobs.

*Mr Buckby interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Yes, there is a distinct difference, member for Light. That was during a recession. An 11 per cent unemployment rate under Labor—unacceptable. This economy has had three years of growth, and you have created no jobs. The Premier today said, 'My goal is to reach the national average. I hope to do it in three years time.' How much growth do you need to reach the national average? The Premier on the radio this morning said, 'It has to be more than 3 per cent.' Yet the Treasurer forecasts only 3 per cent. So, we have the Treasurer forecasting 3 per cent growth and the Premier saying that we need more than that to create jobs. What hope do we have when the Premier of this State is unable to be consistent with his Treasurer? We have a

Premier who is unable to stimulate an economy, to create real and meaningful jobs.

It is a disgrace, and you should be ashamed for your desertion of the unemployed. Just imagine what the unemployed in Hanson, Lee, Reynell, Florey and Unley, the unemployed in your electorates, the parents of the unemployed and those people who are unsure and insecure in their current employment will be thinking on election day.

*Mr Leggett interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** At least I will be in the Chamber. The honourable member will be in the visitors' gallery. At election time, we will make it a very simple message. For three and a half years, the Deputy Premier has been more intent on becoming Deputy Premier than solving unemployment. The current Premier was more intent on becoming Premier than dealing with unemployment. Your Cabinet was more focused on who it would support as Premier than on tackling unemployment. What possible moral authority do you have to contest the next election with any credibility? Mr Deputy Speaker, the point is that this Government—dare I say, your Government—has failed the people of South Australia, and we will look forward, with great anticipation, to fighting the next election on this very important issue.

There are other issues concerning the budget. The Government's claim that this is a jobs budget was totally misleading. The \$145 million priority funding of capital works was an absolute non-event. Capital works are to increase by 19 per cent, in real terms, but the budget confirms that a cumulative underspending on capital works is now approaching nearly \$600 million over the past four years. So, there is this great bonanza of jobs in the budget, a 19 per cent jump in capital works for this year, but they have underspent, over the past four budgets, nearly \$600 million. The \$200 million announced for additional capital is simply an amount the Government underspent this year. The claimed increase is unlikely to be delivered and, even if it were, it goes nowhere towards making up this shortfall. I point out that \$150 million of capital works money included in the budget is private money for public infrastructure, and we are yet to see the full guarantees of this money being forthcoming.

The Liberals have failed South Australia on jobs. As each quarterly figures come in, as each national account figures come in, as each national numbers come in from the ABS, how bad does it look?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Members can joke. I would have thought that the member for Hanson would be more concerned about being re-elected in the marginal seat of Hanson than offering cheap gibes from the cross benches. At least the member for Light has some credibility; even though he turned down the ministry on at least one, if not two, occasions, he will probably be over there at some stage.

**Mr BUCKBY:** I rise on a point of order. The member for Hart is speculating. I ask him to withdraw that comment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If the member for Light will say what the member for Hart is speculating on, the Chair would be—

**Mr BUCKBY:** The member for Hart is speculating on the number of times that I was offered a ministry.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** If it was only once, I am prepared to say—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Would the honourable member please sit down for a moment. The interjections and the frivolous points of order, such as the one from the



member for Light, are doing nothing at all to raise the tone of debate in the House.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise to the member for Light for saying that he turned down the ministry twice. It was only once. I give him a tip. Do not turn it down again: these things do not get offered a lot. But I have some sympathy for the member for Hanson, because he is a bit of a jovial chap, and it will be sad that the member for Hanson will not be with us for much longer. However, I still look forward to buying Stewie a cup of coffee in the members'—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member looks forward to buying the member for Hanson a cup of coffee, if the honourable member does not mind.

**Mr FOLEY:** The former member for Hanson, in that context. I would buy the member for Gordon a coffee—or tea, I believe the member for Gordon has. However, let us have another look at taxes. What we have seen is a bit of revision by the current Premier, where he did a very unsavoury dumping on his colleague, the former Premier, when, in a very stark address before an audience post-budget, he made the observation that he felt that this Government was wrong because it did not raise taxes shortly after the last election—that it had made a mistake.

**Mr Venning:** Who said that?

**Mr FOLEY:** The current Premier said that.

**Mr Venning:** When?

**Mr FOLEY:** At a luncheon. You might have been interstate at the time. But it was well covered in the Adelaide media. That is something that this Premier is into—a bit of revisionist policy. He said that this Government should have come into office and introduced a poll tax and other taxes. He was also highly critical of the 'Going all the way' campaign; he felt that that was inappropriate and a bad choice as a campaign slogan.

**Mr Venning:** What do you think?

**Mr FOLEY:** I thought it was a dopey thing to have done. The fact of the matter was that the current Premier was part of the Cabinet. Here we have the current Premier dumping on the former Premier, saying the former Premier was wrong not to increase taxes—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order. This might be very interesting, but I thought the matter before the House was the Appropriation Bill as it comes from the Estimates Committees, and I ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to rule as to whether this is relevant to the line of debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member should recall that this debate is generally very wide ranging. I am not sure that it is quite so wide ranging, but the honourable member's contribution is being substantially augmented by way of interjection from other members of the House. So, members can hardly be critical of the member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY:** I will miss you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and your reasonable judgments. You can always tell when you touch a sensitive point: the Olsen supporters rise to their feet on a point of order, trying to gag debate. But the fact of the matter is that the current Premier is trying to delve into a bit of revisionist politics. He sat at the Cabinet table and voted for 'Going all the way' and no tax increases, and now he has the audacity—

**Mr Brindal:** How do you know that?

**Mr FOLEY:** I know that—the honourable member will never know—but all Ministers vote for a decision of Cabinet. Every decision of Cabinet is a unanimous decision. I ask the former Premier whether that is correct. Of course, it is.

Cabinet solidarity dictates that all Ministers support a decision. You can have a debate in Cabinet, but all Ministers will be deemed to have supported a position. If they do not support that position, they have the option of resigning from Cabinet. If the current Premier felt so strongly at that time that former Premier Brown was wrong, he could have voted against it and resigned from Cabinet. Had he felt so strongly that 'Going all the way' was a dopey campaign and voted against it in Cabinet, he could have resigned from Cabinet on that issue, but he could not remain a Cabinet Minister and under the confidentiality and solidarity principles of Cabinet agree to a position and then revisit that issue months later and dump it on former Premier Brown. That is the height of hypocrisy; it is a bizarre comment to make.

We know that the current Premier is not against doing the odd backflip, revisiting and changing the course of history. I refer to former Senator Olsen's speech to Parliament on TCF tariffs released yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition. What did the good Senator have to say about the textile industry? From memory, he said words to the effect that they deserved what they got, that they were not a dynamic industry, and that clearly lower taxes—

**Mr Venning:** That was a long time ago.

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Culance says that it was a long time ago. The Premier has never repudiated it.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Will the honourable member accept my saying that the State Bank was a long time ago?

**Mr Venning:** No.

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, I will not accept the honourable member saying that the Premier's comments were made a long time ago. At that time, Senator Olsen was highly critical of the TCF industry, fully supportive of a reduction in tariffs and quite happy to see the industry brought to its knees. You cannot be 'backflip Johnny' and expect to have some credibility.

We also know that the new Premier has always been a big supporter of a GST. I recall when 'backflip honest Senator John' was sent by John Hewson to investigate the GST in Canada and report back to Canberra and the Australian public regarding its benefits. So, we know that Premier Olsen likes the GST. We know that he does not like the TCF industry, that he thinks that we should have higher taxes, and that he thought that 'Going all the way' was a silly campaign. So, we have a Premier who can do a pirouette and a backflip. He is all about re-imaging himself. He changes his clothes like a chameleon: he is capable of shedding one skin and putting on another. 'Backflip Johnny' will do a backflip on any issue.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I understand that it is customary in this House to refer to members by their title or seat.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hart is well aware of that. He keeps testing the Chair and other members.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise for not referring to the Premier in the proper way. Again, it is always the sensitive Premier supporters who rise to their feet. If the member for Unley keeps doing this, the Premier just might give him a ministry one day. He should not buy a house on the prospect of the salary but, if he keeps rising on those points of order, one never knows.

This Premier will go to the polls with some pretty important positions. First, he wants a GST. Secondly, he wants higher taxes. He is already on the record as saying that the Government missed the opportunity to increase taxes when it was elected 3½ years ago. Implicit in that comment

is that a re-elected Olsen Government will raise taxation. I say this: a Labor Government if elected will not increase taxes. This Premier says there will be a GST and increased taxes, that he does not care much about the textile industry, but he will do the odd pirouette or backflip so that he is seen to be trying to help the industry.

The biggest issue of all involves jobs and the current Premier's inability to create jobs and provide them for the future. The Premier is keen to see the sale of ETSA and Optima Energy. We know full well that the Government is putting Optima Energy into a saleable position. It is being packaged as a saleable asset as is happening with the transmission and distribution business of ETSA Power. Clearly, the electorate of this State will have some stark choices to make at the next election. A re-elected Government will mean the following: a GST, higher taxes, the sale of ETSA, and no commitment to jobs.

The truth of the matter is this: never has a Government ever had a mandate that this Government has had. Never has there been a sense of urgency that this Government has faced. Never has an electorate been more prepared to accept strong decisive leadership in Government than where it was 3½ years ago. What did the Government provide? It provided division, in-fighting and a lack of focus on the economy. It deserted the electorate when it most needed and deserved good Government.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I say to the member for Unley that members opposite should hang their head in shame for their failure to provide the governance that this State should have had. They should hang their head in shame at the next State election. They have abrogated their moral responsibility to Government. They have fought amongst themselves, divided their Party, the State and the economy, and they have added to the jobless queues and destroyed the economic fabric of this State.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Thank you the member for Custance and the member for Unley.

**Mr FOLEY:** As I said earlier, we look forward to the next election. We are confident that we will be able to take the fight to the Government, because the electorate of South Australia knows that it has been let down by the people whom they entrusted to provide leadership. The members for Hanson, Reynell, Elder and Kaurna think the same, because they are in the firing line.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Custance will come back, but if he feels no sympathy for the electorate or the unemployed he should at least have some sympathy for his colleagues. He should have some regard for the members for Reynell, Hanson, Lee, Kaurna, Norwood, Elder and perhaps even Florey and Mawson, all of whom will probably not come back, because this Government has failed to give them a fighting chance. Poor old Stewart doesn't have a chance in Hanson. The member for Reynell doesn't have a chance. Members opposite have failed those members. So, if they cannot offer some sympathy for the unemployed or the people who are likely to lose their job, they should at least have some regard for their mates—and they have not done that.

Ever since you knocked off the former Premier's head and dethroned him, the economy has gone further backwards. The great Messiah over whom you risked the whole Party fabric is taking you further down the tube. I find it incomprehen-

sible that members opposite are prepared to risk the fabric of our State's economy and risk the chance of our community's recovering from the dark ages of recent years all because they wanted to put in a Messiah. They were prepared to risk a split in the Party and a split in the economy. They knocked off this bloke who delivered the biggest majority that any State Premier has delivered to his Party in this State's political history to put in a Messiah, and what has he done? We have gone further down the gurgler.

This guy over here—the Minister for Information and Contract Services—delivered a record majority of 37-10. Members opposite like me had to put up with the absolute torrent and barrage the former Premier would deliver to us—he would knock us around during Question Time. We had to tolerate that. We had to bear the brunt of an overwhelming majority in Government. But that was not enough for you guys. You had to risk all of that, slit his throat, get rid of poor Premier Brown and give us a Messiah. I have been fairly disappointed with the new Premier. He is awfully predictable and awfully repetitious. In conclusion—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Leggett:** This is the conclusion?

**Mr FOLEY:** If you would prefer that I went on—

**Mr Brokenshire:** You love to be on the television.

**Mr FOLEY:** What can I say about the member for Mawson? The person whom his own colleagues nickname 'ankles'. In fact, it was 'rubber soles' the last I heard, but never mind.

*Mr Rossi interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Lee, what a treasure he has been to this Parliament over the past 3½ years. I hope he is not offended by this, but I have to tell the member for Lee that we will not miss him. We will miss Stewie and the member for Reynell, but we will not miss the member for Lee one zack. In fact I will take great pleasure in assisting my future colleague, Michael Wright, in overwhelmingly winning the seat of Lee at the next State election. The member for Mawson knows how hard Michael Wright can work at election time.

*Mr Rossi interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** You ask the member for Mawson how hard he fights a campaign.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** No, he didn't, but he certainly made the member for Mawson earn his money. I will conclude, because the debate is degenerating. I have had a constant barrage of inane interjections. We now have a Gallery audience, and I do not want visitors to this Chamber to be subjected to the inappropriate behaviour of Liberal members of Parliament. On the Labor side, we conduct ourselves with decorum. I do not want visitors in the Gallery to be subjected to the lack of decorum and absolutely inappropriate behaviour that we continually witness from members opposite.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** What a shameful performance that was from somebody who purports to be the next Leader of the Labor Party. It goes to show that they have no talent, no vision, and no direction. Members opposite treat this Parliament like a theatre. I suggest to the member for Hart and some other members opposite that perhaps they would serve this State a lot better if they left this Chamber and went further to the north about 150 metres and got right into the theatre. The only thing they have been able to do properly is their performance when acting.

When it comes to creating an opportunity for South Australia, we saw nothing but devastation for 11 years, and now we have the so-called new Labor—the Blair look-alikes, with the red ties, blue shirts and grey pinstripe suits—who do not have one ounce of the ability or performance of Blair. Prime Minister Blair in England very much represents a liberal Government and a liberal philosophy, but they had to get a liberal in there or the Tories would have been in for another 10 or 15 years. The problem for Prime Minister Blair is that, whilst he might have a vision, ability and philosophy like the Liberal Party, the rest of his team over in England are die-hard Labour people and the people of Britain will see that in the next two or three years. Unless Prime Minister Blair is very fortunate, whilst he might have ability, his Party will not be in office for long.

Let us focus on a few things. Last week we had Estimates Committees in this place. Estimates Committees are supposed to be the time in the 12 month season of Parliament when the Opposition can get out and belt the Government around the head. That is what Estimates Committees are about—accountability and showing up the Government for any lack of performance, ineptitude or whatever. Whilst I am still only a new member—and I accept that—I have now sat through three years of Estimates Committees and I would have thought that, because we are coming up to an election in the next four or five months, if members opposite had any chance of being a real Opposition, a potential Government for the people of South Australia, they would have put in some effort, really done some homework and made sure that they got a few scores on the board.

I have never seen such an appalling performance in the three years of Estimates Committees I have sat on. When it came to looking at the lines and Opposition members were called to order on a line, they did not even know what line their question related to because they simply had not done their homework. They were only interested in trying to get the 10 second grab, with the Leader of the Opposition running some untruth on what is happening in a particular portfolio area.

Environment is a classic case. When I doorknock and visit people, the first thing they say is that they are concerned about jobs, both in South Australia and Australia. We know that, and we are rebuilding this State. We are restructuring and getting on with the job of delivering that sustainable opportunity. There are also areas such as health, education and the environment. The environment sits highly with the South Australian community. It is interesting that, in the past 12 months, I have seen the Leader of the Opposition ask only one lead question of Minister Wotton regarding the environment portfolio. As soon as the cameras left, guess what happened? The Leader of the Opposition was nowhere to be seen. He twisted and manipulated, and ran out press releases that totally misconstrued the Bolivar situation. I was pleased to see that some members of the media had credibility and were honest enough to report the facts on Bolivar.

