HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 June 1996

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

SHOOTING BAN

A petition signed by 994 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the recreational shooting of ducks and quails was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 75 and 88; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GOODWOOD ORPHANAGE

In reply to Ms HURLEY (Napier) 28 March.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No portion of the Orphanage site has been sold to the House of Tabor and no sale contract has been executed by the Government. It is the Government's intention to sell 34 per cent of the Orphanage site to Tabor College to enable the Orphanage Teachers Centre to have access to additional facilities to be built by Tabor College. As requested by the Unley Council, the Development Assessment Commission has been approved as the relevant authority to consider this matter and this has not yet occurred.

PARKS HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr De LAINE (Price) 19 March.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Contrary to the allegations made by the member for Price, the Department for Education and Children's Services did consult with The Parks High School community, through a review initiated by the Chief Executive, DECS. The review began in May 1995, and the review team included the Principal, Deputy Principal, School Council Chairperson, District Superintendent of Education, and a project officer. This team formed a reference group, which involved members of the school community, namely two students, two parents, a SAIT representative, a staff member, the local member of parliament (or nominee), a principal of a feeder primary school, two representatives from The Parks Community Centre, and a representative from the Enfield Council. The member for Price was a member of the reference group to the review team and would be aware of the extensive community consultation that occurred.

In 1995, only 22 students from the 101 students in the feeder primary schools nominated The Parks High School as their first priority. As a result of this, and a number of students not being able to access their preferred schools because of ceilings, the 1996 year 8 enrolment was 35. This is a clear indication that the majority of parents are choosing other schools rather than their local high school. The cost of \$7 965 per student for education at The Parks in 1995 was clearly the highest of all schools in the metropolitan area. The decision to close the school at the end of 1996, despite the review's recommendation to maintain the school, was based on the falling year 8 enrolments, the high cost per student, and the difficulties of providing an adequate range of curriculum options. Whilst the recommendations of the review are carefully considered, the final decision rests with the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

In announcing the closure the Minister has given a number of assurances, including:

- Each continuing student will receive individual counselling to assist their transition to a new school, possibly Woodville, Croydon, Gepps Cross Girls or Enfield High Schools.
- Adult students will also receive individual counselling to enable them to enrol either at Thebarton Senior College or Le Fevre High School.
- Special consideration will be given to students from Regency Park Centre and Bowden Brompton Community School who access The Parks High School.
- The Government will work with various community groups to try and minimise the extent of any disruptions.
- A working group has been formed to oversee the school closure and to ensure a smooth transition of all students.

Transition arrangements will be put in place to ensure alternative quality educational placements are available for all students.

MARION CORRIDOR SCHOOLS

In reply to Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition) 27 March.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Marion Corridor Project is a locally initiated planning process involving Sturt, Marion, Clovelly Park and South Road Primary Schools, Minda Special School, Daws Road and Marion High Schools, and Hamilton Secondary College.

The local review team, including school principals and council chairpersons, reported to the Minister for Education and Children's Services late in 1995, recommending that three of the seven schools in the area be closed.

The local review committee reported that due to the changing nature of the suburbs in the area, there has been a significant decline in enrolments in local schools, making it difficult for schools to maintain quality programs and subject options.

The Government has agreed with the recommendation, and announced that Sturt Primary School, South Road Primary School and Marion High School will close at the end of 1996. The Government has guaranteed that over the next two financial years about \$5 million, dependent partly on the value of land sales, will be spent on upgrading and developing the remaining school sites, as well as other neighbouring schools in the south west.

As part of these facility improvements, the Government will upgrade the technology infrastructure of the remaining four schools. Required cabling and infrastructure for eventual connection to the Education network will be provided as a priority, together with assistance in purchasing additional computers and software for students, and training and development for teachers.

The special programs offered at Marion High School are assured. Task groups have been established to identify new sites for the Centre for Hearing Impaired Children (CHIC), the International students program and the Ashford Annexe for students from Ashford Special School. These and other special programs will be relocated for the start of the 1997 school year.

A new facility for secondary aged students with multiple disabilities and significant intellectual disabilities will be built on the Hamilton Secondary College site, and Minda School will subsequently close.

This level of expenditure will significantly improve the quality of facilities for students and staff in the Marion Corridor area.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

In reply to Ms WHITE (Taylor) 27 March.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: On Thursday 11 April 1996 the Minister for Education and Children's Services announced his decisions in relation to the review of Gilles Street, Parkside, and Sturt Street Primary Schools. The decisions were as follows:

- Sturt Street Primary School will close at the end of the year. Whilst no final decisions have been taken about the further use of the site, the Department for Education and Children's Services is considering using the site for educational purposes as a Curriculum Centre.
- The New Arrivals Unit currently operating on the Sturt Street site will be transferred to Gilles Street Primary School.
- Mainstream students currently enrolled at Sturt Street will have the option of enrolling at either Gilles Street or at their local primary school.
- Parkside Primary School will be kept open and a principal will be appointed to the school for a five-year term.

Whilst the local review committee recommended that all three schools stay open, the Minister did not accept the recommendation

because of the very low level of enrolments in each of the schools. A key factor in the decision has been the continued inability of Sturt Street Primary School to attract an adequate number of mainstream students. Their numbers have been low for many years, and the current group of around 60 students is not large enough to ensure a balanced educational partnership between the mainstream and New Arrival students who make up the majority of the school's population. The Minister is advised that there are only about 20 'local' students at Sturt Street Primary School in the total school enrolment.

Students and families of Sturt Street Primary School will receive individual counselling and advice throughout 1996 to help achieve a smooth transition to other schooling options for 1997. The larger number of students at Gilles Street Primary School in 1997 will mean more teachers and staff to improve the quality of educational opportunity for Sturt Street students moving to Gilles Street.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

> Department for Employment, Training and Further Education-Report and Corporate Review, 1995.

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

City of Salisbury—By-law—No. 6—Dogs. District Council—By-Laws—

Dudley

- No. 1--Permits and Penalties.
- No. 2-Streets and Public Places.
- No. 3—Street Traders. No. 4-Moveable Signs
- -Garbage Removal. No. 5-
- No. 6-Heights of Fences Near Intersections.
- No. 7-Parklands.
- No. 8--Caravans, Tents and Camping.
- No. 9-Creatures.
- No. 10-Nuisances
- No. 11-Vehicles Kept or Let for Hire.

No. 12-Foreshore.

- Millicent-
 - -Moveable Signs. No. 2-No. 5-Council Land.

ELIZABETH PROPERTY ENCUMBRANCES

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Housing, **Urban Development and Local Government Relations):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: On the last day of sitting, the member for Elizabeth asked a question without notice referring to the lifting of property encumbrances in the Elizabeth area. I undertook to report to the House on an article in the Messenger Press that the Mayor of Elizabeth was opposed to a recommendation to impose a 10-year limit on existing industrial encumbrances. Following the question from the member for Elizabeth, I asked officers of my department to investigate where this report had come from. I advise the House that at no time have I contemplated a 10year limit on existing encumbrances on industrial properties in the Elizabeth area, nor has any such recommendation been made to me by my department. Investigation has revealed that the Mayor's concern was based on a report from within her own organisation.

I expect to receive a report on the future of the industrial encumbrances from my department in the near future and discussion will then be held with the city council. As I indicated in my original response, I am doing all I can to assist in overcoming the problems with encumbrances on industrial properties in Elizabeth. I had previously given that assurance to both the State and Federal members for the area, and I reiterate that that assurance remains valid.

The issue of commercial encumbrances is a more complex and difficult matter. I have indicated that as a general principle I wish to see them removed, but this will require lengthy negotiation and discussion with affected parties. The greater complexity of the commercial encumbrances has been discussed with the mayor for Elizabeth.

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. What action has the Premier taken over the Federal Liberal Government's plans to cut the National Crime Authority, which will see staff numbers of the Adelaide office of the NCA cut by two-thirds, and what guarantees can the Premier give that the efforts against drug traffickers and organised crime will be maintained given that, at the same time, the Premier has cut the South Australian police budget again?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any interjections from either side today.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Opposition has been told that the Howard Liberal Government plans to cut the NCA's national budget of \$38.9 million by \$11.3 million over the next three years. The Adelaide office of the NCA will drop in numbers from 33 to 10 and those going will include lawyers and investigative accountants as well as NCA police officers.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Today, I received an advice saying that the NCA had had a look at its budget and it will pare back on that budget. The important point is that the NCA exists for the cooperation between the States. We know that a number of exercises conducted in this State have been motivated from our own investigations and we have used the NCA as the coordinating body to bring new resources into this State, or indeed when there is an exercise interstate for that same office to coordinate the exercises in another State. We know that there will not be any less effort. The cuts in the police budget were clearly outlined and explained when the budgets were brought down previously. There was no mystery about that to anyone in this House. I will say again that the reduction in the Police Force is not in the core service; it is not out on the beat. If the members want to use the Estimates Committee, which I am sure they will, to elucidate on some of those issues then I am more than happy to accommodate them. The reduction in the police budget is in the non-core services, which have already been announced. We are talking about the aircraft service, the speed cameras

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Leader made this gratuitous comment about the cut to the police budget. I am saying that there is more effort under this Government, despite the budget retraction, than there was under the previous Government and it is paying dividends. There is no less effort. There is more effort in this State on policing than was evident when we came into power. That is point one. The second point is that, in terms of Federal priorities we will be going back to the NCA and the Federal Attorney-General to determine what resources will remain within this State and how we can continue those exercises that are important from a national viewpoint. Those matters will be followed up, as they should be. From South Australia's point of view, I do not expect that some of the efforts that we have made to date, particularly in the past two years, will be diminished but, certainly, I will ascertain what the level of resourcing will be and how we can manage to continue with those important programs on organised crime in particular and other areas where the NCA has played a leading role.

STATE BUDGET

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Premier confirm that strict adherence to the Government's job reduction target, contracting out program and wages policy is vital to eliminate the annual budget deficit and achieve a sustainable cut in State debt?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Last Thursday the Government introduced a budget that quite clearly continued the Government's strategy in terms of debt reduction and meeting the deficit targets put down by this Government immediately after the last State election. This afternoon we will hear the Leader of the Opposition's response to the budget. Let us look at what the Leader of the Opposition said exactly 12 months ago in his response to the 1995-96 budget: he said, 'It is a budget that fails the Premier's own debt and financial targets.' So, 12 months ago his warning to South Australians was that the budget that we had brought in would fail in terms of both financial targets and debt reduction. The fact is that we are able to say at the end of the year that through the sale of assets we have now achieved a \$1 800 million reduction in debt for the taxpayers of South Australia.

We are 18 months ahead of schedule, even though 12 months ago the Leader of the Opposition claimed that we would fail to achieve that target. Furthermore, our current deficit for 1995-96 is expected to be \$106 million— \$8 million ahead of the estimate put in the budget. Again, the Leader of the Opposition was clearly wrong 12 months ago. People need to be very careful and, when they hear the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon and his statements about the phoney budget that he has been using over the past four days, take into account that he was wrong 12 months ago—and he will be wrong again this year. Let us look at what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying. He has come out and opposed the sale of assets. Time after time he has opposed the sale of assets—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is warned for the first time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—even though the sale of assets has meant that we have been able to bring about a very substantial reduction in debt. He has opposed contracting out, even though the contracting out of services is now saving the taxpayers about \$40 million a year. He has also come out opposing the reduction of the public sector in South Australia. How can he possibly oppose debt reduction, asset sales, the reduction of the size of the Public Service and contracting out and have a budget strategy at all? The only way the Leader of the Opposition could meet his targets would be to deliver a massive increase in taxation.

Let us see whether the Leader of the Opposition has the honesty to come out this afternoon in his budget speech and say that under his budget strategy he would have a massive increase in taxation. In fact, given the parameters that he himself has already put down against his own financial objectives, he would have to raise about an extra \$450 million. That is equivalent to effectively doubling payroll tax in South Australia from 6 per cent to 12 per cent. That is how much credibility one can place in what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying over the past three or four days.

Not only that, however; he said we should have provided more money for teachers' wage increases. We have provided \$67 million, and apparently the Leader of the Opposition supports the full \$240 million claim being made by the teachers. If he does not, let him tell us this afternoon where he stands on teacher salary claims. It is about time he came clean with the people of South Australia on that. On top of that, the Leader of the Opposition has come out and said that we should have made special provision in the budget to allow for Federal Government cuts. Again, let us hear what his budget strategy would be. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to tell us this afternoon where he would reduce debt and how he would achieve it without selling assets, contracting out and reducing the size of the public sector, unless he had a secret agenda for a substantial increase in State taxation.

The Leader of the Opposition has been running around using the word 'phoney' for the past two or three days. We know who is phoney; it is the Leader of the Opposition who is phoney. He has no credibility when it comes to financial matters and no credibility when it comes to budgets. He was wrong 12 months ago, and he is wrong again this year. After all, it was the Leader of the Opposition who sat around the Cabinet table as a Minister and lost this State \$4 000 million through the State Bank collapse—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: So, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to stand in the House this afternoon and outline his budget strategy. I challenge him to tell us whether he is against debt reduction and whether he is against reducing the budget deficit. What tax increases—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I challenge the Leader to be honest with the people of the State and say what tax increases he will impose in Government.

POLICE STATIONS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for Police confirm that, due to staff shortages, major 24 hour police stations are closing their front doors on afternoon shift because they are unable to provide appropriate duty of care to prisoners as well as attend to all other station duties including servicing members of the public at the front counter, and will the Minister advise how this situation will improve following last week's budget? The Opposition has been informed that in the past few weeks three of our largest police stations—Darlington, Christies Beach and Elizabeth—have been forced to close their doors to the public on some afternoons because of staff shortages.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That is just patent rubbish. I do not know where the honourable member gets his information, unless it is the Police Association. We have looked at all our—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, the member for Playford cannot interject across the floor. We have said that we want

putting more effort into policing than the previous Government, and the results are there in the past two years for people to see. So, the member for Playford is getting very selective information. I can inform the honourable member that, where we do not get clientele through the front door, we do not keep the front door open. There is no reason why in selective areas—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Playford misunderstands. The fact that a police station is a 24 hour station means it operates 24 hours a day. The extent to which it is open for customers is a different issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: We have a number of police stations that run patrols that operate 24 hours a day, as the honourable member is aware. Whether they are open at 2 a.m. when nobody is around is a question that has to be asked.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When the House comes to order, we will proceed with Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members do not want Question Time to continue, we can proceed with the other business of the House.

STATE BUDGET

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Following the release of the 1996-97 budget last Thursday, will the Treasurer respond to claims that the budget is a fraud and a farce?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Following on from the Premier, I was amazed by the response from the Leader of the Opposition, but not surprised, because this is the same Leader who last year said there was a billion dollar hole in the budget, and we are still trying to find it. Again we see that the responses this year are a figment of his imagination. The Premier has outlined a number of areas where the Leader has failed South Australians and this Parliament dismally over a number of years, particularly when he was a Minister in the Cabinet. It is the same person who presided over the State Bank and SGIC; it is the same person who wanted to charge business \$500 to get in and look at the ALP conventions; and it is the same Minister who in the previous Government was part of the \$350 million debacle. If the achievements of the Leader of the Opposition are assessed, it is seen that his credibility is at an all time low.

In relation to whether a budget should have been delivered, he should have discussed this matter with the Treasurer of New South Wales, the Hon. Michael Egan, who has also seen fit to bring down a budget, as has the Treasurer of Western Australia. Indeed, we have seen also the statement from Victoria. Is he suggesting that they are a fraud and a farce? I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition talk to those Leaders and impress upon them the substance of his remarks compared with the performance of those Governments.

The budget as laid down is a watershed for South Australia. At 30 June 1997, the debt to GSP ratio will decrease to 20.3 per cent, down from the 28.1 per cent of GSP that prevailed back in 1992. A number of important achievements of this Government have been represented by the budget. The best cure for the ALP may well be to let those who wish to be Leader get out the knives and complete the task.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY INFORMATION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Under what circumstances are the security computer listings that automatically lock movements in and out of Parliament House made available to you, and are they or have they been made available to other members of this House? The Opposition has been made aware that such a list has been supplied to a member of the Parliamentary Liberal Party in an alleged attempt to track down a person who has circulated unsigned, defamatory material about another prominent member of the Parliamentary Liberal Party.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will give the Deputy Leader of the Opposition a considered response in the near future. I want to ensure that all the information is correct.

HEALTH SERVICES, NORTHERN AREA

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Health inform the House how the capital works program announced in last week's budget is expected to improve health services for the people in the northern area?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Newland for her question about this very important matter. The capital infrastructure in which we were asked to provide world quality services was poor because of neglect by the previous Government. We have acknowledged this and we have been attempting to rebuild South Australia's health infrastructure so that we can provide effective and efficient services. Indeed, in the budget announced last week there is a capital works program of \$124 million, which will go a long way towards redressing the neglect of the previous Government. It will not answer every need, but it goes a long way towards the goal.

I believe that other members in the House will be pleased and delighted to acknowledge that in this budget the Government has committed to a five year \$28 million redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Health Service at Elizabeth. The first stage in the capital works budget this year of \$4.2 million provides for ambulatory care and teaching and research. Unfortunately, substandard accommodation was allowed to be the order of the day under the previous Administration but we will replace that substandard accommodation with either new or upgraded facilities in the following areas—and it is an impressive list—: ambulatory care, operating theatres, medical imaging, anaesthetics, pathology, rehabilitation, teaching and research, emergency, medical records, low dependency unit, pharmacy, outpatients department, administration and biomedical engineering.

In addition, in-patient wards will be rebuilt or upgraded in the following areas: medical, surgical, orthopaedic, obstetric, neo-natal, paediatric, intensive, psychiatric and palliative care. This redevelopment will lead to a greatly increased range and scope of specialist services not only for the people in the Elizabeth area in particular but also for the people in the north in general. The project can actually be seen as a metaphor for the way in which the Government is managing the health services—fiscal responsibility with a commitment to better human services.

Everyone would know that, following the election, we commissioned the Audit Commission, which recommended that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be wound back to community status and that it lose teaching hospital status. We did not accept that report. We have amalgamated into the North Western Adelaide Health Services the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin, and in fact we are going to make the Lyell McEwin Hospital a first-class teaching hospital equivalent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Notwithstanding the geography, the demographics and the political representation of that area, the facts are that the former Labor Government basically had allowed the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital to wind down. Labor forgot the west and the north: in contrast, the Brown Liberal Government is quite clearly making a commitment to provide quality, accessible health care to all South Australians.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY INFORMATION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Police tell the House under what circumstances documents can be fingerprinted by police and say whether or not he is aware of any request that has been made by any member of this Chamber for the fingerprinting of an anonymous letter that has been circulated concerning a prominent Liberal MP?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Fingerprinting is quite straightforward: it has to go through the Commissioner of Police or his designated officer. There has been no request, that I am aware of, for any member of this Parliament.

AUSTRALIAN TOURISM EXCHANGE

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Tourism advise the House how South Australia will be represented at the 1996 Australian Tourism Exchange, which is to be held in Sydney from 10 to 14 June, and say what activities are being undertaken to promote the State to the visiting whole-sale buyers and travel trade media? The Australian Tourism Exchange is the country's biggest international tourism marketing opportunity, bringing hundreds of buyers of tourism products to Australia to meet face to face with Australian operators. The exchange also attracts a large international travel media contingent to cover the event and the tourism products on offer.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Reynell for her question. South Australian tourism operators will have a much higher profile this year in Sydney at the ATE because of the amount of money that this Government is prepared to put forward in the international tourism market. Some 38 operators from South Australia (compared with 31 last year) have decided that they want to go over and sell their product on an international basis.

As the honourable member said, it is the biggest single tourism exchange of information and product in the southern hemisphere. It is a very important tourism industry exercise. The fact that we have the biggest number attending— 38 operators from South Australia—is a matter about which to congratulate our industry. There will be 19 booths promoting South Australian product, primarily with the wine industry as the basis, and with a very large number of other people arguing and supporting the ecotourism product.

Tourism managers from South Australia and all around the world will be going to Sydney for this event. We will have together all our agents seeing the products that we are selling and also being able to mingle with agents from other States, seeing their products and what they are doing, so that we can continue to sell better in the international market. By participating in this exchange we put on show, once a year, South Australian products for all the world to see. It is encouraging that so many people are prepared to be part of it. We think it is an excellent promotion and would encourage more South Australian operators to be part of it.

Immediately after this exchange, the Wine Australia convention will be held, and South Australia has some 60 per cent of the space at that event. It is a showcase for all wine and wine products in Australia in the biggest single consumer market possible in this country, and again we will see not only the wine product but the wine tourism product promoted on a national and an international basis.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY INFORMATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): When was the Premier first aware of the release of confidential security computer information from Parliament House to one Liberal member of Parliament? Did the Premier approve or support this activity, which was designed to find the source of an unsigned letter about the member for Coles?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The first thing that I point out is that this is the first Question Time after the budget has been introduced, and I think that we have had one or perhaps two questions on the budget.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Does that mean that the Opposition has officially laid down and accepted our budget strategy?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Does that mean that the Leader of the Opposition apparently has only one question to ask on the budget?

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections on my right. I take it that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a point of order.

Mr CLARKE: My point of order, Sir, relates to Standing Order 98, which provides that Ministers are required to answer the substantive part of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again point out to the Deputy Leader that Ministers have more flexibility in answering questions than members have in asking them, and I refer him again to the methods and style of answering questions employed by the member for Giles when he was a Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, in answer to this question—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It was a serious question: answer it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the Leader of the Opposition once today. He is fully aware that he cannot continue to ask supplementary questions by interjection.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am able to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that the Speaker does not inform me when he accesses or releases that information.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION POLICY

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): As tomorrow is World Environment Day, will the Minister for Infrastructure report on various projects in his portfolio that are having an impact on how we manage and care for the environment in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to advise the House that a new water recycling scheme in the Adelaide Hills will be established, which will result in all the waste water from the Gumeracha waste water treatment plant being used for irrigation purposes. The Gumeracha plant currently releases some 25 million litres of treated water into the Torrens River each year. The reuse project will benefit the environment by reducing the inflows of nutrients to Hills waterways, including the Torrens River, a primary source of Adelaide's water supply. We hope to put this project in place in other locations throughout the Hills.

Treated water from the plant will be used to irrigate an established pine forest operated by the Department of Primary Industries SA on land owned by SA Water as part of the buffer zone of the Gumeracha weir. A new pumping station will be constructed, together with a fully automated reticulation system, including some 64 kilometres of dripper pipe work. A construction contract has been let for approximately \$250 000 to implement this scheme. In addition to that, SA Water has prepared in consultation with the EPA an environment improvement program for the four major waste water treatment plants serving Adelaide. The improvement program will further reduce the flow of nutrients to the sea by major process upgrades at the treatment plants or, in the case of Bolivar, through extensive reuse via the proposed Bolivar-Virginia pipeline scheme.

An experimental pilot plant is already in use at Port Adelaide. That will assist SA Water in gathering design data for nutrient removal by natural biological means. This is a major project involving a capital cost of a minimum of \$100 million up to something like \$150 million, and it will enable SA Water to meet objectives of the Environmental Protection Act by 2001 and further improve South Australia's high standard of waste water treatment.

The Electricity Trust is also active in this matter, ensuring that the corporation meets environmental responsibilities. Apart from the \$500 000 commitment to wind farm operations and research, ETSA has an environment improvement program agreed with the EPA as part of a licensing condition for plants, including the large base load stations at Torrens Island and Port Augusta. As part of its ongoing environmental management programs, ETSA closely monitors emissions from its power stations to ensure continued compliance with EPA requirements and clean power for South Australia.

In addition, it was only last year that we announced an agreement between ETSA and the private sector to tap into gas emissions from rubbish dumps in the metropolitan area and feed into the grid system, creating an opportunity in those rubbish locations, where oxygen is leached from the soil, to preclude the leaching of oxygen from the soil to enable us to plant trees in those locations. The monitoring program that I have referred to covers air quality, stormwater, the effect on seagrasses, chimney emissions and temperature of cooling water emitted from those plants.

From the program that I have identified, clearly South Australia is at the lead of other States of Australia in looking at its major infrastructure—ETSA, SA Water—to meet the environmental requirements by the year 2001. There is a strategy and a program that is being carefully put in place to meet the requirements of the EPA, to ensure that we have and continue to have one of the clean, green environments in Australia which will benchmark our State to enable us to export goods and services out of South Australia with the tag of the clean, green environment of Australia.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY INFORMATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): When did the Premier first learn of the release of confidential Parliament House security information to the member for Florey, and who told the Premier of the actions of the Speaker and the member for Florey in relation to this incident?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is very similar to a previous question.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition contain himself.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I have said, it disappoints me that the Opposition is not raising questions about the budget. I answered this question before: it was virtually an identical question. That is—

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

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was asked when I was aware of this, and I indicate to the honourable member that the Speaker is in charge of the matter. The Speaker does not inform me of when he accesses that information or whom he authorises. It is entirely in the hands of the Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TORRENS RIVER LINEAR PARK

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Premier inform the House of details and timing of the construction program for the completion of Linear Park? The Torrens River Linear Park is of great importance to my electorate and, as the Premier knows, my constituents and the Campbelltown council have a great interest in his reply.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I indicate to the House that Cabinet decided that \$700 000 would be allocated in the 1996-97 and 1997-98 financial years to ensure that the Linear Park along the Torrens Valley would be completed by the end of September next year. I point out to the House that it was a Liberal Government in 1982 that started this very important Linear Park project. It was a subsequent Labor Government that stopped it. The Linear Park is one of the great achievements in Adelaide over the past 15 years.

I notice the member for Torrens nodding her head in agreement, that it was a Liberal Government which put it in place and it was a Labor Government which stopped the work from proceeding. I point out to the honourable member—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The facts are there: Labor stopped the Torrens Linear Park project. A sizeable section up to Gorge Road needs to be completed, and I know that the member for Coles has been pushing for this for the past couple of years. In the budget for 1995-96 \$400 000 was allocated. I can now tell the honourable member that the work will be completed: Cabinet has given the authority for it to go ahead. The work will be supervised by SA Water and will be undertaken in two stages, the first stage extending up to River Drive, and the second stage through to Gorge Road, taking it up to the strawberry farm. Very importantly, it will include cycleways, and we will then have a complete Linear Park along the Torrens Valley consisting of cycleways, pathways and revegetation of that area.

I believe that after the stalling of Labor this will be a great achievement. I acknowledge the role and the campaign that has been run by the member for Coles in this matter. The honourable member should be proud of the fact that this Government has now given a commitment to complete that program. We also compliment the Campbelltown council, because it has made a sizeable contribution. Other councils are due to make a contribution as well, and we look forward to their now being part of this project, which involves a twoway effort between the local councils and the State Government. We look forward to completion of the project, as I said, by September next year.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY INFORMATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again directed to the Premier. During the discussion of the release of Parliament House confidential security information in the Government's Party Room this morning, did the Premier deny to other Liberal MPs and Ministers any prior knowledge of this computer log being given to the member for Florey by the Speaker in order to trace the leak about the member for Coles?

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the fact that the Deputy Leader has already asked me a question, I will respond to the Deputy Leader and cover those matters that refer to me in relation to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to resume his seat. In regard to the other matters that are relevant to the Premier, I call him to answer.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Quite clearly, I indicate to the House that I was not aware at any stage that the Speaker had given specific approval or information to any member of the House.

AGED PERSONS

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for the Ageing inform the House of moves being taken to improve safety and security measures for the State's older residents? Recent reports have highlighted a number of instances involving our elderly people, particularly with regard to property break-ins. In the month of April, when I was overseas, I believe that there was an assault on an elderly person at least once a day.

Mr Atkinson: It's a good question: answer it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased the Opposition is interested, for a change, in something in which the Government might be involved. I thank the member for Lee for his important question, which is one that is of interest especially to older South Australians. The care, security and confidence of our older people in South Australia is of paramount importance, but I must emphasise again that crime statistics clearly show that our older people are among the safest and least vulnerable to crime in the community, and we need to keep reminding ourselves, and particularly older South Australians, that that is the case. Nonetheless, I have arranged a meeting for various representatives of the ageing community with the Attorney-General and myself to discuss issues of crime and promote further strategies in the wake of recent reports, which, I must say, were substantially overstated.

Additionally, publication of a booklet is now under way. It contains tips for safety and security, which I believe will be well used by older people in our community. I also refer briefly to the joint decision taken by the State and Commonwealth Governments through the Home and Community Care Program. We have joined to provide \$500 000 for an initiative to provide access to Constant Care for 1 000 of our elderly people through the Adelaide Central Mission. It is an excellent program and one that I support very strongly. The program involves a monitoring system so that people simply press a button on the telephone or a button on a pendant worn around the neck to connect them directly with Constant Care monitoring staff. A powerful speaker and microphone in the unit enables Constant Care staff to communicate with the person concerned from almost anywhere in the house. I have seen this program in action and it is an excellent one that I believe will bring relief not only to older people but also to the families associated with them. The service has been designed so that it can also be activated by smoke alarms, intruder alarms and movement detection devices.

The \$500 000 allocation means that Constant Care can supply 1 000 elderly people with units free of charge. The only expenses they will need to meet are the installation cost—a minimal cost of \$80—and a \$5 week monitoring fee. I point out to the House that normally the units are sold for \$650, so it is a considerable saving for 1 000 older South Australians. This is a tremendous initiative and again demonstrates this Government's commitment to provide security and care to people of all ages to help them to be in control of their own situation. It is vitally important that older South Australians are able to enjoy this protection and can feel secure in their community.

UNIVERSITY FEES

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Does the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education support the call of the Vice-Chancellors of Victoria's universities for the introduction of United States style tuition fees and/or a massive increase in the higher education contribution scheme charge for students? Yesterday, the Federal Minister for Education, Senator Amanda Vanstone, issued a statement calling on State Ministers and universities to follow the lead of the Victorian Vice-Chancellors, which she described as a model for the rest of the nation.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: First, as a State Minister I am not responsible for fees charged at universities. If other States want to advocate schemes, that is entirely up to them. I am a great advocate of having a university system that is accessible to everyone, irrespective of means, and I believe that university education should be regarded as an investment not simply as a cost.

LORD MAYOR'S ALLOWANCE

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the South Australian Government have any concerns over current activities of the Adelaide City Council, bearing in mind the report contained on page 1 of today's *Advertiser*, which speaks of greatly increased allowances for the Lord Mayor?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Generally, the policy of the Government is that it likes to see local government look after its own affairs. However, the comments in the paper this morning, together with some other matters, cause me considerable concern when it comes to the Adelaide City Council. I indicate to the Parliament that the Government would be opposed very strongly to the Lord Mayor's taking a salary package of \$124 000. We believe that, at a time when the staff of the Adelaide City Council are talking about the financial and budgetary problems of the council, it is totally inappropriate for the Lord Mayor to be taking a salary of \$124 000. On radio this morning I noted that the Lord Mayor was opposed to that idea. I compliment him on that opposition. I would urge the rest of the council to stand by him and reject that proposal.

A number of matters concern me with regard to the Adelaide City Council, including its financial and budgetary problems, which have been brought to the attention of the Government, and the fact that the council was very slow indeed in proceeding with the upgrade of Rundle Mall. Even though the State Government is contributing to the upgrade of Rundle Mall, the council has been slow in implementing it. Furthermore, Lake Torrens urgently needs to be dredged. I believe that it is the responsibility of the council; it has been a council activity in the past, and the Government has been trying to get the council to take some action on that.

We find it quite unacceptable that, right in the centre of Adelaide, with about a third of the area of the lake immediately upstream of the King William Street bridge, Lake Torrens is being silted up with pollution, plastic bags, tyres and other rubbish, and the council has taken no action to ensure that that is cleaned up. The State Government has offered to put in some money to help that dredging process, but again we have had trouble getting agreement with the council to put in its fair share. Finally, it concerns me that the council seems to be worried about other trivial matters and does not appear to be focusing on giving a vision to Adelaide and a long-term future to the City of Adelaide itself. It needs that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In fact, the State Government has set up the Century 21 Adelaide project on a joint basis. We have put in the money. We are concerned that the City of Adelaide needs strategies to combat the growing impact of regional shopping centres; it needs to be able to attract more people to live in the city itself. The honourable member asked what the State Government has done; let us look at what it has done. The State Government has invested millions of dollars in the development of East Adelaide at the eastern end of Rundle Street. The State Government has established in the eastern area of Adelaide the multi-media precinct which will be opened very shortly and which has therefore brought in new jobs to the City of Adelaide itself.

We have had the development of the universities and the upgrade of the TAFE college, and we are about to have the Living Arts Centre redeveloped at a cost of \$15 million to the State Government. There is a range of other initiatives; for example, we have put money into the upgrade of Rundle Mall. So, the State Government has done more than its fair share in terms of helping the City of Adelaide. It is about time the Adelaide City Council had a long-term vision for the city and put its resources where it counts—and that is not into a salary for the Lord Mayor of Adelaide.

STATE BUDGET

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Premier acknowledge that the rate of growth projected for South Australia in the Government budget papers for the financial year 1996-97 will not be sufficient to prevent rising unemployment over the coming year? The budget papers project a growth rate in 1996-97 of 2.75 per cent below the 3.25 per cent projected for the national economy. The publication *State of Play* estimates that growth slightly above 3 per cent is required to prevent unemployment from rising.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We always use very conservative figures in our budget. One has only to look at our last budget to see that we used very conservative figures and that we exceeded those figures in terms of the growth rate for the State of South Australia. Where is the acknowledgment from Labor Opposition members in this State that South Australia had the fastest economic growth rate of any State in Australia? Not one word has come out from them on that subject. South Australia had an economic growth rate of 4.9 per cent in 1995. The next highest in Australia happens to be Western Australia at 3.1 per cent, and the next highest after that is Victoria, at 2.9 per cent. Here is South Australia right up at the top of the list by a mile.

Where is one word of acknowledgment, one word of congratulation from the Labor Opposition? No; all it can do is knock, knock, knock. Every time we come out with a new development in this State the Labor Party tries to stop it. It tried to stop the developments at Wirrina, Granite Island and Roxby Downs, and the clean-up of the Patawalonga. We all know what it did with Roxby Downs. The Leader of the Opposition led the campaign against Roxby Downs, yet he claims to have some credibility.

I highlight the fact that we are now starting to create significant new jobs in the restructured industries that we are putting down in South Australia, in tourism and the car, wine and information technology industries. I challenge the Opposition, particularly the Deputy Leader, to look at the latest figures from a Morgan Banks survey that show that 66 per cent of all information technology companies in South Australia are expected to take on additional employees over the next three months. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to look at the growth that has been occurring in the wine industry in South Australia or at Mitsubishi, where 750 extra jobs are being created because of the launch of a new model and the expansion of the engine plant, or out at General Motors-Holden's. Now we are getting close to their own electorates. We know that General Motors-Holden's has a commitment to invest \$1 400 million over the next five years here in South Australia-first, in the next model of the Commodore, and secondly in the new production line of the Vectra, which will be largely focused on the export market.

Since this Parliament last sat in April, we have had the announcement of the expansion of the General Motors facilities, the announcement and launch of the new model by Mitsubishi, announcements in a range of other areas and the opening of the Westpac Banking Centre. Not once have we heard one positive word from members of the Opposition in this State. All I can say is that they are people without honour, because it was under the Labor Government that South Australia lost the bulk of its industrial development in the five years leading up to the change of Government. South Australia lost more of its corporate base than any other State in Australia. So, the Labor Party must share or take the responsibility for that loss of jobs in this State.

EMERGENCY SERVICES PERSONNEL

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Emergency Services inform the House of the financial commitment the Government has made to ensure that South Australia's emergency services personnel maintain their reputation as among the best resourced in the nation?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Flinders for her question. During the past 21/2 years I have had the privilege to visit the honourable member's electorate on a number of occasions. Her constituents can rest assured that she vigorously represents their interests in many areas, not least of which is emergency services. Certainly, the electorate of Flinders and many other electorates throughout the State will benefit from the emergency services appropriation in the recent State budget. Over the next 12 months emergency services stand to benefit by more than \$7 million on the purchase of new and upgraded vehicles across the State. This money will enable the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the Country Fire Service and the South Australian Ambulance Service to purchase more than 90 vehicles for distribution to various ambulance fire stations across the State

An amount of \$3 million has been allocated to the South Australian Ambulance Service for 1996-97, \$2.8 million to the Metropolitan Fire Service and \$1.5 million to the Country Fire Service for the purchase of new appliances, response vehicles and ambulances. In addition to the new vehicles, more than \$2.4 million will be spent over the next 12 months constructing two new combined fire ambulance stations, one in Mount Gambier and one in the Ridgehaven-Golden Grove area, and the expansion of at least three existing stations to accommodate both those emergency services. The Country Fire Service will spend more than \$1 million over the next 12 months on collocating stations, which will see a number of volunteer emergency service centres constructed throughout the State.

In addition, the State Emergency Service and also St John volunteers will benefit from cash injections of \$200 000 and \$100 000 respectively. The cash injection of \$200 000 to the State Emergency Service will equate to about \$100 for each volunteer in that service, which will match money provided by local government. That will mean that every State Emergency Service unit within the State will receive an increase this financial year compared to the previous financial year, and that is good news for that agency, for it was long neglected by the previous Labor Administration in that it did not receive such cash boosts.

The total expenditure ensures that our emergency services remain well equipped and maintain their reputation as amongst the best equipped in Australia. This \$7 million injection for vehicles also adds to the recent expenditure of \$950 000 on a new appliance for the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. This appliance, known as a Bronto Skylift, combines the concept of a turntable ladder and the flexibility of a 37 metre hydraulic rescue firefighting platform that will be at the ready should the service need it to fight high structure fires.

In all, during this financial year, the Metropolitan Fire Service will purchase 10 new appliances and refurbish two others; the County Fire Service, 42 appliances and two rescue vehicles; and the South Australian Ambulance Service, 36 new ambulance vehicles. So, all South Australians can be secure in the knowledge that their emergency services will be well equipped, at the ready, with the appliances and equipment they need to combat emergency situations as they arise.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Premier now acknowledge that, during the 1994-95 financial year, South Australia had the lowest rate of growth in the nation, and that during the two subsequent years the Government expects South Australia to continue to under perform compared with other Australian States?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford has the call.

Mr QUIRKE: The Government's own budget papers state:

South Australia's growth for 1994-95 was 0.0 per cent.

Its own papers-

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: The budget papers estimate South Australia's growth rate for this year to be 3 per cent and for next year to be 2.75 per cent. The estimates for Australia are 3.25 per cent in both of these years. On ABC radio on 31 May, the Premier stated:

The facts are that, within two years of being elected, we have produced the highest economic growth rate of any State in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! After that long explanation, I call the Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The only thing the honourable member left out of his long explanation was that it was the Labor Party which created the State Bank disaster which created the \$4 000 million debt which absolutely ruined the budget position of South Australia to the point that it took this State to the brink of bankruptcy. How can that man opposite have the gall to stand in this House and raise anything about the damage that was done to the South Australian economy in 1994? How can the Leader of the Opposition have any credibility whatsoever in criticising the debt reduction strategy of the Brown Government? Members opposite have no credibility at all, and the honourable member who just raised this, the shadow Treasurer, should hang his head in shame.

It was the Labor Government that destroyed this State's economy, so he should have the courtesy to stand up and apologise to the people of South Australia. We have been waiting five years for that apology. It is about time it came. No-one in the Labor Party has yet had the gumption or the courtesy to stand up and apologise to the people of South Australia for the enormous damage they inflicted on this State, yet the honourable member has the gall to stand up and talk about growth rates in 1994. The facts are that in 1995 we had the fastest growing economy in Australia, and no-one can dispute that. Members opposite sit there in shame because they know that—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You know you cannot interrupt. You know you cannot interject. You know you have no grounds whatsoever on which to stand. The honourable member knows only too well the sort of financial chaos in which he and his colleagues left South Australia. The shame is that the Leader of the Opposition, one of the Ministers who sat around the Cabinet table—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—has been put in as the leader of this motley group which calls itself the State Opposition. What leadership will they get out of him, given that he sat around and destroyed the State's finances with the rest of the Ministers?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is no credibility whatsoever in the honourable member's question.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Today I want to pay tribute to the many students and many people who, in the pre dawn hours of 4 June 1989, watched China go mad. For several hours, the People's Liberation Army fired on pro democracy students and others who quite peacefully demonstrated in Tiananmen Square. Many tears were shed, not only in China but here in South Australia. I am sure that many of us have Chinese friends or were acquainted with Chinese students who studied here, or even Chinese business people. In fact, as was pointed out to me, you did not have to know these people in China to shed a tear, because many people mourned the loss of innocent people in this atrocity as they expressed what we all believed was a fundamental right.

I recall reading of a 17 year old boy whose only crime was riding his bicycle to work. He was gunned down. Through the media, we witnessed crippled bodies and bleeding corpses and many recall the horrific scene of young people burning to death in a bus. Almost overnight, China had changed. Over the next few months, the authorities arrested tens of thousands of people. Many of these people disappeared into the bowels of the prison system, many without trial and most with no reliable word on their fate. Many prisoners were tortured and common criminals were ordered to beat up and humiliate political prisoners. I recall hearing of many atrocities associated with the arrest of pro democracy supporters.

In Yingshan Prison in Guangxi province, a prisoner was locked away for two years in solitary confinement in a cell that was never cleaned. He died there and officials were not sure what had killed him. One possibility was that he froze to death because he had no blankets. The other possibility was that he died from the gases produced by the fermentation of the 14 inch pile of his own excrement. I am sure that we are all well are of China's history being based on warlords and much bloodshed. Many in authority in China were skilled in the technique of forgetting history. For instance, in 1982, the Communist Party issued a direction banning further works on the Cultural Revolution. The 1958-61 famine was expunged from many records. In the past, repression and torture were applied secretly, but in 1989 the Party obligingly carried out its slaughter in front of foreign television cameras.

The first inkling of the 1989 rise of the people came in the early afternoon of 15 April 1989, with the death of Hu Yaobang. Hu Yaobang was a former leader of the Communist Party, ousted in 1987 by hardliners who believed he was a rather ineffectual leader prone to impetuous suggestions, such as the advice that Chinese abandon chopsticks and switch to knife and fork. He was transformed by his dismissal into a hero for all intellectuals. On his death he became a martyr. Hu Yaobang was portrayed as a great democrat, calling for democracy. On the night of his death, wall after wall of Beijing University was covered in posters mourning Hu Yaobang's death.

It was at this time that a young history student, Wang Dan, who was to become the leader of the Tiananmen movement and the most wanted student in China, reached a turning point. Wang Dan, inspired by people like Hu Yaobang, had no hidden agenda—he simply sought a more democratic and open China. The Tiananmen movement took off more quickly than anyone expected. Students, teachers, business people there were many who knew the risks and still became involved in the movement. There were people like Zheng Yi, the writer, Wan Runnan, a computer company manager, Wang Juntao, a journalist and Chen Ziming, a social scientist and engineer. Many of these people were Party members, people who could be described as the Gorbachevs of China, seeking reform of their Party for the betterment of all China.

The protests, the hunger strikes, and the placards and banners denouncing Deng Xiaoping's regime and calling for democracy, dishevelled the authorities and built momentum amongst the people. The movement was strong but it was peaceful, and up until June there had been minimal reaction from the Communist Party. Those in the student movement were addressed as counter-revolutionaries by those denouncing them. Some within the Party saw the movement as a tool in a leadership coup, and then in a lead up to 4 June a decision was made that turned the whole event into chaos. China feared economic collapse. Incidents such as those in Poland were cited and firm measures were put in place. Noone really knows who ordered the massacre but I do recall reading of Deng's praising the authorities of the Soviet Republic of Georgia. He is known to have said, 'We do not fear the spilling of blood and we do not fear international reaction.

There is much more to be said of the Tiananmen massacre but time does not permit. But I want to record in this House the heroic deaths of many Chinese people. I also want to record my opposition to the incarceration, humiliation and torture endured by many prisoners of conscience who made a stand for what is right. In the throes of death, a Chinese student asked that we do not hide the incident but record everything that happened on that day, 4 June 1989.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I refer to what we all know occurred this morning—a huge bust-up in the Liberal Party room with respect to leaked information—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Confidential parliamentary records which record the comings and goings of every member of Parliament, all parliamentary staff and staff of MPs have been released by the Speaker and given to the member for Florey, who has taken it upon himself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. **Mr CLARKE:**—to have them fingerprinted to try to find the culprit who has distributed an anonymous letter that is defamatory of the member for Coles.

Mr Atkinson: Allegedly defamatory.

Mr CLARKE: Allegedly defamatory. We know that it was circulated by a supporter of the Minister for Infrastructure in his internecine warfare with the Premier over his desire to replace the Premier as Leader of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I raise a point of order, Sir. In his statement to the House, the Deputy Leader is reflecting on members.

The SPEAKER: Order! Each member is responsible for their comments and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! They must bear the responsibility for any comments they make, particularly for the accuracy of them. I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and all members that they are not permitted to impute improper motives towards anyone. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr ANDREW: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would estimate that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been speaking for at least 90 seconds, yet the clock has just commenced on five minutes. I suggest that the clock should be moved ahead in the order of 1¹/₂ minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. The unsigned letter distributed by a member of the Liberal Party who supports the Minister for Infrastructure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood.

Mr CUMMINS: When the allegation was made about this letter, the member for Hart put up his hand and admitted that he had circulated the letter—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CUMMINS:—yet the Deputy Leader has said it was unsigned. The member for Hart has clearly admitted in this House that he circulated the letter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood will resume his seat. That is not a point of order.

Mr Foley: That is also a fib.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that all members calm down. Every member has the opportunity to participate in this debate and, if they believe that they have been misrepresented, there is a course of action open to them at the appropriate time. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. The letter, which is headed 'The "Joan Hall Apology" is an admission of guilt' states:

The *Sunday Mail* of 12 May 1996 apologised to Hall for only two allegations that were made in the 'Backstabber' article of 26 November 1995:

That Hall made a call and leaked the information to Mike Rann.
That Hall organised someone else to call and leak information

to Mike Rann. The apology, demanded by Hall and put in with her approval, indicates Hall as the target of the whole article. The allegations made in the *Sunday Mail* of 26 November 1995 which have not been apologised for are:

1. She is a 'backstabber'.

2. She attempted to 'set up' a Party leadership battle between Brown and Olsen.

3. She attempted to orchestrate a damaging division in the hope that Mr Olsen, the Infrastructure Minister, would be dumped or lose one of his major portfolios.

4. She put her own political ambitions to win a place in Cabinet before the well-being of the Liberal Government.

5. She prompted another MP to ask Mr Brown a series of provocative questions in a bid to set up a leadership challenge.

6. She was involved in a blatant conspiracy which gave the totally false perception of a leadership challenge by Infrastructure Minister Olsen.

Not denied is the public admission by Rann that Hall had rung him on other occasions with information but not on this occasion.

After negotiating for six months with the *Sunday Mail* and giving the Party six months of terrible press Hall then accepts an apology for only two of eight allegations—why? Because the other six were true!

When I received this letter I did not know whether to pick it up with my own hands or whether to use tweezers or gloves so that I would not be subjected to fingerprinting tests by the member for Florey. This raises serious issues regarding the rights and privileges of members of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: The Liberal Party may well have its own internecine warfare and it is for members of the Liberal Party finally to put this State first and settle their internal disputes once and for all and determine who the real Premier is. That does not give them the right, Mr Speaker, to demand of you, or for you, Sir, to give to any member of this Parliament, confidential records—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Deputy Leader that will he cast no aspersions on the Chair whatsoever. He knows what happens when he goes down that track.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. I simply state that it is improper for anyone to release confidential information regarding the comings and goings of MPs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, your predecessor, Mr Speaker Peterson, ejected me from this House for impugning improper motives to the Chair other than by way of substantive motion. I draw your attention to that ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am aware of the incident to which the honourable member refers. I suggest to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that, in raising any issue in the House, he be aware that it is contrary to Standing Orders to impute improper motives in relation to any member. I further advise the Deputy Leader and all members that, when they go down the particular track that the Deputy Leader has taken it does lead to other members making similar comments. I am personally of the view that it is not in the best interests of this Parliament, or of the people whom the members represent, to engage in personal vilification or to make improper statements in relation to any member. The member for Chaffey.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to return the subject matter in this Chamber to logic and sanity. This afternoon I want to report on the progress of the consultation program that has been taking place with Murray River irrigators on the proposed Water Resources Bill, which the Government intends to introduce later this year.

In my capacity as chairman of the backbench committee working closely with and assisting the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources on this proposed Bill, I recently had the pleasure and responsibility of organising and chairing a forum of the representatives of all Murray River irrigators, up and down the river, to meet with the Minister for about half a day. The forum also included other backbench members involved in the consultation committee with respect to the Bill. A wide spectrum of irrigator groups were represented, including the Government High Land Irrigation Board; various irrigation trusts, which included Golden Heights, Sunlands, Renmark and Greenways; the Murray Catchment Consultative Group, which is representative of the Riverland Horticultural Council and the South Australian Farmers Federation; Lower Murray groups such as the Narrung Irrigators and the Lower Murray Irrigators; and the Angas Bremer Water Resources Committee. There were also representatives from local government; the development boards; and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

This forum, as appraised by those present, was a productive, useful and valuable process. By way of introduction and overview of the forum, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, Mr Wotton, supported by Peter Hoey from the Department of Water Resources, summarised and gave detail with respect to the big picture issues affecting water resources and the Murray River at present. Some of the big picture issues included COAG and how our interstate colleagues have related in terms of joint agreements over the last three or four years; the issue of interstate trading for water resources; the issue of water capping with our interstate colleagues; and also the Murray-Darling 2001 Project and its significance and influence for this State.

A summary of the proposed Bill was presented and very good discussion took place on the major issues. All the issues were promulgated very publicly and consultation has occurred since September last year when an issues paper was presented, and subsequent to this a discussion paper was circulated. On each occasion some 600 copies were circulated to representative and interested groups.

Discussion has taken place on the management structure for the future of water resources and, importantly, on the role, responsibility and make-up of the proposed new River Murray Management Board. Clearly, the importance of this board is not to be underestimated, although there was a divergence of opinion on its make-up. The water resources levy was discussed at length, with irrigator representatives agreeing with the principle that a fair and affordable levy was justified and, provided funds go into local projects and programs in the communities, it could genuinely influence the direction of that expenditure.

Also presented at the forum was an indicative expenditure program of a list of potential projects that could be implemented or brought forward as part of this increased financial commitment. Minister Wotton clearly pointed out that levy funds would not reduce existing State Government funds to the River Murray but would have the effect of attracting additional funds for the improvement of the Murray. There remained, though, a divergence of opinion as to whether the levy should be based on allocation or usage, particularly in recognition that most of the Lower Murray irrigators still remain unmetered.

Minister Wotton clearly put to the meeting the option of whether to bring down a levy quickly or to consult further, or to use the preference of bringing down the levy quickly to then get out and consult on the other major issues. There was a strong consensus for that to happen, for the levy to be determined and then to continue with the consultation.

While I acknowledge and understand that the irrigators have concerns about the levy—and I have made strong representations in this regard over recent months—I must say that I am disappointed at the comments that have been made this week in the press by the River Murray Catchment Management Group, which has been particularly negative in its speculation on the levy. It has speculated that the irrigators may have to contribute at $.6\phi$ a kilolitre over the next five years to a total of \$15 million. I suggest that the irrigators hold on to their patience, wait and consider objectively the detailed announcement that will obviously be forthcoming from the Minister in the near future. I have made and will continue to make representations to the Minister to ensure that the levy and the whole package regarding this Bill will be fair and reasonable and a valued contributor to future water resources in this State.

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

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I refer to a grave concern that is shared by my constituents. In October 1995 an application was lodged with the Hindmarsh Woodville council by Vodafone, on behalf of that company, together with Telstra and Optus to erect a mobile telephone base station at 528 Grange Road, Fulham Gardens. This property is owned by ETSA and operates as a substation—property that is owned by the Government and the people of South Australia.

At that time concern in the electorate was substantial. In November I made representations on behalf of my constituents to the Hindmarsh Woodville council requesting that the application be rejected, and this was supported by a unanimous vote of the council. Subsequent to that decision, the Environmental Protection Agency from Canberra visited Adelaide to make an assessment of the situation. It was told in no uncertain terms by people representing the community, by members of the council and by council itself that there was strong objection to the erection of the tower on the basis of the possible health effects from exposure to radio frequency fields from the mobile telephone tower.

Recently a letter was sent by the State Minister for Education instructing schools that they could proceed with the erection of telephone towers if they so chose as a form of revenue raising. This advice was based on a report received by the Minister from Dr Repacholi stating that there was no substantiated or convincing biological effects that could lead to adverse health effects from exposure to radio frequency fields from mobile telephone base stations. Dr Repacholi is a scientist who is attached to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, currently lives in Switzerland and is employed by the three telephone companies.

I then took the initiative of writing to the principals and the chairpersons of the local school councils expressing my concern regarding the health of the children in the community. I said that, if Dr Repacholi's advice to the Minister was to be accepted, before any school went ahead with the erection of a tower they should have a written guarantee that, if any of our children in later years suffered as a result of radio frequency emissions from these towers, the Government would accept full responsibility and pay for the ongoing medical costs for the rest of that child's life. Of course, the reply from the schools was they would not risk the health and well-being of the children simply to raise revenue for the school.

In a recent report six eminent doctors said that telephone towers could possibly cause asthma, cancer or Alzheimer's disease. Regarding Fulham Gardens mobile telephone base station, the bureaucrats from Canberra went into a huddle, totally ignored all the information that they had received from the local community and decided to take it upon themselves to notify the City of Hindmarsh-Woodville that they would be recommending to the Department of Environment that the proposal could proceed. That was signed by Mr John Ash, Assessment Secretary of the Environmental Assessment Branch.

The Department of Environment then wrote to Vodafone notifying it that it could proceed with certain conditions. That letter was signed by Roger Beale. That now means that the prominent bureaucrats from the EPA and the Department of Environment, together with telecommunications, have taken it upon themselves to burden the community with a tower which is in excess of 105 feet in height. In addition, paltry and weak conditions have been placed on the erection which do absolutely nothing but to destroy the aesthetics and increase the environmental impact on the area while exposing the community to unknown health risks. The proposed tower has two banks of antenna and three microwave dishes.

I have yet to see the enormity of the construction in South Australia in an area zoned A1. I have written a letter to Senator Richard Alston, the Federal Minister for Telecommunications, asking that the idea be reconsidered. We will be making an appeal to Austel, because we believe that the planning process was not properly adhered to. I am absolutely disappointed to hear that Federal powers may override State powers so that those towers can be placed in whatever area they want. I believe that it will devalue the real estate in the area, but the most important thing I am concerned about is the health and well-being of my constituents. I see this as nothing but a rubber stamp approval without any knowledge of the Ministers and the public servants, who do not know what the area is all about.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. I call on the member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I rise today at a very important junction for South Australian and national football as a result of the announcement this morning that Port Adelaide Power will be the new entrant in the AFL. All members of the Chamber would join with me in acknowledging that announcement and congratulating the Port Adelaide Football Club, of which I know that you, Sir, are a strong supporter, as are my colleagues the member for Custance and the former Minister for Primary Industries, the member for MacKillop, who is a very much a loyal, longstanding Port Adelaide supporter.

It is a significant moment not just for Port Adelaide but for all South Australia, because we now have our second team in the AFL. We all know the significant impact such an AFL football match in South Australia each week will have on our economy. Port Adelaide has projected a conservative number of 30 000 people per match. I expect that to be a conservative figure: indeed, I would be very surprised if Football Park did not reach a near capacity crowd every time Port Power played, as we have evidenced with the Crows. Port Adelaide, as you would appreciate, Sir, will simply start with humble beginnings but, over time, will no doubt develop into a very strong, successful and competitive AFL team. We will not rest on our past record, which clearly speaks for itself.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will ignore the interjections from those who clearly do not support this momentous day in South Australia.

Mr Atkinson: And we don't.

Mr FOLEY: But you should. You should be prepared to put your individual allegiances to one side and support Port Adelaide at this moment. There will be some great differences between Port Adelaide and the Crows. For one, we will not bite when Sam Newman throws out the hook: we will have a little more style than that. We will learn to travel well, as was evidenced at the weekend when we won in Canberra. Port Adelaide has already established its ability to win on the road and it has not even joined the AFL. What more success awaits us! It is a great tribute to the Port Adelaide Football Club and to the many people who have worked very hard behind the scenes. I do not want to name them because so many hundreds have worked so hard.

An honourable member: And they have good sponsors. Mr FOLEY: Yes, there are very good sponsors, and I acknowledge the great sponsorship in the past of Alan Scott and Scott Transport, from your electorate, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I hope that will lead to far greater sponsorship in the years ahead. Greg Boulton, President of the Port Adelaide Football Club; Barry Wilson, club Chairman; Brian Cunningham, Chief Executive Officer; and the entire board of the Port Adelaide Football Club, both the Magpies board and the interim AFL board, have done an excellent, professional job in packaging together an argument that the rest of the AFL clubs simply could not ignore. The persistence, the way they have gone about it, the style and the commitment that those individuals showed meant that at the end of day Port Adelaide would succeed.

My electorate takes in the heart of Port Adelaide, and after the next election it will take in an even greater part of Port Adelaide. As a State member of Parliament, I am very proud to be responsible for an electorate in which Port Adelaide is the major player. I first went to Alberton Oval as a three year old, and to see the club develop in such a way brings me great personal pride. I have ignored the interjections from my colleagues, who I will not name, because on reflection they too will come to enjoy Port Power. The Crows have done this State proud to this date, but it is time for the Crows to move aside and let the Power in. The real boys are in town. We are about to show them how to play AFL football.

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

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Members of this House will know of the atrocities committed by Turkey in Cyprus since the invasion of Cyprus in 1974. The atrocities are documented in the report of the European Commissioner of Human Rights on Atrocities in Turkey and Cyprus, dated September 1979. Among other things, Greek Cypriots have been evicted from their homes, they have been dispossessed of their possessions, they have been imprisoned illegally and, in addition, Greek Cypriots taken into custody have disappeared, and the inference drawn by the European Commissioner of Human Rights is that they have been murdered.

It is fatuous for the Turks to claim any sovereignty over any part of Cyprus. If one knows anything about ancient history, one is aware that the Mycenaeans and the Cretans were in Cyprus in the second millennium BC, as were the classical Greeks, and that possession and sovereignty over Cyprus has continued. The Ottoman Empire, to say the least, came into the world arena very late. Turkey has been condemned wholeheartedly by the international community, which has not recognised as a matter of law the occupation of Northern Cyprus by Turkish troops. One would have thought from the details that I have given about the attacks on the Greek Cypriots that the Turks would be satisfied with what they have done. Apparently, it appears that is not the case. Recently an advertisement appeared in a British English language Turkish Cypriot newspaper *Cyprus Today* which advertised for lease a church known as Panagia Chrysotrimithiotissa, which is in the village of Trimithi, in Northern Cyprus. This church, which dates from the middle Byzantine period, played an important role in Cypriot Byzantine history and was to be part of the Cypriot register of ancient monuments.

This action of the Turkish occupiers of Northern Cyprus is no more or less than sacrilege. It is an attack on the religious beliefs of the Greek Cypriots, it is an insidious attack on the Greek Orthodox Church and it is also an attack on the cultural heritage of Cyprus. To say the least, it is an extremely cowardly attack, because the church cannot defend itself. Today I call on the Commonwealth Government to demand the Turkish Government to direct the authorities in the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which has not been recognised in law, to cease the criminal act of selling the church of Panagia Chrysotrimithiotissa, because it is nothing less than criminal sacrilege. I call on the Commonwealth Government to demand that the Turkish occupiers of Northern Cyprus respect the religious beliefs of the Greek Orthodox Church.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY INFORMATION

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr FOLEY: During the grievance debate of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Norwood took a point of order to suggest that the member for Hart, namely myself, was the person who had been distributing a certain letter. As the member for Norwood knows full well, we were participating in some cross-Chamber levity. I wish I knew who the culprit was, but I admit that in this case it was not I. I am happy to submit to a fingerprint test or any other test, but it was not I. It was simply a case of cross-Chamber levities. As usual, I have learnt my lesson and I shall not crack such a joke in future.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the issue.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MEDIATION, ARBITRATION AND REFERRAL) BILL

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

BANK MERGER (BANKSA AND ADVANCE BANK) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF TRIBUNALS) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message intimating that it had insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

I will be very brief because I understand there will be a conference on this issue. The Legislative Council, as is sometimes its custom, with the combining of the forces of the ALP and the Democrats, continues to frustrate the business of the Government. That is what happens when you have aberrations and there is certainly an aberration in the other place. The issue of the new system of the courts conducting the role previously undertaken by tribunals has been a matter of considerable debate in this House. The House of Assembly insists upon the fact that we can have a system that is far more efficient and effective by the abolition of the tribunals and ensuring that the conduct of those tribunals comes within the purview of the courts. Therefore, I ask the Committee to insist on the amendments.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading. (Continued from 30 May. Page 1622.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the first speaker, I remind members that this is not a grievance debate and that in the ensuing debate on the Appropriation Bill the subject matter of this measure should be adhered to. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for the explanation that you gave. I wondered why you made that explanation just before I rose to my feet.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was for the benefit of all members. There might be some misunderstanding that this debate was wide ranging. It certainly was not intended specifically for the Deputy Leader.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I assure the Minister sitting opposite that, following the Deputy Speaker's indication, my speech will not now be merely for two minutes, because I have more than enough information to speak comprehensively about the State budget.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The Minister interjects, 'It's a good budget.' The Minister, as part of the college of cardinals who run this State, that is, the State Cabinet, knows as much as I— and as well as every other member of this House and most informed members of this community—that this is a phoney budget. This is a phoney budget, because everyone in this House, including the Minister opposite, knows that the real State budget will be handed down after the Commonwealth hands down its budget at the end of August this year.

Mr Lewis: Get lost, you goose!

Mr CLARKE: The member for Ridley interjects, 'Get lost, you goose.' This is the so-called parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Primary Industries. Maybe he is the one member in this House who is not aware of the fact that Commonwealth revenues to the State Government amount to 55 per cent of the State's income. Members will find that there will be huge cutbacks on Commonwealth outlays to very important programs in this State. The Treasurer in his budget speech sought to shift the blame to the Howard Government by saying, 'Whatever the Howard Government determines come August, and if it cuts programs by X number of dollars, we at a State level will not be picking up any shortfall. That will be the Howard Government's determination of priorities, not this State Government's.' That is very simplistic, but again I give Cabinet members opposite more credence for knowing, better than the member for Ridley knows, what is happening in this world.

Under the specific purpose payment, base hospital funding grants amount to \$338 million. If there are any significant cuts with respect to that payment, it will have a major impact on our public hospitals and on the public welfare of the citizens of this State. That is something that this Government cannot lightly pass by. Also, as the Minister opposite in particular knows, with regard to the Australian National Training Authority approximately \$53 million is involved and, if there were a significant cut to ANTA—and indeed there are suggestions that it may be wound up altogether that would have a devastating impact on TAFE, as the Minister sitting opposite knows only too well. This Government has determined to bring out a phoney budget knowing full well that its projections and the amounts forecast bear no relevance ultimately to the truth.

The Brown Government will have only itself to blame in many respects, because within days of the Howard Government being elected to office on 2 March we had the Premier calling for the Federal Government to slash Commonwealth outlays significantly. The Premier called for the sacking of some 30 000 Federal public servants. The Premier on radio has said on not one occasion but several, 'The Commonwealth Government should do what we have done in the South Australian public sector and cut its work force by 10 per cent.' What the Premier has not taken into account—and one would have thought he should know—is that when those cutbacks take place within the Commonwealth Public Service, as they have already started to take place, many of the job cuts will be in South Australia.

We have already lost up to 1 000 jobs in South Australia through the Commonwealth Government's accepting the Premier's advice by cutting back Commonwealth public sector employment. That is without the Federal Review Committee's reporting back to the Government and before decisions have been made in the context of the overall Federal budget. How many more South Australian jobs will be lost before this Government and this Premier realise that when they call on the Federal Government to slash the size of the Public Service it is regional economies such as South Australia's that are hurt the most?

The other point I make in so far as the State budget is concerned—and it was raised during Question Time today is that the State Government forecast economic growth in South Australia at a very slow 2.75 per cent. This is on top of the knowledge that in 1994-95 the growth in gross State product was exactly 0.0 per cent. We stayed absolutely stagnant at a time when the rest of Australia grew at record levels. With regard to the financial year ending 30 June 1996, we are expecting a growth rate of only 3 per cent. The growth forecast by the State Treasury for 1996-97 of 2.75 per cent compares with, again according to State Treasury's own figures, a growth rate in Australia as a whole of between 3.25 and 4 per cent.

The Brown Government has admitted that South Australia is again leading the nation in terms of low growth. Since the Brown Government's election, we have never participated in the sorts of growth levels set in place nationally by the former Federal Labor Government. At the current levels of economic activity in this State, and given the policies being pursued by this Government, we are unlikely ever to approach even the national average, let alone live up to the Premier's exhortations about leading the nation in economic growth. On several occasions today and on past occasions the Premier referred to the headline that we saw in the Adelaide Advertiser some few weeks ago, where it was reported that in the ABS statistics for the March quarter there was supposedly a growth rate of some 4.8 per cent. We were leading the nation, the Advertiser told us on that occasion. Only a newspaper of the quality of the Advertiser would print such a furphy and such a load of pap, when it comes to a critical analysis of the State's economy.

I will refer briefly to a publication that I always read with interest called *Engineering Business Trends*. It is published monthly, the latest being April 1996. It is a monthly survey conducted by the Engineering Employers Association of South Australia of South Australia's metal and engineering industries. Notwithstanding the fact that we have lost a significant part of our manufacturing industry over the years for a whole range of reasons, not entirely due to the Brown Government's policies on their own, this survey covered 22 companies employing some 8 500 employees. In a summary of the results, under the heading 'Employment', the publication notes:

Employment was down for the month, as it was for the year.

Under the heading 'Production Activity', it reads:

Fifty-two per cent of respondents reported 'very busy' or 'busy' activity levels, which was down on the 60 per cent figure of last month, and 65 per cent the month before.

Under the heading 'Orders', it states:

The current order book situation appears to have deteriorated, with an increased number of respondents, 48 per cent, reporting 'unsatisfactory' order books. However, there was an increase in those companies reporting improved future order books.

The summary reads:

The monthly results continue to reflect a flat activity situation, with trading conditions remaining very tight. Respondents continue to be uncertain about any short to medium term improvement. In a sectoral sense suppliers to the housing industry report no increase in demand, the automotive sector reports an increase in schedules due to new models and continued demand for larger Australian made vehicles, whilst whitegoods remain under strong import competition.

That survey does not give credence to the Premier's exhortations today about South Australia leading the nation in economic growth. Indeed, South Australia continues to languish as the State with the highest levels of unemployment on the mainland and with respect to the level of youth unemployment in this State. At the same time, we have a Government agreeing with the policies of the Howard Government (and, one presumes, with the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training, Senator Amanda Vanstone) that labour market training programs should be slashed and that they do not produce real jobs; and in agreement with a policy that the Howard Government talks about of allowing apprentices to be paid only for the three days they are actually on the job and not the two days they spend off the job at TAFE.