I will touch on Bolivar because, in the past few sitting weeks, we have heard much about it in this Chamber. I will remind the people of what has happened at Bolivar by putting the facts on the public record. With regard to the people of South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition wants to run a line that says that Bolivar is a shambles and that this odour has occurred because our Government has been diligent enough to come up with a new opportunity for South Australia by virtue of outsourcing the management and running of our water and sewerage operation. The Leader

does not want to draw attention to our having saved \$10 million a year for the people of South Australia, our getting new opportunities for companies such as the small Pope Electric Motor company which now has export opportunities or our getting opportunities in Jakarta and such places to be able to develop a lot of the plant and equipment needed as parent companies tied up with United Water take on the opportunity of developing a 25 year contract with those countries in Asia. He wants to twist the facts to make it look as though United Water has been inept. Of course, the people of South Australia are astute, and they do their homework. They can sort out the blue sky from the grey sky, and they know when the smokescreens are up—and the Leader of the Opposition is a classic with smokescreens.

Bolivar should have had a major capital infrastructure program 20 years ago. Who was in government then? The Labor Party. Who was the Premier then? Don Dunstan. How was the economic state of South Australia and Australia then? Very good—not necessarily because the Labor Party was in government but because we were still getting the benefits of post Second World War booms and growth, and we did not have the debt problems we have today. Guess what? No money was spent upgrading Bolivar 20 years ago. It is a far more difficult job to upgrade it today. With the nearly \$4 000 million involved in the State Bank loss alone, we could have built 40 new sewerage plants and an Alice Springs to Darwin line. In fact, we could have built a railway line not only from Alice Springs to Darwin but also to Singapore. That is how much money the Labor Party cost South Australia in 11 years.

I want to remind my colleagues in this House and put on the public record that we should be talking not just about the \$4 billion the Labor Party lost for South Australia but about the \$7 500 million it lost, the \$1 400 million it has incurred in debt to the Housing Trust and, on top of that, the \$3 000 million it did not provide to fund public sector superannuation, most of which will be called upon in the next 10 or 15 years. What a massive legacy for every young child and every South Australian, because it impinges on the lifestyle of every South Australian!

With regard to lifestyles I, like many other South Australians, happened to read the paper on Saturday. I read with a great deal of interest some comments from a professor on how he thinks South Australia should be fixed. He talked about public sector housing. He believes that we can have an economic recovery if we build more public sector housing stock in South Australia. Let us just get a couple of things straight. First, the average of our total housing stock in South Australia is about 12 per cent Housing Trust, but the national average is 9 per cent. South Australia already has 3 per cent more public housing stock than the national average.

Sir Thomas Playford implemented the Housing Trust program in South Australia, and it is a proud flagship of the Liberals. We stand by people who are needy and who are unprivileged. I suggest that, instead of the professor's talking about our incurring more debt to build more public housing stock, if he really knew anything about economics, he should be saying, 'No, stupid, it's about the economy; that's what you have to focus on.' That is what the Olsen Government is focussing on now, and that is what this Government has focussed on for 3½ years. It is a matter of getting the economy right.

If people have special needs, as a local member of Parliament on their behalf, I want to see them with good, affordable public housing opportunities through the Housing

Trust. However, more than that, I want to see them with a job, a sustainable future for themselves, their families and future generations, and with the opportunity to buy a private home. Why should those people have to be subjected to public housing stock only? If we can get a vibrant economy again in this State, everything will start to pick up, as it is. The Premier highlighted this today, but the Leader of the Opposition would not recognise it; he sat there reading the *City Messenger* or the *Adelaide Review* instead of listening to what is happening in this State. I also want to touch on another facet that tied in with the professor's comments in that article in the *Advertiser*. With regard to some of the welfare agencies, the professor intimated that this Government does not have a social heart. That made me very angry.

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

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Before the adjournment I was saying that in this article a senior member of one of the major welfare organisations was saying words to the effect that the Government did not have a social heart—or at least implying it. One gets sick and tired of reading and hearing those things when I happen to know just how much money the Government sinks into the Family and Community Services area. I am the first to admit that in one sense we can never put enough money into those areas but, going back to my earlier points in the debate, I reinforce that, if we have a good vibrant economy, if we have a sustainable future, if we have a State that is growing, then we do not have to put those resources in to the same extent as we do with a run down State in terms of infrastructure, debt load, lack of business headquarters, lack of a manufacturing bases and the like.

In a sense, South Australia is at the crossroad where we can wrap this State and the country in cotton wool for possibly another 10 years. The majority of people in this generation can probably survive this way, but I suggest to the House tonight that that is not the way responsible Governments and members of the community want to head or should head. The bottom line is that the majority of people in the community are saying that they are sick and tired of seeing band-aid measures. They want to see a long-term solution, which is exactly what this budget and this Government are about.

It never ceases to amaze me to see the large amounts of money won by competitive tender under the new tendering process being absorbed by two, three or four of the major welfare organisations and then I see the small amounts won in one-off grants and the like by some of the smaller church and welfare groups. When I look at the actual dollars spent at the coalface by some of the smaller groups compared with the larger groups, it makes me wonder. A couple of things need to happen. Perhaps we should be looking at some of the major organisations to see how big their internal infrastructure is and how much of the money they are getting is being used on administration and the like and how much, in percentage terms, reaches the community that needs it. That was the whole intent of the Government's tendering out and taking away some services from the public sector and devolving them to the private sector: it was to better address funding and opportunities for people with special needs. It is time we called for the accountability of some major organisations to see what real results they are getting. I reiterate: at the end of the day the only way we are going to look after the people who are so important to Government members—people with special needs who are not getting some of the

advantages and stronger opportunities—is to make sure that we get job opportunities and sustainable futures for them.

In the last few minutes, I want to draw my electorate back to the budget. I was interested in the Estimates Committee to hear the Opposition ask a question on the Christies Beach recycled water project. Most members will recall that since I have been in the House I have been talking about and calling for support for our policy to get recycled water from Christies Beach back into the Willunga Basin.

Now it is some 3½ years after the Government and I started implementing that policy before we hear the Opposition talking about it. The Opposition will probably come out soon in the local media and start to show some interest in our recycled water project. I put on record that the Opposition had 11 years to deal with treated waste going out to Gulf St Vincent but did nothing about it. It did not understand the importance of getting that water back into the basin. The fact is that we are fixing that problem and now and, through the Cabinet Natural Resources Committee and the Director of Water Resources, we are really homing in on the project. This will prove to the people that this problem will be fixed and water will come into the Willunga Basin and create jobs. I appreciate that some members opposite might get a bit uptight about that, but I get just as uptight when I read stories and hear the Opposition continuing to push aside the problems we inherited.

There is no way known that any Government could fix the problems inherited in just four years, and this is where I really want to emphasise the message: we have not done everything perfectly as a Government because we are only human beings, but we have been in there trying to do the very best we can. Frankly, the record stands by itself. There is still a long way to go and a lot of work to be done but I get sick and tired of some comments by a few people in senior positions in the welfare sector and I am happy to put this on the record tonight. I wonder whether some of them want to see the problems fixed. What would happen if the problems were fixed is that there would be a job shift away from that sector to a more positive and pro-active sector. In saying that, I am not taking away from the committed people who work in that area, because they have an important job to do, but we have to realise that South Australia needs to get on with the job of being the State that we are accustomed to. That means more hard decisions and a little more effort by all people until we get to that final goal.

South Australia is not a big State: it is geographically dislocated when it comes to the eastern seaboard, which is why projects like the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link are so important. Again, I say that we have had something like 86 years to get the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link finalised. It was promised to us with the Federation agreement in 1901 and now, whilst we still have a lot of work to do, there appears to be an opportunity for it, but suddenly there are questions and people jumping up and saying 'Me too.' I am fed up with the 'me toos'. They had their opportunity and we need the opportunity to continue. We have seen success with the tariff debate issue on cars and that has been good for the south and my electorate of Mawson. We have seen growth in other areas as well. Reference has been made to the wine industry and I have talked about tourism and hospitality, and they are the four main avenues by which we will create jobs in my region of Mawson and the south. It is also necessary to get the future that we talk about. As we heard in the Parliament today, we will see those opportunities sustained.

Therefore, I say to the people of South Australia that there is still a way to go. We need your support. I have called on it before and I encourage you to work with us because I am sure that, at the end of the day and given a few more years, we will be back where we started. I challenge anyone to take on a business which was effectively in receivership with an unknown bottom line and turn it around in four years. If it takes 10 or 11 years to get into such a state, if you can get out of it between four to eight years, I think you are doing well. In summary, I am pleased to support this budget and I congratulate all members who were involved. Certainly, I congratulate the community at large for their efforts in making sure we return South Australia to the State we knew in previous generations.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I have pleasure in following the member for Mawson, because I want to add to the comments he has just made. In my previous budget speech I referred to the fact that constituents within Kaurna and throughout South Australia have done it tough. They might not have agreed with all the decisions we have made but, by golly, they have understood why we have had to make those decisions. The member for Mawson has touched on a true nerve in saying that people have understood the problem. However, there is a fear for me that some people in the community may become rather complacent. In some of the doorknocking I have been doing lately, I get the feeling that a lot of the constituency believe the debt is under control, that we have had three or four years now and that we have taken care of the problem. Let me state clearly on the record, as I said in the other 30 minutes of debate on the budget, we have come a long way. We have reduced the budget by \$1.8 billion but we have a long, long way to go and, if the electorate out there is wise, it will not put this Parliament back in the hands of the Labor Party, which created the monster we are now trying to control. I agree with the statements made by the member for Mawson and I think he is absolutely correct.

I would like to touch on some issues which have come out of the Estimates Committees and which directly affect the electorate of Kaurna and the southern area in general. I congratulate the Minister for Transport, Diana Laidlaw, for the work being done on the Southern Expressway. It was a major announcement for this Government. It has been a major election promise given to the southern area over and over, yet it has taken this Government to bring it to fruition. Stage 1 from Darlington to Reynella will be open to traffic by December this year, and I had the pleasure recently—along with the members for Mitchell, Mawson and Reynell—of going along the Southern Expressway. I think we all agreed that the contractors are doing a superb job and that we all look forward to the opening of the first stage.

Planning and design is now well under way for the second stage of that project which will end at Old Noarlunga and take in sections of my electorate through Noarlunga Downs. I believe that the contractor for the Southern Expressway has done a magnificent job in terms of community consultation, which has now started in earnest for stage 2. I have attended a couple of meetings at Noarlunga and I believe that the effort being put into community consultation is one of the major reasons why this will be an absolute boom for the southern area.

The member for Mawson also mentioned the Adelaide to Darwin rail proposal. For as long as I have lived in Sellicks Beach—I have lived there for about 25 years—I can remember that South Australians have talked about the possibility

of an Adelaide to Darwin rail link. I believe that this is the closest that this State has ever come to the possible success of an Adelaide to Darwin rail link. I see it as absolutely essential for the development of Adelaide, both for tourism and industry. To that end I have been doorknocking my electorate for the past two months with a petition supporting the Adelaide to Darwin rail link as opposed to the Melbourne to Darwin rail link. The support in the community is at least 95 per cent for that rail link to be built. I hope that that message from our electorates gets through to the Federal Government, not only for the fact that we require it as a success story but also for the potential increase in jobs during construction of the project and, more importantly, for the long-term future of tourism and the development of our industries within South Australia.

I would also like to refer to the recreational boating levy. I have had the pleasure of being the Chair of the Recreational Boat Facilities Committee for the past two years. A levy of \$25 is paid on boats and that money is available in South Australia for not only the improvement and maintenance of boating facilities but also the building of new facilities. I am very proud that the committee has chosen, quite purposefully, to spend that money across the State and tried to be as fair as possible with the spread of the money raised. Over that period, we have had the pleasure of spending money at Arno Bay, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, American River, Coffin Bay, Franklin Harbor and Port Neill. We have another meeting next week and, no doubt, we will allocate money to new developments within the State. The Riverland, in particular, has done very well as a result of the levy money being spent in that area.

I am very pleased to see the allocation of money by the State Government for the extension of Adelaide Airport. Anything that can happen in South Australia to increase industry and tourism is obviously a positive for all South Australians, not just for those who might access the airport. The spin-off for all South Australians is obvious and I think the Federal Government needs to be given some kudos for actually bringing this issue out of drawing board stage and into reality.

I have raised with the Minister for Transport on several occasions the possibility of having temporary disability parking permits for people who have a need for such a permit for a short period. They are people who are not permanently disabled but there is a stage within their life when for one reason or another there is a requirement. That has not been possible in the past, but I am pleased that during the Estimates Committees that issue was recognised as important, that it will come on stream and that it will be possible for people to have temporary use.

The success of TransAdelaide in the southern area, particularly through the Lonsdale depot, is superb. The changes that have been made to the bus services within our area, both through TransAdelaide and Transit Regency in the Aldinga-Sellicks Beach area, have improved 100 per cent the services for transport within our constituency. I would like to pay tribute to TransAdelaide for its Night Moves service—the service which picks up people from the city and takes them to Noarlunga Centre, where they meet up with a free taxi to transport them home. I know that a number of people, including my daughter, have used that service on a regular basis. As a parent, I feel much happier when I know that they are coming home in a safe atmosphere and not driving on the roads—not necessarily because they have been drinking but perhaps because other people have been. I think Trans-

Adelaide has done a great job and I take my hat off to TransAdelaide, particularly the Lonsdale depot, for the work it has done to improve services within our southern area.

The next area in which I have a particular interest is the Police Department. I would like to pay tribute to the Minister for Police, who has announced, as part of the estimates and the budget, the extra policing that will be obvious to constituents in the southern area very soon, and I speak of the additional 125 staff—100 police and 25 public servants. Members would be aware that Aldinga and Noarlunga community police stations have opened since I became member as a result of the support of Government and because of the recognition of the importance of community policing. The extra police to be situated at the three police stations within the area—that is, Christies Beach, Aldinga and Noarlunga Centre—will be welcomed by the community over time and will form part of our election promise of an extra 190 police officers.

As part of Focus 21, I had the pleasure of hearing David Easton address a community group recently and give an example of Focus 21 and how it will affect the southern area. It was a very positive presentation and an amazing change in how policing will happen in South Australia, and it will really benefit us. The other important issue coming out of the police estimates is the extensions for the Christies Beach police complex. It is something that the members for Mawson and Reynell and I have worked very hard to have put on the capital works program. I am pleased that it has been brought forward, particularly because there will be an extra 26 police at Christies Beach. It has been made a priority and will allow for much better servicing of police officers within that area. The other part of Focus 21 which I am particularly pleased to see is that it will establish a permanent anti-paedophilia unit. At this stage we do not have a permanent group of people who are part of a unit such as that: members of the Police Department are seconded to that position, but it is such an important issue for us in South Australia and I am very pleased to see that it will be set up as a permanent unit within South Australia.

The other issue coming out of Minister Ingerson's portfolio is that of the CFS and the SES. I have been a long-term advocate—in fact, very supportive—of collocation of St Johns volunteers and the CFS at Aldinga Beach. The new CFS station built not long after my election collocates both St Johns and the Aldinga CFS. I believe it has been a successful collocation program and it is pleasing for me to see that that attempt of collocation, and in addition having the SES collocate, will be continuing. In fact, there has been an increase in budget for that to happen. I am very pleased to see that as a result of the estimates coming through.

I am also pleased that the member for Taylor raised the issue of the rumour she claims has been doing the rounds that the State Government is looking to take over the management of the CFS fleet and move all the brigade equipment to different areas. I have my own suspicions about where that supposed rumour started. I was pleased that the Minister came out and said categorically that we have absolutely no intention of doing that. Hopefully, that will end that rumour.

The other issue from Minister Ingerson's portfolio involves infrastructure, and I raise the issue of the Old Noarlunga sewerage scheme. Members may know, as does the former member for the district comprising Old Noarlunga, the member for Heysen, Old Noarlunga residents have lobbied for a long time for the sewerage scheme at Old Noarlunga. We have offered a sewerage scheme to Old

Noarlunga under the current legislation which would require the capital contribution costs to be paid by each person connected to the scheme.

A poll of all electors in Old Noarlunga was taken as to whether or not they wanted the scheme under those conditions. Very clearly they rejected that scheme. Both the member for Mawson and I have stated on the public record that we believe the 'No' vote was really a reaction to the cost of the scheme rather than indicating that they did not want the scheme at all. It is clearly understood in the community that the scheme is needed on environmental grounds.

The Estimates Committee had some glimmer of hope for the member for Mawson and myself in that the Minister has indicated that SA Water will be prepared to reinstate this project in the capital works program for 1998-99. In the meantime we have to work out how that might be accessed by local residents. It is something for which both I and the member for Mawson (who will represent the area of Old Noarlunga after the next election) will continue to work until we get the promised scheme that we believe the community deserves.

The other issue I wish to raise is that of the Christies Beach treatment plant, which is located in the electorate of Kaurna. As all members would know, we have made a clear statement that, by the year 2000, we wish to have no more movement of discharge to the sea, and that augurs well for the desire of all southern members to have a pipeline that leads the water from Christies Beach back to the Willunga Basin. It is absolutely essential for the continuation of successful agriculture in the Willunga Basin for that water to be returned to the Willunga Basin, not just for the sake of the environment but more importantly for the sake of the economy.

Obviously, if you cannot make the Willunga Basin economically viable agriculturally, the pressure will always be there for that area to be subdivided. Anyone in the southern area would agree that the Willunga Basin is far too valuable in terms of agriculture to have it whittled away and covered with houses. The pipeline has been a vision and a dream of many members down south who have worked very hard to bring that project to fruition. I do not think any of us will stop working until we achieve success in that area.

With respect to those matters dealt with by the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, I am pleased with an announcement about the new board to be set up for the Onkaparinga area. Most members would know that an interim board has been in place for some time. Its members have been working very hard under the chairmanship of Val Lewin. I had the pleasure to represent the Minister on Sunday at the launch of a video focusing on the Onkaparinga estuary and the success that has taken place with Federal Government, State Government, local government and, most importantly, community members working together to improve the water quality of that estuary. It is a very good video telling a very good story how the community has actually made a difference.

That is why I believe that the water management boards will be successful—because they will have a large community input and, particularly because of the wording of the legislation, the community will always be consulted about the changes and the water plans that will be put in place. The Onkaparinga being one of those estuaries of national significance, it is extremely important that it be protected. The final day for nominations for the water management board was last Friday, and when that body is announced they

will obviously have a huge job ahead of them but, with community support, that job will be successful.

The other issue I raise from that Estimates Committee relates to transport within the Willunga Basin rural area. For a long time the only bus service for many in that community has been a community bus. I am very pleased to see from the Estimates Committee hearing an allocation of \$28 100 for the purchase of a new community bus to be used particularly for senior citizens within the Willunga Basin. Most importantly, \$25 000 has been allocated for the coordination of all the different styles of transport, both community and contract transport, but more particularly, to provide an east-west service linking McLaren Vale, Willunga and Aldinga with areas such as Seaford and Noarlunga Centre.

The link to Seaford is particularly important because of the location of the Southern Vales Health Centre at Seaford. The new bus service that accesses Sellicks and Aldinga linking to Noarlunga Centre and Seaford is extremely important to those people living in what I call the deep south, the outer south, where I live. That is something which 12 months ago presented a great deal of difficulty for people living at Sellicks Beach.

Through the work of both the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Family and Community Services in putting together HACC and transport money, we have allocated two new major services for that particular outlying area which I do not believe would ever have been accessed without the understanding that has come to this Parliament by very active local members out in the community but, more importantly, Ministers prepared to listen to local members who do know what is actually going on in the community. I believe that the budget is a good one which will take South Australia forward, and I support it.

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** The Estimates Committee hearings over the past two weeks were conducted in a relatively informal manner and I learnt much from them. Committees A and B reviewed the budget and the Olsen Liberal Government's payments and receipts. As a member of the Government, I attended the hearings involving Education and Children's Services with Minister Lucas; and, for Tourism, Local Government, and Recreation and Sport, with Minister Ashenden. I found both sessions most informative and constructive.

However, like my colleagues, I was stunned by the Opposition's obvious lethargy and lack of organisation and by its preparedness to miss the opportunity to challenge and be briefed on many issues by this Government. These issues related specifically to the budget, payments and receipts, projected estimates on many exciting developments that will boost jobs, the economy in general, and tourism in South Australia. Some of these projects directly involve the electorate of Hanson, for which I am the member.

One such example is the Mile End development, including proposed housing as well as athletics and netball stadiums. It is a dramatic transformation from the old goods yards which for many decades were an eyesore for all South Australians, especially those travelling from the airport along Burbridge Road for their first look at the central business district of Adelaide. Now as we go over the Hilton bridges we see tremendous changes on a daily basis which have upgraded that area by over 100 per cent.

During the Estimates Committee I asked Minister Ashenden what benefits there would be for all South Australians as a result of the athletics and netball stadiums at

Mile End. The Minister informed the Committee that the athletics stadium will be completed by October 1997—and it is obvious to people going over the bridges that it is now well and truly under way—and that it will provide the sport of athletics with a facility of international standard. As the Minister indicated, when this Government came to office, it saw only too clearly that this State had been left with abysmal facilities in many different areas, but certainly in the area of athletics.

The total budget for this facility at Mile End, when completed, will be \$8.4 million and will provide the headquarters for athletics in South Australia. The new facility will serve as the headquarters not just for the elite athletes—and we must, of course, cater for them—but also for veterans (into which category I almost fit)—older people who are still very interested in participating in sport; and the disabled, who love their sport and who, at the last Paralympics, won so many gold medals for Australia, many of those athletes coming from South Australia. This facility will provide South Australia with the opportunity to attract from all over the world a wide range of international athletes in track and field and other events. The development will be a focal point for major athletics throughout the State.

The new netball stadium development will have a seating capacity of 3 000 and will include corporate boxes, offices for administration and the media, seminar rooms, creches, a cafeteria, merchandising and many other aspects. That complex is also well and truly under way, as one can see when one looks to the right when travelling over the Hilton bridges towards Adelaide. The estimated cost is \$9.9 million, which will consist of \$7 million for the indoor stadium and the outdoor courts, and \$2.9 million for the site development. The netball complex will be funded from the sale of assets and other sources by the Department of Recreation and Sport in South Australia.

As a follow-up question to the Minister, I asked how the Sydney 2000 Olympics will impact on the Australian economy and how this State will benefit specifically. I recall, as a 12-year-old boy, having the privilege of attending the 1956 Olympic Games in Melbourne. I was not particularly interested in the economy at that stage: I was probably more interested in seeing Vladimir Kuts and Gordon Pirie in running events and other great athletes of that era also participating. It was a great privilege and experience for me, as a young bloke, to be there that day. And, of course, we now host the 2000 Olympics in Sydney, some 44 years later.

The Minister informed the Estimates Committee that the net impact on the gross domestic product for the period 1991 to 2004 will be in the region of \$7.336 billion for Australia. The bulk of this will be concentrated in the period from 1998 to 2000, up to the time of the Sydney Olympics, and one-third of this money (or \$2.8 billion) will apply outside New South Wales. The Department of Recreation and Sport has set a target of between 8 and 12 per cent of this figure, which is about \$20 million in economic benefits. That is a tremendous amount for the State.

I also asked the Minister what benefit South Australia will receive by hosting the 1998 Australian Open Golf Championships in South Australia. This is a great coup for the State and was announced a few weeks ago by the Premier. I recall, two or so years ago, tremendous criticism by the Opposition and the media for bringing the world's No. 1 golfer, Greg Norman—who, I see in the paper today, has been acclaimed as the world's greatest golfer ever—to South Australia for something costing in the vicinity of \$300 000 to play in the

South Australian Open. That really paid off and boosted the economy of South Australia considerably.

The Minister informed the Estimates Committee that a world-wide television audience of approximately 600 000 000 people will watch the 1998 Australian Open Golf Championships. Golfers of the calibre of Tiger Woods, perhaps Greg Norman and other champion golfers, including Tom Lehman, will compete in that tournament. It is expected that it will attract more than 75 000 visitors, and the South Australian economy will benefit by something between \$7.5 million and \$8 million, according to the Minister.

I was also involved in the Estimates Committee attended by Minister Lucas, dealing with the education portfolio, as well as the Committee considering correctional services. I applaud Minister Lucas for his initiative, creativity and strong leadership in the education portfolio during the past three and a half years. School closures have resulted in criticism by the Opposition, the South Australian Teachers Union and the media. Two schools, Netley and Camden, in my electorate have given great service over many years and have been landmarks in the western suburbs for education in general. Those schools, with total acceptance by the majority of constituents—in fact, most parents believe that this is a great move—will close at the end of 1997 to pave the way for a reception to year 12 complex on the Plympton High School site. The new foundation headmaster of that school is Mr Roger Henderson, whom I know very well. That is a fitting reward for Mr Henderson, who has served for many solid years (over 25 years) as an educator in South Australia.

An emotive issue has emerged involving one of the oldest schools in the State—which is also in my electorate—Plympton Primary School. A review is being conducted to see whether the school remains reception to year 7, as it stands at the moment, or whether it is cut to reception to grade 6, or even reception to grade 5. The Minister indicated during the Estimates Committee that he had not received the review committee's report but, after discussion with his Chief Executive Officer, Mr Denis Ralph, in the near future, he would be in a position to make a decision. The Minister reiterated my strong support for the Plympton Primary School to remain reception to year 7. I have met with the Principal, Simon Dawson, the staff and parents on numerous occasions, and they are very much aware of my views that it should remain reception to year 7. In a letter written to the Minister on 30 May I stated:

The sale of Netley and Camden schools will also substantially help finance a top class complex at Plympton High. I totally support the establishment of the new R-12 super school. I believe the western suburbs very much needs this development and there will be many positives resulting from it.

In another paragraph I stated:

In my capacity as the local member of Parliament I have always been very protective of all the schools in my electorate. I have listened to the many arguments presented by the schools themselves, spoken with parents, staff and the wider community. It is always sad to see schools such as Camden and Netley close after having given outstanding service to the community for many decades.

I further stated:

I have spoken at length to the Richmond and Plympton Primary School communities about the new development at Plympton High School and how it will directly affect them. Richmond Primary School is now quite settled as they will continue to be a viable R-7 primary school within a few kilometres of the central business district of Adelaide. Plympton Primary School, on the other hand, is now waiting for the review decision to be handed down to see whether the school will be reduced to R-5, R-6 or remain R-7.

Plympton Primary School has a great history of service being one of the oldest primary schools in South Australia. Like all of the schools in Hanson it has endured the anguish over the past three years of not knowing whether it would remain open or not. I realise the final decision is yours as to whether Plympton Primary School changes in format, however, I have studied the paper given to me on 'Student data and implications for the future of Plympton Primary School' very carefully and I believe strongly that the school should remain R-7.

I go on to say to the Minister in three brief paragraphs:

I have had many discussions with you on this and have also voiced my support to the parents and friends of Plympton Primary School. . . The main argument for reducing Plympton Primary School from R-7 is to ensure that R-12 school thrives at Plympton High School. I can understand that line of thinking, but the western suburbs have undergone significant change during the past five years with more and more young families moving into the western area. A reduction of the school to R-5 or R-6 would tear the very heart out of Plympton Primary School.

The final paragraph states:

I believe everyone will be a winner if Plympton Primary School remains R-7. There is room for a top class complex at Plympton Primary School but not at the expense of severing the two older class at Plympton Primary School.

Again, I congratulate the Liberal Government for the way in which it has managed South Australia during the past 3½ years. I congratulate the Premier and the Treasurer on the budget which was handed down in May, and I again highlight the way in which this Government has had to pick up the pieces and restore confidence in South Australia after a decade of Labor Government mismanagement.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I want to make a couple of comments about the exercise that we have gone through during the past two weeks and again express, as I did this time last year, my disappointment with the procedures. I believe strongly that the Estimates Committees in their current format have had their day. I said this last year and I hope someone says it next year. It certainly will not be me, as this year's Estimates Committees was my swan song.

The budget should be referred to the standing committees which are quite capable of extracting items they wish to follow through without the involvement of hundreds of officers hanging around Parliament House for two weeks. I believe that the committees can do it far more efficiently and can focus on critical areas rather than going through everything line by line, which I think is inefficient and a waste of everyone's time. Half the time is spent by Ministers answering dorothy dix questions which the departments have drawn up and given to Government members. I do not see anything particularly productive in that.

Of course, politics comes into it to a great extent. Interest drops off as soon as the journalists get their story for the day and off they go. You cannot really blame them. The exercise is pretty fruitless. As a Minister I always enjoyed the Estimates Committees because it meant I had to spend only one day in Parliament over the fortnight. That was the attraction: I had the other 13 days off and I did other things that I thought were more productive, whilst the poor old backbenchers sat in here grinding away day after day on half the salary and with half the interest in the job that they were doing. I spent my day here, and then I toddled off.

That is exactly how it works. There is nothing new in this. As I said last year, I hope a future Parliament changes it. I do not believe that the Ministers will have to work any harder if the budget is split and referred to the standing committees. The standing committees can deal with it sensibly by just



picking the eyes out of the things they want to examine rather than having the whole shebang and spending eight hours a day here or more, four hours of which is spent on just answering dorothy dix questions. It is a pretty pointless exercise.

I was amused by the member for Peake who objected to the aggression that was shown to Ministers. I did not notice any aggression particularly. The Ministers did not seem to be flinching too much when answering questions. The member for Peake also said that he was disappointed that the Opposition did not seem to be interested in extracting useful information in the way in which he did when in Opposition. The member for Peake may remember these things, but I do not remember him extracting anything of any value during his umpteen years in the Parliament. Once he stopped having spies at the Westfield Shopping Centre looking for Government cars—that apparently was his only reason for being here for 25 or 28 years—there did not seem to be a lot left for him to do.

I think there was next to no aggression, but there was certainly a great deal of disappointment amongst members of the Committee because of the way in which a couple of the Ministers could not answer any questions at all. They did not seem to understand that more could be gained by assisting the Committee rather than stonewalling. I think that was a great pity. For example, I was surprised at the Minister for Primary Industries' stonewalling of the Committee. He was not as bad as some of the other Ministers, but I was surprised that he found it necessary to stonewall the Committee and not be helpful at all. I could not see why he was being so defensive. The Minister for Local Government was the Minister for Local Government—I will say no more about that. It depended very much on the capabilities of the Ministers as to how comfortable they were. I do not think that the Premier or the Treasurer found the exercise particularly onerous. Perhaps that comes with experience.

The number of advisers seemed to be something of a record. I would not have liked to add up the number of advisers and their salaries, some of which would be far in excess of members of this Parliament. How much the exercise cost would have been a frightful amount and for very little benefit. It is a horribly expensive and inefficient way of dealing with the Government's budget.