On a number of occasions at functions I have attended with the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education sitting opposite, he has referred (and I agree with him on this) to the necessity of up-skilling our work force, and how we must encourage our young people to look towards the trades to give them the due recognition that they deserve in our society as being a valuable contributor to our State's economy. He has also talked about encouraging young people, both young men and women, to take up apprentice-

ships; and yet we have a Commonwealth Government that is determined to slash the amount of money spent on training these young people. As the State Minister for Employment, Training and

As the State Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education knows only too well, we will not encourage our very bright young people who might be tempted to go into the trades area to do so if they are paid only for the three days they are actually at work and not for the time they are attending training. We will not attract those people into those skilled areas, and Australia as a whole will be the poorer, particularly small regional economies like South Australia. So, I do despair at this State budget, because it does not give us the vision or the outline of what will happen in this State for the next 12 months. This State cannot afford to be held in limbo simply because this Government does not have the guts to recognise what everyone else knows will happen come the Federal budget and plan accordingly.

In so far as some of the major areas of expenditure in major portfolio areas are concerned, the State Government tries to wax lyrical about the alleged increased expenditure for schools but, taking inflation into account, the budget has in fact increased by just \$2.3 million. That nowhere near compensates the schools in our State for the \$47 million that has been ripped out of our budget over the past two years. Even this tiny increase is based on the assumption that the Howard Liberal Government will increase funding to our schools by about \$2.3 million.

I wonder what the Premier and the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education in this State will say if the Howard Government guts the Disadvantaged Schools Program, which is funded by the Commonwealth Government. If that program is gutted, will this State Government stand by idly and snap to attention to its Federal colleagues and say, 'Thank you, Sir; three bags full, Sir; please beat us over the head one more time'?

In so far as public hospitals are concerned, the Premier claims that this is a caring budget but, after inflation, funding for hospitals has been increased by only \$1.3 million. Again, that is based on John Howard's not cutting expenditure in this area come August, which we all know he will do. In any event, what it overlooks is that, over the past two State budgets, this Government ripped nearly \$80 million out of the public hospitals budget.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I understand that the member for Unley will soon be the Independent member for Unley and will no longer be saddled with the onerous responsibilities of being parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. We have yet to find out what he actually does as a parliamentary secretary, other than open doors or perhaps purvey letters around the corridors of Parliament House; I know not which, but—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition clearly made an allegation against me to which I take personal objection and of which I ask his unqualified withdrawal. Mr CLARKE: I withdraw, Sir, because obviously there are 36 under suspicion. Some of the other issues I would also like to canvass—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows very well that he is now impugning the reputation of every member of the Government.

Mr CLARKE: I will withdraw the whole comment, Sir. On the basis of efficiency, you are quite right, Sir: I will allow the witch-hunt to continue and no doubt the culprits will be unearthed in due course.

I also raise the issue of regional development. I see little incentive in this State budget with respect to moneys that can be made available to the regional areas of Upper Spencer Gulf. I have looked forlornly over the past 2½ years to find what concrete work this Government has done to try to promote industries within the regions, and I have not forgotten Mount Gambier, Sir. I accept that you have a special interest in that area, being the local member for that district. However, in respect of the Upper Spencer Gulf area, and from what I have observed in the South-East, I have seen little evidence that this Government has committed itself to regional development.

When it came to office, the Government took away the Labor Government commitment to make enterprise zones in particular regional areas, commencing with Whyalla and eventually extending to Port Augusta, Port Pirie and down to Mount Gambier, drawing a distinction between those areas in our State and metropolitan Adelaide. It was proposed that for 10 years those enterprise zones would be tax free, in terms of State taxes and charges, and would have local government rebates with respect to council rates, and a range of other incentives to try to attract industries to those regions. When he assumed office, the Premier said, 'We will scrap that idea altogether. We will make the whole of South Australia an enterprise zone.' The difficulty, as you would appreciate, Mr Deputy Speaker, is that it is hard enough to attract industry to South Australia, and Adelaide in particular, but to get them to go to Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and the like, you have to say, 'There is some other more tangible reason to go there instead of Adelaide.' It is no good simply saying, 'We are about getting jobs in Adelaide only and we do not care two hoots about regional South Australia.'

We must have a Government that is committed to saying, 'We want to save Whyalla and Port Augusta; we believe that Port Pirie and Mount Gambier are worth saving', and retain employment levels there, including Commonwealth and State public servants, so that they help generate economic activity in those cities and regions, and continue to help attract other industries to those areas, or else it may as well say, 'We do not care about anything north of Gepps Cross.'

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): The member for Ross Smith, the Deputy Leader, disappoints me. I would have thought that, with all his knowledge and industrial background, he would stand up for and promote and encourage development within the rural industry of South Australia, because that is where he earned his living. That is where his living came from. That is basically what South Australia has always been about. It is still a rural economy; it is a great State and will become an even better State if we get behind all sectors of the community and support them. The Government exists to serve the community. That is what it is all about. I am sick and tired of listening to the Leader of the Opposition, the ideas man for the Labor Party in years gone by, the person who came up with all these wonderful ideas—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, 1950s style of imagination in the 1970s and 1980s. He is now using dear old Don Dunstan and you have to say 'dear old Don Dunstan'—and Jack Wright to promote opportunities in the northern and western suburbs. I cannot believe that a modern political Party would have to go back to a politician who was first elected here in the mid 1950s, who eventually became the Premier in the 1970s and who had such an economic and social impact on this State whereby in the 1990s we are still trying to extract ourselves from the mire. That is what it is all about. Of course, Jack Wright and some of those people from the old Australian Workers Union who supported Dunstan are out there being revived to prop up the flagging support of the Leader of the Opposition.

Let me warn the Opposition. It has a responsibility to serve this State as well as anybody else, and it has a job to keep the Government on track. It has a job to come forward with ideas to support the growth and development of this State. Instead of that, all it does is criticise and knock at every opportunity. It knocks anything that looks like it will be good or beneficial for the people of South Australia.

This budget follows the strategy that the Treasurer implemented in 1994. It is a budget strategy that our Government wants for the benefit of the people of South Australia. If we look briefly at the impact achieved by the Treasurer, we now have a total current outlay of \$5.7 billion, with capital outlays of about \$588 million, making a total of about \$6.3 billion. From that, with our own taxes of about \$2.2 billion, and the Federal Government grants received, specific and otherwise, of just over \$3.3 billion, the total revenue and borrowings amount to about \$6 billion. The end result will be a \$60 million deficit.

This is a wonderful projection for the State—a reduction in the debt we inherited of some \$350 million down to about \$60 million for the financial year under review, 1996-97. By the 1997-98 financial year, the budget should be in surplus. When we came to government we picked up a \$350 million debt and, as a result, we implemented savings that had to be made. Every now and then, after a number of years of any one particular style of government, a little bit of fat develops, so a new Government has the opportunity to come in and trim that fat for the benefit of the State.

If we were to follow the lead of Governments throughout the world, starting back in Maggie Thatcher's days in the United Kingdom, through the British Commonwealth, America, Europe as it is at the moment, and elsewhere, we would see that the trend and policy is for leaner, smaller government. In other words, the taxpayers have said to the politicians, 'You exist for the benefit of the community. Therefore, there comes a time when we will not pay any more in taxes, when we expect a leaner, meaner operation from our Government.' So, if private enterprise or small business can handle the functions of government, they should be given that opportunity, and they should be given the opportunity to perform. Of course, supervisors are required to keep an eye on them, but that occurs through the bureaucracy of the Public Service and the management of good government.

There is no doubt that, the longer I serve in Parliament, the more I become convinced that we are over-governed. We are over-governed, not only in this State and country but in the western world, particularly when the performance of this country is compared to that of European and Asian countries. If we are to survive, we must reduce the cost of government. The Minister for Infrastructure, when Leader of the Opposition, promised that he would reduce the number of politicians in South Australia, but he was criticised unmercifully by the honourable member who is now Leader of the Opposition, who suggested that it was only a ploy. Olsen was right. The timing was right to reduce the size of the Government, with the impact that would have on the taxpayers of this State.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the Minister says, he was ahead of his time. He is quite right. Unfortunately, there are no prizes in politics for being ahead of your time. You have to be in the right place at the right time. At the same time, the people have to understand what it is all about. The GST under John Hewson would have been the greatest thing that ever happened to this country. This country would have boomed. There would not be the unemployment, disappointment, or anywhere near the tragedies we are experiencing at the present time. When you have full employment, when you have affordable housing, only then will you have a lifestyle of which you can be proud. As a result of that, you stop all this mischievous nonsense which has been occurring and which has been caused by drugs, by excessive gambling and by bad habits. Much can be said for a clean style of living in this community and much can be said about the morals of a community.

I believe that the budget is on track, the strategy is right, and the timing is right; we must support the budget to ensure that the recovery of this State is well and truly cemented on time. I remind everyone that it is easy criticise. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition say that it is a fraud and it is false but all he can say is that the Federal Government has not brought down its budget and therefore we do not know what is happening.

Let us look at what the Treasurer tells us about the possible impact of the Commonwealth budget. He says that most of the Commonwealth's \$8 billion targeted deficit reduction will come from cuts to its own purpose spending, stating:

No cuts in general purpose funding to the States are anticipated; any cuts in specific purpose payments to the State will be accommodated either by equivalent cuts in related expenditure and/or by efficiencies possible as a result of less onerous Commonwealth administration. That relates to specific purpose payments: it will not impact upon our own budget. Any Commonwealth budgetary adjustment in August is not expected to affect the underlying deficit.

We all know that interest rates will probably stabilise: it is a very brave person who will predict what interest rates will do in the next 12 months world-wide, let alone in this country. However, I believe that there will be a period of stability in the next 12 to 18 months.

The nature and scope of possible cut-backs will not be known until mid August and it will be too late for the majority of budget planning purposes. For this reason three other States have already announced their budget plans for 1996-97: New South Wales, Western Australia and Victoria. They have done their budgets: why cannot South Australia? If we were to listen to the Leader of the Opposition, we would not even tackle it.

This State budget clearly indicates the Government's own priority with any adjustments after August reflecting solely Commonwealth priorities. Most of the Commonwealth's \$8 billion targeted deficient reduction will come from cuts to its own purpose spending over a considerable period. No cuts in general purpose funding to the States have been anticipated and any cuts to specific purpose payments could be of two types. Dropping SPP programs will simply result in the elimination of the equivalent spending in the State budget and the discount per dollar of funding with the Commonwealth seeking to capture a share of the cost efficiencies expected at the State level from the broad banding of many small related programs. This will involve administrative adjustments at the State level which could take up to two years to implement. All up, the Commonwealth budgetary adjustment in August is not expected to affect the underlying deficit budget for 1996-97 or 1997-98 with any cuts being accommodated either by equivalent cuts in related expenditure and/or by efficiencies possible as a result of less onerous Commonwealth administration.

The budget strategy is right. I am pleased and proud that it has been my Government that brings in the budget during May with an attempt to have it passed by the end of June, or as early as possible after 30 June, so that Government departments and Government-related authorities have the opportunity of a full 12 months to deal with their income and expenditure. I still believe that we have to encourage the Commonwealth Government to bring down the Federal budget possibly in March or April so that we can have a clear start to the financial year on 1 July, having had all the processes of the budget dealt with by State Parliament. There should be no delays, be it through this House, the budget Estimates Committees or the other place.

This budget will rebuild South Australia in a positive way. Much has been said about the competition between the States and let us not forget the benefits that the new Government has brought to South Australia. South Australia is one of the lowest taxing States in Australia, being 23 per cent below Victoria and 26 per cent below New South Wales; we have the second lowest payroll tax of all States; and we have 50 per cent rebate on payroll tax for new exports.

Recently in Germany I was advised that Mercedes Benz was about to redevelop one of its existing plants to make new motor cars. It obtained statistical information from the French Government—because the French were keen to attract new industries—and the cost of operating and manufacturing in France would be 20 per cent cheaper than Germany. Instead of rebuilding and redeveloping the existing plant, Mercedes Benz went a few kilometres across the border and established a new factory where the savings will be 20 per cent.

Industry will do that. Industry will use the benefits of competition between the States, and the States are mindful of the competition between them to attract industry and provide employment. Our role is to ensure that there are growth and development opportunities and that there is employment for those who need it. It is for those reasons that there will be continual competition between the States in this country, as there is in the Common Market in Europe, where there are no boundaries as far as competition is concerned. Already we have heard the cries from Victoria and New South Wales that the competition is hurting them and that they are not happy. This State must be prepared to attract industry to South Australia. We have been extremely successful in bringing new industry into South Australia.

I now raise an issue that has not been highlighted by the only paper in this State, the *Advertiser*—and you wonder whether they are half asleep or whether the editorial staff does what it wants when it wants. If you look at the Asian countries and ask why they are successful, you recognise that they do not have a bleating, negative media. Whether it be the *Adelaide Review*, the Messenger newspapers, the *Advertiser*, the radio stations or the television stations, the whole bloody lot should be lined up against a wall and told, 'Lift your game'; Murdoch and Packer should also be told that, notwithstanding that they expect us to operate lean, mean Governments, we could go through their operations and find a lot of fat as well. The media should assist and promote the benefits of the State and, if they do not, there is something wrong with them. They should be told clearly that there is no support for them in this State and this city. We do not want them.

South Australia has the chance of \$5 billion worth of development. Some of it has started, most of it is under way, and much of it is about to start. Certainly you get no credit from the Opposition, but I remind members opposite of one thing: anyone who travels overseas will discover what happens to Governments and political Parties like them. The worldwide trend is that, if people do not like a Government or a Party, they throw the whole lot out. The Labor Party is lucky it has 11 seats; it is extremely lucky it won 10 seats at the last election, because it appeared that only one or two members would be returned for the Labor Party in this State. That is what the result should have been: it should have been only one or two members, but there was the possibility that the Party would be wiped out altogether. However, this gives a warning to my Party that, when those sorts of things happen, the people will reverse the situation just as sharply. Overseas Governments can come and go pretty quickly nowa-days if they do not perform, reduce the cost of government, and demonstrate accountability and cost benefits to taxpayers.

How can any person in this State, in all honesty, vote for a political Party which has been unable to attract the amount of business that we have attracted? Some \$5 billion worth of growth to this State is a magnificent achievement in three years, and this Government deserves all the credit it can get for it. There is the \$1.4 billion investment by Holden's for a new model Commodore; \$525 million invested by Mitsubishi to produce a new world car and engine block for overseas markets; \$200 million expansion of the Westfield Marion Shopping Centre; \$200 million expenditure by Santos, during the next three years, on Cooper Basin exploration; \$170 million for the construction of a co-generation power plant in Adelaide; the relocation of back office functions to South Australia, including the Westpac Mortgage Processing Centre, with already 450 and possibly 800 staff; Bankers Trust, with more staff; Australis, with more staff; Telstra, Mobile Net and Link Communications, with more staff; and plans for a \$1 billion expansion to double the output from Olympic Dam mining and processing facilities.

That is \$3.5 billion just for starters. And then we have what the Government is proposing to do: a \$144 million economic development program that is well under way; \$28 million for various assistance and incentive payments to industry; \$38.2 million for tourism; \$30 million for the MFP, which is about to start showing results; \$15 million in State funding for the extension of the Adelaide Airport runway; \$2.5 million to continue South Australian exploration initiatives; and \$1.234 million for various capital works that will create 20 000 jobs. No mean feat! No mean budget! No, Mr Leader of the Opposition, it is not a fraud, it is not a myth: this is a reality. This Government in South Australia is doing something for South Australians and has already \$5 billion worth of development on the board, reduced Government costs and tremendous benefits for the taxpayers of South Australia.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): There were three things that struck me about the South Australian economy when I entered this Parliament in December 1993—three things which were associated with this economy and which related to the previous Government. The first thing that I saw was that, for every dollar raised in tax by the previous Government, in excess of 30ϕ was going to meet the interest costs on our State debt. That was horrendous: close to one-third of the money raised by taxation was going towards paying the interest costs for a debt that should never have occurred, a debt that occurred due to the mismanagement of the previous Government.

The second thing that struck me in relation to the economy of South Australia was that public sector outlays had grown faster than in any other State of the Commonwealth of Australia. As a result, the previous South Australian Government was spending \$350 million per year more than it raised in revenue: \$350 million more was being spent year after year than was being received by way of income. That had the potential to blow State debt through the roof.

The third thing that struck me as regards the South Australian economy was that State debt, as a percentage of the gross State product, was running at 28.1 per cent, compared with pre State Bank debt days, when it was only 14 per cent of gross State product. The previous Government, the now Opposition, had no financial strategy, and has proposed no financial strategy since it has been occupying the Opposition benches. When the Opposition lost office, State debt was running at \$9 billion, and with contingent liabilities State debt was in excess of \$13 billion. We had a \$350 million deficit with a \$1 billion interest payment year in and year out.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have claimed that this is a phoney budget and that it has no relevance to the future of South Australia. One only has to draw members' attention to the three other States in this Commonwealth which have also brought down their budgets: New South Wales, which has a Labor Government; Western Australia; and Victoria. All have brought down their budgets because of the need to have their planning processes in place for the continuation of business in their States. As we are all aware, the targeted reductions in the Commonwealth deficit will come from cuts to is own spending. However, we have been advised there will be no cuts in general purpose funding for the States and that any cuts in specific purpose payments for the States will be accommodated either by equivalent cuts in related expenditure or by efficiencies possible as a result of less erroneous Commonwealth administration.

Until recently the Opposition had a policy under which it would buy back the assets that had been sold by the Brown Government. The Opposition has continuously opposed the sale of assets such as the State Bank, SGIC, the Pipelines Authority and so on. But, as I said, it now no longer has a recurrent policy to buy back those assets. However, that policy could change in the future now that the Opposition no longer has a Centre Left, and given the increasing power of the Left faction and the unaligned Left faction. The relevance of that situation is that there has been \$1.6 billion worth of State asset sales to reduce the State debt. If the Opposition were to want to buy back those assets, how it would find the \$1.6 billion to do so would be very interesting. That basically means that there would be a tax on every man, woman and child in South Australia of \$1 000 to buy back those assets: to meet the Opposition's policy, every man, woman and child in South Australia would be subject to a one-off tax of \$1 000.

The Opposition has chosen to oppose the contracting out of the management, maintenance and repair of services. The contracting out of the management and maintenance of the State's services has resulted in a saving under the budget of \$40 million per year. The Opposition has steadfastly opposed the reduction in the deficit which, when we came into office, was running at \$350 million. If we followed the Opposition's philosophy of buying back the State Bank, the SGIC, the Pipelines Authority and the Timber Corporation and if we maintained public expenditure at the levels that the Opposition required us to meet, this State would, as a result, see increases in taxation never seen before in the history of the Commonwealth. Not only would we have a \$1 000 capital tax on every resident-every man, woman and child-in South Australia, but to maintain that level of expenditure, to keep up that level of interest payment of \$1 billion, to keep up that level of deficit in the State budget, would result in an extra tax of \$20 per week per household-an increase in taxation above and beyond the taxation levels currently applying in this State.

That would be just to bring the deficit in line with the same level in dollar terms as 1992. It would not account in real terms for today's dollar. Because of the Opposition's lack of financial management, we would face a capital tax of \$1 000 up front, plus a \$20 per week per household increase in tax. This would be a State where we would say to people, 'The last person to leave can turn off the lights,' because no-one could afford to live in South Australia under such a Labor Government's taxation regime, and that would be just to meet the level of expenditure commitment that it made public recently.

It has been said by members of the Opposition and others that we have not maintained spending on police in dollar terms. More efforts in policing have been carried out in this State than under any previous Government. The level of capital expenditure for the Police Force can be seen by the works that have been completed on the Sturt Police Station and the Port Augusta Police Station. As you are well aware, Mr Speaker, the level of capital expenditure on the Port Augusta Police Station was despicable. The conditions under which the police were required to work in Port Augusta were shameful, but these conditions existed for a number of years under the previous Government.

Capital expenditure for education in this budget is set at \$102 million, which is \$14 million more than 1995-96. The Opposition has said that expenditure in education has gone up in real terms by only \$2.3 million, but the increase in education expenditure in real terms is running at \$27.3 million. When one speaks to principals and school councillors, one finds that the comments are consistent, namely, that under the previous Government there was a total lack of maintenance and repair planning and expenditure. There has been a major reduction in public sector employment. That has been necessary for proper deficit and debt reduction strategies.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

Mr CAUDELL: Mr Speaker, I appreciate that the member for Unley is out of order, but he did raise an issue about capital expenditure on schools in the south-western suburbs. When the member for Unley was the member for Hayward, he would remember that the expenditure on the

Darlington Primary School was negligible. There were big holes in the wall through which you could put your fist, but the previous Government continued to ignore them. Expenditure on the Paringa Park School has been overdue for years, but the arruine Government foiled to address the issue. It

but the previous Government failed to address that issue. It was not until this Government came into office that money started to be spent on Brighton High School. Also, \$600 000 has been included in the budget for expenditure on the Clovelly Park Primary School, which will leave that school with better facilities so that they will not have to put up with transportables as they did under the previous Government.

In public sector employment, the reduction from 15.5 to 13 per cent of the work force has been necessary to assist the deficit and debt reduction strategies. Health expenditure has been set at \$1.6 billion in this budget, an increase of \$91 million on previous years. Included in the budget is the provision of \$6 million towards increasing throughput of waiting lists. A sum of \$124 million has been included in the capital works project. Included in that \$124 million are projects in the Mitchell electorate and surrounding areas of Mitchell. The Government has allocated funds for the upgrading of facilities at the Repatriation Hospital, for the upgrading of the operating theatres at Flinders Medical Centre, for the provision of facilities in conjunction with Lions International to establish a public eye centre at Flinders Medical Centre, and for the Marion Community Health Centre in the northern sector of the Marion triangle. Those expenditures will account for \$22.8 million of the capital budget, of which \$10.3 million will be spent in 1996-97.

Mr Brindal: I notice that the shadow Minister is strangely quiet.

Mr CAUDELL: She is extremely quiet. The State budget, which was delivered on Thursday last, provides for \$72.3 million in new capital works projects for the southwestern suburbs areas. As I said, included in those projects are \$22.8 million for health, of which \$10.3 million will be spent in 1996-97. The health expenditure deserves mentioning again. It includes the upgrade of the veterans' and aged rehabilitation facilities at the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital, the Flinders Medical Centre project in conjunction with Lions International to establish a public eye centre, and the Marion Community Health Centre in the northern section of the Marion triangle.

As well, \$2.5 million has been allocated in 1996 for new capital expenditure on local schools, including \$600 000 for the South-Western Special Education Unit, which will be located at Hamilton Secondary College. An amount of \$1.2 million has been allocated for the Hamilton Secondary College restructuring, which results from the Marion Road-South Road corridor project, involving the amalgamation of a number of schools, and also the commencement of middle schooling, year 7, in 1998 at the Hamilton Secondary College. Another \$600 000 has been allocated to the Clovelly Park Primary School for the upgrading and restructuring of that school, which followed an amalgamation of Tonsley Park and Mitchell Park Primary Schools on the Clovelly Park campus.

Other capital projects totalling \$47 million as announced in the budget impact on the local area of the south-western suburbs. Firstly, I refer to the provision of recreation facilities and a safe boat harbor and berth at Glenelg for the Kangaroo Island ferry. It also includes the associated works and extensions to the Adelaide Airport, as well as the changes to the golf course and roadworks around the airport. Also included in the budget are funds for the Industrial Premises Development Scheme, which will assist projects such as the new facility for Bankers Trust Australia Limited at Science Park. Hopefully, that will be the first of many facilities to be established in Science Park over the coming years. Of course, Science Park is on the edge of Mitchell.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: As the member for Unley says, that establishment is part of \$400 million of private and Government sector expenditure in the electorate of Mitchell, which will see employment opportunities for in excess of 3 000 South Australians, including young South Australians, in the electorate of Mitchell and neighbouring areas. Besides the Bankers Trust establishment at Science Park, \$50 million worth of expenditure will be associated with the private hospital development at Flinders Medical Centre. There is another \$50 million worth of expenditure on the Mitchell Park housing estate, and there is also the \$200 million investment by Westfield at its new facility at Marion, which will make that the second largest facility in the whole of Australia.

The investment by Westfield in South Australia is very relevant when one talks to the Westfield executives about why they are investing \$200 million in South Australia rather than another State such as Queensland. The hierarchy of Westfield have stated openly and to all who were at the opening of the new facility that they could see a future in South Australia. They could see that the hard work had been done in regard to the South Australian economy, the State's economy was on the move and it was very worth while to invest those funds in South Australia rather than in any other State. As a result of the investment of \$200 million in their shopping complex at Marion, they could see that it would provide an extra 1 650 jobs at the completion of the project. There is also the investment of \$50 million in the northern section of the triangle by the Marion council and the start of the Southern Expressway running from Darlington to Reynella, which will provide greater access to jobs in the southern regions of South Australia. This commitment by the Government represents overdue and worthwhile facilities for residents in the south-western suburbs, as well as providing employment opportunities for local residents.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that this budget had no vision. Obviously, the Deputy Leader needs glasses, because included in the Government's medium term financing strategies are its intention, first, to reduce the State debt and, secondly, to ensure that South Australia has a competitive taxation regime. This budget is committed to a reduction in deficit from \$350 million in 1993 (when we took office) to \$60 million in 1996-97. This deficit will be eliminated in 1997-98. The State's net debt has been reduced from 28.1 per cent of the gross State product in 1992 to 20.3 per cent. Now South Australia has a competitive edge with labour costs below the national average and per capita taxation 23 per cent below Victoria and 26 per cent below New South Wales.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): We all know that health has been a failure for this Government. It is the Achilles heel for the Brown Government—and they know it—not only in relation to the \$79 million in real terms that has been taken out of the health sector over the past two years but also because of the fact, as Government members know, that health above all other areas in the State budget is exposed incredibly to any cuts in Commonwealth grants. In fact, health is exposed to the extent of \$650 million to Commonwealth cuts. In all areas of the State budget, health is the one that will feel it when John Howard struts his stuff in August and we will see the Brown Government step back from responsibility and say, 'Well, it's all their fault and we will slice off these programs.' I will talk about that in more detail later in my speech.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Elizabeth is not addressing the substance of the Bill, which is the State budget. The honourable member is talking constantly about the Howard Government and I cannot see to what that is relevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! The budget debate is traditionally a pretty wide-ranging debate, and my understanding is that the honourable member is talking about health matters, which are related, but I would ask her to link up her comments to the Appropriation Bill, which is the Bill before the Chair.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Obviously, the Liberal Party has been doing its polling. It knows that the community knows that it has broken all its promises in relation to health. It knows that the budget that it has introduced is a phoney and it has been put forward with the approval of a Premier who stands aside while, in a highhanded way, an arrogant health Minister proceeds to decimate the health services to our community. The community will not be fooled: people know what is going on and this strategy will not work. Let us look at some facts. The increase of the State-only contribution to the health budget is \$17.2 million. If we take into account the inflation rate of 3 per cent, it means a small increase of \$1.3 million over the 1995-96 budget allocation. Members should note that \$7.5 million of this amount comes directly from poker machines. Remember also that the Government has to pay nurses a salary increase after their well deserved pay rise, which will cost it \$35 million. Therefore, members will appreciate that the \$1.3 million increase will not be seen at all.

Let us return to the issue of Commonwealth funding, which is an integral part of the total State health budget. The total State health budget is predicated on an increase of \$19 million from the Commonwealth which excludes funds related to the transfer of the Daws Road hospital. As I have said before, to predicate a budget on increases in Commonwealth spending in health is highly questionable: indeed, it is insulting. We all know that the Howard Government, on the advice and urging of our own Premier, will make severe cuts to its budget and that those cuts must fall in areas such as health, directly affecting this State.

Let us look at some of the tied grants listed in this budget which are coming from the Commonwealth Government and which bear a direct relevance to what will happen: for example, the base hospital grant, in excess of \$300 million; AIDS funding, \$2 million; aged care assessment, \$3.5 million; early detection of breast cancer, \$2.5 million coming in tied grants; specialised drugs, \$6.6 million; palliative care, \$1.2 million; Red Cross, \$4.4 million—and there are more. When the inevitable cuts come we know that the Brown Government will simply chop the programs and say, 'It is not our fault.' Where is this Government's responsibility to these very important health programs in our community?

In the health area, the Brown Government will also continue to go in the directions that it has set down previously and, in particular, in the privatisation direction. I noticed again the Premier and others talking about privatisation, saying that this is the way the Government will proceed in the near future. We know of course that this is what it has always had in mind in the health area. We will examine Modbury Hospital in detail in the estimates process, but we know how this experiment is wavering. We know that the building of the promised new private hospital has not occurred. We know that the turnover times for people wanting to get access to elective surgery at Modbury are way behind the times in the other public hospitals in the metropolitan area. What does this mean for the brave new world which was to solve all our problems and which was to be the new dawn in the delivery of public hospital services?

We know that the savings on which the whole deal was predicated—\$6 million a year—are way off target. We know that there is increasing concern by both parties to that contract about the details that of course will not be met. At the same time, the Government is continuing with the privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—a massive exercise; it is a teaching hospital. Again, it is fast tracking it and driving down the price. I believe it is throwing away one of our most important public assets and public services, which provides a health service to the western suburbs, where we know that the health needs of the people are paramount.

I turn now to mental health, because this is a real shame for the Government. In fact, the Government should hang its head in shame. If we look at the budget estimates for mental health from last year to this year we see a decrease in funds of \$5.3 million. We also note that throughout last year the Government underspent its mental health budget to the tune of over \$4 million—about \$4.5 million. It did this knowing what was happening, for instance, in Glenside hospital with mentally ill people, and knowing what was happening—or, I should say, knowing what was not happening—out in the community. I think that is immoral, the fact that members opposite can stand in this House and say that everything is okay, when they know and are confronted daily with evidence that without a doubt things are in crisis.

Members opposite stand in this place and say, 'That's okay; we are going to drop the budget for mental health by \$5.3 million.' So much for their commitment to those people out there in our community who are probably the least able to fight for their rights and get what they deserve in terms of adequate health care. Even when we stand here and say, 'Yes; we also got it wrong', the Premier and the Minister for Health still refuse to acknowledge that there is a problem and that they have a role to play in solving it, and solving it quickly.

In the disability sector, I note that the Premier made a special announcement in relation to support for families caring for intellectually disabled people. The Premier stood up in front of them all, beat his chest and said what a great job he was doing and how the Government was giving \$3 million to this task. Well, Premier, I am not sure that you have been listening to another very worthy sector of our community but, in fact, \$3 million is only about a quarter of what is required to provide services to those most in need. I have been to many meetings set up by Project 141 and I have had dozens of letters, which I am sure went out to other members of this House.

No-one who read those letters could fail to agree that something needs to be done to alleviate the suffering that these families are undergoing. Is it fair that the mentally ill, the intellectually disabled and their carers have to bear the burden? Is that fair; is that just? I say it is not just. I think that any civilised society that fails to do something when it has the ability to do something about changing this situation should be ashamed. I believe that in those two areas—mental health and support for carers of intellectually disabled people—we stand condemned if we do not act. This Government has the ability do that. It has a windfall of \$130 million from poker machines that it did not bargain on. Why has some of that not gone to those two areas in particular? Let me hear the answer to that.

I turn now to capital works. I was interested to see the capital works program for health. I was very interested to see that more than half the projects mentioned in this budget and in this program were mentioned last year. I have gone through both the statements together, last year's and this year's, and, hey presto! We see them not even started last year but simply rehashed, recycled and reannounced as great new initiatives. Remember, they are all under the same heading: 'New works' last year and 'New works' this year. That is all part of this phoney attempt by the Government to hoodwink the South Australian community into thinking that it is doing something in the health sector.

I turn to the Premier's famous press release in relation to the health budget. I must say that I was very interested to see him on the television and to receive this media release. I noted that it was put out by the Premier and that the Health Minister was standing next to him. After all the statements which the Health Minister makes and which set the community off into enormous protest, perhaps he has to be kept out of the limelight a little when major statements are made.

The Premier needs to start doing a little homework in the health area. In his media release he talks about 'the great new things in the health sector'. In the first line he mentions increasing the number of admissions to South Australian hospitals, and he talks about that as a major measure of the effectiveness of the health system in South Australia. For the Premier's information, one of the problems—and this is a big issue in South Australia—is that we have large numbers of admissions. That is a complicated issue. It requires a whole range of strategies, but simply to say that we will pour money into increased admissions shows how superficial is this Premier's understanding of this area of his Government's stewardship.

I had to smile a little because I remembered that, in last year's Estimates Committee, the Health Minister made quite a big deal about the fact that he was going to cut admissions. In fact, in December last year, we had meetings of all metropolitan hospital chief executives to talk about ways that they could safely ration health services. So, one year we will cut back on admissions and then, hey presto, the next year, increasing admissions is the great measurement of an effective health system. I can tell the Premier that that is not right, and perhaps he should do more homework. The other part of the Premier's press release that was interesting to read was his assertion as follows:

The introduction of casemix funding has not only introduced a much fairer system of funding hospitals but it has led to much greater efficiency.

Well, the Premier is wrong on both counts. First of all, as to a fair system, ask the people who have been discharged from hospital and have had to go home and have not had the support they required and then had to be readmitted. This is possibly where the great increase in admissions he has been trumpeting has come from—the people who have had to be readmitted, because casemix funding has some issues in relation to pushing people out of hospitals faster. There is much evidence, especially from the older sections of our community, of many people who have been put out of hospital too soon, quicker and sicker, and this is one of the great legacies of casemix.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: Let us talk about the other things which, it is asserted, have led to greater efficiency. Let us talk about the Mount Gambier Hospital where, unfortunately, the Health Commission got the casemix funding wrong. It is not the only hospital where casemix funding, and the inability of the Health Commission itself to manage and implement its own program, has meant that, instead of having greater efficiency, we have had cuts beyond all reasonable extent—in fact, cuts that have caused those hospitals to be brought right to their knees. The reference to casemix in that press release again shows how little this Premier knows or cares about what happens in health, one of the most fundamental areas for any community.

I am fast running out of time. I should like to be able to spend time on other areas, including Family and Community Services. I will address this in more detail in the Estimates Committee. Again there is an increase, but it is predicated on an increase in Federal funding. Do members believe that John Howard thinks a lot of welfare services? No, we know that he does not. We know that the poor and weak in our community are not priorities for Liberal Governments. When the Federal budget is presented, Family and Community Services will also take a cut.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I support the Bill and commend the Treasurer on his presentation and the depth of his budget. I happened to hear the Leader of the Opposition on Matt Abraham's program in which he had the chance to reply to the Premier who was interviewed last Friday. The Leader of the Opposition spoke very little in reply to the budget, apart from saying that he disagreed with the cuts that had occurred to education and health and, in fact, across the budget over the past two years of the Liberal Government. It makes one wonder how the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party would address \$350 million worth of debt and recurrent expenditure, and how they would address the \$4 billion blowout of the State's finances due to the State Bank. The Leader of the Opposition has often said that he supports SAIT's log of claims, which is worth \$240 million, and which would reinstate all of the support officers and all the cuts that this Government has made.

One really has to wonder just exactly where members opposite would make cuts to be able to rein in the budget deficit. As they have already said that they do not support the cuts that the Government has made to various areas, one can only assume that, had the Labor Party retained Government, it would have put up taxes to ensure that some of the debt was wound back. If it did not put up taxes, we would have just kept on adding \$350 million to the State debt each and every year.

What I say is not based on my assumptions—it comes from the Leader of the Opposition, who said that he disagrees with the cuts that have been made over the time of the Liberal Government. So, you really do have to laugh when these sorts of suggestions are made in criticism of the State budget, because the Labor Party is obviously bereft of any ideas or leadership in this area to make South Australia a State that is both respected and one which can manage its finances.

The Labor Opposition continually carps about the school closures but, if we go back a few years, a large number of schools were closed under Labor, yet we hear this constant carping. This budget does highlight a number of factors, and probably the most important is that the State Government is sticking to its budget. It is reducing the level of State debt. The 1996-97 budget will reduce that debt to \$60 million in the recurrent budget, and we are gradually winding back the overall debt of the State by asset sales and greater efficiency within Government.

In 1997, as has been predicted, we are aiming for a surplus, and that will put this State well on the road to recovery, especially in respect of the amount of interest that we are paying on that debt at the moment. That is taking up some of those programs which we would much rather see remain in place but, because of the State Bank debt and because of the previous Government's poor handling of financial matters, we are paying out more interest than we should be. Once we get our budget back into credit, that situation can improve.

I should like to cover a number of initiatives that relate to the electorate of Light, probably the most important of those being the Hewitt Primary School. This was announced in last year's budget but, because of the downturn in the housing industry in the Hewitt area, the school has been held over for six months prior to its commencement. However, the school's activities will start in September this year, although the school will not open until the first term of 1997, albeit in temporary buildings, whilst the major building of the Hewitt school will be completed by March 1998. The residents of the Hewitt and Willaston areas in Gawler will have a new school come February 1997, one that can be accessed by the many students and the growing population in that area.

Another important commitment in the same area has been that of a preschool in the Hewitt area, alongside the primary school. This budget allocates \$460 000 towards that, and it will be completed by March 1997, again providing preschool places to an area which is growing very rapidly with young people who have children.

I also note that the office of the Department of Family and Community Services in Murray Street, alongside Julian Terrace, has required some capital expenditure. I note that there is provision for upgrading the office to the value of \$400 000. I am pleased that the staff at FACS will obtain better facilities than those they presently have.

Turning to the area of transport, the Barossa Valley Way between Gawler and Lyndoch and Tanunda for some time has been of importance in terms of the number of tourists who travel to the Barossa Valley. However, the road has areas which are narrow and intersections where a line of sight is not always available in both directions, and it does need improvement. I am pleased that the Minister has allocated \$4.5 million for this project, \$321 000 of which is to be allocated in this financial year. The project will commence with a study of the length of the road, the options that are available and the engineering work that needs to be undertaken.

A study will also be conducted in relation to transport movements around Gawler and the need for an eastern bypass. In my maiden speech in the House I referred to the amount of traffic that moves along Murray Street, Gawler; it is the only way that the traffic can travel to the Barossa Valley. A bypass, which is linked to either Main North Road or the Sturt Highway, is desperately needed to alleviate the traffic flow along Murray Street, much of which is heavy transport. I am pleased that the study will commence this year and that we can plan for easier traffic movement around the Gawler area in the future. Another project which is continuing is the Sturt Highway and Daveyston bypass. The area between Daveyston and the Greenock turn-off for some time has been a dangerous section of road: the project will provide a passing lane as well as a bypass around Daveyston. I congratulate the staff of the Department of Transport who have attended two public meetings to hear the comments of the local residents and who have made arrangements that have satisfied the local community. Tenders have been let and work should commence in September to provide a much better road. The budget also provides for the supply of two new fire fighting units at Roseworthy and Hamley Bridge, each to the value of \$124 000, and I know that they will be well received.

Earlier, the member for Elizabeth referred to health and how she perceived the planning of this Government in the health areas. I do note that she did not mention the improvements to the Lyell McEwin Health Service; \$28.5 million has been allocated in this budget for the Lyell McEwin Hospital. It involves a five year development of the existing site. In 1996-97 funding of \$4.2 million will be directed to the ambulatory care, research and teaching sections of the Lyell McEwin Health Service and will result in a large improvement in the facilities that are presently provided. As I said, it is interesting to note that the member for Elizabeth overlooks that, even though the hospital is within her own electorate.

The Northern Community Health Centre is receiving \$4.9 million to provide new facilities at the Elizabeth City Centre, \$2.9 million of which will be spent this year. This will replace the substandard accommodation at the Lyell McEwin Hospital: I expect that is also an oversight by the previous speaker.

An important project, both to South Australia and to the area itself, is the Virginia pipeline. The budget allocates \$10.1—\$9.9 million of which will be spent in 1996-97—for the construction of the pipeline from Bolivar sewerage works to the Virginia area and further north to Two Wells. Already growers and market gardeners are talking of producing a completely different range of vegetables in that area to suit the Asian market and that will result only because of the water supplied by that pipeline. It is an excellent program and I commend the Minister for Infrastructure for the implementation of this program. It has been discussed for some time, but only under his direction has it been brought to fruition.

A few salient points come out of this budget and indicate that South Australia is gaining stature and is recovering from the debts and the perilous situation left by the Labor Government. Some figures are interesting and were also cited by the member for Peake: South Australia is now one of the lowest taxing States in Australia, and that is a turn-around from the 1980s when we were one of the highest taxing States; we are 23 per cent below Victoria and 26 per cent below New South Wales; we have the second lowest payroll tax of all States and there is a 50 per cent rebate on payroll tax for those companies that show they can undertake new exports. That is a vast turn-around from the situation that existed when the Labor Government was in power. At one stage we had not the second lowest but the second highest payroll tax of any State in Australia. Employers will not be encouraged to hire new employees when they face those hurdles.

We have strong growth in GSP that cannot be overlooked. As I have said, our State debt is slowly decreasing. I do not think that people understand the magnitude of the job that has to be undertaken in this area. It is all very well to sit back and say, 'Yes, it was \$4 billion; let's just forget about it and get on with life,' but the number of businesses that left this State in the late 1980s and transferred to interstate locations was quite amazing. At that time I was employed by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies and we kept an eye on the number of businesses that were leaving this State. It was interesting to note that they invested within Victoria and New South Wales because those States were far more stable and had far lower tax regimes than we had in South Australia.

I believe that the job of clawing those businesses back into South Australia or attracting businesses to this State, when we are coming off such a low base left to us by the Labor Party, is not easy. I commend all Ministers for their efforts and I believe that the correct direction has now been taken. We are now looking towards exports. In a recent survey it was found that 41 per cent of South Australian companies are now exporting overseas, and that percentage is far higher than any other percentage or proportion of companies in other States at the moment. In economic terms it means that we are not reliant on Australian demand for our market and that we look elsewhere. The fluctuations which occur within the Australian market and which are beyond the control of companies within South Australia do not affect the companies to a great extent because a large proportion of their production is being sent overseas.

I note in the budget the expansion of Olympic Dam, which is a particularly important project for South Australia. Any company which is to spend \$1 billion on expanding its production is a force to be reckoned with and should be commended for its investment in this State. That shows the confidence that it has in the present Government of this State. That expansion will yield significant export income for this State and will create further jobs for the people already in the area and for those who will move into it.

This Government is restoring the financial position of this State, as we said we would do at the start of this term of Government. We are maintaining our position. We are keeping the promises that we made to the South Australian public that we would wind back the debt that we had inherited and that by the 1997-98 budget the recurrent budget would be in surplus, and we will achieve that aim. This Government is restoring confidence in the economy. We have reformed the public sector and will continue to do so. We have reformed Government services and, through contracting out, we are ensuring that the resources that this Government has are being spent in the most efficient way. I commend this Bill to the House.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I support the Bill. I would like to address some of the broad effects of the budget statewide. This budget confirms yet again the well-proven fact that Labor Governments cannot manage the finances of the State and that Liberal Governments need to be elected after each spate of Labor excesses to rectify the State's economy. We were elected to rectify Labor's financial mismanagement, mistakes and debt increasing policies. In previous budget speeches I have referred to the Labor Government as a Government which governed on bankcard. However, this Government has shown, by a strategic vision of debt management, raising taxes and borrowing excessively is not the only means to the end of securing the future for South Australia.

Our first budget in May 1994 set down the vision, and this budget has adhered to that vision. Two years ago South Australia's underlying deficit was \$350 million and, in two budgets, Treasury and our policies have turned this around to an underlying surplus of \$374 million, as well as making an important contribution to the Labor Government's unfunded liabilities for superannuation, which it had allowed to grow to \$4.4 billion. It is easy to bandy around large figures, thus I believe that quite often the general public looses all context of the enormity of this achievement. After 2½ years in this place, I am still astounded that any Government as totally void of business principles as the Labor Party could have been re-elected by the people of South Australia. I hope the enormity of our turnaround is not lost on the people of South Australia.

Part of the policy vision to overcome debt has been asset sales such as the State Bank, State Fleet and SGIC. Another part of the policy vision to overcome debt has been a series of successful deals for South Australia in the area of contracting out, such as SA Water and transport. This has resulted in excellent revenue deals for all South Australians. TransAdelaide's success in the outer south has already led to a 23 per cent cost saving, allowing it to improve local services.

The third arm of the policy vision for debt reduction was restructuring and reduction of the size of the Public Service work force. This, at times, has been difficult but, on balance, few public servants two years ago would not have agreed that there was fat to trim. All this has occurred without our increasing taxes. It is noteworthy that all the above—that is, asset sales, contracting out and public sector reform—are opposed by the Labor Party and the Democrats. While they are publicly opposed by the Labor Party, we all know that deals were being done in Cabinet by that Party to do these exact things and that it intended to take the deals further and sell off the areas of water and electricity.

The Labor Party and the Democrats also take the stand that we should not have implemented any of that vision but should have framed the budget with great big holes in it, waiting for the Federal Government to take away money from South Australia. The difference between this Government and the Opposition is, clearly, that we have framed a budget for the benefit of South Australia based on two years of hard decisions. We have got our house in order and now the Federal Government has to do the same and not look to the successful States to impose its lack of will. This Parliament should be united in its message to Canberra that this budget is framed without the holes that the Opposition wanted in place.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mrs ROSENBERG: What does the member for Ross Smith think would have happened if we had framed the budget with the holes in it that you and your leader, Mr Rann, suggested? The Federal Government would have walked straight into those holes and taken away that funding without any consideration. Why should we lie down and allow that to happen? My question remains: without the vision, where would Labor and the Democrats have got the funds to balance the budget? Would they have increased taxes? Would they have reduced services or increased borrowings? Or would they have done all three? Where would the solutions to debt have come from? South Australia did not elect this Government to go down the same path and to make the same mistakes as the former Government. Every South Australian should continue to reject the bleatings of the Opposition; it cannot manage the finances of the State and it deserves to be ignored.

Secondly, I would like to address some of the budget items that have a specific impact on my electorate. In the past I have been outspoken about the Government's policy of cutting SSO hours in schools: indeed, I have crossed the floor to support a motion of the ALP on this issue. I now feel that that stand has been justified, with this budget allocating an extra \$3 million to be used in schools for children with learning difficulties—money which can be used for SSO work with children.

The other area that I have been outspoken about is IT in schools. I have constantly asked for inequity to be addressed in the schools in my area which do not have the capacity to raise enough funds to supply computers and cabling for their students. With Seaford 6-12 school being a technology centred school, I have argued for extra expenditure for our local primary schools so that it can be spent on teacher training to ensure adequate skills so that all children can properly access the technology.

I am pleased that this budget has announced DECStech 2001 and has committed \$15 million for the first year of a five year strategy to put one computer for every five students in all schools in South Australia and to provide extra training programs for teachers in all schools. Some \$12.5 million will be available for back-to-school grants, and this will be very beneficial for my electorate, which has a range of new schools but also some very old schools which have been allowed to run down considerably over the years. After many years of neglect they will benefit from these grants.

Another good policy announcement in the education budget is the connection between education in the school and the work force. This is a very important initiative and is supported by the recommendations of the Youth Unemployment Task Force. The clear message that was given to the task force from businesses in South Australia was that youth are not job ready, that they lack appropriate work skills and that businesses are reluctant to employ school leavers because of these shortcomings. One of the recommendations of the Youth Unemployment Task Force was to build a greater connection between the school and the work force.

This initiative will support the further integration of school students and the businesses that they may move into. Where this is currently in place in the southern area, such as in the Lonsdale area and at the Willunga High School, it is working extremely well. Stage B of the Seaford 6-12 school has been budgeted for and construction will commence. This will be an important facility in my electorate and is a reflection of the growing community need for completion of the next stage.

Child-care facilities are being constructed at Seaford Rise and are to be associated with the new community recreational centre, which is a joint facility being built by the council and the Education Department at Seaford. Preschool facilities have been budgeted for as a carry-over of the \$500 000 that was planned for a preschool in Aldinga. Ongoing discussion will occur on the appropriate location for this preschool. There is considerable pressure from the community that this new preschool should be located at Sellicks Beach rather than at Aldinga. I believe that the community will have a lot to say about that in the near future.

The Seaford Health Ecumenical Centre is a joint venture which is under construction at this time and which is due to be open for constituent's use in about August this year. The services at Seaford will be readily available to all people in my electorate, particularly those in the Aldinga, Maslin, Moana and Seaford areas, where people have a much more direct association with the Seaford area and will be able to access these facilities much better. The Noarlunga Health Service has looked very carefully at a way of providing adequate services most equitably to all residents in the catchment of the southern area. The solution that has been devised is the development of three centres at Woodcroft, Noarlunga and Seaford.

TransAdelaide recently won the tender for the supply of the Outer South contract, based at Lonsdale. In the short time that it has been operating this contract, it has generated 23 per cent savings, which my electorate is now seeing as improved services, starting with an improvement for people wanting to access both the Seaford Shopping Centre and the Noarlunga Centre. The improvements mean that people in Old Noarlunga and Moana, and indeed Seaford, can access the Seaford Shopping Centre without travelling first to Noarlunga and then catching a bus back to a shopping centre which might be only 300 metres from their home. This improved service also means that constituents in those areas have access to Noarlunga Centre every 20 minutes.

Some 12 months ago, a small community committee consisting of the taxi industry, the Aldinga Bus Service, the Willunga Community Bus operators and Willunga Mayor Aldridge made a submission to the Passenger Transport Board for a subsidised door-to-door taxi service linking to the Transit Regency bus at Aldinga during its transport times, and then to Maslin Beach during the nights and weekends. A recent report to the PTB by the Southern Region of Councils clearly supports this original submission, which was made from my office, proposing the same ideas included in that report. It is time for the PTB to seriously consider including the Aldinga Beach area in the metropolitan ticketing zone. People in my electorate of Kaurna should have the same standards and costs for transport as people in Gawler receive to balance the equity between north and south.

It is timely that the Aldinga waste water treatment plant is to be built and it is also necessary that serious allocation be made so that a greater number of households can be linked into this sewerage system. This budget introduces a \$3 million Charitable and Social Welfare Fund to direct money towards community groups, welfare agencies and charities helping families in need. I am particularly pleased with the \$300 000 to be allocated towards children who are victims of sexual abuse. This money will establish for 12 months an interagency abuse assessment panel, which will make assessments about allegations of sexual abuse and decide which should be referred for criminal investigation or for welfare support. The panel will operate at the Noarlunga FACS Department. This recognises the need in the Noarlunga area, and I am pleased that the response has been to allocate this money in the southern region.

Road upgrades will be commenced for the Commercial Road, Gawler Street and Grey Street area of my electorate and community consultation is about to begin. Other road upgrades along Main South Road from Noarlunga to Cape Jervis will support this important tourism area, further promoted through the recent decision to concentrate on tourism signage as a first priority. Port Noarlunga Neighbourhood Watch has recently been launched and on 12 June we will launch Neighbourhood Watch for Christies Beach. I place on record my thanks to the Noarlunga Police Rangers and two community members, Mrs Coe and Mrs Sargeant, who helped to letterbox the invitations to Christies Beach residents for the launch. We will also see the building this year of the Port Noarlunga CFS station, which is being relocated to Seaford. We are constantly being told by the Opposition that our concentration on economic issues is too great and that we are not a Government that is committed to social welfare in our community. To counter that misinformed attitude I should like to include a few highlights that I consider to be the most important from the FACS budget. They are: \$66.5 million in concessions that will go to 270 000 people, including Seniors Card holders, social security recipients and pensioners; \$900 000 to the Office of Families and Children for the development of research and family based policy and programs; and \$11.9 million for custody, care and the rehabilitation of young offenders, including the administration of community service orders.

We also hear constant complaints about the health budget. as we have heard this evening, and this year the State health budget has been set at \$1.6 billion, which includes a capital works program of \$124 million. During the 1996-97 budget, \$6 million will be provided from the Community Development Fund to continue increased throughput from the surgical waiting list. This will mean that \$18 million will have been spent over three years to bring about improvements to the throughput and the waiting times. The other important issue about the health budget for the southern area is the \$50 million private hospital being built at Flinders Medical Centre with private finance. Anyone who took the opportunity to go to the Flinders Medical Centre open day held recently would have seen that the upgrading of the emergency centre for the separation of children is a really great thing for the southern area, and I am proud to have been associated with supporting it. In conclusion, I support the Bill.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise to speak in support of the budget. Having been in this place for six years and served my apprenticeship, I am amazed that the Opposition calls the budget a phoney document. What absolute and total hypocrisy! The record is there for all to see and one does not have to have a long memory to recall that a short time ago that mob and I apologise for using that word—were in Government, and look what they did to this State! Now that we have a Government in charge of an economy that is the most improved in Australia, they have the hypocrisy to say that the budget is a phoney and a dud. I have been listening to members of the Opposition, and I want to hear them tell us what they would do, if they think our budget is a phoney.

We have been in Government only a little over two years, and look where we have come in that time. I wish I could turn my farm budget around like that in two years, rain permitting. We have done a miraculous job, and we have been sailing into a pretty stiff wind at times, with no help from members of the Opposition. As soon as we make a tough decision, they are the first ones to wimp out, making it twice as hard for us. All the way they grizzle and knock, and here today, when the Government can justifiably take credit for handing out a budget that rewards the people of South Australia for the tough times they have been through, members opposite still say that it is not a success, that it is a phoney budget.

How dare the Opposition accuse this Government of being phoney. I ask: who is phoney? It is the Opposition and the Democrats, because they have said, as is well documented, that they are opposed to the sale of Government assets, they are opposed to the sale of Government institutions and they are opposed to the outsourcing of Government services. They are opposed to all these things. How were they going to solve the economic problems of this State? We saw what they did and we know how they left it. Yet, they have the audacity to criticise the Government, of which I am a proud member, for what we have done.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Ross Smith and his colleagues would try to do exactly the same thing, but the political restraints prevent them from doing that. Members of the Opposition sit just in front of me, as I am standing on their side of the House, because there are so many of us and so few of them. So, for the benefit of the people who may be reading this, I stand here at arm's length of the Opposition, or what is left of them. They have been decimated, yet they have the hide to come in here and call this budget a phoney. I get pretty cross about it, but they have not given us any ideas of what they would have done about it.

What gets me about the institution of Parliament itself, and I have been here six years and am still not convinced, is that we carry on in this way. Surely the member for Ross Smith as Deputy Leader knows what is the responsible thing to do, but we play political games and carry on like actors in this place and we fly in the face of reality.

I come from a farming community and a business community background where business was business and where, if you took a risk and you lost, you bore the lot. You had to be accountable. If you were not accountable, you went down the gurgler. The rules are no different in this place. The budget for this Government is definitely finite. Certainly, a Government that spends or invests the people's money in the wisest way is to be encouraged, but in this place the rules do not seem to work that way. The Opposition at all times criticises. We have a media that is prepared to pick up anything that is controversial: for example, when the Government makes a hard decision, particularly in relation to outsourcing contracts. It is an absolute disgrace—

Mr Clarke: Have you seen the contract?

Mr VENNING: I have seen the contract. I have undertaken many contracts in my private life. Those contracts are private and between myself and the people with whom I enter them. The very essence of a contract is that the details are usually secret, but in this place now all has to be revealed. I am totally confident—and this is on the record—that, in time, the contract Minister Olsen has drawn up in relation to the outsourcing of SA Water will prove us to be correct. First, it is a very good contract because one side trusts the Minister to get it right; and, secondly, I know that the ground on which it is based is solid ground. We are leading the way—we do not follow in this State, we lead the way—and I have confidence in this Minister to get it right.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi): There are too many interjections from members on my left.

Mr VENNING: When I reflect back to when I first came into this House and recall the line of Ministers then representing the Labor Government, I shake my head because there was not a person among them in the House who knew how to count or who had an accounting or a business brain. Time and time again decisions were made. Remember Mr Klunder: \$60 million down on Scrimber. There was hardly a whimper. We scratch and scrounge to try to make up for lost ground but, as we do that, the Opposition tries to make every inch of the way hard for us, purely because with this institution of Parliament that is expected.

Members of the Opposition know in their own mind that the Government has done the honest thing. It has been an honest toiler. The runs are on the board, or they will be. Quite honestly, it makes me sick that we have to go through this nonsense. We have to make these hard decisions. We know they are not popular. All we ask of the Opposition is that it be constructive and helpful and that, if it wishes, it should knock us when we get things wrong or when we do not go far enough.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is all under control; no worries. I know these two members outside this place. Most of the time they are reasonable, but when we come into this place members think they have to carry on like a pork chop. I gave the Labor Government its due where I could. For example, every time I drive on the highway from Adelaide to Port Wakefield I think, 'A Labor Government put that there.' I give the Opposition, when in Government, the credit for that, but there is little else that I can see that the previous Government left us, apart from a legacy of debt or evidence of wasted money. I give credit where credit is due, but there were not enough runs on the board by the previous Government. It took big risks, as this Government has taken risks, but it had no insurance backing it up. It did things in a completely unprofessional manner.

I am very pleased with this budget, particularly in relation to what it does for me and my electorate of Custance hopefully soon to be the new seat of Schubert.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I thank the honourable member very much for his offer of assistance, I am sure I will take him up on that. In my electorate, work on the Barossa Valley Way has been allocated \$4.5 million, that work to be undertaken over several years and due for completion in June 1998. Roads in the Barossa are particularly bad, and I thank the Minister for his efforts in this regard, because this project involves a very critical area in the Barossa Valley. Even today I have received letters about trucks, particularly B-doubles, which cannot get into the wineries. This being a premium industry for South Australia, it is not on that B-doubles should have to go on a roundabout route and then break up and be taken in halves to four or five of the key wineries. We need to upgrade the whole road structure in the Barossa Valley, not only for access by commercial vehicles—

Mr Clarke: Why haven't you done it?

Mr VENNING: I want the member for Ross Smith to tell me what was spent in the Barossa Valley over the past 10 years. Absolutely nothing that I can recall. For obvious reasons, I have been tallying up what has been spent in the past two years in the Barossa and it amounts to nearly \$30 million. When I go back over the previous 10 years, it is not even \$3 million. Nothing is obvious; nothing stands out. The previous Labor Government did not spend a bean on any roads, any bridge or a new entertainment centre. The previous Government saw the Barossa Valley as a strong Liberal area and, very negatively, chose not to spend a cent. Members have to give this Government-and the local member-a little credit, because it has spent a great deal of money in the Barossa Valley. We know that this will be a critical region in getting the South Australian economy back on the rails. Even the Minister for Infrastructure, who is listening with interest, knows how important the Barossa is.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: After all these years of filthy water, people in the Barossa will at long last see some clean water. Five members of Parliament before me have come into this place and tried to do something about the Barossa Valley's water. The previous Government said, 'We will fix it. As

soon as the Myponga filtration plant is finished we will do the Barossa.' It is reported in *Hansard*, and members of the Opposition should read it. The previous Labor Government finished Myponga three years ago and nothing at all was done about the Barossa Valley's water supply. It did not intend to do a thing about it. What absolute and total hypocrisy! We see it now and we have seen it before. I am pleased that Minister Olsen has eventually laid down the plans to have filtered water not only in the Barossa but in the Mid North—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The record speaks for itself; you do not have to carry on like that. However, I will not be distracted. I am very pleased with what the Minister has done. Members may not be aware, but when one entertains visitors and they go into the small room of the house, one often hears the toilet flush before they use it because they probably think the toilet has not been flushed from the previous time it was used. But, no, that is the colour of the water: that is how embarrassing it is. The member for Ross Smith takes clean water for granted, as would most members of this House. All members have seen that brown coloured water because I have given out bottles of it. People in the Barossa have to live with that. For example, when people who do not have rainwater have a white shirt to wash, they had better go to the laundromat and hope that it has filters connected, otherwise they cannot wash that shirt.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: Even when you clean your teeth and the water with which you rinse your mouth goes down the sink, you think, 'My gosh, I have a dirty mouth', but then you realise it is the water. Coming to Adelaide frequently, I get used to clean water, but when I return to my district I am never allowed to forget how bad the situation is. Not only is this water found in the Barossa but it is right through the Mid North. People are ruining their hot water services. The valves get stuck, and thousands of litres of water is lost down the drain.

There is no compensation for the people who experience this unsatisfactory situation. So few of them complain, and they need a medal for the hassles they have had for so long. Their forebearance in this regard is a credit to them. Many of the people in my electorate, particularly of German origin, do not complain. I am amazed that some of them who have small farms in marginal areas can make a living. However, they do so and are cheerful about it. They do not complain: all they ask for is a reasonable go. They expect to have clean water in the taps and access to other Government services. I am very proud to represent some of these people, and I would be quite happy to introduce them to members.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Certainly; and those two more than ever before. I represent them all. The member for Ross Smith knows that I represent even his colleagues. I treat all the people in my electorate in the same way, and I do that with some passion. I am very pleased with them. I am very pleased with what the Government has given to the Barossa Valley, particularly in relation to roads and water. The Barossa Music Festival will again receive \$150 000. I am very pleased about that.

We can see the problem we are having with the Adelaide Festival; it is a bit of a concern. Without being too critical, all I can say is that to pay for festivals you have to get people on seats. The Barossa Festival is usually booked out. I love to go the Barossa Festival. I go at every opportunity I can, not only out of loyalty but also because I enjoy it, because the program is enjoyable. I have to say that I cannot switch on to some of the things at the Adelaide Festival; they are not my thing and I go to only a few of them. Many years ago I went to many events at the Adelaide Festival, such as the Dave Brubeck Quartet, and would have attended at least six to 10 events, but at later festivals I would be lucky to make two or three. I have a message for the organisers: you put on a program that appeals to the people who go to these shows and you will have success. If you have any doubt, just check the Barossa Festival; it is a great success. I thank the Government for that support.

Barossa wine tourism has also attracted \$154 000 of Government money, and I am very pleased about that. A total of \$1.219 million was allocated to tourism within the electorate of Custance. That figure of \$1.2 million does not include the \$1.5 million which was put aside for the new Barossa convention centre. As I speak today, the walls go up on the new Barossa entertainment complex. I inspected it last Friday as an opportunity to meet the people and discuss it with the media. The member for Ross Smith is very slow. I give it to him on a plate and he still does not pick it up. Today, the walls of the entertainment centre are being raised and the people in the valley will wake tomorrow to a huge building which was not visible today.

I am very pleased with the Government, particularly Minister Ingerson, who had a great part to play, because the people up there will get an absolute bargain. For \$1.5 million of Government money and about \$4 million of local money they will get a complex worth about \$7 million or \$8 million. It is something that the previous Government ought to have provided at the same time as it established a complex at Port Pirie, Whyalla and the Riverland. Why did it not provide one in the Barossa? Of all the places in this State where music is paramount, the Barossa did not get one. Once again, it was a very cynical point of view: no votes, no money. I am very pleased that roads in Custance have attracted a large amount of money, with \$8 million being allocated for the new Blanchetown bridge. I am very pleased, because that has been concerning me. Some \$4 million is allocated for the Sturt Highway Truro bypass deviation and overtaking lanes, and \$4 million for the ongoing Morgan to Burra road. No speech of mine is complete without a discussion of the Morgan to Burra road. I report to the Parliament very good progress with this road. As members would know, the Government has put aside \$17.5 million for this road. It is well on track. I know that the member for Mawson says, 'Good heavens!', and my constituents also are astonished that I have been able to gather this money for them.

Mr Clarke: It's all due to you?

Mr VENNING: It's all due to me; yes, that's right. I do not care what you call me or what you say: the record speaks for itself. I am very pleased, first, that I was able to get the ear of the Ministers and, secondly, that the Minister has come along there. The people of the north will be very grateful to the Government. Not only has it taken responsible and hard decisions, it is also now rewarding people with resources in the correct areas. So, now we will have things which really matter, which last and which are tangible—capital works that all the community of South Australia can appreciate, and not just lost in Government bureaucracy.

I am very pleased that this Government has been able to fix the problems in education with the investment of \$60 million and in health with \$90 million. This is all due to a responsible Government making hard decisions. I am pleased to be a member of the Government. In 2¹/₂ years we have had a tremendous turnaround. I congratulate the Government, particularly the Treasurer, and I have much pleasure in supporting the budget.

Mr WADE (Elder): I rise to support the Appropriation Bill. My colleague the member for Light has drawn our attention to the fault line that has cracked wide open in the Opposition's approach to this Budget. The Opposition Leader is on record as saying that he would not sell Government assets that are surplus to requirements; that he would not contract out services to the private sector, which would run them more efficiently; and that he would not make any cuts to the Public Service. He has said that he would not do these things if Labor were in Government.

How would the Opposition Leader propose to raise the money to bring this State back to an even keel? How would he raise the money to pay the mortgage on our State; to pay the interest rates on this huge debt that has been left to us; and to pay off as many chunks of the principle of that debt as possible? He would have to find about \$600 million from somewhere if he wanted to keep things as they are, maintain the inefficiencies in the current system and not change anything. That figure of \$600 million is a lot of money to find. He would probably have to raise taxes. The people of South Australia, having come out of one of the worst recessions experienced since the Great Depression, would not be too happy about their taxes being raised.

Perhaps this pseudo Labor Government would have to look at another aspect: that kind of money could be gained if payroll tax were increased by a few per cent. It would have to increase payroll tax from 6 per cent to 12 per cent. That would send South Australia into a bottomless spiralling depression from which it would never recover. All I can say is that the Opposition is safest where it is, and the people of this State are safest where it is, and that is in Opposition. A constituent approached me the day after the budget was announced and said, 'Our future must be looking really good. Did you see that cake on the front page of the newspaper? It had plenty of candles and looked very bright.' The Treasurer's birthday budget was indeed one of celebration, not just a celebration of his 50 years of life-and I think the past 40 were earned during the past 21/2 years-but also a celebration of this wonderful State in which we live.

We are on the road to recovery. We have already passed some of the signposts that we were not scheduled to reach for some time yet. We are speeding along the road to new economic and social health. However, like a professional Grand Prix driver—yes, that is the same Grand Prix that the Labor Government gave away to Victoria—we know what we are doing. We have control of the vehicle, we know the road, its corners, its dangerous turns, and when to go flat out on the straight. Unlike Labor, we have no intention of selling this State short or giving away its opportunities for the benefit of others. We are on the home stretch and we are way out in front.

South Australia suffered greatly from the loss of output from key manufacturing industries, the Federal Labor Government's policy of structural adjustment, and the 1990-1992 recession. Industry decline was the fundamental problem facing our State after years of neglect by incompetent administrators. My electorate of Elder comprises over 2 000 small and medium sized businesses. Many local people own and/or work in these businesses.

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

Mr WADE: Before the dinner adjournment, I had mentioned that in my electorate of Elder there were over 2 000 small and medium sized business, which employ local people who either own or work in those businesses. Many others would like to work closer to home in small businesses. Industrial decline means the loss of jobs, and my electors are highly dependent on a healthy, vibrant local small business sector. This Government developed a strategy to arrest and reverse this decline, a strategy to introduce policies and measures not directed to individual enterprises. As members know, the approach to direct policies and measures towards individual enterprises is doomed to be ineffectual, particularly in a regional economy like ours that is increasingly exposed to international competition.