Regarding the budget itself, there is not much one can say. Having been Treasurer for a very brief period (about 15 months) I have some understanding of how the Treasurer feels when he is chasing a decent bottom line. It seems that no matter what he does something else impacts upon that bottom line so that he never really gets to where he is trying to go. It is difficult and, as I say, I have some understanding of it.

The way in which the Government presented the budget was unfortunate. It was a lie: the presentation of the budget was a lie. One cannot say any more than that. It is unnecessary in this day and age, because people are not stupid. However, there is no doubt that the *Advertiser* would not point out that this was a lie, and we understand that. How many of the other media take the trouble to examine it, I do not know, but the Australian *Financial Review*, for example, on the Friday following the budget made perfectly clear just what the budget is in fact rather than what was stated in the budget papers. For example, the *Financial Review* of 30 May, among other things, states:

The South Australian Government has forecast a \$1 million underlying surplus for 1997-98, but accounting standards adopted

nationally for State budgets show the South Australian budget will move from a total Government surplus of \$26 million in 1996-97 to a deficit of \$44 million in 1997-98.

That may still be a good effort, but do not let us pretend that it is some kind of surplus when it is not. It is nonsense to do that. It is insulting to the real journalists on real newspapers who are capable of doing a very simple analysis of the budget. The quote I have just given was by Simon Jemison and I recommend it to all members of the House who want to get an expert impartial analysis of the budget. On the same page is a comment by Alan Mitchell who says, among other things:

Has South Australia's new Premier, John Olsen, lost the plot as completely as his unfortunate predecessor, Dean Brown? Or is Olsen planning to make up for yesterday's unsatisfactory effort once he has the State election out of the way? The best that can be said for the budget is that it did not stray too far on the wrong side of the lazy fiscal consolidation plan inherited from Brown. The Government claims it is budgeting for an underlying surplus of \$1 million. In truth the general Government sector will run an underlying deficit of \$129 million.

I repeat that: 'an underlying deficit of \$129 million.' It continues:

The public sector is expected to finish the year with an underlying deficit of \$44 million, compared with this fiscal year's surplus of \$26 million. The budget features the usual pre-election raids on hollow logs as well as one-off revenue hits—all of which will be spent on vote-buying job creation schemes, program enhancements and capital works. This may enhance Olsen's majority in the new Parliament, but it will do little to enhance South Australia's ability to attract business investment and sustainable jobs growth. Yesterday's budget means all the reduction in public debt and underlying deficit in the Liberal's first term has been achieved through asset sales.

My guess is that the Treasurer almost cried when he read that. He would know, after almost four years, that no matter what he seems to have done on the current account, no matter how many public servants he has got rid of, it is like a dog chasing its tail and the bottom line has not improved much at all.

The only improvement, as the *Financial Review* states, is to asset sales. The Auditor-General made clear that asset sales gained the budget only about \$4 million after some tremendous asset sales over three years. That was in last year's Auditor-General's Report. All in all the Treasurer's job is extraordinarily difficult. I have an understanding of that, but I object to the farce we were subjected to on budget day when it was suggested that some kind of genuine surplus had been created. That simply was not the case.

Another publication for which I have always had quite a bit of regard—not that it has always been very kind to me—is the *Stock Journal*. The *Stock Journal* of 5 June carried the headline 'Rural SA lashes "nothing" budget'. The article, which was written by Jessica Sullivan and Craig Malin, states, amongst other things:

It has been described as an historic turnaround in the financial fortunes of the State. Last week's State budget appears to have snubbed the rural sector.

It goes on to say:

Groups such as the South Australian Farmers Federation are critical of the budget's lack of substance for regional South Australia. The South Australian Farmers Federation highlighted the favourable treatment handed to city residents at the expense of the farming community. Whilst SAFF President, Wayne Cornish, welcomed several budget initiatives, he said it did 'precious little' to invest in an industry that was clearly vital to the State's economic performance.

Quoting Wayne Cornish, the article goes on to say:

From the rural perspective we are disappointed that so little of the planned capital expenditure is to be invested in regional South Australia.

There are two long columns of those kinds of comments from the reporters of the *Stock Journal*. If you take two of the most conservative newspapers circulating in this State—the *Australian Financial Review* and the *Stock Journal*, newspapers that you could say generally speaking were favourably disposed to conservative Governments—we find that they have given this budget the thumbs down, and rightly so.

The comments in the *Stock Journal* bring me to a favourite topic of mine: the way the non-metropolitan area of this State has been treated for almost four years by this Government. It has been treated appallingly and the Farmers Federation, amongst other rural groups, are right to point this out. I understand that the private sector has some difficulty in maintaining its numbers in rural areas in regional and provincial cities in South Australia. I understand the workings of the market and, if you are a world player, you are a price taker; and, if the prices are no good, you cannot go on forever maintaining the level of employment you have. You have to meet the market or stop playing the game.

Whether it is primary production or some other wealth creation activity outside the metropolitan area—my own city of Whyalla and the steel industry—the difficulties they are having are essentially due to the world market. I do not say I agree with them, but I understand the actions of the likes of BHP and other companies. Often they have no option. This is not the case with State Governments.

State Governments have the ability to spread around their employees in a more equitable way. They do not all have to work within the metropolitan area. I know that that is the preference of the employees. I am sure that, if there was a choice between working 500 kilometres from Adelaide or working close to the eastern suburbs of Adelaide, what people would choose is understandable, but the South Australian public sector is there for the whole of South Australia. It is not there just for Adelaide. It is not the Adelaide public sector or the Adelaide Education Department or the Adelaide Health Commission. They are South Australian bodies. There is an obligation on the Government to see that those non-metropolitan areas are serviced by public sector employees to the maximum extent possible. I believe—and everyone outside the metropolitan area knows it to be the case—that this Government has done the opposite. Where they have been able to take away people from rural or regional South Australia, they have done so. Where they have been able to centralise into Adelaide, they have done that. The consequences of the loss of population in the regional and rural areas has been devastating.

It was suggested to me that the reason for there being no revolt in the Liberal Party room over the depopulation of the rural and regional areas of South Australia is that essentially there is no sanction on those Liberal members of Parliament. The worst that can happen is that at some stage in the future they will lose at least one more rural seat due to loss of population. That seems a long way off to some of them, so I do not suppose they care. They work on the basis that the public employees who go out of their electorates will help their majority in the elections to come, even though it does economic damage to those electorates. So there is no political sanction. By and large, they are right; there will be no political sanction on this Government in response to its policy of depopulating non-metropolitan South Australia.

It is callous of those Liberal members of Parliament who represent country areas of South Australia, who hold country seats, not to have stood up in any way whatsoever for their electorates and for the maintenance of Government services in those electorates. If they have raised their voice in Caucus, they have been utterly ineffective. I do not think we have seen such a period of depopulation occur in South Australia for generations. Under policies not just of this Government but of the Federal Liberal Government, the position will get even worse. So my appeal, even at this late hour, is for Liberal Party members in the Liberal Party Caucus to stand up for rural and regional South Australia and to try to reverse some of the policy decisions resulting in the depopulation of those areas.

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** This was my third Estimates Committees exercise, and the Committees that I attended were not different from those of the first or second years. This year, I was very surprised at the attitude of the Opposition on activities in South Australia. It is an attitude that is reflected in everything that proceeds before this House and also in the public arena—an attitude of knocking everything as soon as it arises. There is no better example than the outsourcing of the operations of SA Water. The Opposition's total opposition to the contract has led to its creating a public perception that a privatisation of assets occurred in relation to the contract, when it knew—and everyone in this House knew—that that was totally false. However, it failed to recognise that the project itself has provided savings to the South Australian budget.

Those savings have seen a reduction in the recurrent budget. They have seen an end to budgets of past eras, when the member for Giles was Treasurer, where the day-to-day expenditure for the State was financed by borrowings. It led to the stage where consistently we had a recurrent budget with a deficit of \$300 million. The outsourcing of the maintenance of water and waste water has meant that more moneys are available for education and for health. In South Australia, we have seen a reduction in our interest costs from \$3 million to less than \$2 million a day. As a result of the reduction in interest costs, more money has been spent on education. More money has been spent in the Mitchell electorate on back-to-school grants and on painting and repairs. As a result of more money being available in the area of education, a school in my electorate is able to have its building painted for the first time in 20 years.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CAUDELL:** And the member for Unley is well aware of the standard of painting and the state of repair of some schools in the Mitchell electorate, formerly the Hayward electorate. They were absolutely deplorable, and very little money had been spent on those schools. As a result of the savings in the budget, more money is available. The same applies to the back to school grants, which assist schools that have problems with space and facilities for the students. Buildings were moving because they were sited on fault lines and repairs were necessary to fix cracks through which one could see daylight.

Further, the reduction in interest costs and the deficit under the budget have made available more funds to supply computers to schools. In the Mitchell electorate, the schools have taken to the DECSTech 2001 program, with the purchase of computers. In particular, the Seaview Downs Primary School is playing a lead role in the supply of information technology to students in that area. One wonders

where this State will go when the Opposition continues to knock and oppose everything that is put forward. One wonders why this State is not improving or starting to fire up economically, as has occurred in Queensland and in Western Australia: the Opposition has put into the marketplace facts and perceptions it knows are incorrect.

I sat in the Estimates Committee while the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources was the witness. I listened to questions of the Leader of the Opposition regarding the smell at Bolivar and the work done by the EPA and the independent auditor. Based on the Leader of the Opposition's persistent questions in this regard, one would think that he was blind, dumb, deaf or stupid. Despite being told consistently by the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources that no cover-up had occurred and that the EPA was an independent authority, and despite being told consistently by the Director of the EPA that no cover-up had occurred, that the EPA was an independent authority, that the independent auditor was completing a report on the issue, that that report would be coming to the EPA and that it would be made available straight after the lunch break during the Estimates Committee, the Leader of the Opposition went outside and said that there was an attempt to cover up. He said that the Minister for Infrastructure had requested that the effluent be pumped into the gulf and that the EPA was a toothless poodle.

That came from the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition who was supposed to be in this House to represent an alternative point of view, not to carry on with innuendo and creating false perceptions in the marketplace, with businesses and with people in the suburbs, feeding false information, knowing that, as a result, these people would make decisions on an economic basis that affect this State, would turn around and decide to—

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the member for Mitchell's alluding to improper motives on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition. I ask for your ruling on this matter.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I did not hear the phrase to which the honourable member is alluding. However, I simply remind the member for Mitchell that, if the allegations are correct, he should refrain from making them.

**Mr CAUDELL:** People make decisions based on what is said in this House and what is said in public in press interviews, and it behoves all members of this House to make correct statements which are based on fact, and the statements that were made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the water contract and the Bolivar issue were totally unacceptable, and I am surprised that a person of the calibre of the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition would come out and make those statements. When you listen to the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, you get the impression that Bolivar is something that has only just existed, that has only just raised up out of the lagoon in the past couple of months.

In fact, as the Minister for Infrastructure pointed out today, there was a statement by the then Minister, who was later a Premier of this State, Mr Corcoran, who said, 'We will spend \$40 000 and spray some perfume over the lagoon to ensure that everything will be okay.' Ten years later the then Minister for the Environment and the former member for Reynell was reported in the paper in 1989 as saying, 'We will fix this problem but it is going to take us a long time.' She said it was going to take a long time to fix. She wanted people to write in to tell her if they had any problems. The Minister for Infrastructure pointed out that the then Minister for the

Environment highlighted the funds that would be required to fix the problem, but at no stage from 1989 to 1993 would the then Treasurer in South Australia release funds for the correction of the Bolivar problem.

True, Bolivar has been around for a long time, the problems are there and they need to be fixed, but there is no need for Her Majesty's Opposition to come before the Estimates Committee and pretend that there is a cover-up and go outside, despite reassurances from the independent authority, the Environment Protection Authority, that there would be no cover-up and that the report received from the independent auditor would be available for all to see. The issues over the water contract and the drawing of the long bow by the Opposition remind me of the Patawalonga clean-up. For a long time we had promises and promises. The people in the south-western suburbs of Adelaide were promised a clean-up of the Sturt Creek. There was a promise of a clean-up of the Patawalonga and improvements in the Sturt triangle. The Patawalonga clean-up is on target, as the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources showed in the Estimates Committee. The Patawalonga clean-up is on target and is happening. Sturt Creek is starting to show improvement and we have seen negotiations commence with the Patawalonga Catchment Board and the MFP in relation to the Sturt triangle wetlands. Certainly, we are looking forward to an improvement in that area.

A number of questions were asked by the Opposition about employment—the Government's employment objectives and the employment targets. It was interesting that the questions by the member for Ross Smith asked not only of the Premier but of the Treasurer and the Minister for Employment and Further Education were the same questions. Most of the questions were hypothetical about what the unemployment figures would be, based on the number of people leaving South Australia and moving elsewhere. It got to the stage with the hypothetical questions that one wondered whether the questions were being asked of the Minister for hypothetical affairs rather than the Minister responsible for a particular portfolio. The answers that came back were much more positive than the gloomy picture that the Opposition was trying to paint for the future of South Australia.

Earlier today the Treasurer pointed out that the level of debt in South Australia in June 1990 was \$4.6 billion. In June 1994 following the collapse and bail-out of the State Bank it had risen to \$8.4 billion and in June 1997—at the end of this financial year after the sell offs—it was reduced to \$6.8 billion. As I said before, the interest to finance that debt has been reduced from just under \$1 billion a year to \$600 million a year. This reduction in debt and interest has gone a long way in assisting business confidence. Indeed, it is through this improvement in the State debt and the reduction in our interest costs that we will see an increase in employment in South Australia.

That employment will come from businesses such as Bankers Trust establishing in South Australia. Bankers Trust has undertaken an employment project in the Mitchell electorate involving more than 400 people. The establishment of Bankers Trust in the Sturt triangle is part of more than \$400 million in capital expenditure in Mitchell in the past three years. As well, I refer to the confidence shown by the Westfield Group evidenced in the development at Westfield Marion, a project involving more than \$200 million. That investment, that one project, represents 60 per cent of the total retail capital expenditure in this State over the past seven years.

The \$200 million investment also represents 3 000 jobs both in construction and once the project becomes operational. Indeed, the project will become the third largest regional shopping centre in the southern hemisphere and, as such, it will be more than just a place to shop. It will be a place for local family activities; 30 picture theatres are to be established, numerous restaurants and entertainment facilities, including a virtual reality project. This economic activity is not confined to the private sector: it involves local government, with the City of Marion deciding to proceed with its development in the Marion domain. The area to the north of the Westfield development is seeing \$50 million in capital investment, and the first stage of that development has commenced with the construction of the RAA headquarters to the north of the old Oaklands Park Primary School.

All this would not have occurred without business confidence, without confidence in the future of this State as a place worthy to invest. As I said, there has been more than \$400 million in capital expenditure in the electorate of Mitchell in the past three years and some of that has been through Government activity as well. Jobs have been created by the Southern Expressway, which was commenced by the Minister for Transport after the last election and which is on time and on budget. It will be completed by the end of December and will provide opportunities for employment in the southern suburbs. The completion of the Southern Expressway is due in no small part to the work undertaken by Maunsells, which conducted extensive community consultation with the local community on behalf of the Government.

As well as that, we have expenditure at Flinders Medical Centre with the accident-emergency upgrade. Flinders Medical Centre has the second busiest accident and emergency centre in Australia, just coming behind Royal Brisbane Hospital. Also, there is the \$50 million private hospital development at Flinders Medical Centre and, when we look at this, we must wonder about some of the Opposition's statements in the Estimates Committee.

The member for Elizabeth tried to portray that waiting lists had increased at a number of hospitals. At Flinders Medical Centre, the number of surgery cancellations in 1994-95 was 1 201; by 1996-97 it had reduced to 578—a reduction of over 50 per cent in the number of cancellations of operations since 1994-95. This is due in no small part to the efforts of the Health Commission and the Minister for Health, together with the increased funding provided recently to the Flinders Medical Centre and the developments that have occurred there.

We have also seen an increase in activity in housing development in the Mitchell Park area, with the \$50 million housing development joining together both the South Australian Housing Trust and private developers in establishing a new class suburb in that part of Mitchell Park, an area that has become much sought after by both the elderly and the younger people in the electorate.

I commend the budget and the work done by the Government in the reduction of debt, in the reduction of interest costs, and the building up of business confidence which will lead to employment and more jobs in the electorate of Mitchell.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Tonight, we address the Appropriation Bill as it comes out of the Estimates Committees. It is in that context that my attention was drawn today to an article in the *Adelaide Review*, headed 'Olsen's

aromatherapy', by that great political pundit, the former Premier of South Australia, Don Dunstan. I am one person on this side who is not afraid to admit that Premier Dunstan was a social reformer and someone who will go down in South Australia's history as probably one of our more significant Premiers. He is certainly someone who contributed, rightly or wrongly, a great deal to this State. It seems to me a pity that as an elder statesman he turns himself into a political pundit, because too often we read articles which are largely in praise of Donald Dunstan and the Utopia he created by his own vision and by his own genius and which he himself continues to praise to whoever will listen. That is sad—and I mean that genuinely—because he will be remembered, as I said, probably as a great Premier, but he would be remembered as a greater Premier if he did not blow his own trumpet quite as much and left it to others.

However, in this case it is slightly different. Not being able to claim credit for the entire invention of the EWS and the sewerage system, he writes that his part in the Bolivar saga was, in fact, when Gough Whitlam was elected and said as part of the 'It's time' campaign that the major cities, towns and suburban areas were all to have the advantage of being sewered. Premier Dunstan went along to Canberra, in his own words 'irate', because South Australia was already sewered and South Australians had already done the job. He writes:

That was true—the last serious gaps in sewerage service had been dealt with in the 1950s by an efficient Engineering and Water Supply Department which handled waste water as well as the water supply.

He talks, again, of the efficient operation of the EWS Department and the dedication of the Playford Government to see that water was available at an affordable price to householders. Thus, he went to Gough and said to the great man that what Adelaide needed was filtered water. He records, with no modesty, that he was instrumental in obtaining some money for water filtration. I find that, in itself, interesting because, along with other members in this House, I have lived on the Adelaide Plains for many years and I do not know how much money Don Dunstan got, but I distinctly remember that it was under the Bannon Government—not the Dunstan Government—at least a decade later that we started to get water that you could see through coming through our taps. I do now know what measure of filtration Dunstan achieved, but I consider that it was very little and much less significant than that which was done later by subsequent—and I will admit Labor—Governments. Don Dunstan goes on to write:

The sewerage operation was efficient and under the department was closely monitored. In subsequent years, the load and potential load was constantly watched to maintain capacity and efficiency and we operated without major problems.

If members listened to the record, as detailed by the Minister today, of the periodic stinks which have emanated from Bolivar, unless my ears were entirely wrong, a number of stinks occurred in Bolivar during Dunstan's time. I doubt that he was exempt, but I do want to address this—and it is a serious issue I ask members opposite to consider. I will quote the words again:

... the load and potential load was constantly watched to maintain capacity and efficiency and we often operated without problems.

The question is: why? The answer is that in inner suburban areas such as Norwood, his own electorate, and Unley, often and without thought the waste water system and the storm-water system, especially the run-off from roofs, were interconnected. That is now illegal because, as every member in this House knows, intervals of rain create a periodic excess

capacity in the sewerage system. That occurs every time it rains.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Well, the member for Taylor does not understand this but until we go through every house in Unley, Norwood and other inner suburban—

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** That is what happens. I am just explaining, if the member for Taylor will listen.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** What happens is that the volume is increased. With the increased volume, the tanks—

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Taylor thinks that she is an intellectual genius and, indeed, she might be on some matters, but it does not give her the sole capacity for knowledge in this Chamber. It may have been a breakdown, but it was a breakdown in the biological processes, and those breakdowns are given to occur when there is excess capacity in the system.

Under Dunstan, and under a number of Governments subsequently, when an excess capacity came into the tanks it was dealt with quite simply: the gates were opened and raw sewage and semi-treated sewage was allowed to flood into the gulf.

*Mr Caudell interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes, they did. That was their way of dealing with it efficiently and expeditiously.

**Mr Caudell:** How long did they do that?

**Mr BRINDAL:** They did it for two decades or more. Too much sewage, too much in the ponds, so they let go that which was surplus to requirements and virtually destroyed Gulf St Vincent in the process. Read the articles on the seagrasses and the movement of sand along our beaches which has been linked to the seagrasses; read the statements by Susan Lenahan and other subsequent Labor Ministers, who learnt more and decided it was not a good practice.

When we had a periodic event some weeks ago, we had a problem that we could have dealt with in the same way as it had been dealt with, wrongly, some decades before. We could have released a lot of that liquid into the gulf, stabilised the ponds and made it better. As a Government that cares about the environment, we decided that the problem actually needed to be fixed and not hidden and that we did not need to transfer the problem into Gulf St Vincent: we needed to fix it. We have put up with the pong and the repercussions of the pong which have not been pleasant, because the Government has been blamed for it. The Opposition has blamed United Water, and so on, but we have done that rather than pollute our gulf.

If the Opposition thinks for one minute—and I have not heard one honourable member say it—that the best remedy would have been to dump the water, we could have done that to hide the problem. At least members opposite should give us credit for grappling with the problem. While I find it odd that Don Dunstan has moved in the *Adelaide Review* from commenting on food to sewage, I suppose it is one and the same problem—it is all a matter of perspective. While he was a significant Premier, as a political commentator Don Dunstan makes a great *maitre d'*.

This Government and members of this Government bench are proud of this budget. The Opposition has labelled it an election budget. I say to them, 'So what?' After three years in Government, when you are facing an election it is hard for

the budget before the election not, in fact, to be a budget in preparation for the election.

The Government has worked hard for three years preparing the strategy to put it in a position in which it now finds itself, and I do not think any member of the Government should be other than proud of that position. Our first three years were not without difficulty, because although we recorded an overwhelming mandate in the Lower House the electors of South Australia had great expectations. However, since it appears that it has been possible in this State for any major Party to achieve a majority in the other place only with successive good victories, we had a large mandate down here and the ability not to enforce that mandate because of a minority Party in another place. Thus we were on the one hand expected by South Australia to govern like Jeff Kennett but on the other hand not given the mandate to do so.

If you add to what I have said the impossible expectations of some who elected us and understand that only a handful of our parliamentary team had ever experienced a time in Government, members would realise the mountain that lay ahead of us. I admit that in a decade we had learnt to be a very good Opposition. I would also say that, when we came to Government, Ministers and members of the backbench had a learning curve, because being in Opposition is not the same as being in Government. Over three years, we have learnt and are learning still to be a good and better Government. It is only a pity that the Opposition, who had so long in Government, has not yet learnt to be a good Opposition.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart speaks of the former Premier, the Hon. Dean Brown. In this context, on election night, in accepting victory he spoke of an eight to 12 year commitment and not a four year quick fix. It is just a pity that many who heard did not even bother to listen, yet already we are three years into the task. At such a time, as a Government, as a political team and as individual representatives of our electorate, we are called on to reflect, to account for what we have done and to set out clearly what we plan to do. That is what this budget does.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart goes too far. He sits there and asks me how I sleep at night. I would suggest that the member for Hart examine his own conscience. I have never seen anyone preening himself or practising as assiduously for the crown that one day might be his. Not only is he the sorcerer's apprentice, but also he is daily trying to conjure more tricks to be the sorcerer. I do not know who else saw the television news tonight, but I saw—again, not the Leader of the Opposition but the glad rags man, there with all the right quotes, the correct hair style, the nice tie, groomed to be king. And he has the hide to talk about politics on this side of the House. When it comes to low, when it comes to internecine war, when it comes to striking down the person as soon as he is weak, nobody, no political Party ever created—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I would say that the Australian Labor Party does a better job of attacking its own than even the Chinese Communist Party, and that is saying something.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, members.

**Mr BRINDAL:** This Government, of which Premier Brown played no insignificant part—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:**—seeing he was the Premier for three years, has been on track.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** If those craven gutless wonders on the other side of the House keep interjecting, I will start telling them what I really think and this House might not like it.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Deputy Leader.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The budget has been a considered one. It was a result of three years of planning set down by the former Premier and carried in train by the current Premier and his Ministers. It will not be a Government like the mob opposite who are—there is an expression about the barber's cat that is 'something and wind'; I forget what the first word is, but the term is very applicable to the member for Hart. That is exactly how the last Government used to behave—all bangs, whistles, fripperies, allusions and mirror tricks. Smoke and mirrors was the hallmark of that Government. This Government has not been like that.

The member for Mitchell carefully laid down a number of matters, and I want to refer to some in my own electorate. When we came to power, the Unley Primary School was like most primary schools in this State: it had not been painted for years, it had inadequate furniture and the heating and cooling system did not work. It was generally in a state of decay. This Government has quietly and prudentially put into that school \$486 000 to get it to a state which it should now be in. There have not been great announcements. It has just been 'on with the job, fix the schools; on with the job, fix the roads'.

Members opposite who styled themselves a Government decided they would repair Cross Road. They were going to do it in sections. They started it, disrupted the road for years, and then we got into Government. The Department of Transport came to me and said, 'We would like to see what you believe the political downside is of finishing off the road. It's not supposed to be finished for another six years.' They explained to me that, under the Labor Party plan, they would do two-thirds of the road, and they would run the new stormwater drain into the old stormwater drain which was considerably smaller.

So, instead of a particular area in my electorate flooding about once every four or five years, which it has done since time immemorial, there would be episodic flooding approximately twice a year because of the way the stormwater system had then been designed. I said, and was proved correct, that perhaps it would be better to complete the road and not have the houses in the area flood. Cross Road has now been completed, six years ahead of schedule.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith talks about Victoria Avenue. There is another point in question. One of the things that is happening in the budget this year is a \$2 million injection into Unley Park, but that \$2 million injection is for a sewer. It is not the sort of thing you go out and do a major press release about, but the sewers in the older part of the city are in a bad state of disrepair. Some of them are collapsing. So, rather than spend \$2 million on something above the ground that we can all whistle at and run around strutting and taking extraordinary credit for, the Government is doing what it should do: putting its money into infrastructure, investing in the future and repairing that which under 20 years of Labor neglect was left to decay, rot and run down. The Government is not getting the credit that it deserves, because this Government has been about quiet achievement, quiet rebuilding and getting on with the job of establishing a secure foundation.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Hart, rather than ask inane questions as he does, would do better to concentrate on the question as to why there is a \$1.291 billion capital works injection in this budget. He carped and criticised the carry over of \$600 million, I believe he claimed. If members read his speech carefully in *Hansard* tomorrow, they will find that in one part of his speech he belied job creation in this Government, but in another part of his speech he said something to the effect of, 'That \$1.291 billion injection is really just a job creation scheme for the Government.' I believe we will find that comment in *Hansard*. So, in one part of his speech he said that this Government is not about jobs and in another part of his speech he said that this capital works injection is just a grand effort to buy jobs. He cannot have it both ways.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** This is an injection to provide infrastructure—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Hart is imputing improper motives to the member. The honourable member took a point of order on another member earlier and, if his point of order was at all sincere, I suggest that he refrain from making further comment along those lines.

**Mr BRINDAL:** 'Sincere' and the member for Hart do not go readily together. The \$1.291 billion secures infrastructure for this State. It also secures jobs for this State. This Government is to be commended for its budget because, rather than introducing a poll tax, it achieves employment through growth.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I believe that the debate tonight is an example of the problems we have had with the Estimates Committees for the past two years. We have had this debate with respect to the importance of the Estimates Committees and the findings of the various members of Parliament through quizzing Ministers when, basically, there were but two Government Ministers in the Chambers and only one or two Government backbenchers here out of 36. Clearly, they do not take this issue seriously. Indeed, they do not take the whole business of Parliament seriously, because of the contempt which they show to the Opposition and the people of South Australia, when they are not prepared to front up in the Parliament and listen to debate.

One of the things which I noticed during the course of the Estimates hearings of the past fortnight was the sheer time wasting of Government members. We saw the three monkeys from the Government side on the committees asking pre-prepared Dorothy Dix questions of their Ministers. Things sank to a very low ebb when the member for Mawson became so cretinous and so craven-like—he was absolutely subterranean in his cravenness—as he sought to ingratiate himself, through a series of penetrating questions, with the Minister for the Environment. The questions were along the lines of, 'Why, Minister, are you the greatest Minister for the Environment that South Australia has ever had?' and 'Why are we blessed in this State to have the best environment Minister in the world?'

That is but one example of the insightful type of questioning that was put to Government Ministers by Government backbenchers. Of course, the Minister for the Environment gave his usual straightforward 35 minute answer to a simple question to say, 'Yes, I am grateful for your question. I am

indeed the greatest Minister for the Environment Australia has ever seen.' I interjected and said, 'Why not of the universe?' But he was modest. He did in fact reflect, but then said, 'Just nationally the greatest Minister for the Environment.' Whilst at the same time lording his credentials as Minister for the Environment, the Minister said Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of Britain, was wrong on the subject of greenhouse gases. Here he is, the Minister for the Environment, saying, 'Let us stick more smoke into the air, let us stick more carbon dioxide into the air. Do not worry about these South Pacific islands that are about ready to be submerged by the seas because of the greenhouse effect.'

The Minister for the Environment might as well have been the Minister for industrial development, in terms of his answers. As to Bolivar, he did not want to know about it. Of course, it does not stink in Stirling. The good burghers of Stirling and the electorate of Heysen cannot smell the stink of Bolivar, so the Minister for the Environment washed his hands of that issue.

The greatest tribute, the greatest accolade, the one shining example of the Minister for the Environment's tutelage of the past 3½ years is the Mount Lofty Cafe; that it, arguably, ought to have been funded by the Tourist Commission. That is what the Minister's greatest claim is. Yet, when it comes to Cobblers Creek, he does not mind sticking a Vodafone mobile phone tower on it. That is the Minister for the Environment.

During his Estimates Committee hearing the Minister for the Environment showed that he is unfit to hold office as Minister for the Environment. He disagreed with President Clinton, Tony Blair, most of Europe, Helmut Kohl, Jacques Chirac and a whole host of industrialised nation leaders who are calling for an end to the greenhouse effect. But we had the Minister for the Environment in this State cravenly following the line of the Prime Minister of Australia, who said that we are entitled to belch more carbon dioxide out into the atmosphere than any other nation on earth, if necessary. That is a disgrace for the Minister for the Environment.

I will deal with some of the questions I put to a few of the Ministers that I am the shadow for. I asked the Premier about regional development and the number of jobs he has allegedly created or retained in the bush. He could tell me that the Government created or retained 5 000 jobs in regional South Australia. I asked a simple question. There he was, the Premier surrounded by his flanks of advisers—not as big as the Pretorian guard that the Minister for Health had—and he said that he did not know. He said, 'I know that I have created or retained 5 000 jobs over the past 3½ years.' I said, 'List them. You must have a computer button you can push. List all the companies and their locations and the number of employees retained, because how else could you come to the figure of 5 000 jobs?' He said, 'I cannot answer you. I do not know. I do not have it in front of me.' He did not take the question on notice. It is a furphy.