This Government directed its strategies towards specific industry sectors as the primary objects for ensuring sustainable competitive advantage. It is essential to tighten the two types of networks that exist in the marketplace. The horizontal network is where smaller firms are linked by a provider of collective services such as joint marketing arrangements, shared technology facilities, access to advanced technology, information, joint investments and so on. This Government has opened a horizontal network door by assisting small and medium size businesses to develop new export markets through NECS, the New Exporters Challenge Scheme. Already, this financial year, 143 businesses have submitted claims of almost \$1 million worth of expenditure in developing export markets.

A total of 90 companies were assisted by the Government during 1994-95 to the value of over \$400 000 to develop business plans focused on export development, value adding to agriculture and import replacement. Import replacement means that we make it ourselves rather than have it made by cheap labour overseas. It is a hard fact of life that the sourcing of cheap overseas imports is a formula for reduced competitiveness in the longer term. Leaner operations are seldom fitter. Resources for research and development are lost in this environment. Resources for training acquisition are lost in this environment. Design innovation is lost in this environment and, of course, competitive advantage is lost in this environment. Frequently, the result is a greater vulnerability to competition from the less developed nations. The Government has not taken this road to certain economic ruin.

Our small business best practice program gives a dollar for dollar incentive for businesses to engage consultants to assist in developing benchmarking and best practice programs, to keep our skills at their peak. The small business mentor program gives a dollar for dollar incentive for businesses to test new ideas and new directions. The Business Centre has become the focus of the AusIndustry Hub that includes BizLink, BizHelp, BizAccess, the business licence information system, internet access, export registers, and a bilateral business association database. These are not empty talkfest programs. Over 10 000 South Australian businesses accessed the AusIndustry Hub in its first six months of operation.

South Australian businesses were hungry for this horizontal networking of information and services. The Government has supplied the demand. The second type of network essential for economic recovery and growth, as all members would know, is commonly known as the 'vertical' network. This network is one where businesses are in a relationship of interdependency in a production chain of the kind that links the major producers with suppliers of components such as tools, glass, plastics, textiles, and so on.

Mr Brindal: Horizontal and now vertical.

Mr WADE: Now vertical. This Government undertook a conscious, rational industry policy of applying stimulus to particular industry sectors that will in turn stimulate the supply of local inputs. This emphasis on fostering cooperation between local providers and growing industry sectors will promote a virtuous cycle of productivity improvement and economic growth within the State. The targeted industry sectors include aquaculture; automotive manufacturing, where, of course, the Government facilitated the establishment of the Australian Centre for Automotive Management, a centre that develops and teaches management techniques for international competitiveness; business services; food and beverages; and information technology, where the Government has actively assisted the establishment in our State of companies such as Motorola, Tandem Services, Electronic Services Business, Link Telecommunications, and so oncompanies that have created over 4 000 new direct jobs, with the potential for many thousands more becoming available in satellite feeder companies.

The Government also has applied stimulus to mining and minerals-based technology, water management and wine management, to name but a few. The Government has taken the proactive step of melding our manufacturing, primary and service industries to take the greatest advantage of the horizontal and vertical networks essential to our survival. Our economy will rebound over the next few years as a result of this Government's actions. Economic growth is lifting. More jobs are being created. The South Australian business community is becoming more internationally competitive.

It is becoming alive with activity—life that has not been seen since 1989. The State budget will be in surplus in 1997-98. Public debt is falling. Investment opportunities will continue to rise in our State, and this will bring enhanced economic and employment growth. South Australian exports are penetrating the Asian market in greater numbers, and this will continue to grow, as does our confidence that we can better whatever the Asians have to offer in quality, reliability and price. We are an environmentally clean producer of quality goods and services, and these will be in greater demand by our northern neighbours as well as markets in the Middle East.

Through exporting, South Australia will grow far more rapidly than we can ever envisage. Our industry base will diversify further, creating an even greater degree of economic stability for our State. The key objectives of the Liberal Government on coming to power were to restore the financial position of the State: to restore confidence in the South Australian economy; to reform the public sector; and to provide the highest possible Government services. We have not yet achieved these objectives in their fullest; we have been working on it for only 21/2 years. What has been achieved so far is a credit to the leadership team, headed by the Premier, which has been unswerving in its dedication to improving the quality of life of the people of South Australia. Many said it would not be easy and they were right. In conclusion, the candles on the birthday cake were indeed burning brightly, but the future of South Australians can only get brighter.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): In rising to support the Appropriation Bill, I congratulate the Treasurer on his third successful budget. The budget highlights the Liberal Government's considerable achievements in reducing debt and maintaining quality services to all South Australians. We have been committed to our four year debt reduction strategy without the benefit of new taxes, with exceedingly difficult pressures being applied through wage increases and interest rate fluctuations, and we are succeeding.

The budget clearly sets out the path for financial stability of this State's finances. From an inherited massive State debt, which included a spending regime of \$350 million more than the State's income, to a forecast of a \$10 million surplus next year, is an undeniable statement acknowledging responsible financial management, which is in sharp contrast to the incompetence of the previous Labor Government. Indeed, the dire predictions from the Opposition Leader that last year's budget had a \$1 billion hole have, once again, proven that Labor's leaders are literally financial fools.

Both the Leader of the Democrats and the Leader of the Labor Party have seriously underestimated the intelligence of the people of South Australia. Both these political Party leaders have issued quite amazing statements as to their interpretation of the Liberal Government's budget. Without giving their inane claims credibility by repeating them, I suggest that the test of their veracity is to compare their visions of our budget with their solutions in their hypothetical budgets. The bottom line is that massive tax increases and debt increasing borrowings would be required to fulfil the claims of these financially incompetent leaders who still refuse to learn the lessons of the past.

The Labor Opposition Leader has continued to attack the outsourcing policies of this Government and at every opportunity has disgracefully attempted to confuse members of the public by claiming that the Liberal Government was privatising State owned facilities or utilities, such as Modbury Hospital and our water supply. The hypocrisy of these claims is of truly staggering proportions when we understand that the previous Labor Government had not only the intention but also had actually moved to privatise both Modbury Hospital and our water supply. It was their intention to dispose totally of these State owned assets into the hands of the private sector-not to outsource the management of these utilities as we have done, not to maintain ownership as we have done, but to get rid of them without the safeguards that we believe are necessary. Their intention to sell has been ratified by the approvals registered on their own Cabinet documents.

As for the Democrat Leader, the best that can be said for his financial capabilities is that his hypothetical budget will never be tested and, therefore, he can say what he likes, when he likes and where he likes, and not once does he have to be accountable for his fiscal fantasies.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: With a bit of luck he probably won't. The State Liberal Government has achieved significant reform since coming to office and the dividend is now being returned to South Australians. Significant savings from financial management reducing the size of Government and contracting out some of the major Government functions are providing a lasting benefit to the community. Evidence of this is the \$150 million increase in funding for health and education.

A further dividend to all South Australians was announced by the Premier recently: the reductions in electricity charges. Domestic electricity charges will be frozen, rising only in line with inflation of 4.4 per cent; tariffs for small to medium size businesses will fall with a rise of only 2 per cent, well below inflation, while tariffs for other businesses will rise only 3 per cent. This is on top of the 22 per cent savings that have already been implemented. Contracting out is saving taxpayers more than \$40 million a year, and this process will continue over the next 18 months, further increasing the savings. Not only does this provide savings but also it stimulates the business activity within the private sector and provides incentives for further job creation.

In South Australia the private sector is competitively providing services that were previously undertaken by Government and the dividends will benefit all South Australians. This is highlighted by the reduction in the size of the Government. In just 2½ years the size of the State Government's work force as a percentage of the total work force has dropped from 15.4 per cent to 12.9 per cent.

Major Government activities contracted out to the private sector over the past 2½ years represent work with an annual value of \$230 million for the private sector. This has been a most significant reversal in the role and growth of Government in the past 50 years. These initiatives combine to further improve South Australia's competitive edge over other States, establishing an attractive investment and expansion climate to create new jobs for South Australians.

The Government's deficit and debt reduction strategies mean that State taxation in South Australia is 23 per cent below Victoria and 26 per cent below New South Wales. Payroll tax rates are the second lowest of all States, with the most competitive payroll rebates for exporters. In addition, there are exemptions for small business from payroll tax which provides the sector with \$110 million in savings each year.

Education continues to be a priority of the Government, despite the South Australian Institute of Teachers' attempt to sabotage the Government's commitment to literacy development programs. The budget shows a \$61 million increase in the education budget for 1996-97. This extra financial commitment to education will mean that South Australia continues to spend more per student on education than any other State in Australia. The extra resources in education will be spent on significant pay increases for the Government's employees. A new five-year information technology plan for schools, further early year strategy initiatives and a range of other initiatives in other areas are included.

The Government will commit \$15 million from the capital works budget for the first year of a five year strategy. This is DECStech 2001, which will help provide computers and associated high technology to all schools in South Australia. Major objectives of DECStech 2001 include the provision of one computer for every five students by the end of the fiveyear plan; classrooms to be linked to the Internet and to have easy access to information data bases across the country and the world; an education network that allows teachers in one location to provide quality distance education to students in another location, thus increasing subject choices for students in city and country schools; speech pathologists and other specialists to provide assistance to country students who currently have limited access to such services; and training and development programs to be offered to teachers in all schools, with particular benefits to teachers in remote country areas.

The main features of DECStech 2001 will involve a subsidy scheme to purchase computers and funding to link all schools in an education network. Students will be the big winners under the new plan with access to a wider range of subject choices, information from international data bases and specialist services such as speech pathology. This will be the first serious commitment by a Government in South Australia to assist parents and schools in purchasing computers. For decades Governments have left the responsibility of buying computers solely to parents: the only budget commitment by the previous Labor Government was \$360 000 per annum.

Next year, up to \$4 million will be provided as subsidies to assist parent fund raising in the purchase of new computers. The budget also includes further initiatives as part of the Government's Early Years strategy, which gives priority to extra assistance to students with learning difficulties in the early years. Some of those initiatives include \$3 million in cash grants to schools to support the Early Assistance Action Plan, and this money can be spent on extra SSO hours to provide classroom assistance to students with learning difficulties. It can also be spent on the purchase of resources or training and development for staff. There will also be extra funding to increase the number of schools using the reading recovery program, extra funding to hire additional speech pathologists and continued support for early intervention projects such as First Start, Eclipse, and Parents and Teachers in Children's Services.

The other features of this area of the budget include, for the first time, over \$100 million to be spent on capital works, with \$12.5 million in the Back to School Grants Scheme and increased funding for minor works and maintenance. Looking to country areas, the sessions at 19 small rural preschools will be increased from two to three per week and extra funding will be provided to establish a special interest high school for students with high intellectual potential, and this is something that parents have desired of teachers and Governments for many years. There is also increased assistance which will allow students in years 11 and 12 to spend some of their school weeks studying at TAFE and working in business or industry.

In another area of the budget, our commitment to families and children is emphasised by the introduction of programs that strengthen family life in South Australia and enhance the welfare of the State's children under an increased funding package for the Department for Family and Community Services in 1996-97. As the Minister is in the House, I congratulate him for this productive and extraordinary budget that takes such a determined interest in families and children in this State. There is a \$3 million charitable and social welfare fund, which will provide a new avenue for directing resources into the community through non-government agencies and charities. The emphasis of this money will be on helping families develop skills so that they are able to help themselves and on building community resources that support independence. An additional \$500 000 will be provided to spearhead this new approach through a positive parenting campaign to be coordinated by the Office for Families and Children.

The program aims to improve the skills of parents by promoting the status of parents, informing parents of available resources, improving access to the services, providing relevant parent education and training, and ensuring that an adequate range of support services is available. Families and parents are the cornerstone of a healthy and productive society, and they should, indeed, be provided with encouragement, status, support and respect. This campaign will provide a grassroots, back to the basics approach in social policy. It is about keeping families supported and enabling them to cope rather than picking up the pieces in a crisis. The 1996-97 budget allocation of \$243.6 million is an increase of \$10.2 million over expenditure in the previous financial year. The non-government sector would receive \$97.2 million, which is an increase of \$8.7 million over last year.

I now refer to employment and training. Thousands of new student education and training positions, significant information technology initiatives and an increased capital works budget underpin the 1996-97 budget for the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education. Additional training programs have been provided for 3 800 new students in TAFE across the entire State. Among the areas providing the jobs of the future, targeted with the additional student places, will be the growth of areas such as IT, electronics, tourism, hospitality, aquaculture and viticulture. All the industry priority areas are reflected, including computing, with 600 students; tourism and hospitality, 600; primary industry, 800; community services, health and education, 500; food processing, 600; general education and training, 500; utilities, 100; and other areas, 100.

This financial year, 1 100 young South Australians will be recruited into the public sector under the 1 500 Traineeship Scheme. Since its implementation, 400 young South Australians have been offered a range of traineeships as clerical, laboratory and dental assistants. This scheme is providing the biggest single intake of young trainees in the public sector.

In another area, the capital works budget topped \$70 million, which will be spent by the South Australian Water Corporation on capital works to improve the State's water supply, sewerage and irrigation systems. Over \$12.5 million will be expended by SA Water on major metropolitan water supply projects. A total of \$1.24 million will be outlaid in 1996-97 on expanding the water supply mains in the Angle Vale area to serve residential development in Munno Para West and extending the Willaston and Morphett Vale water supplies.

In 1996-97, SA Water will spend \$4.65 million in the first year of an ongoing program to replace water meters to ensure the continued reliability and accuracy of the corporation's metering. The maintenance of the State's water supply and waste water headworks infrastructure was an ongoing priority, and the new financial year will see more than \$2 million spent on works to upgrade the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline, renovate the Torrens Gorge weir, rehabilitate the Gumeracha Weir and Hope Valley aqueduct, and renew the Millbrook trunk main. In recognition that water quality is always of prime importance in this State, just over \$1 million will be spent on further work to ensure that our water supplies continue to meet stringent water quality guidelines during 1996-97.

The protection of public health in the State's environment continues to be a major Government priority and more than \$7.5 million has been put aside to be outlaid in 1996-97 for sewerage capital projects. Rehabilitation and renewal works for Adelaide's four major waste water treatment plants are planned, with projects valued at \$4 million approved for the Bolivar, Port Adelaide, Glenelg and Christies Beach plants. Important work to extend sewers in Adelaide Hills communities will continue, with \$783 000 committed for the coming financial year. This ongoing project to improve the standard of waste water disposal is further protecting water quality in the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment.

I should also add that, through the environment budget, South Australia will contribute \$18 million to the management and clean up of one of the nation's most significant environmental projects, the Murray River. South Australia has become the first State to put its money on the table to help fund the Murray-Darling 2001 project.

Within the Newland electorate, a purpose-built fire and ambulance station will be built, with an allocation of funds amounting to \$1 million. A sum of \$241 000 has been put aside to complete the amalgamation of the Banksia Park Junior Primary and Primary Schools, a process that the school community initiated some four years ago. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been allocated to all the schools in Newland during the past two years: money to train teachers, to construct and develop projects, and to maintain schools which have been previously let go. Some schools were so sadly lacking in maintenance that it caused occupational safety and health matters to arise. Moneys that were not put aside by any other Government have had to be picked up by this Government, and those moneys total somewhere over \$50 million.

This is a very small snapshot of all the areas which this budget in particular has picked up and which will add to the benefits that this State will see under this third Liberal Government budget. Again, I offer my congratulations to the Treasurer and I am sure that those who have criticised this Government and its budget processes in the past will—

Ms Hurley: Will see the light.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you very much; that is an exceptionally good statement. The Opposition is prepared to see the light eventually. Thank you very much for your support. I am sure that down the track we will be hearing the kudos from the Opposition that we have offered to the Treasurer on this budget.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition. Can I take it that the Leader of the Opposition is the lead Speaker?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, Sir, thank you. I rise to deliver the Opposition's reply to the Treasurer's budget speech. This was the Treasurer's third budget, marking the near completion of the Government's deficit and debt reduction program. But it is phoney because it takes no account of cuts that will be coming at the Premier's conference and in the forthcoming Federal budget to the 55 per cent of the State's revenues provided by Commonwealth grants. The Premier has tried to convince South Australians that this is somehow a caring budget, but the cold facts are that Police have been cut by over \$3 million; Correctional Services take a cut in real terms of \$1.8 million; the State contribution to TAFE has been cut \$11.5 million in real terms with the Premier crossing his fingers that John Howard-and Amanda Vanstone-will increase Commonwealth funding by \$9.5 million.

Also the supposed increase to education is phoney. After inflation, the increase in recurrent spending is a mere \$2 million and does nothing to redress the \$47 million worth of cuts made to education in the previous two years. But even worse is the fact that this mean-minded increase is based on the assumption of increased grants from John Howard but, as we all know, education is a key area most vulnerable to Commonwealth cuts. The claim of more than \$100 million for new schools, redevelopment, maintenance and other capital projects is scarcely any better. It comes after under spending of the capital program of nearly \$25 million over the previous two years. No fewer than 14 of the new schools announced this year have been announced previously.

The claim of more money for hospitals is nonsense. A further \$69 million is supposed to be spent in 1996-97, but

after inflation is considered the increase is a mere \$1.3 million and goes nowhere near redressing the previous cuts of \$79 million made to the health budget over the previous two years. The increase depends entirely upon increased Howard Government funding of \$19 million and no-one believes that that will happen.

This is a budget that locks South Australia into a continuation of its economic under performance over the past two years and out to the turn of the century. The Premier wants South Australia to forget all his promises on jobs and all his promises on economic growth because South Australia has largely missed out on the benefits of the national economic recovery. This is not a caring budget. It is a budget that shows just how little this Liberal Government cares for ordinary South Australians. It is a phoney budget, the fine print of which reads, 'Blame John Howard later.' This budget has a shelf life of no more than a few months. The Premier knows it, the Treasurer knows it and the Minister for Infrastructure knows it. Even Cliff Walsh, former adviser to the Premier and former Audit Commissioner for the Brown Government, said:

If they have not factored into the budget numbers any significant cuts in Commonwealth funds then we know that the bottom line that they predict on budget day is going to be blown out.

The Howard-Costello budget in August will deliver \$8 billion in cuts over the next two years. Those impending cuts make this budget a complete phoney, a complete fraud.

Let us look at the details. With 55 per cent of total State revenues coming from the Commonwealth, with the Federal Liberals determined to cut \$8 billion out of the Federal budget over the next two years and with our Premier and our Treasurer urging them to do just that, everyone knows that this budget is a phoney. Everyone now knows that even the minuscule increases in funding of schools and hospitals cannot be delivered. Everyone knows that the Premier and Treasurer will deliver deeper cuts to the fundamental areas of social infrastructure after the August Federal Budget is brought down.

The budget papers themselves tell us that the undertakings of the Premier and his Treasurer in this budget are hollow. This is what the budget papers have to say on the coming Howard-Costello cuts:

This budget reflects the State Government's own priorities. As such, it takes no account of any budgetary adjustment which may flow from this year's Commonwealth budget. Any budgetary adjustment which the State Government is forced to take as a consequence of announcements in Canberra in August will be reflected entirely in the Commonwealth's priorities, not the State's.

That is in Financial Paper No. 1, page 1.2. The Brown Government's stance leaves the way open for cuts to special purpose grants from the Commonwealth, but these have absolutely nothing to do with duplication. Commonwealth specific purpose payments are paid to the States to cover the costs of essential services like hospitals \$490 million, Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service \$4.4 million, Australian National Training Authority \$53 million. The hamfisted advocacy of this Premier has left this State fully exposed to the impending cuts. He told ABC Radio on 31 May:

... all of the States have a three-year agreement with the Federal Government for what we call general purpose grants. Now if the Federal Government cuts special purpose payments for special programs ... they do not in any way undermine the integrity of this budget. That is what the Premier had to say, but the reality is that these cuts, aided and abetted by the Premier, will have a serious and adverse impact on ordinary South Australians.

We talk about the Howard cuts and the budget crisis. In the opening lines of his budget speech the State Treasurer declared he had 'broken the back of the debt burden we inherited'. It is true that the Liberal Government is running slightly ahead of its medium term fiscal targets and, all things being equal, will eliminate the underlying deficit early next year. But all things are not equal.

A little over a week after the Federal election the new Commonwealth Treasurer released a document claiming that there would be a \$200 million deficit in 1995-96 instead of a small surplus and a deficit of about \$4.9 billion in 1996-97. The latter represented an \$8.3 billion difference to the forward estimate released in last year's Federal budget. Hence, the so-called \$8 billion black hole. Treasurer Costello said that it was the new Federal Government's intention to make \$4 billion in cuts to outlays in each of the next two financial years to fill in that black hole. Mr Costello and Mr Howard have tried to attribute the black hole to the previous Federal Labor Government and to the former Minister of Finance, Kim Beazley. The purpose of the Costello exercise was transparent: it was to find a set of budget numbers, by whatever means, to create an aura of crisis sufficient to distract attention from what is to be done, to legitimise an ideological slash and burn exercise.

The Premier of this State applauded this political stunt, and he completely and uncritically accepted the need for \$8 billion worth of cuts. But the claimed hole has little to do with any laxity in budgetary housekeeping or overspending, as 90 per cent of it was a consequence of the Commonwealth Treasury revising down slightly both its growth and inflation forecasts. Members do not have to take my word for this, even though the facts are clear from the Treasury press release announcing the new budget numbers. The Governor of the Reserve Bank says the same:

Of the \$7 billion deterioration since May 1995 in the budget estimate for 1996-97, for example, 90 per cent reflects revisions to the economic forecasts.

That is from the *Reserve Bank Bulletin* of April 1996, page 27. Those revised Treasury forecasts were made obsolete by the March national accounts which showed economic growth of 4.8 per cent for the year. The fact that the forecasts used to create the black hole were no longer valid was demonstrated by the way the Federal Treasurer suddenly began using other justifications for making \$8 billion worth of cuts, such as the current account deficit. These cuts are coming no matter what, because the Liberal Party wants to make them for ideological reasons, and it wants to do it now when the Federal Government is furthest away from an election and in the post-election honeymoon mode.

During the election campaign John Howard's essential promise was that the Liberal Government would not hurt anyone: we would all be 'comfortable and relaxed' under a Federal Liberal Government. He promised to maintain all the Liberal Party's old enemies—from Medicare to the ABC. The defence budget was specifically quarantined from any cuts. A couple of weeks ago, the economic editor of the *Age*, Tim Colebatch, wrote:

Only \$12 billion of the \$130 billion the Commonwealth spent last year goes on its own non-defence expenditure. To save \$4 billion here would mean cutting one-third of the leanest bureaucracies in the western world. It is not possible. The Commonwealth's job is giving money away: \$44 billion in individual benefits, \$31 billion to State Governments and institutions, \$13 billion to off-budget agencies, \$10 billion in interest payments. That is why. . . programs must be cut. . . You can't get where these guys want to go any other way.

The Liberal Government has now spent a couple of months working on its expenditure cutting exercise. If it did not know already, it now knows that if it is to cut \$8 billion from Commonwealth expenditures it will hit more than a few political landmines. Even in the Liberal Party's state of postelection euphoria in Canberra, let us not assume that their political guard is down to minimise the political damage to themselves. They will attempt to avoid as much as possible cutting Commonwealth spending on the Commonwealth's programs. To protect its own programs Canberra will have to make heavy cuts to the financial assistance grants or specific purpose payments made by the Commonwealth to the State Governments—probably both.

For States such as South Australia, which rely on the Commonwealth for 55 per cent of their revenue, the financial consequences will be serious. Our Premier obviously concurs in this strategy, because he has made no protest and has parroted his Federal Party's rhetoric in an attempt to obfuscate on what is a very obvious ideological agenda. On 19 March this year the Premier told this House how prior to the Federal election John Howard had provided 'a commitment to me and to the other State Premiers that he would give a guaranteed share of the total economy to State Governments'. That is totally inconsistent with reducing net Commonwealth outlays by \$8 billion, unless, of course, Mr Howard plans to cut the States' share of the total economy. That means cutting the real level of financial assistance grants.

But the Premier of this State told the House that 'John Howard has given a commitment to reduce the tied grants in percentage terms to the States'. That is easy to achieve if the Prime Minister wishes to cut them. I presume that the Premier is not a fool and understands the implications of the Prime Minister's statements to him in the context of \$8 billion worth of cuts. If he says later that he was given assurances by the Prime Minister that have been broken, he should not be believed. In April, the Premier visited Canberra to see the Prime Minister. In contrast to all his predecessors, from Playford to Arnold, he did not plead South Australia's case. He gave the Prime Minister advice on how to cut Commonwealth expenditure. The Premier told John Howard to cut the Commonwealth Public Service as hard as the States had cut theirs.

The Premier was quite explicit. He told the Liberal Prime Minister to cut 30 000 jobs, even though many of them would come from South Australia. He did that because he wanted to be seen advocating cuts which would not affect his own State budget. The Premier then convened a meeting in Adelaide of State and Territory heads of Government. Together they put together a submission to the Howard Liberal Government's Audit Commission, which, of course, covered the usual State-Federal financial relations issues, such as:

vertical fiscal imbalance, providing no scope for reducing Commonwealth without increasing State taxes;

 the decline in grants to the States over the past decade, resolution of which to the States' satisfaction would involve increasing Commonwealth outlays;

• the increasing proportion of Commonwealth grants, which have been tied, reversing this trend being easy and attractive to Canberra, as it requires cutting only specific purpose payments, and in this State it has \$1.6 billion worth to choose from; • overlap and duplication, which involve the cost of administering specific purpose payments, which the Commonwealth Department of Finance estimated costs only \$60 million for the whole of Australia—that is an easy saving if all grants are untied, but it does not contribute much to Mr Howard's \$8 billion;

• the potential to improve coordination, effective mechanisms being likely to add to the administrative costs, not produce savings; and

• the increase in the size of total spending on the Commonwealth's own programs.

Let me just say tonight in this budget reply that it would be a triumph of hope over experience for Canberra to make a huge adjustment to its spending without a heavy proportion of that burden falling on the States. At no time has the Premier or any of his Liberal or National Party State and Territory counterparts critically examined the need for that \$8 billion in cuts, even though it is obvious that they will impact severely on the States. In all his comments since the Federal election, the Premier has accepted the \$8 billion cuts rationale. Not once has the Premier of South Australia even suggested that the need for them should be examined.

It is the State Liberal Government's position that it supports the \$8 billion worth of John Howard cuts. In his budget speech, the Treasurer said:

As Treasurer of South Australia, I had to lead the process of budgetary adjustment in this State, and I call upon the Commonwealth to put its own house in order, just as we have done.

The position of the State Opposition is that the \$8 billion worth of cuts is not necessary. This will be a fundamental difference between us and the Brown Liberal Government, which supports them. State-Federal relations are about to replace the State Bank as the No.1 financial issue facing South Australia's future. Canberra's policies are being driven by ideology rather than rational analysis. They are being urged on by the Premier and his Treasurer. It is the same ideology of small government that drives the Brown Liberal Government in South Australia. It is the same Liberal Party; it is the same ideology.

South Australia is about to pay dearly for the policies of John Howard and Peter Costello, and it is vital for this Parliament, including Mr Howard's cheer squad within it, to understand the pointlessness of the pain they are about to inflict on the nation and South Australia. The new Howard Government has manufactured a fiscal crisis which is being handled in a way calculated to create real problems for the States in terms of their own budgets. Hardest hit will be States like South Australia with a high dependency on Commonwealth funding, which will be cut by the Howard Government as the politically easiest means of meeting the Government's fiscal targets. The Howard Government will have to slash like fury expenditures, activities and jobs in order to find \$8 billion of savings for the August budget. That \$8 billion is no small number; it is equivalent to 12/3¢ in every dollar of Australian activity. It is half the historic average annual growth in Australian output, and it takes away more than 40 per cent of the demand growth needed to sustain next year's potential GDP growth.

This means that the pain will be felt not just in relation to the State and Commonwealth budgets but at the cost of a significant reduction in economic growth. I suppose the Liberal Party will try to tell the public that they should blame that on the Labor Party as well. Slower growth would stand in contrast with the Reserve Bank Governor's view that 4 per cent growth is potentially attainable at the turn of the century and a similar view of 4 per cent plus growth expressed by one of Australia's leading business associations, the Metal Trades Industry Association. If this period of straight-jacketed growth occurs, just like the last time a Coalition Government took over the national reins, it will be only at the cost of a continuing steady upward climb in the unemployment rate since with the better productivity growth on record in the 1990s a growth rate of about 3.25 per cent is needed annually just to stabilise unemployment.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that we may be looking at a year 2000 national unemployment rate of about 10 per cent in contrast with the previous Federal Labor Government's target of 5 per cent by that year. Small wonder that Prime Minister Howard says that he does not believe in setting targets for jobs. There is a need for ongoing caution in the conduct of fiscal policy, but one that is both sensible to our requirements and sensitive to the economic circumstances which do not currently include a Federal budgetary crisis. The orgy of cutting about to be visited on the Commonwealth budget will be justified on the grounds of the need to improve national savings and to address our current account problem. I support the thrust towards surplus rather than deficit in the national budget as important to our national saving needs and alleviating our current account problems, but national savings problems are medium-term in nature for which medium-term solutions are appropriate.

Mr BRINDAL: My point of order is relevance. I am quite sure that this is interesting, but it is not addressing the current Bill before the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members were advised by the Chair at the outset of the debate that very close relevance to the subject matter was necessary. I understand the member for Unley's point of order. I have been listening to the Leader. He is linking the impact of a future Federal Government budget to that of the present State Government and, as such, I take the comparison to be of importance. I ask the Leader though to adhere to the subject matter.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. It is extraordinary that the member for Unley does not realise that 55 per cent of the State's budget comes from Commonwealth revenue. That is why members opposite have got themselves in the position that they have with the State budget being totally contingent on Federal increases which he knows are not happening. The member for Unley gets his fingerprints taken to make sure that he spends his time running around and putting up dirt sheets against fellow members. Obviously, that is why he is getting himself involved in pre-selection problems.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is obviously not relevant.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There is no pressing current account deficit crisis at the moment—there never is when the economy is slow, nor will there be while the economy is kept under chloroform. Our wholesalers in Australia do not import things we cannot sell. Any government can avoid a current account problem with a recession, but I fear that this is where the policies of the new Government in Canberra egged on by the likes of the Brown Government in South Australia are leading us. The purpose of mobilising both private and public saving is that when there is a major upturn in investment we can finance it with our own savings and with much less recourse to foreign capital. It is a problem for the next boom, not the current period of sustained growth. In any event, the Liberal fiscal strategy of starting with the goal of a surplus come what may and then slashing furiously to obtain it is curious policy. When the economy is travelling well, the budget deficit is lower and the extent of cutting indicated is less; but when the economy weakens, the deficit increases and the amount of cutting required is increased.

It is a rule of thumb in Commonwealth public financing that, for every one percentage point lower or higher in the economy's growth, the Commonwealth budget bottom line is 1.5 percentage points worse or better. It does not make much sense to adopt a fiscal policy which only requires little action when the economy is overheating but requires withdrawing stimulus when it is travelling more slowly. With a budget forecasting slower growth for South Australia than the national average over the next year, the damage which will be caused by the Liberal's fiscal policy will hit harder in this State.

For the Federal Liberal Party, this strategy simultaneously affords the political convenience of proximity to the previous Government and distance from the next Federal election. That, rather than economic circumstances, is determining the Howard Government's course. The State Liberals here in South Australia agree with that program. They wrongly believe that, in supporting it, they may be able to blame it on the previous Federal Labor Government, but if the political heat gets too great, the Government will blame Canberra and John Howard. Always blame someone else—that is the hallmark of his premiership. He blames the former State Labor Government; he blames the Keating Government; next he will be blaming the Howard Government. This Premier—

Mr Clarke: He blames Brindal for-

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is right. Just as privately, to business leaders and others, he blames his colleagues for his own deficiencies. The Premier's State Treasurer took out some political insurance in that area on Friday morning at his budget breakfast. The previous day the Premier said that his budget's integrity would not be affected by what John Howard did. But this is what his own State Treasurer said the next day:

We are not going to take any rubbish from Canberra. They are not going to pass their problems down the line ... [and] I don't wait for someone to kick me in the head.

You could hear Peter Costello shaking in his boots, with the thought of this toothless rabbit coming at him. It is pathetic! These comments were an admission that the Federal Liberal budget will cut State funding and the budget delivered last week by the Brown Government is a phoney.

The shape of the coming Howard cuts is as disturbing as their size. When productivity growth has finally been restored to good levels, this is not the time to be slashing training expenditure. When South Australia's educational retention rates have fallen below the national average, this is not the time to be slashing education funding. When manufactured exports have grown at sparkling levels for a decade, but business is suddenly faced with a less competitive exchange rate, this is not the time to be slashing export assistance. When productivity sustaining investment is finally recovering from a long slump, this is not the time to hack into infrastructure spending. When the investment in the human capital of our long-term unemployed potential workers is finally paying off with a virtual halving of the proportion of long-term unemployed over the past two years, this is not the time to neglect them.

When what is needed is to lift national savings to provide sufficient investment for good growth, this is not the time to be contemplating cutting both human and physical investment to fit the available but inadequate savings. When manufacturing prospects are caught in a series of short-term vices, this is not the time for the Premier of a manufacturing State like South Australia to be egging on the proponents of these policies. Yet courtesy, not just of John Howard and Peter Costello, but also of the urgings of our Premier and the Treasurer on the sidelines, these are exactly the woeful circumstances about to be visited on South Australians.

But even before these Howard cuts come to pass, the Premier and the Treasurer have delivered in their third budget a continuation of their assault on public schools, public health and community safety. Has the Premier at any time challenged John Howard and Peter Costello on the supposed need for the \$8 billion Commonwealth cuts? Never; not once. There is no record of it. He has swallowed the line totally hook, line and sinker. When asked about the issue in Parliament, he has accepted the claim that the \$8 billion cuts are needed.

This third budget of the Brown Liberals continues the Government's attack on the basic infrastructure of a truly caring Government in South Australia. The budget continues the Government's ideological attack on public schools and hospitals in this State. The harder edges of that attack, evident in earlier budgets, have been softened just a little for public consumption and for public relations purposes; but, political opportunism aside, this budget continues the attack. The Government wants South Australians to believe that it is a caring budget after all the broken promises to increase funding for schools and maintain class sizes, to increase funding for law and order and public safety, and to not go beyond the previous Government's target for public sector work force reductions of 3 900.

The Premier and his Treasurer want South Australians to forget all of that. They want South Australians to forget that, even after this caring budget, funding for schools is still \$45 million down in real terms from two years ago, and our year 12 retention rates, once the best in the country, have fallen from 92 per cent to 71 per cent. They want South Australians to forget that, even after this so-called caring budget, funding for hospitals is down \$78 million in real terms, despite the fact that the previous Labor Commonwealth Government increased hospital funding by \$62 million over the past two years. This year the Brown budget forecasts a further increase in Commonwealth funding of \$19 million, excluding the transfer of the Daws Road Repatriation Hospital from the Commonwealth to the State.

Let us look at schools. While the Premier and the Treasurer have attempted to con South Australians into believing the public education budget will be \$60 million better off, they have simply proved how cynical they are. For a start, the budget glossies, paid for by the taxpayer, do not mention that the \$60 million is a nominal figure taking no account for inflation. That is what the Premier thinks of the public of this State; that is what he thinks about the public's interest in schools. The increase in recurrent spending is \$47 million and presupposes an increase in Commonwealth grants. After inflation the real increase is \$2 million, not \$60 million, and does not address the cuts of \$47 million over the previous two years. Education is one of the areas most vulnerable to cuts by the Howard Liberal Government. This year's budget is based on increased grants from \$125.9 million last year to \$128.2 million this year.

Questions remain as to what will be cut if the Prime Minister keeps his promise to cut \$8 billion from the Commonwealth budget. Will the Government continue to get rid of teachers to make up the difference? Will our year 12 retention rates, once the best in the country, continue their disastrous fall under this Government? Will curriculum choices continue to be narrow? Will there be more school closures over the next year? The Premier's glossy on the health and education budget claims that the Government was spending more than \$100 million for new schools redevelopment, for maintenance and for other capital projects.

The increase in capital works is \$14 million, and this compares with the shortfall in spending in 1994-95 of \$22 million, and a further shortfall of \$2.7 million in 1995-96. But the Premier also failed to point out that almost a quarter of this is the re-announcement of projects on the Schools Building Program that should have been started over a year ago. No less than 14 of the supposedly 'new' schools were announced in last year's budget and should have been commenced then. Two of those 14 schools have been announced now in all three Brown Government budgets and should have been finished some time ago.

But as ever with this budget, the fundamental savagery of its assault on education will be seen when John Howard and Peter Costello give us their August budget. Even the paltry \$2.3 million real increase to the education recurrent budget, trumpeted by the Premier, is wholly dependent on the Howard Liberal Government increasing its contribution to South Australia's schools. No-one could seriously believe that.

The fact is that the Commonwealth contributed nearly \$126 million to South Australian schools this year; that is over 11 per cent of total recurrent payments by the Minister for Education. Any cut to these payments by John Howard will see even the claim of a mere \$2.3 million real increase vanish. After three years under the knife of the Brown Liberals, and even before the full consequences of John Howard are felt, South Australia's public education system is in danger of becoming second rate. You cannot be the smart State in the clever country if you slash education; you cannot be the smart State in the clever country if you lie to the people about increases that do not and will not happen.

I turn now to hospitals. The Premier's claims to have boosted hospital funding are nonsense. Total expenditure on health is up \$69 million from \$1.413 billion to \$1.482 billion and presupposes Commonwealth grants will increase by \$19 million excluding funding relating to the transfer of the Daws Road Hospital from the Commonwealth to the State. The State appropriation has increased by \$17.7 million from \$632.2 million in 1995-96 to \$649.9 million in 1996-97 and includes \$7.5 million from the pokies super tax. After inflation, the State increase is a mere \$1.3 million in real terms and does not address the cuts of \$79 million made in the State's health budget over the previous two years.

Nowhere is South Australia more vulnerable to the impact of cuts by John Howard than in the provision of health services. This year the Brown Government has budgeted for \$650 million from the Commonwealth. This is what the Treasurer said about his phoney budget:

If the Federal Government walks away from programs, we are not staying in those programs. It is on their head not ours.

That is what he said on ABC Radio on 31 May 1996 already planning 'The blame John Howard later' strategy. It will land on the heads of ordinary South Australians first and hardest, and the Treasurer knows it. South Australia's hospitals are firmly in the Commonwealth's firing line. Should the Prime Minister's promised \$8 billion in cuts flow into the health budget, what will go? Will there be more ward closures at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Will more nurses go? Will there be further cuts to the mental health programs?

In 1995-96, the mental health budget was underspent by \$4.8 million; in 1996-97 the budget has been further reduced by \$586 000, making a total cut of \$5.4 million. It will be some time before the budgets for individual hospitals and health units become available to the Opposition, but it is clear that many units in the country and in the metropolitan area have already cut services in order to meet budgetary targets set by the Brown Government.

At the same time, the Government has embarked upon programs of further privatisation by calling for submissions for the redevelopment and management of the QEH. This is despite the evidence that the Modbury Hospital privatisation has not delivered any of its promised savings, that its waiting lists have blown out, and that its operators want to renegotiate the contract because it is not delivering the rewards they had hoped for.

Let us look at the police. Recurrent funding of the Police Department has been cut by more than \$3 million in real terms. This equates to the salaries of about 60 police officers and continues the Brown Government's hypocritical approach of talking big on law and order while at the same time slashing the resources required to combat crime. The Police Department's capital budget has also been cut by \$4.6 million in real terms, but the problem is compounded because the 1995-96 capital budget has been underspent by more than \$12 million. We have a Government that is planning for an extra 25 per cent increase in the revenue from fines; a Government that at the weekend announced an extra 100 radar guns to provide revenue as tax collectors for the State Treasurer. The fact is that the money is not being ploughed back into law order: there is a cut to police and there is a cut to both the recurrent and capital works budgets of the Police Department.

Let us look at Correctional Services and the \$379 000 increase in recurrent payments from \$72.7 million to \$73.1 million, equating to a cut of \$1.8 million in real terms. If this is the Brown Government's response to prison riots and dangerous situations caused by under-staffing, then it may be inviting continuing problems in the prison service. I urge the Premier tonight to rethink his level of funding to our prisons before we are again faced with tragic circumstances. Here is an area where there should be a need for bipartisanship. Let us see the Premier step in to restore funding to this critically important area.

Let us look at TAFE and youth unemployment. In the area of TAFE, the fingers crossed approach by the Brown Government becomes completely transparent. The Government has budgeted for receipts from the Commonwealth to rise by \$9.5 million. This is right at the time when the Howard Liberal Government and, in particular, the hapless Senator Amanda Vanstone are under heavy attack from education and welfare groups for contemplating massive cuts to education and training programs. These cuts will include DEET and TAFE programs which assist the unemployed, particularly our young unemployed.

What message will this give our young people? South Australia now has the highest unemployment rate of any mainland State. Our youth unemployment has been the highest of any State and remains above the national average. Our school retention rate has fallen massively from the highest in the nation under Labor to below the national rate. When the Liberals cut education and employment programs,
it is our young people who will bleed. Premier Brown, rather than sooling on the Howard Government to make cuts, should be leaving no stone unturned to make sure that the Canberra cuts do not proceed. Otherwise, South Australia will be facing increasing youth unemployment levels and will be condemning hundreds, if not thousands, of young people to a life without the full range of education and training opportunities and ultimately life without a job.

If we leave Commonwealth funding out of the equation, we find that the Brown Liberal Government has reduced recurrent funding to TAFE by \$11.5 million in real terms. If the Commonwealth falls out of the ANTA agreement—the agreement which I negotiated on behalf of South Australia in 1991-92 and which brings tens of millions of dollars extra to TAFE in South Australia per year—the TAFE budget will be in real trouble with another \$7 million in jeopardy.

Let us look at some of the other economic consequences of this Government's actions. The third Brown budget provides further confirmation, if any were needed, that South Australia's economy is languishing under the Liberals. The Liberals have put South Australia into a low growth, high unemployment rut. Moreover, the Brown Government has the singular distinction of having done so during a period when the Australian economy was growing at its fastest for 20 years.

The Opposition was pleased to note some of the latest improvements in our growth figures after a disastrous 1994. No-one was more pleased than I to note the belated improvement in our recorded economic performance when the Bureau of Statistics brought out its estimates for our growth for the 1995 calendar year. But, quite simply, this latest spurt provides no basis for optimism, much less the Premier's constant self congratulation. The latest ABS figures show us essentially what the Opposition predicted: that is, South Australia went backwards in 1994 and has entered the national recovery late, that we would see a late upturn corresponding to the position of other States earlier in the economic cycle and, with the national economy now slowing, we are likely to see a progressive deterioration in South Australia's position.

Now that the national economy is slowing, South Australia's recovery could be stopped dead in its tracks, particularly now that Mr Howard and Mr Costello have embarked on a policy which not only makes the third Brown budget a complete phoney but which will also stunt our potential growth rate and deprive hundreds and thousands of Australians of the opportunity for work over the coming years.

What did the latest figures show about the South Australian economy? They showed that, in trend terms (and I am happy to explain 'trend terms' to members opposite), South Australia finally caught up to the national rate of growth for 1995. Over 1995, the ABS estimates that South Australia grew by 3.3 per cent—at last. The ABS shows that, despite this belated improvement, we have been under performing under the Brown Liberals. During the first two years of the Brown Liberal Government, South Australia grew by a trifling 2.9 per cent, while Australia as a whole zoomed past us with a growth rate of 8.8 per cent for the two years. Of course, the seasonally adjusted estimate of our growth over 1995 was much higher at 4.9 per cent. It was on this basis that the Premier, as reported in the *Advertiser* on Anzac Day of this year, claimed:

South Australia was 'leading the way' in economic growth.

But did the Premier bother to examine the ABS's previous estimates for our performance over 1994 and 1995? Clearly not. If he had, he would have seen that in the seasonally adjusted series for each and every one of the seven quarters prior to the latest December quarter the estimates for growth during the first 21 months of his premiership have been revised downward.

Even when we take the more reliable trend estimates (which, I repeat, bring us up only to the estimate for the nation's growth during 1995) what do we see? We see that, for the first seven quarters of the Brown Liberals the ABS has radically revised its estimate for South Australia's growth. In all but one of these quarters, the ABS has revised downwards its estimate for South Australia's growth. The latest ABS estimates show that South Australia actually went backwards in trend terms in 1994. In that year, South Australia's growth performance was the worst in the country, as we went backwards by .4 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay, I can hear the member for Unley, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and the member for Goyder asking, 'What about under Labor in the recession times?'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You listen to me, and you listen good. In 1994, South Australia, under the Liberals, went backwards by .4 per cent. In Labor's last year in office, the South Australian economy grew by 4.3 per cent. So, the figure was 4.3 per cent under us and minus .4 per cent under the Liberals. It is useful to remind ourselves just what this Premier was telling South Australians during 1994—at a time when there was, in his own estimate, zero per cent in the budget estimate and when the ABS was saying that we had minus .4 per cent growth. This is what the Premier was then telling us through the *Advertiser*, the Parliament, and so on. He said:

Things are looking so good we've had a huge jump in the number of people pouring back into the job market.

Today he is saying that we have a crisis, and that we have to populate or perish. In 1994, he said:

I said we'd aim for 4 per cent annual employment growth—and we've actually exceeded that at 4.5 per cent—and that's ahead of a 3.9 per cent national figure.

The Premier said that our employment was growing at 4.9 per cent in 1994: we were growing at minus .4 per cent. Someone should replace his five PR officers on his staff with a couple of economists. This is what he said:

We had the worst forecasts of any State 12 months ago. Now we're out there with closer to the best—and they started their recovery before us. We've had, without a doubt, the biggest turnaround in our economy of any State in Australia.

That was his address to BOMA on 13 December 1994. He said that we were leading the charge, but it was minus .4 per cent. Let me remind you: this was when the South Australian trend growth rate was at minus .4 per cent and when the national trend growth was 5.5 per cent. Only this Premier, in his own mind, believes that minus .4 per cent equates to better than a national growth rate of 5.5 per cent. Not only is this budget phoney but so is the Premier who leads this State in his pronouncements.

In responding to the new figures, the Premier was no less fulsome in his praise of himself. That is what he is best at congratulating himself. The late improvement in our economic performance was, according to the Premier, 'exactly what we promised our strategy ... would achieve'. He said, 'Importantly, this growth is coming from private sector investment rather than Government spending.' That was in the *Advertiser* of 25 April 1995. Every year on Anzac Day, the Premier makes these pronouncements and every following year he gets caught out—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You listen to me. I have got unlimited time, so you keep talking, Sunshine. Come on, keep talking. Get it out of your system.

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

Mr Brindal: He called him 'Sunshine'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps the Leader sees a little bit of sunshine in the member for Goyder, as we all do.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Premier—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am determined to be heard on this. The Premier was again comprehensively wrong. The reality is that private sector investment fell disastrously during 1995. During 1995, private investment fell by more than 31 per cent in seasonally adjusted terms and by nearly 25 per cent in trend terms. How this is evidence of the success of the Brown Government's policies only the Premier could say. After all, we were going all the way.

The reason for the late spurt in growth in South Australia, apart from the welcome improvements in exports and the rural recovery, was growth in private consumption expenditure. South Australia had the highest rise in private final consumption of any State in Australia, being 5.3 per cent seasonally adjusted. That recent belated improvement in our growth is vulnerable precisely because it is based heavily on increased private consumption. That growth is particularly vulnerable to the \$8 billion in Commonwealth budget cuts that the Premier and his Treasurer have been urging the Howard Government to make.

The position in the labour market is also worrying. Since December 1993 the Australian labour market has grown by over 6 per cent. In South Australia the growth has been around half that. More worrying still has been the loss of 10 000 full-time jobs from the South Australian economy over the first four months of 1996. Our State accounted for 80 per cent of the entire loss of full-time jobs across Australia over this period. We have seen a recent slide in retail sales and the loss of much-needed jobs in the retail industry. The Premier used the occasion of the release of the ABS growth figures to point to 'thousands of new jobs created in the manufacturing area,' while the head of the Premier's SA Development Council (Dr Blandy) said 'the large growth rate had also helped the State reduce its unemployment rate'. The truth of the matter is that there was almost no net increase in jobs seasonally adjusted in the six months to December 1995. In trend terms there was actually a loss of jobs in that period.

Let us look at the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, which used to be the shining castle of light for the Liberals opposite—the fountain of all truth. The conservative Centre for Economic Studies was correct to state in its latest briefing:

The fact that our State's smoothed seasonally adjusted unemployment rate is currently half a percentage point below its level of June quarter 1995 is a reflection of a substantial reduction in the labour force participation rate... and not of employment growth over that period.

I repeat: 'and not of employment growth over that period'.

An honourable member interjecting: **The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It continues:

If South Australia's participation rate in February 1996 had been at the June quarter average of 62 per cent (instead of the recorded 61.6 per cent), South Australia's recorded employment level would have left our smoothed seasonally adjusted unemployment rate at 10 per cent.

The member for Unley says, 'This is boring.' He describes as boring an unemployment rate of 10 per cent. The claim of thousands of new manufacturing jobs also bears no scrutiny. The DEET quarterly survey shows South Australian manufacturing employment has been falling since June 1995. Over the September and December quarters, manufacturing employment, as measured by DEET, fell by 1.8 per cent in this State.

On ABC radio on the morning after the budget the Premier was still congratulating himself for his economic miracle. He never congratulates the Minister for Industry and Minister for Infrastructure who, we all know, would be doing a better job and would never be going around taking fingerprints of members opposite. On ABC radio the Premier said:

Within two years of being elected we've produced the highest economic growth rate of any State in Australia and they're facts you just can't refute.

This is what the Premier said. But the paradox in all this selfcongratulation by the Premier is that he need have gone no further than his own budget papers to see the real position. Presumably, the Premier would not say of the Treasury that it is a pawn of the Labor Opposition 'pedalling lies' and 'continually talk[ing] down the economic prospects for South Australia', as he said in the *Advertiser* on Anzac Day 1996 the very terms he used to describe people who disagree with him on the state of our economy. Yet it is this Government's own Financial Paper No.1 of last week's budget which shows precisely that this is a budget which will confine South Australia to a lower growth performance than the national economy and which will see our State caught in a low growth, high unemployment rut.

The key economic assumption of the budget is that South Australia will grow at a pathetic 2.75 per cent over 1996-97, a full half of a percentage point below the last Treasury forecast for the national economy. It projects a continuation of this under-performance compared with the national economy. For 1997-98 and 1998-99, the Treasury predicts growth rates that are a full half percentage point below Australia's. What does the Treasury say about growth during 1994-95, the period in which the Premier claimed we were leading the nation? It estimates our growth over 1994-95 to have been zero, that is, no growth at all and the worst performance in the entire country. The Premier is out there saying, 'We are leading the charge; we have the best economic growth and the best employment growth in the country,' but his own budget papers say that it was the worst performance in the country. It was zero per cent growth over the time that the Premier said we were leading the economic charge. The growth projected-

Mr Condous: It was .4 per cent.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It was minus .4 per cent. Steve, you have to look at the minus before it. Minus means going backwards, not forwards. Stay out of the economy; you were not good at it when you were mayor. The growth projected for this coming financial year gives South Australia an anticipated rate of growth in employment of just 1 per cent. This is nowhere near enough to prevent an increase in the level of unemployment over the next year. This is the Brown Liberals' present to South Australia after 2¹/₂ years of cuts to essential social infrastructure—higher unemployment in the State that already has the highest mainland rate of unemployment.

While the Premier is at it, perhaps he needs to sort out his Treasurer who, only last Friday at a breakfast hosted by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, repeated the heresy that South Australia was expected to grow at rates well below the national average in this and coming years, out to the turn of the century. He said that we cannot expect to grow at rates equal to or better than the national economy and he expected no dramatic improvement over the next three or so years. So, we have the Premier saying we are going gang busters but the rest of the world saying we are going nowhere at all: even his own Treasurer, even his own Treasury and even his own budget refutes the Premier's PR line.

Instead of wasting the money of this State on piffle like 'Going all the way', all this self-promotion, all these picture opportunities and all this denial of the work of the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Minister for Infrastructure, it is time that reality and hype collided in the interests of South Australia. The Brown Government has declared that it has broken the back of State debt, and in doing so it has run out of alibis and excuses. The imagination of the Premier and Treasurer knew nearly no bounds in at least one area—finding others to blame.

When there was a Federal Labor Government the Premier complained that this State could not go forward until the Commonwealth budget was slashed and it could not go forward without a change of Government federally. With the election of the Howard Government, the Premier and Treasurer are about to get their way. Since the Federal election they have comprehensively sold out South Australia's interests to John Howard and Peter Costello. Having done so, they have brought down a phoney State budget with a maximum shelf life of a few months. In a very short time the people of South Australia will be in absolutely no doubt about the Brown Government's agenda.

In conclusion, the Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot say that it has a budget based on increases in funding from the Federal Government to the State and at the same time beetle off to Canberra and say to John Howard, 'Go ahead, make my day. Cut deeply; make it 10 per cent; do as I do,' and so on. The two things do not equate. We cannot invite retribution on South Australia on the one hand and then frame the budget dependent totally on increases from the Howard Government—increases that even the Premier, with his own self-delusions and self-congratulations, knows cannot occur. That budget last week has across it, 'Wait until time to blame John Howard later.' That is what it was all about—a total fraud on the people of this State.

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Shakespeare was a fine practitioner of his craft, but I did not realise that he was prescient. It must have been the Leader of the Opposition about whom he was thinking when he wrote these words:

It is a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury signifying nothing.

I can think of few words which better sum up the main contribution of Magic Mike opposite. We have had David Copperfield: now we have Magic Mike. Some of what the Leader of the Opposition said tonight really had to stretch the credibility of every South Australian. We are digging ourselves out of a hole, we are going forward rather more slowly than anyone in this Chamber would like, but what the Leader forgets is who dug the hole, who created the mess and who betrayed the trust of the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: What members opposite absolutely— *Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any further interjections. The member for Unley has the call.

Mr BRINDAL: What members opposite absolutely fail to realise is that this Government is not the only agency in the economy. If people in businesses are hurting, if they are not buying like they should, if they are rather cautious with their money, it is because the former Government in this Chamber betrayed the trust of the people of South Australia.

Do you blame them for being cynical about all politicians? Do you blame them for wondering whether they should spend money and whether they should hire more people in their business when time and again Mr Teflon, Mr 78 per cent, told us that it was all right and that everything was fine in this State? He led us over not one but several precipices. We had Magic Mike, that guru, that 100 per cent in hindsight visionary of State economics, who turned around. Not only did we suffer the State Bank, but we had Myer-Remm as a little catastrophe, a little sort of interregnum. We had State Bank; we had SGIC; and we had any number of other catastrophes. As they told us, everything would be all right. So, spare me and any intelligent person in this State—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Elizabeth are out of order. I do not want to speak to them again.

Mr BRINDAL: The Deputy Leader asks whether we take any responsibility at all. I think I can speak as at least one person who was in this Chamber at the time. I certainly wish—as I am sure do all members who were on the Opposition side—that we had known and understood more about what was happening before it was allowed to happen. But we, as were many fairly decent members on the Government benches at the time, were kept in the dark. We in this place were all hoodwinked. Yes, I take some responsibility. I know that some of my colleagues do as well. We wish that we had known more. I am sure that, along with other members who were on the backbenches on this side at that time, we would have all done our best to expose it and save the State. I do not think anyone in this State takes any pleasure from \$7 billion that we might as well have flushed down the toilet.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Go and talk to Bob Francis; you would do rather better there than you do here. We listened to a heap of drivel. The Leader of the Opposition talked about cuts in education. He talked about moving forward slowly. He talked about .4 per cent as opposed to about a 4 per cent forward—

Mr Condous: He was the biggest supporter of Tim Marcus Clark.

Mr BRINDAL: Not only that, but ask anyone in the private housing sector—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. **Mr BRINDAL:** Ask anyone in the private housing sector—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have had enough interjections. If the Deputy Leader and the member for Colton want to have a discussion I suggest that they do it in the lobby.

Mr BRINDAL: Ask anyone in the private housing sector how that lot opposite robbed Allan to pay Delfin; how they artificially stimulated the private housing sector to the point where there is a huge hole that no-one knows how we will get out of. This occurred just because John Bannon wanted it to look as though this State was surging forward. They used every trick in the book to encourage an oversupply, an overdevelopment, and now this State suffers because they were more worried about getting to the next election than about good, sound development for South Australia.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I can assure the Deputy Leader that I am not sweating at the moment. Whether I last to the end of this term or another five terms, at least I will have done my job as honestly as I can. For the Deputy Leader's sake I sincerely trust that when he leaves here he can say the same. I know that there are some members opposite, as there are on this side, who do not take much pleasure from what happened with the last Government. The Deputy Leader had best do well to remember that, at the end of the day, whether he is here 26 years, such as the Speaker, or eight years, or some combination in the middle, he will be judged on his record and on what he did, and he will not be able to keep hiding behind the rhetoric of whoever may be his Leader for the current few months.

He chortles about unpredictability on this side of the House. This side of the House has not even started to comment on what might be happening over there, because we are not as silly as the Deputy Leader might think. We pick up a few signs too. We believe that the Deputy Leader might indeed have his knife sharpened, but we could not say for whom.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No; the name doesn't escape me. After all, it can only—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: We have only the Deputy Leader's word that he comes in here and does not push—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to speak to the Deputy Leader again. Members may think it is funny; he has been spoken to for the last time.

Mr BRINDAL: In the Leader of the Opposition we have a true indication of what he will do when he leaves politics. He is obviously planning to set up as Nostradamus. He has the gift of prophecy; he can look into the future and divine not only the future of South Australia but also the mind of the Prime Minister and the Treasurer of Australia. Before anybody else knows, he can announce to this Parliament not only the exact size but also the shape and nature of Federal Government cuts.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: He may be; if he is correct we will all have to come in here and—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence says 'sackcloth'; it will not be. I can assure him that it will be a TV spectacular: Nostradamus rides again! There he is, Magic Mike and the mirrors, predicting every Government move.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. This is the fourth time in his contribution here the that member for Unley has referred to the Leader of the Opposition as 'Magic Mike'. I ask that he desist.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! During the Leader of the Opposition's contribution he made some jocular, light-hearted comments in relation to the member for Goyder.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is aware that he should refer to members by their district or title. I would suggest to him that his comments have gone far enough in this vein, and I think that it would be best if he concentrated on directing his comments to the Appropriation Bill. He has not been assisted, however, by the constant stream of interjections. Therefore, I remind members that they ought to cease interjecting or they may be the victims of Standing Order 137.

Mr BRINDAL: I thank you for your guidance, Sir, but in referring to the Leader of the Opposition's contribution it is necessary to expose some of his rank hypocrisy and the position of hypocrisy from which he criticises this current Government. He talked about a possible shortfall in education—predicated, mind you, on his magical understanding of the Prime Minister's mind—from \$128 million down to \$125 million. There would not be a member of this House who was not insensitive to the fact that the education budget in South Australia is about \$1 billion. So, he divines a possible shortfall of \$3 million in \$1 billion and tries to promote this as some catastrophic occurrence that we should have built into the budget.

I ask members opposite how anybody can budget against a likely catastrophe. I do not know any Government that is so flush with money and hollow logs that it can salt all this money away just in case the Federal Government decides to do something that the Opposition is determined it will do because the Opposition has nowhere to go if it does not. Speech after speech by members opposite was not addressed to what the Treasurer introduced in his budget. Basically, they said no more and no less than that this budget will not work, it is cobbled up, it is really an apology, and you will blame Howard later. Well, if that is the best they can come up with, we should give them a few free weeks off, let them study the thing and make a reasonable contribution in this Chamber instead of keeping us here until all hours of the night with inane stupidity. If they want to predict what the Prime Minister-

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, I would prefer anything other than stupidity from the member for Spence. If you would like to concentrate on this budget and the accomplishments of this Government, everyone here would be pleased. This is exactly the same Leader who talked about a new spirit of cooperation: 'Let's work together for South Australia.' But what do they do? Do they help business confidence, do they help small business? No, they come in here and ring the gloom and doom bell. They do their very best to knock the Premier, the Government and the entire State, because nothing would suit them better than to take over the same ash heap that they left us with when we came into Government. I invite the Opposition to contemplate some numbers. There are 36 members on this side of the House, and there are 11 members over there. None of us will sit by lamely and watch 11 members of the Opposition destroy this State during this term of Government as they destroyed this State during their last term of Government. If you want to come in here and make a positive contribution, do so, you are more than welcome, and we will join you. If you want to come in here and carp and criticise, you as an Opposition should learn—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence is the most pedantic person I know, but he should also understand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL:—that I am quite capable of speaking through you, Sir, and referring to members opposite as 'you' in the collective term.

Mr Atkinson: The plural of 'you' is 'ye'; you should know that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I find it difficult to understand the relevance of the last interjection or the necessity for it. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: The Leader of the Opposition referred to only \$3 million in the \$1 billion education budget. He kept referring to shortfalls. I do not quite understand to which area he is referring. Perhaps a future speaker could explain. The education budget in this State is funded largely from the recurrent expenditure of the State Government. While there are some specific purpose grants, I have to inform—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: How many did the member for Elizabeth say? While there are some tied grants, they are hardly critical to the functioning of the Government. Certainly, they will have an effect, but they will not have this absolutely catastrophic effect that is predicted opposite. I invite the member for Elizabeth or anyone with a background in education to say when the Labor Government even bothered to look at areas—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes. Well, I actually heard the member for Elizabeth, Sir. I know that I should not listen, but the member for Elizabeth said that they all went to school over there. I thought that the member for Elizabeth would realise that that is one of the problems with education: everyone has been to school and everyone thinks they know more about education than the professionals. I would have thought that she would give her profession enough credit not to make such an inane comment, which I think teachers would find insulting.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the retention rate. He claimed that in the day of his Government the retention rate was reduced from 92 to 71 per cent. I will not dispute those figures, but I ask this House what that proves. Perhaps it proves that, when his Party was in Government, there was so little work out there that no-one in year 12 had any choice but to go back and do year 13. Perhaps the fact that the retention rate has dropped suggests that there are more youth in employment now than there were then.

Mr De Laine: No, it doesn't.

Mr BRINDAL: All I am asking the member for Price is exactly what that retention rate proves. With many members on this side, I am all for people staying at school longer, provided in their staying at school there is a positive benefit, both to themselves and to society. I do not believe that staying to year 12 is necessarily any virtue at all unless the education they are getting is relevant, unless it is providing them with greater skills as human beings for when they join the work force. Staying at year 12 for its own sake proves nothing at all. I would rather see a 50 per cent retention rate at year 12 but a greater level of education accruing to those who stay and greater life experiences accruing to those who leave, than stand there and prattle—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Elizabeth says there are no jobs. That is a deplorable situation. Who in this Chamber will stand up and say that is great? None of us. None of us wants to see our young people, our middle aged or old people unable to find employment, but it is a problem which must be worked through. It is a problem which even the member for Elizabeth will acknowledge was not created by this Government or necessarily by her Government. It is an endemic problem that seems to exist in Australian society at present, and this and every other State and the Commonwealth have to work their way through it. We will try, and we are trying.

I do not know anyone who is working much harder than Minister Such or Minister Lucas to address that type of problem. What we seek is the cooperation, not the criticism, of the Opposition. Let us work on this jointly. Let us try to help create jobs. Let us not stand here and argy-bargy, making cheap political points, solely for the purpose of making the Opposition look good. This is a good budget. The Treasurer and the Premier deserve credit for this budget. Even the Leader of the Opposition, in one flash, admitted that we were slightly ahead of the target which the Government set itself upon its election. If nothing else, there is one moment in his speech where he may well have been honest. All I ask is that all members opposite be as honest and try to give credit where credit is due. Sure, they are entitled to criticise where criticism is due, but I have not heard much legitimate criticism from members opposite. I have heard much fabrication. I have not heard much praise where praise is due. The Government deserves credit, and the Government should get credit.

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

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to support this Bill. I would like to give an overview of the budget by saying it takes a very fair and responsible path in addressing the Brown Liberal Government's prime objective of debt reduction, economic growth and delivery of quality and affordable Government services, based on sound, economic reform. The Government continues to deliver responsible economic management to this State, and this budget maintains the Government's four year debt reduction strategy and savings target outlined in its first budget in power in 1994.

The performance of last year's budget clearly indicates that this State Government has continued to successfully control the State debt, and really we are on track for the first budget surplus of approximately \$10 million for 1997-98. The Government has achieved this by eliminating the overspending inherited from the previous Government, a figure of more than \$300 million per year as an annual deficit as a result of totally irresponsible management at the time.

This fair and reasonable budget, after 2½ years of sound financial management, now appropriately will allow for the inclusion of an injection of additional funds into health, education, youth unemployed and community services. This additional spending will facilitate the delivery of valuable community programs and, in so doing, address areas of

identified need which will improve the future prospects of the people of this State, without generally resorting to borrowing to fund the current day-to-day expenditure of this State. Against expenditure increases in health, education and welfare, overall current outlays, I recognise, are expected to decrease in real terms by about 2.3 per cent as the Government implements these reforms in the public sector and gets on with the task of boosting economic development in this State. I understand that the budget papers forecast the net debt to fall to 20.3 per cent of gross State product by the end of this coming financial year, down from a record—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: When we came to power we inherited a public sector debt from the honourable member's mob on the other side of over 28 per cent, and that was only three to four years ago. We cannot forget that we inherited other things as well. We inherited not only the debt but unfunded superannuation was also spiralling out of control.

Mr D.S. Baker: It was \$4.4 billion.

Mr ANDREW: Yes, \$4.4 billion, increasing at something like \$200 million a year. Not only—

Mr D.S. Baker: Absolutely disgraceful!

Mr ANDREW: As the member for MacKillop says, it is disgraceful. Not only did we inherit a cupboard with a bare bone but we inherited a cupboard with a poison bone that was literally degrading everyone in this State who took a sniff of it. This Government's financial strategy will include eliminating that unfunded superannuation by the year 2024, and we are on track to do that because of the economic management produced by this Government over the past 2½ years. I also mention that we will reduce the gross State product of our debt to about 16 per cent by the turn of the century, and I will come to that in a moment.

Asset sales have been a significant factor in the debt reduction strategy. To date, over \$1 600 million of asset sales have been realised, and these funds have gone directly into reducing the State's debt, with an amount of about \$300 million expected for this coming financial year. The Government has made it clear all along that proceeds from the sale of State assets will go towards a reduction of the State debt, and not in an attempt to balance the current expenditure. I congratulate the Treasurer and the Asset Management Task Force on their very successful achievement in these asset sales.