I asked him what he had done for the Upper Spencer Gulf, in particular Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie. I will have to send the Premier a road map so that he knows where Port Augusta is, because he could not name one single job that his Department for Regional Development had created or retained in Port Augusta during the past 3½ years. He said, 'We don't keep statistics on individual towns, we do it by regions', or something of that nature. Port Augusta is a significant city in its own right as are Whyalla and Port Pirie, which the member for Frome ought to know, but we have never heard a word about Port Pirie from the member for

Frome since he became Minister. In fact, I do not think that the member for Frome has uttered the words 'Port Pirie' more than twice in his 3½ years in this House.

In any event, the Premier could not name one company or one job that he had retained or acquired for those three cities. He said, 'It's too hard, and we don't keep those statistics.' Funnily enough, the Premier was then able to tell us how many jobs had been created at Port Lincoln, Kimba, Berri, Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge. He then had a lapse and thought of one job in Whyalla. When I pressed him about Port Augusta and Port Pirie, I drew a total blank. Port Augusta is on the brink of an economic collapse because AN is being privatised. As the Minister for Transport has said, a minimum of 600 to 800 jobs are being lost in South Australia as a result of that privatisation, but the Premier could not name one positive thing he had done for Port Augusta in his 3½ years as Minister for Regional Development.

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I realise that the member for Frome is embarrassed. During the past two days, I have visited Peterborough, which is currently in his electorate but which after the next election will be in the electorate of Stuart. When Ben Browne the Labor candidate for Stuart and I tour Peterborough and other towns in the bush, they think that we are the local members. Councillors, many citizens and leading people of Peterborough said to me only yesterday and Sunday that they thought Ben Browne and I were the local members because we are the only politicians they have seen.

They have not seen the Liberal candidate for Stuart in Peterborough. They have seen his leaflet, but they have not seen him in Peterborough talking to the people to try to learn about their problems. They have not seen the member for Frome regularly. I left my calling card at the member for Frome's office to say that I was embarrassed because the people in that town thought that I was the local member. I am pleased that the member for Frome, or the person who thinks he is the member for Frome even though none of his constituents think so, got my note from his secretary.

I will deal with the police very quickly. Unlike the Minister for Police, I have visited many police stations in the Far North, the Mid North and in the metropolitan area. The police do an outstanding job in the appalling conditions imposed by this Minister and his Government. Up to 30 June this year, the Liberal Party has cut almost 300 sworn police officers from the number who existed when it took office. Even with the extra 100 police officers that the Government is putting on, they will still be 385 short of what was promised at the 1993 election. I will now deal with employment. During the Estimates Committee I put to the Premier, 'You have said—

*Mr Bass interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I don't need to apologise, Sam, because I never attack the police. They do an outstanding job. It is people like you, the member for Florey, who voted against WorkCover claims for police officers, who consistently voted against the rights of workers, including police officers—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will address the Chair and refrain from personally haranguing the poor member for Florey.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I do not think it is right to refer to the way in which members have voted in connection with other Bills that have been before this place. The member for Ross Smith clearly did that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member should not refer to votes taken on other legislation in the House during the course of the same session, nor should he reflect, in an intimidating way, on the way in which members vote.

**Mr CLARKE:** I take your point, Sir, but the record shows that the member for Florey ratted on his workmates and on the people who paid his wages during the years in which he was the Secretary of the Police Union. For 5 years he drew wages from the dues paid by Police Union members, and he ratted on them on each and every occasion on industrial matters.

I will now deal with employment. We had the unedifying spectacle last week of the Minister for Employment during the Estimates Committees knowing nothing. She knows nothing, and she will never learn anything. She is like the Bourbons of France: she knows nothing and will never learn. We put this question to the Premier also, so it should not have been too hard for the Minister for Employment. I might say that the former Minister for Employment (Hon. Bob Such) was a far better Minister. He answered all the questions that we put to him during Estimates Committees. Similarly, the former Minister for Correctional Services knew what he was doing. He answered all the questions and did not need to be surrounded by flanks of public servants.

However, the Minister for Employment could not answer questions despite the fact that she was surrounded by flanks of public servants to assist her. She could not answer simple questions. For instance, it was put to the Minister that she said that the Government could achieve national average levels of unemployment in this State inside of two years but that her budget papers showed (page 3.2 of Financial Paper No. 1) that her own Treasury predicted that South Australia would have a lower growth rate and a lower employment growth rate than the rest of Australia until the year 2000.

The Minister was asked what assumptions she had made about the net outflow of migration from South Australia based on participation rates in Australia. And what could she do? Nothing! She stood there with her jaw open and needing the protection of the Chair of the Committee who at that time was the member for Florey. No doubt the member for Taylor—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must not reflect on the Chair.

**Mr CLARKE:** I am not, Sir. I am supporting the Chair by referring to the fact that the Chairman of the Committee at the time did an outstanding job in protecting the Minister. I simply point out that the Minister did not know her brief after six months, that she could not answer a question. No doubt the member for Taylor will go into more detail in the areas that she covered later that night with respect to the Minister in another capacity.

Similarly, today the Premier could not make head nor tail of a simple question. He was prepared to say publicly in May that he would get unemployment down to the national average within two years. On the radio today he pushed that out to three years. When asked during Question Time how he expected to achieve that and how many extra people he would need to employ over the next three years to achieve his target of the national average given his own budget predictions, all he could do was go into a lot of hot air and windbagery about the State Bank and other things. He is the one who made the predictions, the one who said, 'We will get unemployment levels in South Australia down to the national average. I will ignore Treasury advice and Treasury predic-

tions. I will not answer questions as to how many more jobs we will create to make sure that we reach that target within three years.' The Premier is an emperor with no clothes. He reached his position through treachery and deception. That is the position with regard to the Premier.

Now we deal further with regional development, that is, the appalling position in which the regions find themselves. Unfortunately, many Liberal members of Parliament in their rural seats believe that, because they get 80 per cent of the rural vote, they are safe, that they do not have to worry about doing anything. I refer to Peterborough—the town a little bit north of Jamestown, about a hour out of Port Augusta and about a hour out of Port Pirie—where I have been visiting in the past couple of days with our candidate Ben Brown. He is an outstanding candidate for the seat of Stuart, a farmer who has shorn sheep in the area and broken bread with farmers in the district. He knows the area—a formidable challenger for the Liberal Party in that seat.

In talking to the people of Peterborough we find that in this town, which has had a large number of youth suicides over the years and has high levels of unemployment, close to 50 per cent of the population is relying on some form of Government welfare. But, where do we find FACS? Four people previously employed there, only two or three years ago, have gone, pulled back to either Port Pirie or Adelaide, at the very time that young people in that community, as well as those suffering all the problems of unemployment, need but do not get any assistance from this Government.

A horticultural centre was opened by the Minister for Primary Industries in his own electorate. All that that horticultural centre needs is about \$25 000 to pay for one person for 12 months to pull the loose ends together to ensure that sales can be achieved. They already have a number of orders, but they need a person—TAFE cannot do it on its own, although it was an idea of TAFE through the campus manager at Peterborough—and that centre could produce five or six full-time jobs ultimately and a dozen or more part-time jobs on a seasonal basis. For a small community like Peterborough, that is a lot of work.

It simply needs one Government Minister to find \$25 000 to fund one person for a year to get this under way. What do we find coming from the Minister for Primary Industries, the member for Frome? Nothing. He opens the place, but in terms of putting up cold hard cash to make the scheme work, nothing. The Government is happy to put in millions of dollars to get jobs in Adelaide—and I do not gainsay that—but we have to remember that South Australia extends beyond Gepps Cross. Unfortunately, too many rural Liberal members have forgotten their rural base.

The current member for Frome, the Minister for Primary Industries, has forgotten that, as has the Liberal candidate for Stuart. Those areas need attention and, after having visited Peterborough over the past two days, I will be working my damndest for that local community.

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

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright):** I found this year's Estimates process to be an interesting one as I had the opportunity to examine it from yet another perspective from that which I have had to examine the process in previous years. It is fair to say that I have now had the opportunity to examine this process from every aspect.

**Mr Brindal:** From every seat.



**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Yes, from every seat, as the member for Unley interjects. The first year I had the opportunity to participate in Estimates Committees questioning, as a new backbench member of Parliament, of the Labour Minister of the day. For the three years after that as shadow Minister I questioned again the Labour Minister of the day. For three years as a Minister I was subjected to questioning from Labor members and this year for two days of the Committee proceedings, indeed the first two days of Estimates Committee B—the proceedings for the Education and Children's Services examination and for that of the Attorney-General—I had the opportunity to Chair the Committee.

I have listened with interest to other members regarding their perspective on what occurred in the Committees in which they participated. I put on the record my congratulations to all involved in the two Committees that I chaired—to the Attorney-General, the Minister for Education and Children's Services, and to members from both Government and Opposition.

I felt that the process was orderly, cooperative and mature and indeed one in which the Opposition had a greater opportunity to question Ministers than did Government members. That is an important aspect of the questioning in Estimates Committees. I regard it as being an opportunity principally for Opposition members to question the Government and to examine critically and in detail the Government's budget process. If the Government and Ministers are confident in their abilities and budget, they should have no fear of that process.

I put on record—and members may like to compare this with the Committees in which they are involved—the outcome of the questioning in the two Committees I chaired. Turning to the Committee on Education and Children's Services, 119 questions were asked—80 by the Opposition, 39 by the Government—and a further 17 supplementaries—11 by the Opposition and six by the Government. In total 91 questions were asked by the Opposition and 45 by the Government. That is an appropriate break-up. The reason for the low number of supplementary questions is that the Minister in that Committee answered questions fully and in detail and gave the Opposition every opportunity to scrutinise. I pay tribute to the Minister for Education and Children's Services for that. It is an example of how a Committee should be run and I invite members to talk to members of their own team involved in that Committee and they will find that they had a similar view.

With respect to the Attorney-General and his associated portfolios, 55 questions were asked by the Opposition, 18 by the Government, and a further 10 supplementary questions by the Opposition and one by the Government: in total 65 questions were asked by the Opposition and 19 by the Government. Again, that is a proper use of the Estimates procedure in that the Opposition had an opportunity to exhaustively and intensively question the Attorney-General. I commend that Minister for the comprehensive way in which he answered those questions and for the way in which Government members, as in the Education and Children's Services Committee, backed away from their asking of questions to give the Opposition a fair go. If that did not happen in all Committees, it is a damn shame. It is not an appropriate use of budget Estimates and Opposition members have every right to register their protest in this forum if that is not the way it occurred.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** It is not often that I agree with the member for Giles: we have crossed swords on many occasions in this Chamber and in the Estimates, but I heard part of his contribution tonight regarding alternative ways of examining the estimates. He may be right, as indeed may those members who suggest an exhaustive process with no time limit on questioning so that questioning continues until the line of questioning is exhausted. That may be a fair and appropriate way of looking to future budget estimates. There is room for improvement in the procedure and I look forward to that occurring in future.

I also had the opportunity in this Estimates process to examine the contributions of Ministers other than those I witnessed during my two days in the Chair. Prior to coming into politics I set myself objectives, as no doubt does every member in this Chamber. My objective was to make a positive impact so that upon my departing from politics there would be changes that would live on. I got some enjoyment from reading contributions in part of some Ministers where there is evidence of that occurring. By way of example, in the first instance I turn to part of a contribution made by the Deputy Premier in his role as Minister for Emergency Services and I thank the Minister most sincerely for putting on the record the following comments:

First, I take this opportunity to acknowledge that many of the matters on which I report were initiated by the previous Minister, the Hon. Wayne Matthew, member for Bright.

I am particularly grateful to the new Minister for acknowledging the work I put in place in emergency services and I am pleased to see that that work is continuing. Likewise, I took some satisfaction from the statements of the Minister for Correctional Services when she stated, in part:

I would like to place on record the Government's appreciation for the advances made by the department over the past 3½ years.

She later said—and I take particular joy from this statement:

The future direction of the department will continue as established in recent years.

I am pleased that the Minister acknowledged in her Estimates Committee that it was I who established the corporate planning for the Department of Correctional Services and for the first time established a forward plan.

I also appreciated the comments of the Minister for Information and Contract Services on my former portfolio of the Department of State Government Services with regard to the initiatives which I put in place and which he is continuing with, including the implementation of the results of the procurement review, the establishment of an electronics services business, the sale of State Print, the sale of the Central Linen Service, the disposal of a number of Government building assets and changes to the Construction Industry Advisory Council. I take some solace from the fact that those things are continuing, despite my resignation from the ministry under circumstances I would wish had not occurred. I am proud of my achievements as Minister.

I am also pleased to note the significant changes that are occurring in the Police Department. They are changes that my colleagues know I would have wished to see occur during my two years as Police Minister. It is being demonstrated that those changes are more possible today under the new leadership of Commissioner Mal Hyde—a man who is demonstrating himself to be intelligent and competent and an un-blinkered administrator, a person we have needed as Police Commissioner, I believe, for a long time. I look forward to seeing the changes that Commissioner Hyde

makes to the Police Force. I congratulate him on his fine effort to date and indeed on the way in which he has fitted into the South Australian Police Force and strongly taken command of the force. He is presiding over a job which can be regarded as one of the State's most difficult, but he is doing so in a particularly professional way.

I am also pleased by the achievements I have been able to place on the record in my electorate over the past 3½ years. I am proud of the capital works project for education. In my schools, more than \$14 million has been expended in the past 3½ years, including some \$4 million for the expansion of the Hallett Cove R to 12 school to incorporate year 11 and 12 components. In this year's budget is included a further \$910 000 for a performing arts centre which will be used by the school and its community. There is also the creation of extra classrooms at the exciting housing concept school at Hallett Cove East—a concept for which I was bucketed when in opposition but which has been a resounding success. The school of houses is visited by Education Ministers from around Australia as they seek to duplicate the success that has been created here. That school also will shortly have open its new enclosed hall facility, and I look forward to witnessing the Minister for Education and Children's Services' opening that facility.

The upgrade of the Sealiff Primary School, recently opened by the Minister at a cost of \$1.3 million, is now being enjoyed by those students. In the very near future, the revamped Brighton Secondary school, at a cost of some \$4 million, will be opened by the Minister, and I look forward to being present at that. We also have in the Woodend Estate subdivision something that the member for Reynell and I worked on together prior to the last election, that is, the establishment of that new school, and that is something enjoyed by the community. Again, that is a wonderful new concept. In this case, it is a school of houses, and it will have a further use one day. Also, \$250 000 has been provided to upgrade the Paringa Park Primary School facility, and further moneys have been injected in recent weeks into that school. The sum of \$2 million has been provided for the upgrade of Seaview High School. There is also the Southern Expressway and Brighton jetty. I am proud of the capital works record in my electorate, which would not have been possible without prudent financial management of this Government and strong lobbying by the community. I have always been pleased to work with my community to achieve those outcomes.

I am also pleased to have had considerable influence over the implementation of this Government's information technology strategy in working with some of the significant companies involved and also in having a significant part as a member of the Government Information Technology Cabinet Subcommittee in establishing the DECSTech 2001 computer proposal. I am pleased with the way my schools have benefited.

At this stage, after 7½ years in Parliament, I am satisfied that I have made a mark. Quite frankly, I had considered that now would be the time for me to make my departure from this place. Politics is not without its pressures, and the achievements I have been able to put on the record have come about not without their pain. We all know that this is a rough business. I can always be accepting of the fact that the Premier has the right to change his ministry, and I bear him no malice for that change. I can also accept that politics is a place of rumour and innuendo, and you learn to develop a thick skin and overcome that. What I cannot and never will accept—and no member must ever accept—is the pressure

under which one's family can be placed in politics. I have been dwelling upon this very closely in recent weeks.

I can never accept that my wife had to be the receiver of more than 20 phone calls—death threats in fact—levelled toward me during the time I was Police Minister, presiding over an industrial dispute, delivering a Cabinet directive which in fact I never agreed. I can never accept that union stickers were placed on every street sign leading to my house, nor can I accept the distress that caused to my wife. I can never accept the fact that my wife was forced off Lonsdale Road at 90 km/h, in broad daylight, by a marked police patrol car. I can never accept that the police officers concerned gave her the traditional one finger salute and skidded off in front of her. I am grateful for the Police Department at the time investigating the matter, endeavouring to identify the officers and, upon failing to do so, warning a group of officers that such behaviour should never occur again.

I can never forgive the fact that, as a result of those processes, as is known well by members on this side of the House—at least by some—that my wife was hospitalised for a period of a fortnight and required considerable counselling as a result of the trauma she underwent at that time. I will always be grateful to former Premier Brown for accepting a letter from me and acting upon it to split the emergency services and police portfolios to assist my wife, and for telephoning me at 6 o'clock in the morning on the day of the reshuffle so that my wife could be the first to know of the outcome of those reshuffle details to assist her in her recovery. For that process, I bear the former Premier the strongest indebtedness.

Many of those things should not have occurred. The former Premier and I discussed making them public at the time and believed that, to do so at that time would have reflected unfairly on the majority of decent, law abiding, law enforcing members of the Police Force. I am appreciative of the support given to me behind the scenes by members of the Police Association when some of its members acted in a way in which it would never condone. They know who they are and they accept my thanks for that.

With those things behind me, over the past two weeks, I have had a particularly difficult decision to face with an employment opportunity elsewhere outside this Parliament. Many members know that I have agonised long and hard over that, and I have had the opportunity to reflect over the contribution I have made in this Parliament for some time. I was some 24 hours away from accepting that opportunity. As a number of people in the media have contacted me about my intentions for the future, I think it is fair to put on the record so that no-one can misinterpret it that I have turned down that opportunity. After a lot of anguish, I have decided to stay here, because I come back to my starting point. I came to this place to achieve a few things, to make a difference, and I have done that in some areas.

However, at the age of 39, I do not believe that that job is finished. I would like to go back to the electorate to have another opportunity to continue achieving for my electorate—an area which I love, an area in which I live, an area which has as its inhabitants some terrific people who have been tremendously supportive to me and my family particularly over the past six months. My decision to stay in this business is one that has been made by my entire family and talked through laboriously. I remain in this business with the support of my spouse and my children and will contest the next election with their best wishes and support. It always ought to be incumbent upon members to bear in mind the attacks that

can occur on one's family, and to always condemn those attacks.

I thank members on this side who knew of my dilemma at the time for their support. It is never an easy thing being a Minister in an industrial situation. It is even a less easy situation being involved in an industrial situation where you are the subject of a Cabinet directive that is not consistent with your recommendations, and I do not mind people knowing that, yes, I was rolled on my recommendations in the police dispute but I was happy to go forward—as I was duty bound—to deliver that. What makes it hard to accept is when your family is personally subjected to the most vicious attacks. As the father of two children, the trauma my children were caused through that process was frankly an unacceptable one, and I hope that no member in this place ever has to go through what I and my family went through. Indeed, I offer in advance to any member who goes through a similar situation—no matter from which Party they come—my personal support to work through that process.

I look forward to contesting the next election and the verdict of my electorate. If my electorate so determines that I should continue for a further four years I will exercise their will to my fullest level of ability, as indeed I have for the past 7½ years. Budgets like this one make it easier to deliver in the future the positive changes that we seek for our economy. I believe that Treasurer Baker has undertaken a superb job with an incredibly difficult portfolio, a job in which, frankly, he is much maligned by all members of the House. It is never an easy job being Treasurer, as the member for Giles well knows, and the Treasurer has taken the job on the chin, has made the tough decisions and has been unflustered by those tough decisions. I believe he has delivered for South Australia in a way that will put him on the map as probably one of the best Treasurers this State has seen for more than two decades. If one goes back and looks at the names of Treasurers over that time, it is no mean feat. This budget has been demonstrated to be one that has been delivered in a competent and professional way. It is a balanced budget and, for the first time, Labor's way of living on a credit card has been put to an end.

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

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

Motion carried.

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** Given the importance of the Estimates Committees in which we have just participated, in the short time remaining I would like to make a brief comment. We on this side of the House in the Labor Opposition form part of a small team of 11 members and, as such, most of us got to be rostered almost every day on the Estimates Committees. I had access to most Ministers in asking questions on the budget. Yet again this had to be done without the Auditor-General's Report, another arm of accountability that was not available to us in questioning the budget estimates. I would have thought, given the importance of this election year and of this budget, that Ministers would respond better than they did and give more capable performances in addressing issues of importance on their budget lines.

As several of my colleagues have commented, on many occasions we had to sit through extended periods when Ministers responded at length to pre-prepared dorothy dix

questions from the Government benches. I do not want to pick too much on the Minister for Tourism, but there was something that came out of the tourism Estimates Committee that is worth commenting on because it is an important area of our economy. The tourism industry in South Australia is an area of potential growth and jobs growth. It was particularly disappointing for me when we got hold of the budget papers to see that marketing within tourism had been reduced significantly. There had been some changes within tourism. The Minister for Tourism used to look after tourism development in this State and now looks after marketing and events, with those former and important functions being moved to the MFP Development Corporation. When asked about the marketing funds decrease, I must say the Minister gave incredible answers to the obvious decrease in funds. He gave waffly explanations trying to imply that there had been no decrease to the tourism marketing budget.

As our daily newspaper has pointed out and as respected industry leaders in the tourism sector have pointed out, marketing is one of the most important functions we undertake to encourage tourists to visit South Australia and spend their tourist dollars in our State. That reduction was most disappointing. For the information of the House, domestic marketing, which had been budgeted in 1996-97 at \$15.2 million, received a budget allocation this year of only \$13.999 million. In the international tourism market, compared to last year's budget allocation of \$8.244 million, this year the budget was only \$7.462 million. It may not come as a surprise—or perhaps it will—but South Australia has been doing no television marketing interstate since the end of 1995. We have just not been marketing on television at all. The decrease in marketing funds obviously will affect our ability to attract tourists to the State.

The Minister's explanation of carryover funds and the like just does not wash. There has been a decrease in marketing, and it is not appropriate at this time when tourism presents one of the best opportunities we have to increase our State revenue through tourism dollars. But it is not the Minister for Tourism I want to concentrate on mainly. My colleague the Deputy Leader of the Opposition alluded to the pitiful performance by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. I must say it was the most frustrating experience to pose questions to a Minister who had no grounding in the portfolio and obviously less interest in that portfolio. The Minister was unable to answer the most basic and fundamental questions that any other Minister or any member of the House, sitting in the Minister's place, could have answered. Out of the 50 questions asked by the Opposition of the Minister on her DETAFE responsibilities, the vast majority were taken on notice. The Minister had no idea; she could not answer questions. Of those she attempted to answer she was handed pre-prepared speeches which she read out and which bore little resemblance to the question asked; and, of those remaining that she tried to address, she sidestepped the issues.

An extremely small proportion of questions were actually addressed. Despite listening to extended dorothy dix responses from the Minister, Opposition questions were largely unanswered. They were simple and basic questions, the most fundamental questions that anybody could ask. I asked the Minister what new initiatives she was planning for her youth affairs portfolio in the coming year and she answered, 'I will have to take that on notice.' She did not even come prepared for a simple question like that. To questions such as, 'Of your budget allocation, where does it

go; how much do you spend on your employment division; how much do you spend on TAFEs; and how much do you spend on administration?' she answered that she would have to take it on notice. She had no idea.

Fancy coming into the Committee as a Minister and not even answering the basic question, 'Where does the money go?' How can a person who does not have that fundamental knowledge make any assessment at all as to whether taxpayer dollars are being spent appropriately? The answer is that she cannot. In case members think that I am being unfair on the Minister, when asked these simple budgetary questions—and, frankly, that is what Estimates Committees are all about: to ask questions about the budget—the Minister seemed to think that it was not fair. I asked her how she could not know how much it cost to run the TAFE institutes, and she said:

The statistical requirements that the honourable member is seeking are certainly not part of the make-up of accountability.

She does not even recognise that she should know the answer to that question. She does not recognise that it is her responsibility and that it is part of accountability of Government to know where the money in her budget goes. When I asked how much training she got from the public sector and how much training she got from the private sector, she said:

There is no requirement for that specific break-down.

We are entering an environment of competition in the further education area between public sector providers and private sector providers. It is incumbent upon the Minister to make decisions about whether we should continue with courses in the public sector when there are courses on individual programs in the private sector. This Minister has no idea about the costs involved in running private sector courses as opposed to public sector courses. How can she be making correct decisions? Of course, she cannot and she does not.

Let me remind members that there has been absolutely no improvement in the youth unemployment rate in this State in this financial year—none. She has presided over no improvement in the youth unemployment rate. The Minister was asked about projections for employment growth that appear in her own budget papers, namely, that: employment growth for the next two years in the budget papers is predicted to be 1½ per cent compared with a national average over the next two years of 2 per cent.

When asked by my colleague the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, 'Can you tell me, Minister, what the number of additional jobs per annum that the budget paper forecasts of 1½ per cent equates to?', the Minister said:

Quite obviously the answer is a little bit more complex than I can deal with at the moment.

That says it all—the most fundamental question that she should have expected, that the Opposition had been raising with the Government for weeks beforehand, and all she can say is that she does not know, it is beyond her.

I raised with the Minister the issue of the impact on young people, in particular, of cuts through a range of agencies, including cuts that the Federal Government has implemented in labour market programs and the university sector. I raised with the Minister the issue of additional HECS charges, the changes to Austudy, the youth allowance changes that are coming in and the reduction in access to university courses in our State. The Minister, quite simply, defended what the Federal Government has done to South Australian students. Instead of coming out and saying that she was standing up for this State, she defended the Federal Government and said:

Under the Federal Government's reforms, increased access to education has been quite dramatic.

Instead of condemning the Federal Government, instead of trying to help our young people, all she can come up with is a defence of Senator Amanda Vanstone's changes to education. In this State we have seen a massive fall of 11 per cent in applications to our three universities, yet all the Minister could do was cite national figures of enrolments. She did not even understand that access to our universities in South Australia has been reduced dramatically. All she could do was defend the Federal Government.

This performance by the Minister, taking practically every question on notice or not being able to answer Opposition questions, was appalling and it is not good enough for the people of South Australia and not good enough for somebody who purports to be a Minister and carries out the ministerial duties and responsibilities of a Minister for Employment in this State. With the massive unemployment problems we have, particularly the youth unemployment problems, it is not good enough for a Minister not to be able to answer fundamental budget questions. For a Minister not to be able to say where her budget allocations go, for a Minister not to be able to say, in general terms, how much training in this State is costing, or to be able to say whether taxpayers are getting the best value for their money in the way training is structured, is appalling. It was an appalling performance from a Minister who had no idea—absolutely no idea.

The fact that she had no idea became evident by the responses of the Government members on the Committee who had embarrassed looks on their faces. In fact, it took the Chairman of the Committee to defend the Minister by cutting off the Opposition's questioning; by saying that he was sorry but he could not elicit any more responses from the Minister. To take on notice the most fundamental questions that you would have asked the department when taking on the position of Minister is extraordinary. I would say that any member of this Parliament—Government or Opposition—sitting in her place would have been able to answer questions better than the Minister. The real tragedy of this is that—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Ms WHITE:** The member opposite talks about the unemployment rate, seeming to imply that we have had some growth particularly in youth unemployment. In the last financial year, we have seen no improvement whatsoever in the unemployment rate. Members opposite can scream and try to defend their Minister as much as they like. Everybody can read *Hansard*. Everybody can read about the embarrassing performance of the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. The tragedy really is that the Premier is protecting this Minister. He has put her in one of the most important portfolios, the employment portfolio, at a time when the growth of employment opportunities is one of the most pressing issues the State has to face. The Premier has put somebody in the portfolio who has no idea and no handle on the portfolio, and I would even question her interest in it.

**Mr Becker:** That is not fair.

**Ms WHITE:** The honourable member should read *Hansard* and see just how appallingly the Minister performed and how her lack of knowledge on fundamental issues about the budget was portrayed in the Committee. I conclude by sending a simple message to the Government. This Minister is not doing anything for employment. This Minister is not facing the very real and pressing problems that we have in terms of unemployment and training, particularly for the

young people in this State. If the Premier and the Government are willing to let this Minister stay in this portfolio and float along, they will be seen to be doing nothing to address the unemployment problem in this State.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I have to say that the remarks I have heard made by members of the Opposition in this debate, following the scrutiny of the budget in the Estimates Committees, fairly accurately and clearly demonstrate the level of inanity in the Labor Party. Members opposite do not understand the Estimates Committee process, and that is a reflection of the fact that most of the members in the Labor Party have not been in the Parliament before. They do not understand that the process is intended to ensure that the Government's proposed programs spend the money where it says it will spend it, dollar by dollar, and to discover exactly what it is that the Government expects to achieve, through the policies which it is pursuing by spending the funds which it has appropriated from general revenue for those purposes.

Labor Party members are hell-bent on trying to find a line for the media. It seems to me that they are all about publicity for their position and discovering something they can claim is scandalous, something which they can use to create the impression that policy direction in this State is about conflict, not cooperation. Indeed, the approach taken by the Leader of the Opposition is to do just that: to fabricate background information upon which he constructs a house of cards and puts that to the public of South Australia as though he has discovered something of great importance about the way the Government is proceeding in doing its work and where the Government, in his opinion and as he tells the public, has failed, when in fact no such thing has happened at all, and closer scrutiny of the allegations reveal that they are a fabrication. Everybody in the Opposition seems to have caught this disease.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** That is an allegation that the honourable member knows to be untrue.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Then make it the substance of a motion and step outside and say so. The honourable member's conduct in making such an allegation is despicable. He only has to look at the figures to see that. Indeed, my electorate office is the cheapest of any electorate office, including his. His is the most expensive, I remind the House. It cost more than \$40 000 of taxpayers' money to set up. It is one of the highest rents payable, in the order of \$30 000 per year.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** It does not have to be.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** It is not. I live in my home, and that is not my electorate office. Because it happens to be in the same building does not necessarily mean that is where I dwell. It is not. The member for Hart is trying to cover up his own extravagance in setting up his electorate office in Semaphore in the fashion that he has. Let me tell the member for Hart, the Deputy Leader and the member for Taylor that the unemployment rate when the Labor Party came to office was 11 per cent. The unemployment rate 10 years later, in 1993, was still 11 per cent, but it is not 11 per cent now.

**Mr Foley:** It is 9.8 per cent.

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, which is more than a 10 per cent fall.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** That is beside the point. The fact is the Labor Party did nothing for unemployment during the 10

years it was in office from 1983 to 1993, with control of the policy reins, with its hands on the levers and buttons. All members opposite did in that time was ruin the State, and all the things they bleat about now as needing attention could have received that attention had it not been for the incompetence of people like the member for Hart, who advised senior Ministers to do stupid things. Even though he was told by Rod Hartley and others that the decisions being made by the State Bank were bad, imprudent, and poor judgment on his part, he sits there supporting his Leader. Maybe he covets the Leader's job and that is why he has got him there. He keeps him there so that, in time, he can raise his own credibility within the ranks of his Party and give—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart has gone far enough.