I alluded to public sector debt which is projected to fall to 16 per cent of the gross State product (the lowest on record) and which is in line with Government strategy to achieve an economically competitive State. Another key objective has been for the reduction of the public sector work force, with the five year targeted reduction firmly on track. A reduction of 12 400 full-time equivalent public sector employees will be achieved by the end of five years up to 1997. Additionally, privatisation of Government commercial businesses has resulted in another 1 100 people moving to the private sector. Millions of dollars have been saved through outsourcing of Government services, yet we heard all this claptrap from the Leader of the Opposition tonight—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: The member for Hart is sanctioning the claptrap his Leader presented tonight. The Opposition will not even consider, condone or understand the merits of outsourcing and letting the private sector do the job more efficiently. We have achieved savings with our outsourcing in terms of management, whether it be in the areas of health and water management or transport operations. The Leader

of the Opposition continues to say, 'No, it is not a good idea.' How many calculators did he need, when looking at the budget papers, to add up that, in terms of what we have already outsourced, we are saving about \$40 million a year. It is unbelievable that the Opposition cannot and will not accept, or does not have the knowledge or the basic nous to understand, the benefits that this outsourcing is bringing to this State.

The commitment to restructuring the State's economy is clearly illustrated by the budget. I reiterate that South Australia continues to be one of the lowest taxing States in the nation—23 per cent below Victoria and 26 per cent below New South Wales. Members should bear in mind that there are no new taxes in the budget, other than adjustments to the gaming machines tax structure which are already in place. We continue to provide incentives for export growth and to refocus the structure of this State's economy to maximise and capitalise the benefits of the export potential in respect of our northern neighbours. Payroll tax concessions for extra exports are also assisting in this area. We are also ensuring that regulation and administration do not unnecessarily hold back business.

The Government will continue to ensure that the costs of operating a business in this State are below those of other areas in Australia; they are currently 5 per cent below the national average. If you add our low tax status figure to the latest industrial dispute figure of only 28 days lost per 1 000 employees compared with the national average of 79 days, it is clear that the Government priorities in these areas are being achieved, they are working, the benefits are being passed onto business and successful growth is being achieved. That situation has been expounded by my colleagues this evening in terms of fully illustrating this State's growth as the highest in the nation in the most recent ABS figures for the past two quarters and for the past 12 months.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: I point out to the member for Hart that those figures are undisputed and could not have been matched by his predecessors in this place. I now turn to the areas that affect my electorate, and I will focus on the direct and indirect benefits that will be achieved. I believe that constituents and businesses in the electorate of Chaffey will welcome some of the issues and aspects of the budget. In particular, I mention the injection of capital in terms of capital infrastructure, because the previous Government over the 13 years that it was in power literally left the electorate of Chaffey in a drought in terms of capital injection. The sum of \$5 million will be spent on the redevelopment of Glossop High School. The first phase of the project will commence by the end of this year.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: Yes, exactly, but bear in mind that the \$5 million for the Glossop High School redevelopment will include development of a two stage campus in Berri to allow it to tap into and share TAFE resources. The sum of \$336 000 will be spent to establish a child care facility at Renmark, which was identified as an area of high need by the National Child Care Strategy, and centre based child care facilities will commence shortly.

As announced in the budget, \$110 000 of \$1.2 million from the SA Water Corporation will be used to commence stage one of the Monash extension to the Berri irrigation area. This is fundamentally important in terms of the good work which has gone into the potential irrigation expansion in the Government highland irrigation areas at Berri and which has been well promoted and is currently being sold by the Riverland Development Corporation. This will provide specific drainage and pumping infrastructure and will be of direct assistance to potential investors to develop an additional 2 000 hectares of irrigation development in the Monash North area adjacent to Berri. An amount of \$17.3 million has been allocated for the Berri bridge; I will reserve my remarks on the bridge until the report is brought down by the Public Works Committee. Although this is private sector funding, the State Government has given a commitment for the bridge to proceed, which is absolutely welcomed by my electorate.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: I thank the member for Ridley because I assume his comments reflect all of my colleagues, who are not only good but support each other, which is what the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government are all about. The sum of \$2.4 million is going into the Cadell Prison redevelopment and, although not directly within the electorate of Chaffey, it impinges upon the value and contribution to the total electorate. It will be started off with about \$1.7 million this financial year. The program will include significant fencing around the prison, a detection system, upgrading the effluent system and, importantly, a new accommodation area for up to 45 prisoners. It will also establish development opportunities for the prison enterprise system, which will be a worthwhile project at Cadell. I must make reference to the substantial efficiencies in the Correctional Services Department that will be achieved by the end of the year. The department expects that the cost of keeping a prisoner in South Australia to be \$18 000 less than it was three years ago.

I also have to mention the capital works program with respect to the Morgan to Burra Road. I know that this will interest you, Mr Speaker, as an ongoing project because a further \$4 million will be spent in the current year. I have talked much about that project in this place before because of its value to the total South Australian economy and particularly to my electorate in terms of being a valuable link to the Riverland. The sealing of the road means that the Riverland will become very much a national hub and transport corridor for both tourism and cargo in terms of interstate transport east and west and north and south across the nation.

The sum of \$4 million will also be provided for rehabilitation of irrigation infrastructure in the Loveday division of the Cobdogla irrigation area. This project involves the replacement of the degraded open and inefficient water channel system. Last financial year the State Government provided \$5 million for rehabilitation. Not only will this project increase the productivity of the horticultural area but it will provide increased potential capacity for extra irrigation expansion, as well as reducing drainage and improving the environmental bonuses to the total Murray River system.

I now refer to the allied bonus to the Riverland and the income that will be put into the area. In respect of the Blanchetown bridge, although federally funded, about \$8 million this year will be expended through the State to replace that bridge. Further, \$6.5 million will go into the initial first stage of infrastructure provision to provide for the Riverland's filtered water scheme that will ultimately be provided from 1998.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: This infrastructure is required initially, and not before time, as the member for Peake rightly says, because Riverland residents have long awaited pure filtered water in major Riverland towns. This expenditure is the first capital injection from the State Government. The tendering process is now in place with the preferred tenderer guaranteeing that the project is on track and that it will happen. As to capital infrastructure benefits to the Riverland, I have to acknowledge thankfully the \$15.2 million allocated for the upgrade of Adelaide Airport. During this financial year this will become clear and tangible to everyone in terms of the extension of the runway.

Members interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: I am sure the member for Peake will maintain a close interest in it. As I have said often in this place before, that is a valuable capital injection for businesses in Chaffey, not only because of the increased tourist traffic it will bring to the State and the region but, more importantly and more effectively, because of the bonuses it will bring to horticultural producers in terms of direct, cheaper and more efficient market access to the northern markets for their fresh fruit and vegetables. Not only will this involve cost savings but also it will mean that their produce can get there in a higher quality status, because they will be able to minimise the time required for transportation and meet the appropriate market schedules by having that access through greater facilities at Adelaide Airport.

I mentioned the Burra Road, and I want to reinforce the fact that this State Government is spending considerable sums on country roads. It values the important economic development that these country road sealing programs will bring to this State through the creation of jobs. I will not list all the roads, as time does not permit, but eight or 10 roads are involved; for example, the Wallaroo to Port Wakefield Road and the Hawker to Orroroo Road, etc. In this financial year's budget a total of about \$13 million will be spent on rural arterial roads.

I want to mention a couple of other programs from the budget that are having a direct benefit to the Riverland. In the Kickstart for Youth Program, an additional \$250 000 will be injected, and 70 per cent of all participants in the 15 to 19 age group in this program have been getting jobs. It is a valuable program, and I commend the Treasurer, the Government and the Minister for continuing this program and for ensuring that it is reinforced.

There is also a new pilot program called the Regional Labour Exchange Program in which the Riverland will participate, as part of the \$150 000 injection. This program is designed to increase employment opportunities while meeting seasonal labour shortages in horticulture, viticulture and related industries. It will operate at a regional location, on a pilot basis this year, and will serve as a direct assistance to coordinate labour shortages and requirements in the Riverland's horticultural production area. I commend the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education in this area. Unfortunately, time has not permitted me to go into some of the other benefits that this budget will bring in a broader sense. I wanted to comment on the education and health arenas, but time does not permit. I will therefore use other opportunities as required.

In brief summary, this budget is a sound and responsible one. It is part of a continuing effort aimed at restoring the confidence of the community, of the business sector and of our trading partners overseas that the Government has turned around the economic structure of this State, with sound economic management and determination. It is being understood, accepted and appreciated by this State and those whom I have mentioned and, because of this, South Australia as a whole is now moving strongly ahead. I congratulate the Treasurer and the Government on this budget.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond $10\ \mathrm{p.m.}$

Motion carried.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): This is another interesting episode in Government backbenchers' receiving their notes from the Premier's speech writers, simply coming into the Chamber and espousing the Government line. It is always very useful, and we know how it works: the Premier's minders quickly prepare the dot points, the details of the budget, whack it around to all the patsies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY:—who will simply get up there and espouse the Government line. I do not want this to be a confrontationalist contribution from me tonight, but it is important that we clear up a few points. What has concerned me about this budget is that it lacks honesty and a degree of decency from the Premier. We all know what will happen in August when Peter Costello brings down his first budget that, by his own expressed intention, will remove \$4 billion from recurrent expenditure this year and \$4 billion next year—and such a significant proportion of our State's budget moneys come via Canberra.

The Premier and Treasurer of this State should have come into this Chamber with a bit of honesty, decency and openness. They should have said that this budget was based on the available figures, that it was predicated on the numbers—the forward estimates—that were provided to the Government last year. The Government should have said that it had endeavoured to deliver a budget that could work within those parameters. However, along with every other Australian, we know that Peter Costello will deliver significant State budget cuts in August this year, so it may be necessary to bring in a revised budget. But not the Premier and the Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I do not give a hoot what Bob Carr does. I am worried about this State, and what this Premier can never do is take it on the chin. He always has to blame somebody else.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order! The member for Mitchell will get his turn.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. I will excuse the member for Mitchell because has a few guests in the gallery tonight and it is important that he looks as though he is performing, but I will ignore him. The Premier's whole approach since the Howard Government was elected has been quite silly, given his move to call on Canberra to cut the States and to cut the States hard. Sitting over there in Canberra, John Howard must have said to his minders, 'Get me a copy of that transcript. I cannot believe that a State Premier has actually invited us to cut.' That is what the Premier of this State did: he called on Canberra to cut.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Excuse me. He called, and if you do not have the media copy in front of you—

Mr Caudell: Neither have you.

Mr FOLEY: I do not need it in front of me. It is on the public record. Dean Brown called for significant public cuts. He said that Canberra should cut its cloth the same way as the States have done.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Hartley says, 'What is wrong with that?' If the honourable member knew anything about budgetary policy-and he clearly does not-he would know that a fair proportion of the money comes in direct State tied grants or in general purpose grants and allocations to the States. If Canberra is to cut its expenditure, you can rest assured that the States will receive the significant cuts. The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education is waging daily battles with his Federal colleague, Senator Vanstone, to stop these cuts, and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is in dispute with the Federal Minister responsible for the environment over budgets cuts. It is happening right across the portfolio breadth of this Government, but why? It is because the Premier of this State, probably the first Premier in the history of Federation said, 'Please cut. We think you should cut.'

As we get closer to budget time, this Government will start to panic and realise the impact that this will have. Government members were all happy to say before the election that we needed the great John Howard to be elected. Even shortly after the election they were espousing the virtues of a John Howard Government, but they are all a bit quiet now, because the cuts are coming, the unpopular stuff is coming, and the pain is coming to this State, courtesy of John Howard at the invitation of Dean Brown. What an absurd situation! The Government's tactics leave a big question mark as to what the Premier is attempting to achieve in his relationship with Canberra, but I suspect that John Howard is loving it. In Dean Brown, John Howard has the perfect Premier.

Some of the numbers in the budget are very concerning. The Government's budget forecast for economic growth in South Australia in the forthcoming year is 2.75 per cent, and we all know that we need a bare minimum of 3 per cent, if not closer to 3.5 to 4 per cent, to make any inroads into unemployment. We have unemployment locked up above 9 per cent. This budget predicates economic growth considerably below 3 per cent. Therefore, there will be no dent in employment out of this budget. Frankly, all members in this place should be concerned about the quality of this budget in terms of its ability to generate jobs and to stimulate economic growth. It is a budget that lacks imagination. It is a phoney budget, because it is predicated upon a set of assumptions that even my seven year old knows will not be the real picture come August this year when the Federal budget is delivered by the new Prime Minister and the new Treasurer in Canberra. Quite frankly, the Premier and the Treasurer of this State should have had a bit of decency and come forward and made that very clear to South Australians before they brought down this irrelevant budget.

Another aspect of the budget that gives me great concern is the performance of SA Water. It will be contributing a reasonable dividend to the budget again this year. I look forward to the Estimates Committees when I will endeavour to get further behind the veil of secrecy and the walls that have been erected to keep inquiring minds out of SA Water. Some elements of SA Water are very relevant to this budget, for instance the whole outsourcing contract which the Minister for Infrastructure has entered into and which effectively signed away our water to French and British interests for the next 20 years.

It was an extraordinary coincidence that, on the day before the budget was brought down, we had the Auditor-General's report relating to the concerns expressed in writing by the Leader of the Opposition to the Auditor-General and the request that he inquire into the events of 4 October. Given the absolute enormous impact on the budget bottom line by SA Water, it is important that we look a little more closely at this report because, if we had believed the Minister for Infrastructure and his supporters around the Chamber as they joined in the pre-rehearsed chorus that this report had absolved the department and everyone in the Government regarding its handling of 4 October in respect of the—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will read the first line, then I will read a number of lines.

Mr EVANS: Mr Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understood that we were debating the budget. I wonder what the events of 4 October have to do with a budget that deals with the next 12 months.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member was linking his remarks to parts of the budget and, no doubt, he will do that again.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. I am used to it. When I am criticising the Premier, one of the wets jumps to their feet with a point of order and, when I am questioning the Minister for Infrastructure, one of the dries jumps to their feet. It is all part of a spoiling tactic. This is very important, because the financial contribution of SA Water to the budget is a significant budget line and one that deserves scrutiny.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will. The first sentence talks about relevancy. It is important that this report be considered as a whole, not line by line. It states a number of things. It states that there was no criminality or corruption found, but—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, but I have said this report states that it was found, as best as is practicably possible, that there was no criminal activity or corruption in the events that surrounded 4 October. There is no argument with that. But what else does it say? The report states:

The contractual relationships under the request for proposal process are being undertaken in 'a legislative vacuum', in the sense that in this State the rules associated with this process have not been publicly developed and endorsed. This is not to suggest a criticism of the RFP approach to contracting associated with the SA Water outsourcing project or, for that matter, any other project, it is simply a statement of fact.

That is one of the very interesting facts that are brought to the reader's attention in this report. Following that line, it states:

In essence, the public legislative machinery of Government has not kept pace with the market practices required of Government to achieve—

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the relevance of the argument of the member for Hart. We are supposed to be debating the Appropriation Bill, not the Auditor-General's report on SA Water.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take the honourable member's point of order. I have only just assumed the Chair. At the outset of the debate I reminded members that this was not a broad-ranging grievance debate but a debate specifically to follow the subject of the Appropriation Bill. Perhaps the member for Hart will follow that instruction.

Mr FOLEY: As I said earlier, the member for Mitchell also needs to frustrate this, because members opposite do not like what they hear. The financial impact of SA Water on the budget bottom line is significant. This report is littered with criticisms of the way in which the process was handled. It makes the point:

On the basis of an objective analysis, in the opinion of Audit this was a real risk and could not be described as a fanciful or far-fetched possibility.

That was the whole issue that was raised in respect of SA Water which, as we know, has a significant impact on the financial bottom line of this State. The Auditor-General said that the concerns of the Opposition were not fanciful or farfetched. I can find other moments to debate this in more detail, but it is important to link this back to the budget, because the budget receives about \$50 million to \$60 million from the dividends of SA Water.

The report is critical of the procedures. The procedures of 4 October, on becoming known, created a perception that gave rise to public concern, and this circumstance should be guarded against in the future. The reality is that this report is critical of the process. It states that no criminality or corruption was found, but the report significantly criticises the—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Sure, that could be found. It is a qualified assurance on all the evidence provided.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Caudell is participating too much in the debate.

Mr FOLEY: It was necessary to make that contribution. That report has been in the public domain for one week and I want to get some important points on the record and, most appropriately, link my remarks back to the budget.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: You can grumble as you like, but I am on my feet delivering a speech which is clearly within the guidelines of parliamentary debate. Coming back to the budget, what have we seen? We had the Deputy Premier today admitting that we have 24-hour police stations which are not open 24 hours. Has anyone heard a more ludicrous comment from a Minister today—words to the effect, 'They are 24-hour operations, but it does not mean we have them open all the time.' Frankly, we have severe shortages of police. We have many fewer police now than when this Government came to office.

The Fire Brigade is under threat. There is the distinct possibility that, if the wages increase that the firefighters are attempting to negotiate is passed onto the budget, it will see another 81 positions go, so we will have fewer firefighters in the front line courtesy of this Government and its budget.

As regards the schools and hospitals sectors, it depends on which inflation rate is used to measure inflation and the numbers that are taken into account. The Government's increase in spending in those areas is quite illusory, particularly as nearly 50 per cent of the health budget is Commonwealth money channelled through the States. It is ridiculous to suggest that that budget will sustain itself in August. If the Federal Government is to cut anywhere, it will certainly take the axe to health.

As I said earlier, a bit of honesty from this Government would have gone a long way. But why be honest when it can set itself up to blame the Federal Government for whatever ill is put on this State? The reality is that this Government is having to learn with a Federal Government in Canberra that will make decisions which it does not like and which will impact on this State. Welcome to the real world. The naive comments on the eve of the election and the naive comments post-election about the great benefits of the Howard Liberal Government are clearly just that: naive. John Howard will take a signifi-

are clearly just that halve. John Howard will take a significant axe to this State's economy. When members opposite sit in the halls of the Liberal councils in the months ahead and rub shoulders with the famous Senator Amanda Vanstone and others, they should make it very clear that this State is hurting.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell is doubly out of order, for interjecting from the gallery.

Mr FOLEY: Triply out of order, Sir, had we caught what he actually said, but even for the member for Mitchell I would not dare to earn him the wrath of the good Senator. This budget is a disappointing budget. It is disappointing for the fact that it is not a budget built on honesty. It was a budget built on deceit—which was unnecessary. We will see in August, when Peter Costello and John Howard take the axe to State allocations when a whole raft of Government funding is addressed, how the Premier and the Treasurer address the issue.

With respect to my electorate, there is not a lot that we can be thankful for. We have fewer police now in Port Adelaide than we had before; we will probably have fewer firefighters; we may well have fewer ambulance operators; and we certainly have fewer teachers. I suspect that we have fewer anything that is directly associated with the State Government. That is very sad, because electorates such as mine need the support of Governments, but they are not receiving it.

Schools in my electorate need more teaching staff and more resources. We need to give those children in my community a real chance to make it in this world. Quite frankly, they are not getting that opportunity because Governments are looking at education, particularly in areas such as mine, without the respect and without the support that they should have. As the local member whose children go to school in that community, it pains me that there are fewer teachers today than there were just 12 months ago. I only hope that the Government will see reason in the months ahead, following the August budget and perhaps even in the framing of the next budget (if we have not had an election in between) to think very seriously about service delivery, particularly in areas such as mine, and those of my colleagues on this side of the House, and areas in other parts of the State. These are areas where increased services are required. We need the Government to deliver good quality services where they are in most need and not simply withdraw them at an ever increasing rate.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I support the Appropriation Bill. I understand why the member for Hart and members opposite say that this is a disappointing budget. It is a disappointing budget from the point of view of members of the Labor Party, because they expected something that they could criticise. They expected something to have gone wrong so they could say, 'Look, we told you so.' If we look at the budget from the point of view of the South Australian economy and the South Australian public and in terms of the future of South Australia, it is on track. That is what it is all about. I believe that we need an Opposition. I believe that we need the Chamber in the other place. I support all aspects of Governments and our democratic process. I believe that there must be an effective alternative Government. I rather wish it was an alternative Government and not an Opposition. What we heard tonight was continuous opposition. In its last stages of Government it was a failed Government, and tonight members opposite have shown themselves to be a failed Opposition. Members opposite could not stick to the text of this budget.

They had to go outside South Australia; they had to go and blame Canberra. They had to make Nostradamus predictions and tell us what might and might not happen. They did not stick to the point. I, too, have gone outside South Australia. I bring to the attention of the House an article from the *Australian Financial Review* of Friday 31 May 1996. What does the *Financial Review* have to say about the State budget? The article's title is 'South Australia on track for budget surplus', by Simon Jemison—not a South Australian, not notes from the Government, as the member for Hart has been saying in his contribution. The article states:

Three years of assets sales and public sector retrenchments have put South Australia within reach of a modest \$10 million budget surplus in 1997-98 and provided scope in the year ahead for a \$47 million program of grants and incentives to attract new investments to the State. The Brown Government's third SA budget released yesterday builds on the framework of its four-year debt and budget deficit reduction program released in 1994 with a 1 per cent fall in outlays in 1996-97 and a forecast budget deficit of \$60 million. Lower interest costs through debt reduction and a major overhaul of public sector including the exit of 15 000 public servants in the past five is expected to lead to a balanced budget 1997-98 and modest surpluses until the turn of the century.

We are on track. Hard decisions had to be taken. No-one doubted that we had to make some hard decisions, and we have; we have not run away from them. We cannot go on budget deficits forever. You cannot apply Keynesian economics forever. When we came to power in 1993, 28 per cent of Gross State Product went to finance the debt. No-one can go on like that forever—no-one. It is a little like someone buying a house on bridging finance for 10 years. They can do it for one or two years, but eventually they have to sell their present home so that they can pay for the one they have bought. However, the former Government had the idea that it could go on with a budget deficit forever. Whenever it got into trouble it renegotiated the loan. You cannot do that. It does not work in the long term, and we know that it did not work for South Australia.

As commentators have said, we have now put the economy back on track. The decisions we have had to take have not been easy. They have not been made without pain or cost. No-one has said that they could have been-they never are-but we are getting this State back to the position where we can say we have a future. We are getting to the point where we are attracting investment to the State, where manufacturing again is playing a key role and where exports are beginning to bring back dividends. That is what it is all about. You cannot have welfare without wealth; you must have wealth creation before you can distribute it. You have to make the cake before you can cut it. To go on predictions of what will happen in the Federal budget and what might happen next year and so on is just nonsense, with hypotheses about matters which do not exist or which are beyond our control. You have to deal with the present and what is within your parameters. We have done so within the State parameters, and I believe that we are on track.

I welcome back the focus on health and education in this budget. No-one can doubt that we have given health and education a priority again—an increase of \$90 million extra allocated to health; an extra 20 000 admissions in the past two years, with a further 3 000 next year; an extra \$39 million for major building works at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Lyell McEwin General Hospital; plus major equipment purchases and information technology projects.

Health is a priority for this Government, but it cannot be treated as a priority unless you have the funds and the organisation to make sure that things can happen. Let us be realistic. Members opposite have gone on about what happened with SA Water and EDS. They have been nitpicking; they have been picking up the crumbs and throwing away the loaves. How dare they pick on those micro-aspects of contracts and so on when they blew it and sold off the whole State! It is about time that they put things into perspective and focused on what can be done. This Government is getting the State back on track not only for this generation but for the next.

Other capital works in the health area that have been announced under this budget are a \$30 million rehabilitation facility for general hospitals (\$6 million in 1996-97); a \$5.6 million 40-bed psychiatric unit at Queen Elizabeth Hospital (\$3.2 million); and a \$2.1 million helipad for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which will be of great benefit in emergency cases. Three capital works projects will be privately financed: a \$50 million private hospital at Flinders Medical Centre (\$28 million in 1996-97); a \$19 million redevelopment of the Port Augusta Hospital (\$12.2 million); and a new \$23.4 million hospital and community health centre at Mount Gambier.

So much for the criticism of members opposite that the Government does not care about rural areas. They did not mention those figures tonight, because it did not suit them. They are trying to give us doom and gloom and tell us what might or might not happen by focusing on something which is not within the realm of this budget, that is, what happens in Canberra. Why do they not tell us what is going to happen on the New York Stock Exchange? Will members opposite blame us for what happens on the New York Stock Exchange, or in Turin or Tokyo? Let us stick to reality. Be honest! In fact, members on this side did not believe that we could be on track after such a short time of only two years. After all, we are only a toddler Government, only 21/2 years old, and we have learnt to walk and talk-and, in some cases, run-and have put the State back on track. Members opposite should admit that, as the commentators have.

I would like to focus on a few of the major objectives for education by the year 2001. There will be one computer for every five students by the end of the five-year plan. Classrooms are to be linked to the Internet and to have easy access to information databases across the country and the world. An education network, which will allow teachers in one location to provide quality distance education for students in another location, will increase subject choice for students in city and country schools. Speech pathologists and other specialists will provide assistance to country students who currently have limited access to such services. Training and development programs will be offered to teachers in all schools with particular benefits to teachers in remote country areas. Again, we are looking after country areas and the disadvantaged.

The Opposition, together with some of the leadership of SAIT, has focused on class numbers. Perhaps that is a reflection on the 11 members opposite in this Chamber: it is as difficult to control a small class as it is a large class. However, let us not make generalisations. We must think of the future and try to put in place things which will be of benefit not only for this generation but for the next. In order to do that, you must get the economics right.

I believe that we have done so. You have to plan for a reduction of the debt. You have to plan for an eventual budget surplus so that you can have the resources and flexibility to meet the demands of a changing world, because it is certainly a changing world, and you cannot go back and depend on Keynesian budget deficit economics: it does not work. Even Keynes would tell you, if you sat around in a seance and tried to work out his theory, that it does not work when you abuse it. It has been abused in the past.

Members opposite talk about school closures and so on. Let us consider as percentages the number of school closures effected by the previous Government. I can tell you what happened in my electorate to the Payneham Primary School, St Morris Primary School, Trinity Gardens Primary School and Campbelltown High School, my former school. They were amalgamated. The simple fact is that, with an ageing population and a low fertility rate, those sorts of structural changes do take place. I am not blaming the former Government for closing those schools. The realities were that the numbers were not there, and the process that took place then will take place now but in a more refined way involving more community consultation. There is not a hit list of schools, as some members opposite would want us to believe, with schools being closed without consultation: that is not the case.

We are trying to deal with the falling birth rate, the decline in population and the ageing population. We are trying to encourage a greater migration to this State and to get people to come back to South Australia, to reinvest, and to see the cost and competitive advantage and excellent lifestyle that we offer South Australians and visitors to this State. The Leader of the Opposition claims that the budget is a fraud because it takes no account of likely Federal spending cuts. He says that Dean Brown must be the only politician in Australia who cannot see the locomotive coming. Obviously he must be a fan of Cat Stevens and waiting for the peace train. You have to create the climate to have economic peace.

Mr Caudell: Cat Stevens?

Mr SCALZI: Cat Stevens. Let us stop pussyfooting around and get on with it. The Premier is on the same train as New South Wales Labor Premier Bob Carr. The New South Wales Government introduced its budget last week without making any allowance for Federal cuts. The Victorian and Western Australian Governments have done the same.

The States have made a submission to the Federal Audit Commission stating that the Federal Government should deal with the Keating/Beazley \$8 billion deficit by cutting its own programs rather than the States'. Under the Hawke and Keating Governments, Federal grants to the States declined by \$8.9 billion, while the Federal Government's own spending was increased by \$1.5 billion. To assume that there should be no cuts at the Federal level is to assume that there can be no efficiencies at that level. What a hypocritical stance to take! How can you say we must be efficient in one part of Australia and not in another? How can we say we must be efficient at the local level by getting councils together and looking at economies of scale, and how can we say we must be efficient at the State level and exempt the Federal Government from that efficiency? It just does not compute. You have to be consistent. If efficiencies can be made, they must be made.

No-one from this side of the House has said we must cut essential services. No-one from this side of the House has said we must disadvantage the communities of South Australia. In fact, the Premier and the Ministers have put the cases for South Australia very strongly. No-one has promoted the Adelaide Airport runway and the Alice Springs to Darwin railway more than our Premier, and we would welcome support from the Opposition when it comes to standing up for South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition also claims that education spending has increased little in real terms and that the Government has failed to provide for teacher pay increases. The budget increases education spending by \$27 million in real terms, and that is after inflation. That is not bad after 21/2 years, considering that the State was on its economic knees. That is not bad for a State that did not appear to have a future. There is now confidence in the community. People know that the hard decisions have taken place; they can see the benefits are coming, and they will come because this State is under sound economic management.

That is what it is all about. You must get your house in order. Do not blame the Federal Government budget, which might or might not cut certain aspects of funding. The budget makes no changes to class sizes and would not lead to any increase in the already publicly announced number of possible school closures. The Leader's statements with respect to teachers' pay suggests that he wants the Government to cave into union demands for increases much higher than the 12 per cent offered. The budget makes provision to meet the 12 per cent offer. The Minister for Education and Children's Services has increased his offer.

I am the first person to defend teachers. I am the first person to acknowledge the work done by teachers in difficult circumstances. I am supportive of teachers, but we must be realistic. The State cannot afford a Federal award. It would be irresponsible to cave in and grant that Federal award. Education is a State responsibility. It must be dealt with under State institutions. The Minister for Education and Children's Services has been willing to compromise: SAIT should do the same, instead of escaping from this arena to another, thinking that it will get a better deal. Let us be realistic. South Australia has a cost competitive advantage.

Why should we deal with something at a Federal level that has traditionally been dealt with at a State level? The competitive priorities of this Government are to make South Australia a competitive, low tax State, to support export growth, to improve public sector efficiency, and to reduce red tape and unnecessary regulation of business. People will choose to come to South Australia because labour costs are 5 per cent below national average, and per capita taxation is 23 per cent below Victoria and 26 per cent below New South Wales. Latest industrial dispute figures-and I congratulate the union movement-show 28 days lost in South Australia per 1 000 employees compared with the national average of 79 days.

There are positive signs from the labour movement of cooperation to make this State a better place. Why not focus on that, get behind what I believe have been extraordinary achievements by this Government in 21/2 years, and support the future of South Australia.

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

Ms HURLEY (Napier): The Liberal Government has dismissed our criticism of this budget's being a fraud. It reiterates that the general purpose grants from the Commonwealth will be protected for South Australia and that the specific purpose grants only will be affected. The Liberal Government thereby infers that the special purpose grants are the province of the Federal Government and have little to do with the State. The obvious intention is to blame their Federal Liberal Government colleagues for cuts in program. Therefore, this Liberal Government is trying to create the impression that the special purpose grants are the cream on the cake of Government spending and that their cuts will not make a lot of difference to the people of South Australia.

Government members know that is not true and the South Australian public will know that is not true when the Federal Government brings down its budget. For example, page 243 of the Budget Estimates and Receipts of Payments states that the Commonwealth special purpose grant is listed for public housing in an amount of \$51 548 000. That amount is 62 per cent of the total recurrent receipts, 62 per cent of the source of funds for the whole of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The interesting aspect is that the budget estimates a 15 per cent increase in real terms in Commonwealth special purpose grants in this area on the basis that the grant has been down in previous years and it is now that the Commonwealth will catch up with it. Pollyanna was never more optimistic than this current Government. I will read from the Budget Financial Statement regarding that increase:

Funding of \$89 million is expected in 1996-97, up by 15.9 per cent in real terms on 1995-96. This increase in real funding reflects a return to more 'usual levels' of funding. Funding in 1995-96 was down by 9.6 per cent in real terms on 1994-95, reflecting the impact of the provision of additional funding in 1992-93 and 1993-94 from the scheduled allocations in 1994-95 and 1995-96, as well as lack of real terms indexation.

This current Government is expecting the Commonwealth to reverse previous decisions and give it an increase in funding in the housing area. This is in the climate where the new Federal Liberal Government has abolished the Federal Department of Housing. It has turned its back on other aspects of housing and housing development and said that its involvement is purely as a welfare program. It has dramatically reduced the staff of the Department of Housing and incorporated that department into the Department of Social Services.

I would like to have some confidence that the State Minister for Housing will fight for this State; indeed, I would like to know that the Minister has gone to Canberra and stated the case for South Australia with the Minister for Social Services, Senator Jocelyn Newman. I would like to think that the Minister has argued astutely and persuasively for special treatment and has received a promise of a 15 per cent increase in real terms; but I doubt it. I would like to think that he would be prepared to stand up to the Federal Minister. He attacked the former Minister, Brian Howe, on the former Government's Community and Nation Package, yet I have heard no similar comment from him on the Federal Liberal Government's current plans to abolish the Department of Housing. I can only assume that he is happy with the arrangements and I will look, with exceptionally great interest, at the housing provisions of the Federal Government.

I now comment on the low level response by members of the Government in supporting this budget. They have been subdued and insipid when they have not been simply incompetent.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: You must have been one of the incompetent members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of his place and out of order.

Ms HURLEY: The member for Mitchell gave one of the few impassioned moments. The problem is that his contribution was riddled with mistakes and inconsistencies.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Much better than I do. For example, he said that the Labor Party policy was to buy back all the assets sold by this Liberal Government. That is not now and never has been our policy. The member for Mitchell acknowledged that it is no longer our policy but then went on to suggest that this situation was likely to change; he did hamfisted calculations of what that meant for the State and that was a totally irrelevant exercise.

The member for Mitchell also claimed, as did the Premier at Question Time today, that the Labor Opposition opposes all asset sales in blanket fashion. That is simply and obviously not true. It did not oppose, for example, the sale of the State Bank, the SGIC, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, SAMCOR and various other small sell-offs, such as shareholdings in AMDEL Ltd and Enterprise Investments Ltd.