**Mr LEWIS:** —the current Leader the flick straight after the next election. Of course, that is the strategy used by the deceitful types of people who tend to be attracted to politics these days, especially on the Left—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** The member for Hart knows that his electorate office costs the taxpayers of South Australia annually more than four times what mine costs, yet he represents no more people and has no greater responsibility.

**Mr Foley:** It is not my house, though, Peter.

**Mr LEWIS:** It does not have to be. It is a matter of what it costs the public purse, is it not?

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** Neither am I. As I said earlier, I invite the honourable member to step outside and say that, and I will join him in the same action, as I will be joining others. I turn now to other important matters that arise out of the Estimates Committees. Some members have drawn attention to the problem that the Labor Party has had throughout this Parliament, in that it cannot go the distance. Not only does it not understand the process and its purpose but also it cannot go the distance. Every day it wants to pull stumps early.

In fact, the Minister currently at the table and I can testify to the fact that in primary industries, an area that generates more than half of this State's GDP, an area in which there are policy options—and I am sure that the Left would see a different view of how to go about it than we do if they bothered to put their mind to it (but I do not share that view)—they never attempted to discover where the Government strategies would differ from their own in the course of their questioning. In fact, they pulled stumps when they knew that it would not appear on that day's television news. They pulled stumps as quickly as possible after 4 p.m., just four hours after the scrutiny began. I had the opportunity to ask merely six questions.

**Mr Foley:** You could have kept asking them. I would have stayed longer.

**Mr LEWIS:** The bellicose attacks which the member for Hart made on me and which were made on me last year during the Estimates Committees by the member for Playford in exactly the same vein, and which the member for Giles made in his derisive interjections against me in that Estimates Committee, and which the member for Hart got away with and which the member for Giles got away with, and which the member for Playford got away with 12 months before, simply made it an unpleasant experience to be in the same Chamber with them on the same Committee. They had no commitment to the process of Parliament whatever and they

had no interest in discovering information. All their questions were aimed at attempting to create the impression that there was something wrong.

I say to the member for Hart that it would be helpful to him and his cause if he were able to convince the people in rural and regional South Australia that he had some understanding of what they see as their concerns. He suggested no alternative policy directions we could take that might change that. However, it is not my place to tell him in detail how to rectify the problems he has in relation to his own inadequacy.

Let me turn to something more positive and draw attention to the fact that right now quite an exciting undertaking is to be made to standardise the line from Tailem Bend to Pinnaroo through my electorate in order to enable trains carrying grain from the Mallee to be able to continue through to Port Adelaide without having to be unloaded and reloaded, as they are at present, because there is a change of gauge between Tailem Bend and Pinnaroo: it is still broad gauge through the Mallee. To my mind, that represents a real achievement for this Government in general, and the Minister for transport in particular, in ensuring that we have an efficient means from now on of getting that grain from the Mallee to its market. Whether it is held in the large inland terminal at Tailem Bend, or whether it is otherwise freighted straight through to the port, does not matter now. There will be a standardised line. There are other changes occurring in consequence of the arrangements which the Minister has been able to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government over the future of the non-metropolitan railways, and I am pleased about that.

I also want to draw attention to some matters which I would otherwise have pursued, had the Opposition not got stitch at 4 o'clock on the day that we considered the lines on primary industries in that Estimates Committee—things that are now to be illustrated by a project that is being funded locally and which I believe a small amount of additional funds from State and Federal Government sources will more rapidly result in the take up of the ideas embodied in the project. The project is to take saline groundwater from the watertable near Cooke Plains in a township called Bedford, which was surveyed but never occupied. It is about 2 kilometres west of Cooke Plains. The depressions in the ground in that area mean that the elevation is zero; its altitude is zero. That, of course, would explain to members why there is a good deal of samphire in that area and why ground watertables are rising in consequence of the lucerne dying out through the attacks of aphids and, over time, the clearance of native vegetation in recharge areas, and a wet year that we had about 15 years ago, in 1981, when it rained for eight weeks straight.

That project demonstrates what can be done by simply removing the ground water after digging a hole in the ground and pumping the water into tanks inside plastic covered houses, if you like—something which I pioneered in 1966 on the river flats at Athelstone. The water there then evaporates from those tanks, while algae and brine shrimp grow in them. The condensed water runs down the inner walls of the tanks and can be collected in plastic semi-cylindrical piping at the bottom of the walls where, whilst it is not distilled water because it has dissolved gases in it, it is still free of all dissolved salts. The beta-carotene that is produced can be sold. More particularly, though, the brine shrimp that is grown can be sold and/or fed to more valuable species in a process of aquaculture value adding.

The water that has been caught in those troughs can be then put into a cistern in those same enclosed houses where,

once nutrients have been added to it, it can be used for hydroponics and you simply use that water, recirculating it through the hydroponic tubes, with the appropriate levels of plant nutrients already dissolved in it, testing the water constantly and adjusting its pH and nutrient levels to do the kinds of things that are now being done, very successfully, for the export market, both interstate and overseas, by vegetable growers at Virginia. It is especially important in salad-vegetable production, because it reduces the risk of infection by fungus diseases and attack from insect pests by having them in that semi-controlled environment inside.

So, you get a number of saleable items, the most important of which, on a small scale, are fish like mulloway or, in certain other areas of the State, barramundi, or whiting or snapper and brine shrimp—if you have an excess of brine shrimp over the appetites of the fish that you are producing—and hydroponically produced pesticide-free salad vegetables of one kind or another for sale. You can also use the water for the propagation of trees and other plants that can be sold. In addition to those products, salt is left and the bitterns, which are the salts of magnesium, which can be used to stabilise the surfaces of limestone rubble roads and make them much harder and tougher and longer wearing—something which, throughout my electorate and most of rural South Australia, is a real boon; a godsend. These bitterns, once extracted, can also be used as the base for a quick set cement, which is a growing and increasingly sought-after product in South-East Asia, where quick set cement is necessary to get the pours in place and then, before a heavy downpour has an adverse effect on those concrete pours, they are set sufficiently.

I want to commend the people who were involved in that, particularly Clarrie Fisher, who is the Public and Environmental Health and Development Officer in the Coorong council—which is a combination of Coonalpyn Downs, Meningie and Peake, and which had its first meeting today. I also mention in passing Roger Taylor, Mark Coleman and Steve Clarke from SARDI for what they have done in inspiring the soil board in that area (the Coorong and the near farmlands) to take what they see as a problem, treat it as a resource through lateral thinking and make it a profitable enterprise—and it can be an incredibly profitable enterprise. They have been able to turn costs into cash and do what we all want to see done in South Australia—that is, create jobs. How very important that is.

I turn now to another problem that we are having in that area. We need to have access to and from the large grain storage facility at Tailem Bend, to which I referred, from the main highway, which is the extension of the South Eastern Freeway (at Tailem Bend it is not a freeway but a restricted access highway). We cannot go on moving trucks in and out of that grain storage terminal by giving them access through the town. It is dangerous and too much of an expense for the local residents to have to bear, because the roads through the town are being torn to pieces by the heavy grain trucks that come and go. Therefore, acceleration and deceleration lanes for heavy traffic in both directions along that restricted access highway need to be provided to the grain storage terminal.

It is the largest inland grain storage terminal anywhere in this State and it is equal to anything interstate. We need to have that storage there because it enables us to hold the grain and quickly forward it to the port as necessary. More importantly, it provides us with storage from which we can take the grain and add value to it by milling it and making it available as feed for the important emerging feedlotting industry not only in cattle and more particularly pigs but other

animals such as emus, ostriches and deer. That area is ideal for that purpose because the limestone beds beneath it will prevent any contamination of the ground water in that area. The cost of this crossover access is only a meagre \$500 000.

There is another matter to which I believe we should be directing our attention and that is the fairer way in which we can make water available to the towns in the Murray Mallee. It is important that those towns get water at the cost that is actually incurred and not at the high costs at present.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I call the Treasurer.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** The Deputy Leader called on me to be a statesman, and you, Sir, called on me to speak. I think I can do both adequately. I wish to reflect on the Estimates Committees. This year there have been many positive contributions.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** That is exactly right, not by the Opposition. I will remind members what the Estimates Committees are about. This is the time for the Opposition to ask questions to keep the Government accountable. If the results of the Estimates Committees are any indication, the Government was given a ringing endorsement of its budget and its policies. I doubt whether more than a handful of questions were not more than adequately handled by Ministers. There was obviously some element of tiredness or something else which overcame the Opposition because, having looked through some of the material that was dispensed through the Estimates Committee, I could not believe that with all the time available such poor quality questions were asked.

That makes life easy for the Government, but I would have thought that during an election campaign, which obviously the Labor Party is into, it could have spent a little more time researching the material for which it is responsible. That is not true of all members. I think the front bench let the side down a little. The unedifying spectacle of the Leader's 'Liar, liar' contribution, which was probably his only contribution for the whole of the Estimates, was a poor reflection on him.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The Deputy Leader suggests, 'We will see you in court.' I hope the Deputy Leader is in court; it will be an interesting spectacle. When I was in Opposition, I do not think we ever finished before 10 p.m. I believe that we received significant amounts of important information which was helpful in our understanding of the Government, but in the realm of politics—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I can assure the Deputy Leader that I got far more compelling headlines than were obtained by any member of the Opposition, and my colleagues could say the same when they were in Opposition. It is an important time for Governments. We spent enormous numbers of hours preparing for this and understanding clearly the sorts of issues that may have arisen. That was shown in the more than adequate way in which Ministers dispensed their duties in response to the Opposition's questions. It is surprising to me, given the vital nature of this year, that the quality of the Opposition's questions was exceptionally poor.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I am simply reflecting. I normally pay credit where credit is due, as the Deputy Leader

would clearly understand. As I said, the performance of the front bench was not reflected fully by the remainder of the Deputy Leader's team, but by and large I would say that the quality of the questioning during the Estimates was very poor. It seems as though the cheap shots were the major order of the day, not the important prevailing and challenging questions which Governments must face. In terms of giving marks out of 10, there were one or two to whom I would have given a seven. I gave the Leader of the Opposition a zero but the Deputy Leader did better with two.

**Mr Clarke:** I am insulted. If the Treasurer gave me two, I did not do well enough.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** As I said, I always compliment a member of the Opposition who gets a question right and probes the Government, because I believe the Government should be probed intensely on all its operations. As I said at the very beginning—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** He is now relying on the Auditor-General to help him out. He could not do his own research, so he now hopes that the Auditor-General can come up with something.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! We have had several contributions from the Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** With the number of hours that were spent questioning, the return for the investment was very poor. Bearing in mind the resources spent by Government during the whole budget process, I think the taxpayers of South Australia could feel quite cheated by the performance of the Opposition. As I said at the beginning, I am delighted. Given the paucity of the Opposition's questions and its lack of real zeal, it is quite clear that the Government has passed the test in terms of its budget, and obviously the Opposition supports all its policies.

With those few words, I thank all members for their participation during the Estimates debate. Obviously, there is need for reform. The Opposition seems to get tired very quickly or is so strung up in its own internal divisions that it cannot do the job properly. We will have to look at the timing of the Estimates Committees so that we can work out when they are working together so that the taxpayers of South Australia can get a more than adequate result, or certainly one better than the one we have had during these Estimates.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

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

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I will be brief, as is my wont, but I must say that the Deputy Premier and Treasurer has a real hide to come here and make a sleaze-bag of a speech. I would have expected better from the Deputy Premier, but I have been repeatedly—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I am sorry—he is not the Deputy Premier any more. He was talking of divisions on our side of the show and I forgot that this time last year he was the Deputy Premier but he is not any longer because of the divisions in his own show.

In answer to the Treasurer's point, the Opposition had more than enough questions to ask the Government, but the debauchery of the Estimates Committees is to have all the dorothy dixers lined up from tame-cat backbenchers who get up and ask the Minister, 'Why are we blessed to have you as our Minister?' Then the Minister will trot out, in 25 minutes, no less, an answer as to why we are blessed in having that person as our Minister. Time out of number Opposition questioning was stifled because of the waste of time and the antics conducted. The former Premier, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, would go into Estimates and say to the Opposition, 'It is your day: ask the lot. Ask me all the questions. The Government members will sit down. It is the Opposition's day: go ahead.' Never in three years has this Government or any of its Ministers done that.

The Treasurer has a real hide to talk about when Committees adjourned. I was on a number of Committees, as were most of us, and they sat well into the night. Obviously the Treasurer did not listen to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education on her night. Obviously the Treasurer did not turn up to listen to the Minister for Health with his dorothy dix questions and the way he padded it out to try to avoid scrutiny. He was surrounded by 23 advisers—more than George Bush had when he negotiated the end of the Cold War.

The Treasurer has a real hide, an absolute hide, because we know—and if the Treasurer would like us to do it, we will happily accommodate him—that, when the Liberal Party was in Opposition, a number of shadow Ministers would go around to Labor Ministers and say, 'Can you give us some questions to ask?'

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** There were a number of them and they hold high office in the Liberal Government. If the Treasurer would like us to name them, we can do it. None of our shadow Ministers has ever, over the past 3½ years, asked Government Ministers to supply them with questions to ask about the administration of their portfolios.

In conclusion, the Estimates Committees and the way we do things needs to be revised. It is a Lower House Committee, but Oppositions of any political persuasion are hampered when their shadow Ministers from another place cannot personally be present to ask questions as they are the ones most familiar with the portfolios they are shadowing for the more intense questioning and the follow up. We can overcome that. But, more particularly, Government members, if this Government had any guts, should be told, 'No questions: it is the Opposition's day, it is the Opposition's scrutiny of

our operations. We will take any questions from Opposition members and we will sit on our hands.'

I challenge the Treasurer and the Government, as I did on two previous occasions, to give us, when the Auditor-General's Report comes down, a full day of Opposition questions—not dorothy dixers like last year, where we were given half an hour (15 minutes each per Minister, including the Premier and the Treasurer—15 minutes of questioning from the Opposition) to examine those Ministers on the Auditor-General's Report. In the previous year it was a gum flapping exercise where, after 7.30 at night, we were allowed to make speeches on the Auditor-General's Report but not ask direct questions.

The Treasurer will now respond by saying simply that we can ask so many questions each day in Question Time. That is interesting. Since the Government of the current Premier unilaterally withdrew the offer of a minimum of 10 questions from the Opposition per day, we are lucky to get seven questions. This Government does not want scrutiny. The Premier today answered three questions and it took him over 20 minutes to answer them, including a dorothy dixer. We always have the night watchman, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, who can talk underwater with wet cement and both feet in his throat at the same time and still go for 25 minutes without drawing a breath on any dorothy dixer.

If this Government was dinkum on scrutiny, it would open it up on the Auditor-General's Report. They would say that we will have two days or whatever on the Auditor-General's Report when the Opposition only ask the questions rather than this dreadful circumstance of dorothy dixers where you have the likes of the member for Mawson, who grovels to such a craven extent that he is indistinguishable from the ground on which he walks. I simply ask the Treasurer to bear that in mind and, whilst he likes to be pious with respect to these viewpoints, he does himself no justice, because it shows that this Government and its Ministers are frightened of open scrutiny. They have shown it endlessly with the water contract, the EDS contract, the prisons contract—the whole lot. All the time we have had to drag it out of them like a dentist dragging teeth out of a client. At the end of the day we will get them, and this Government will pay the cost at the polls.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 2 July at 2 p.m.