It was well known at the time of the last State election that the then Labor Government planned to sell the State Bank and SGIC and had negotiated a very advantageous deal with the then Federal Government to receive over \$600 million as part of this exercise. This Government has been the beneficiary of much of that money. When talking about asset sales, it is useful to look at the partial list of asset sales in the budget financial statement. I will run through some of them. There is Bank SA, the Government shareholding in Amdel Limited, the State Flora Nursery at Berri, Enterprise Investments Limited, the State Clothing Corporation, State Print at Netley, the Island Seaway, the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, SGIC, Austrust, State Fleet, the State Chemistry Laboratories and Marino Asphalt Depot and Sign Services. Major properties at 333 Collins Street, Melbourne and 91 King William Street, Adelaide are currently being prepared for sale. Other properties sold include Chesser House, the Myer Centre, the MacArthur Centre in Brisbane, the Terrace Intercontinental, Qantas House and Elizabeth City Centre. Other companies up for sale include Forwood Products and SAMCOR; Festival City Broadcasters is under review; there are shacks throughout the State, and the ASER project and Adelaide Casino are marked for eventual sale in regard to part or all of those assets; and there are other surplus Department of Transport assets, the bulk loading plants and other surplus assets of the Ports Corporation.

It is useful to look at this long and impressive list of the State's investments that have now been realised and no longer exist. Where we have opposed asset sales we have done so on practical and businesslike grounds. We oppose the sale of the whole of the State Government's computing assets to EDS for a paltry \$18 million. We would have opposed the sale of this State's water management if the Government had had the courage to bring it before Parliament. We opposed the sale of our State's health facilities such as Modbury Hospital because we do not agree with the sale of fundamental assets.

We believe that water, health and power are fundamental assets of the State, and we are not alone in that view. The people of South Australia agree with us, which is why the Government has fought so hard to suppress the polling which shows the results of the survey on the sale of our water utility. The Liberal Government fails to mention in its budget that the sale of assets will give this one off hit to the budget process and then provide nothing. In many cases it has cut off a valuable source of revenue. It is widely acknowledged that the States now have limited revenue resources and that South Australia is one of the hardest hit States in this respect. The Brown Government is breaking its neck to sell off ETSA, for example, yet ETSA is paying a dividend of \$154.7 million and the Government is also demanding a special dividend of \$55 million from the corporation.

The Government is going for the short-term fix, but the State may regret many of these actions in the future. We will be left with little revenue other than from taxes. If we want to improve our infrastructure or build up other assets, we will have no recourse other than to raise taxes. This budget relies heavily on the revenue from gambling taxes, and in future we may have to hope that South Australia becomes a State of habitual smokers, gamblers and beer drinkers if we want to achieve anything.

I turn specifically to my electorate with regard to an issue that had considerable airing today, that is, the reduction in resources to the police in our State. The Elizabeth police station is one of those police stations that are supposed to offer 24-hour service, but it is not a service that is accessible to members of the public who want to go in there and talk to police or report anything on a 24-hour basis. This is particularly concerning to me because people in my electorate use the Elizabeth police station regularly. There have been a number of horrific incidents in my electorate, including firebombings for the second time in a street at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and other incidents. My constituents would like to know that they can go to the police station, walk in the door and report incidents.

Members interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I want to protect their ability to go to the police station if they need to. The current Government ran heavily on law and order in the last election, promising increased police resources, and we can see now what has happened: police have been given reduced resources, the Government is trying to squeeze their pay, squeeze their ability to get out and do the job, and all the time claiming that they have increased resources. It is absolute nonsense. It fools no-one, especially not the police and those people who try to walk into Elizabeth police station but find the door shut.

One aspect of the budget that I would like to report being entirely happy about is the allocation for the construction of the Virginia pipeline. This has been a very long process, of necessity. It began and continued under Labor Governments and was supported by Federal Labor Better Cities money, without which it would not have been possible. The State Government likes to claim full credit for this projectnaturally-but most of the construction of the Virginia pipeline is due to Federal Government Better Cities money and also to the commitment of the Virginia growers in that area. They are the people who formed the committee; they have committed themselves to a great deal of expenditure; and they have done a lot of work in ensuring that it gets done. I would like to congratulate those growers who have worked so hard on the committee and committed their time and money to the construction of this pipeline, which will benefit not only the market gardeners themselves and our export markets but also the environment in that effluent from Bolivar will not be put out to sea any longer.

One other aspect of the budget that I am happy about is the provision of a new school, which is called Smithfield East in the budget but which those of us who are local call Craigmore. Craigmore is a growing area, and I am sure that the school there will be most welcome, particularly for the Adams Road preschool which is in the vicinity. However, in saying that, I would also welcome a little more stimulation of the housing market from this Government.

Although Craigmore is a growing area, the outer suburbs need much more stimulation in terms of housing starts, and I have pointed out before the abysmal record of this Government in terms of plummeting housing starts in this State. I would like to see the Government commit more funds to building public housing and to working with private developers to stimulate more housing development in this area. The Government, through the South Australian Urban Projects Authority, still owns quite a lot of land in this area, and a joint development of the Golden Grove type would be a very useful stimulus for the housing industry and the economy generally in this State.

In my electorate, I am extremely disappointed to see the continuing low level of funding and resources for community services. This is not a caring and sharing Government by any means. Family and Community Services is under great stress in my area, having to cope with its level of work, partly as a result of closure under previous budgets of various community and Government agencies such as Carelink and the Para Districts Counselling Service. The long-term effects of those closures are starting to be felt, and they will be felt over a long period, so I should like to see the Government reverse some of those changes because it is creating great problems in my area.

Another program that has just been cut is the literacy program, which was undertaken at the Davoren Park Community Centre. This was due to a Federal Government cut. The Department of Education, Employment and Training cut the funding to that program.

Mr Brokenshire: That was Keating's Government.

Ms HURLEY: This current Government, as soon as it got in, cut the funding.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: No, it wasn't. The member for Mawson is trying to tell me that it was the former Federal Government that cut the literacy program at Davoren Park Community Centre. That is not true. The directive came from the current Minister, and it is just a sign of times to come as far as she is concerned. The Federal Government not only ceased funding the staff of this program but also backdated it to April. This literacy program took Davoren Park Community Centre two years to develop. They trained the staff at their own expense and spent a great deal of time and effort working with TAFE to prepare the program for DEET.

Literacy is particularly important. It is self-evident that literacy is very important these days in getting a job. Many people are left behind because their literacy skills are not up to scratch. The cutting of this program illustrates again that Liberal Governments really do not care about the disadvantaged in our society and are just intent on an ideological program of cutting Government services for very little financial gain to the Government. This is likely to be an ongoing project because the current Liberal Government is also cutting funding to schools and not providing enough resources to our education sector. In terms of literacy specifically, the Cornerstone project is greatly underresourced, and many of the schools in my area use school services officers to help out with that program. **Mr BROKENSHIRE** (Mawson): It is with more than great pleasure that I rise tonight to support the Appropriation Bill. Having been a member of the Government on two previous budget occasions and knowing how difficult those budgets were to bring down, it is a real pleasure to see a budget which is socially and economically responsible and which deals with the major issues that were so inappropriately handed to us and the community of South Australia after 10 very hard years of Labor.

I must say that I was quite surprised to see the increases in the two portfolio areas of education and health, because I admit that I was a little worried about how we would go with the debt reduction strategy, looking as we were for a surplus by the fourth year in office. I thought that was a rather ambitious task given the \$10 billion total debt that we inherited from the previous Labor Government. We are 18 months ahead in the debt reduction strategy, and we are able to show that services which under Labor would have become virtually non-existent, given that that Government did nothing about building a sustainable economy for South Australia, can be supported. Indeed, we are now in a position where we can put \$90 million of additional funding into health.

That will represent \$1.67 billion worth of health budget to South Australian taxpayers in the 1996-97 financial year, and that will allow 3 000 additional operations on top of a 20 000 increase in operations in South Australia last year, even though the Government had to reform and restructure the health services. I commend the Minister, the staff, the nurses and everyone who has been involved in that restructuring process. It shows that through due diligence and initiative these issues can be addressed.

An additional \$60 million will be put into education. It will be put into important areas such as additional speech pathology hours for the children of South Australia who have problems with literacy and need that assistance. It will also be put into areas such as information technology, which was almost totally neglected under the previous Government. We have realised that this area is of absolute importance to future generations, and I am delighted to see that money being put into that important area. I know the teachers in my electorate will be very pleased to see that information technology funding coming through. It is such an important initiative.

Clearly, there is now real evidence of gain from the tough and difficult decisions that we as members of Parliament on behalf of our community had to make. I am delighted to see that our community is reaping those gains and benefits sooner than I ever thought they would.

With regard to the environment, at the same time as reining in that debt and establishing a sustainable future we have been able to be proactive in the environment. We have now addressed the degradation of the Torrens River and the Patawalonga and a draft Bill relating to a new whole-of-State approach to water resources will soon be put out for public discussion. This Bill will enable catchment management authorities to be set up right across the State to address issues of degradation and provide long-term water resources to our State.

I am pleased to see that over the past 12 months additional funding has been put into Noarlunga Health Services Incorporated to help assist those with mental health problems. I know that the staff, under Paul Gardner, have done a fine job in implementing the new mental health service in the southern area. I also know that both the patients and the families in the south have appreciated the opportunity of having those very good services on their doorstep so that they can keep in contact with their families.

Also, it has been announced that there will be a \$50 million expansion to the Flinders Medical Centre to provide a 100 private bed hospital in tertiary care. In time, that expansion will benefit all health services in the south because it will allow a cash flow right across the public health system. With that facility tied in with the southern health strategy that we are now developing with people such as Deputy Mayor, Doreen Erwin, and other committed members of the community in order to enhance and to have once and for all an integrated health approach to the south, it will within a couple of years be very good for health in my electorate and the whole Fleurieu Peninsula.

With respect to education, I was absolutely delighted to see that Wirreanda High School has now been given \$800 000, which is more money than I ever expected in my wildest dreams would become available when we first started to lobby for \$200 000 to bring a best practice hospitality tourism focus into the home economics area of Wirreanda High School. The students, the staff and the school council know that we are developing that magnificent resource that we have in the south. I commend the students in years 9, 10 and 11 for wanting to become involved in those areas. They will now have \$800 000 to improve those facilities and their science facilities.

The Morphett Vale East Primary School, of which I am very proud, has fought for seven years to get a reasonable upgrade of its facilities. At last it is getting that done; it is happening now. However, it took seven years. It should not have taken the school council and the principal seven years to get that sort of opportunity for the school.

The Woodcroft Heights Pre-school has now been completed at a cost of \$500 000. It is a brand new, state of the art, superb pre-school on the campus of the growing Woodcroft Primary School, which is another fine example in my electorate, so ably run by the principal and his staff.

Let us look at another infrastructure project—the Southern Expressway. The Labor Party ran three elections on the Southern Expressway and never delivered. We will have the first stage of that expressway opened by the end of 1997. Every document and feasibility study that has been instigated over the past 15 to 20 years has stated that was an essential fundamental infrastructure project to get job creation into the south. However, Labor never delivered. We have delivered. We have stuck to our promise. Another \$29 million is going into the next stage during the next financial year. I am very pleased for the people in the south that that is happening.

As a result, we have seen record applications over the past 12 months by the Noarlunga City Council for commercial and industrial development in Lonsdale. We have seen new industries starting to come up, such as Sealy, some pharmaceutical industries and others. We have seen companies such as Krix Loudspeakers getting in there and exporting \$1 million worth of technological loudspeaker systems to China. Soon the Premier will come and open an expansion in Hackham, and more jobs will be created. We have seen the initiatives that we worked on with Mike Quinn and all the people in Mitsubishi come to fruition. We are seeing real job creation right across the board in the southern area.

We now have a state of the art \$2 million visitors centre under construction in the south. That will be the engine room that drives the tourism opportunity that we have in the south. As has been identified in recent reports, that is already starting to create jobs, and it will create many more in future. We hear the Opposition talking about the fact that we have cut policing. We have not cut policing at all. We have restructured and reformed and started to bring policing into the twenty-first century. That is something that Labor failed to do. We have more operational police on the beat than was the case under Labor. We do not have qualified police officers sitting in cars with speed cameras. Why should we? Highly trained police officers should be out protecting our community. That is what this Government is doing with the police. We are protecting our community and being responsible. We are also bringing more technology into the Police Force.

We have opened an additional police station at Aldinga, which has lightened the load for the whole of the southern area. Together with that, seven new detectives, under Inspector Bill Newman, have been brought down since we came into office and they are starting to catch up with the backlog of criminal activity that has been occurring. Very soon we shall have a \$17 million regional police station opened at Darlington, which will bring fast police response throughout the south. I am delighted to see that.

Let us consider a couple of other areas in which I am involved as parliamentary secretary to Minister David Wotton. Aged services are very important in my electorate, because we have an increasing number of people who require aged services. I am delighted that St Basil's, for example, is building a \$5.7 million 100-bed complex in the south for the Greek Orthodox Church. I am also delighted to see the expansion of the Elkanah Baptist development and the announcement of serviced apartments in McLaren Vale and, hopefully soon, another aged care service at McLaren Vale Hospital. There has been a \$3.6 million increased allocation to aged services under this budget.

Let us consider FACS and some tie-ups that it has with the Attorney-General's Department. The sum of \$300 000 has been allocated to set up a child abuse panel to overcome the unfortunate problems that we have with sexual harassment of young people. An extra \$100 000 has been allocated to combat fraud.

Let me refer to the bigger picture again. Some \$500 000 has been allocated for a positive parenting program. Labor never did anything about positive parenting programs: it was more about tearing families apart. This Government is committed to the family unit. The fundamental core of our society is the family. Our Government is doing something about it, because it has put \$500 000 into this program, and a lot more will be done in the future. In the charitable and social welfare fund area, \$3 million will be provided, and this will allow us to introduce new programs and services to assist families and communities in our area.

I now turn to the state of the State. When we came into office there was a ballooning recurrent budget deficit of \$350 million. That meant we were spending \$1 million a day more in this State as a Government than we were earning thanks to the debt incurred through the ineptitude of the previous Government. By the end of the 1996-97 financial year we will have reduced that debt to \$60 million. By 1997-98—and for the very first time in my life—the budget will be in surplus. We will then see what this Government is all about. We will no longer have to be reactive to those shameful years of Labor when they lost \$4 billion with the State Bank and \$1.3 billion with the Housing Trust, and ran up another \$3 billion of debt in just 10 years. The public of South Australia will be able to see a fully proactive Government. I very much look forward to that in the next

term so that I can bat even harder in a positive direction for my community.

Economic development has been addressed. In excess of \$1 billion on capital works projects will be spent over the next 12 months, and this will have enormous flow-on effects for jobs. As the Brown Government pledged, there will be no new taxes. We cannot tax people as Labor want us to, because many people in my community cannot afford another \$200 or \$300 in tax. They need every dollar they can get to look after their families. We are eliminating that budget deficit. We have cut debt to a low level, and we will cut it even lower. We have a number of economic programs on the books.

South Australia had the fastest growing economy in the past 12 months, but Labor would not admit it. Instead, the Leader of the Opposition talked about phoney budgets and about the phoney Government. He is the only thing in this Chamber that is phoney. The Leader of the Opposition is a joke in the electorate. Wherever I go people ask, 'What is Mike Rann about? Doesn't he want to give South Australia any future at all?' Sadly, I have to agree with the people when they ask that.

I have asked the Leader of the Opposition, as a supposed colleague in the Parliament wanting to do good things for South Australia, to cooperate with the Government when it does good things and to criticise it when it does bad things. But he has never done that. He runs to Mike Duffy from the *Sunday Mail* and says that he wants to see a new image in Parliament and that he wants to see things happen, but he has done nothing whatsoever. He is the only phoney thing about this budget, because he is a phoney, negative, carping Leader of the Opposition. I wish that my colleagues in the Labor Party would once and for all fix that by getting rid of him and by bringing in someone who is interested in helping to develop this State.

Members opposite will not recognise that we had to restructure; they will not recognise that we have to bring in reforms; and they will not recognise that we had to get rid of non-core assets because that was the only way to achieve a sustainable future for our families, our children and our children's children. That is what we should all be aboutresponsibility. This budget is about responsibility. This Government is about responsibility. And the people of South Australia demand responsibility. They demand it not only from our Government but from the Labor Party. But they not getting it, because the Leader of the Opposition is far more interested in getting a headline in a newspaper than in working in a cooperative manner for the state of the State. Not once in the 21/2 years I have been here have I heard the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Rann, apologise for being part of the biggest disaster nationally that this country has ever seen.

Not once have I heard him say that he is sorry. Not once have I heard him say that Dean Brown is 75 per cent of the way toward getting a rail link between Darwin and Alice Springs. Instead, every now and again, when Mr Brown is back in the board room putting together this program that we should have had since 1901, Mike Rann, the Leader of the Opposition, thinks, 'Here's a chance: I'll run out and be positive today; I'll espouse the virtues of a rail link.' The fact is that he did not espouse it when he was a Cabinet Minister. When there were Federal and State Labor Governments the Labor Party in this State did nothing. He was a senior Cabinet Minister and the Labor Government did nothing to get that rail link up. We all know that it is fundamental to a good future for South Australia.

What did the Labor Government do with the population of South Australia when the Leader of the Opposition was a senior Cabinet Minister? Decline, decline, decline. What did it do to attract new industries into this State, when the Leader of the Opposition was a senior Cabinet Minister? We lost hundreds of businesses. Now we have the lowest number of corporate capital national business headquarters of any State in Australia. They all left us, because they lost their confidence in South Australia under Labor. We are rebuilding that now; we have turned the corner. Members opposite do not like it, so they continue to run on, negatively carping. Why did Labor not get an extension to the runway when it was in power for 10 years? Because it could not operate as a cohesive force in Government. It was torn apart; it did not have the business acumen, the strength and the teamwork that the Liberal Government has; it did not have a committed Cabinet team that was prepared to look at the long term vision and not merely forward plan for the crisis of each day, as Labor seemed to generate as a Government. It certainly could not form mid and long term plans as we have.

Finally, I remind the community of Mawson and the South Australian public generally that, for the first time since my taking an interest in State politics—which is about 20 years this Government has actually built a program that is about the long term, sustainable future. What disappoints me is when I hear the Leader of the Opposition talking about phoney budgets. I tell the community of South Australia that the Leader of the Opposition wants to see John Howard cut the hell out of the South Australian budget, because he thinks it might give him a few more brownie points at the next election.

This budget has addressed all those issues and will stand, irrespective of that. What the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition in general could do is talk up the South Australian economy, help build up confidence and give us a chance to get South Australia back on its feet even faster than is already occurring. The previous Government caused the problems, and members opposite have not apologised yet. They still owe that apology to South Australians. I want to call on them time and time again until they do give us an apology. If they are at all responsible as a potentially credible Opposition and Government, from the Leader down they should be working with our Government, applauding this budget, which they know is an extremely good budget, and recognising the fact that South Australia is back on track after the major debacle that we had. There is still a lot of work to do; we recognise that. We will not be swayed by it but will continue to work for the good.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this is indeed a phoney budget, based on certain levels of Commonwealth funding which we all know will not eventuate. For that reason, a State mini budget will certainly be brought down after the Federal budget is brought down, and that will more accurately reflect the position in South Australia. The so-called \$8 billion black hole and the new Government's razor gang to slash spending lead one to realise that the final outcome of the situation will be a mini budget and the State will not receive anywhere near the funding the members opposite think it will get. Over the past seven or eight years when the Federal and State Labor Governments were in office we suffered much in the way of funding cuts from the Federal Government. That will

certainly continue, and even more so this time, with this announced razor gang policy of slash and burn.

South Australia relies on the Commonwealth for 55 per cent of its revenue, so the \$8 million cuts announced by the Prime Minister (John Howard) must have a severe effect on the State's current budget. Already, many services in this State are in crisis, and I will mention four: health, mental health, education and employment. My local hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, has suffered massive cuts over the past couple of years. In my opinion, it is being softened up for privatisation. The only way that this great hospital is continuing to operate is through the hard work and dedication displayed by doctors and staff. I pay tribute to those people for their hard work, commitment and dedication under duress to keeping the hospital running. That great effort cannot be sustained in the long term because it will take too much out of the staff. Sooner or later, unless more funding is provided, the hospital will go down the gurgler in no uncertain way.

One thing that really infuriated me was the recent criminal demolition of historic Tenterden House, a magnificent local heritage treasure located on hospital grounds on the other side of Woodville Road. Tenterden House was bulldozed to provide car parking for about 30 cars. This wonderful old residence has been demolished to allow parking for 30 cars. I am doubtful whether it would have covered the area of 30 cars, but it is somewhere between 25 and 30. It is absolute vandalism. This place has been knocked over for the provision of parking space for cars when all around that area are more than adequate grassed and sealed areas that could be used for parking without demolishing this beautiful old building.

For some months it was saved by the actions of the building construction workers, but in the end they lost the battle and the place was demolished about two weeks ago. I also condemn in this situation the Hindmarsh-Woodville council. The council made a lot of noise over many months to the Government about the retention of this magnificent home, but it was not prepared to put its hand in its pocket and buy the place even though it was offered by the Government. It did not come up with the money to buy it, even though I was told that it would have cost about 50¢ per ratepayer to purchase this beautiful place. The council did not do it: it sat on its hands and saw this magnificent place go down. All that I can say is that I hope the ratepayers who felt strongly about this building remember this at the next local government election in May next year and deal with the elected members as they see fit. It was a terrible shame to see this place go. I got a tremendous shock when I came back from interstate and drove through that area to see that half the place had been bulldozed. It would not have been allowed to happen in some other areas of Adelaide or, indeed, Australia; it was just that it was situated in Woodville in the Port area. I think this was a major factor. The Government did not worry about it, it just knocked it over, and it can never be replaced.

In the area of employment, Premier Brown promised jobs, jobs, jobs when he came to office in December 1993. Where are these jobs? I cannot see them. Unemployment in this State has increased over the past 2½ years. Recent national figures show that a massive 80 per cent of the nation's job losses (16 million people) occurred in South Australia. All the other States of Australia contributed 20 per cent to the increase in unemployment, while South Australia contributed a massive 80 per cent (1.4 million people). So, I cannot see that this Government is going very well. It certainly has not lived up to its promises in that regard. As I have said before in other

speeches, I do not blame Governments entirely for unemployment, because other factors are involved. In particular, in this day and age, the impact of technology is one of the biggest factors in causing widespread unemployment.

However, when this present Government was in Opposition, it continually blamed entirely the former Bannon and Arnold Labor Governments for the high rate of unemployment. Now that it is in power, it must be judged by the same criteria, the same arguments, and accept the criticism dished up to us when we were in power for the high rate of unemployment. You cannot have one set of rules for one Government and another set for another Government.

Another area of concern in South Australia at the moment is education. There were some school closures under Labor, but these in my view mostly amounted to mergers, after much consultation with the community, set up to provide better standards of education and a wider curriculum choice for our kids in certain areas. On the other hand, the school closures by this Brown Government are purely to save money and are mainly hitting disadvantaged families in disadvantaged working-class areas. Last year we saw the closure of Port Adelaide Girls High School, one of only three single sex girls high schools in South Australia. It was an outrageous decision which saw the closure of an excellent school that provided valuable education opportunities for heavily disadvantaged students and gave them a real chance in life.

This great traditional school is now gone, and many young women, not only in the Port area but in other areas of Adelaide and South Australia, are denied the chance to better themselves through the education facilities provided by that school. It was a very short-sighted decision by this Government, just to save a few dollars. What price do we put on education? Some of these students have gone to other schools, but my reports are that they are not coping particularly well because they are missing the particular environment that was present at this wonderful school in Port Adelaide. As I say, it catered for very heavily disadvantaged students, many Aboriginal students and young women who were unable to fit into other school communities. They were studying subjects that they really enjoyed. Over the years, some of them have obtained quite good employment opportunities, and the school has been a wonderful thing for that area. But now it has gone, thanks to this Government.

This year we have had the announced closure of The Parks High School at the end of this year. I have spoken previously about The Parks High School. It is a very unique school, which opened in 1979, so it is still a very modern school, and there is no reason in the world to close it to education. The school was a gift at the time to the people of The Parks Community Centre and the entire Port Adelaide catchment area from the Whitlam Federal Labor Government and the Dunstan State Labor Government. It is an excellent school, probably the best resourced school in the State, if not Australia. It is part of The Parks Community Centre, which was set up as a focal point to service the area and provide services other than merely education to the people of the area. It has been a remarkable success and something that was badly needed. The school provides tremendous educational opportunities and is internationally recognised, and it is a disgrace that its closure has been announced.

It also houses other disadvantaged groups, such as the disabled wheelchair students from the Regency centre and disadvantaged students from the Bowden/Brompton area, and it also conducts an extensive program involving adult re-entry students—a program that I am led to believe is the second most successful adult re-entry program in the State. During the previous parliamentary sittings, I asked the Minister in this House where the Government intended these disabled students to go following the school's closure. My good advice is that to duplicate the facilities to cater for these disabled students in another school will cost \$1 million.

Much infrastructure has been put in place over the years. I still have not received a satisfactory answer to that question. The other question related to what will happen to over 250 adult re-entry students when the only two adult re-entry schools in the western suburbs are situated at LeFevre and Thebarton, which are both at full capacity and cannot take any more students. If these 250-plus students, perhaps even more next year, have to attend another school, where will they go? I believe the answers are not available from the Minister because he does not have them. The Minister and the Government have not thought through this decision and the implications of the school closure, and I condemn them for that.

I would like to place on record the dedication of the teachers and staff of this great school. Teachers from other areas specifically come to teach at The Parks High School. They know it is a difficult school but they are attracted to it and want to be there. Some teachers have given many years of service. They do much more than they are paid to do, putting in tremendous efforts in their own time and catering to the needs of these particular kids in this area. It is a magnificent school and I pay tribute to the staff and, in particular, to several past principals. Having been a member of the school council for the past 10 years, I have worked closely with them, and I also know the parents.

I have been on other school councils in my area but this council is the best I have been involved with. The teachers and staff are absolutely dedicated. The parents likewise are very interested in the education of their children and work well together. As I say, the staff and, in particular, several past principals have been very dedicated. In fact, at a recent public meeting I saw a previous principal who was still taking an interest in the school. It is an area of very high unemployment; it is an area with a high proportion of single parent families; and it is an area where in excess of 30 per cent of families do not own a motor vehicle: if the school closes, those people will be severely disadvantaged in terms of travel.

I do not believe the school will close. There is enough feeling in the community to ensure that the Government will not allow the school to close. I will certainly be giving all my support in this regard, and that includes implementing almost any measure needed to keep the school open. I give the Government and the Minister notice that this school will not be closed and that they will be forced into a situation, as happened in Victoria, where they must keep the school open. There is enough resolve in this situation, which unfortunately was not there for the Port Adelaide Girls High School, and certainly enough support for this school to ensure that it stays open.

As I said, the facilities at The Parks Community Centre are second to none. Perhaps the suggestion for the Government to merge Croydon High School with The Parks would make some sense, in order to continue making available these excellent facilities and to obviate the need to retain the older premises at Croydon. I do not want to put ideas into the Minister's head, but that certainly would be an option worth pursuing and it should be examined. The review initiated by the Minister and conducted at the school last year strongly recommended that the school remain open yet, despite that recommendation, the Minister and the Government decided to close the school.

I received an answer from the Minister today intimating that my allegation that no community consultation had taken place was incorrect, but I refute that. There was no community consultation. The explanation in the Minister's reply indicates that community consultation took place during the review process. I dispute that, because the review process was designed to look at what services the school provided to its students and families in the community, and to examine the needs of the local community and the school's performance in meeting the needs of people in this disadvantaged area.

This was not community consultation in my view. The Government should have come clean, announced the proposals being considered, and then set up the review team to determine reasons why the school should not close and ways to increase involvement and enrolments at the school. It should have taken into account the views of members of the school and the wider community about whether this school could be saved. The enrolment figures were not greatly under the figure at which the Minister said a school would be vulnerable. The adult re-entry students, the mainstream students and the disabled students total nearly the magical 400 figure uttered by the now Minister before the State election when he was shadow Minister.

Despite what the Minister says, I dispute the fact that there was community consultation in relation to possible closure of the school. A review was set up to look at the performance of the school. As I said, the findings were overwhelmingly in favour of retention of the school for the local community. Even the *Advertiser*—that great source of knowledge which is always so conservative and so much on the side of the Liberal Party—has twice criticised the closure of the school. An editorial was hard hitting of the Government and stated that the school should remain open. If the *Advertiser* editorial supports an issue which the Labor Party is espousing and which is contrary to Liberal Party policy, then it is really saying something about the issue.

One of the major reasons that the Minister gave for the closure of the school was the cost of education at the school. This involves an outrageous and unfair rental charge of about \$800 000 a year that has been placed on the school. This is an outrageous figure. A cross-charging mechanism was set up when the Labor Party was in Government. It was a paper cost between departments and does not accurately reflect the costs of running the school. The former Angle Park school was originally on the site; the freehold land was owned by the Education Department; the school was demolished and the land was donated to the Federal Government; and 63 per cent of the cost of the new school was provided by the Education Department. Despite that massive donation, the school is still charged a rental of \$800 000 a year, which is outrageous. This argument is used to take the cost per student to about \$7 965 per year for education costs and is one of the factors that the Government has given to justify the closure of the school.

I intended to mention other capital works, but I have almost run out of time. In conclusion, I advise that The Parks High School will not close despite what the Government and the Minister say. There is resolve in the local community and that is supported by me. Measures will be taken to retain the school for the benefit of the disadvantaged people in this disadvantaged area. I finish as I started: the debate is a phoney and only a mini budget will show the true position of the budget for this year.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I realise how late it is and will not keep members or staff very long. I support the budget and the motion of supply. This is the third budget of the Government and is part of a four year strategy to bring the budget into a surplus situation: at last the State will not be spending more than it earns which has been the trademark of South Australia under Labor Governments and, indeed, the trademark of Australia under Federal Labor Governments. In Australia, whether Victoria under Cane and Kirner, Western Australia or South Australia, or indeed federally, one of the great trademarks has been the ability of Labor Governments to spend more money than they earn.

As a result of that we have ended up with huge debts: when Liberal Governments have been elected they have put in place measures to correct that debt situation. This Government has put in place a four year strategy to correct the debt situation in South Australia. I have no doubt that the Howard Government will put in place a strategy to correct the budget deficit situation; I understand it is an \$8 billion cut over the next two years.

While Labor members have spoken tonight at length about the probable cuts in the Federal budget and about how it may or may not affect South Australia, in all honesty I think they expect no less. They should expect no less, because the people of Australia are not fools. They realise that Australia has a budget deficit and they realise that it needs to be addressed. Generally, they are an intelligent electorate and they expect the Howard Government to make the cuts to rectify the budget deficit left to it by the Labor Government. I believe that the Australian people are now at a point where no longer do they want huge deficit funded programs provided simply for political gain. I believe they are at a stage where they want the country and this State to live within their means and so they will accept cuts if they are achieving that aim.

I congratulate the Treasurer on bringing down this budget. As I understand it, at the end of this year the budget deficit will be about \$60 million, some \$4 million better off than we predicted two years ago. When we first came to power the budget deficit was about \$350 million a year. Slowly but surely the Liberal Government under Brown and Baker is bringing the State's finances back on track. One of the more interesting budget statistics I saw was that the budget strategy is addressing the superannuation liabilities left us by the former Labor Government. It will be another 28 years before the State has fully funded its superannuation liabilities. When we came into Government there was a 30 year lag and it will be another 28 years before the strategy of fully funding superannuation is finally achieved.

One of the pleasing aspects about the budget in my view is that as a Government we have stuck to the promise not to increase charges and taxes above CPI. It is a commendable effort in difficult times, trying to cut the debt and not put up charges above CPI. It is a commendable achievement and the Premier and Treasurer have done a good job in that regard. Of course, committing to and keeping that promise has meant that we have had to address the debt by the sale of assets. As a Government, as we have sold assets the funds have gone to debt reduction and not revenue or programs, which was a habit of former Labor Governments, which would sell assets and plough the money into 12 month or two year programs. We have adopted a different attitude by saying, 'We need to get our debt down and, if and when an asset has been sold, that money is to go to debt reduction rather than into revenue.' I am pleased to see that we are some 18 months ahead in our debt reduction strategy in that regard. The budget has lots of good news for the electorate of Davenport. We have fared well with regard to capital works. We have confirmation of a previous commitment of \$650 000 for the Coromandel Valley Primary School; \$791 000 for the collocation of Belair Junior Primary School with Belair Primary School; \$250 000 for Blackwood High School for new science laboratories; and \$1.8 million for the Daws Road High School as part of its upgrade since the decision on the Marion Road corridor.

Davenport has fared fairly well with regard to the education budget. It is pleasing to see that some schools are finally getting their capital works projects addressed, because they had been ignored under previous Governments and I am pleased that even in difficult circumstances we are getting these programs addressed. Also in the electorate of Davenport I have the pleasure of representing Flinders Medical Centre. As a major hospital, if not the major hospital, in this State I am pleased to say we have lots of money budgeted to be spent on the centre for this 12 months: \$655 000 for the accident and emergency upgrade; \$1.92 million for the eye centre; \$1.6 million for theatre upgrades and \$1.1 million for the psychiatric unit. I should also give credit to the members for Mitchell and Elder who are continually lobbying for extra funding for Flinders Medical Centre because the hospital also services their electorates. Generally, it is a reasonably good news budget in addressing our debt and increasing expenditure on capital works. Education spending is up \$59 million and I am pleased that in that sum is an extra \$15 million payment for the start of a five-year project for an IT program in schools, which is excellent.

I know that my son's school, Heathfield Primary School, has just borrowed a lot of money to provide computers. It is unfortunate that it was put into that situation. The most the previous Labor Government spent on computer technology for primary schools in any one year was about \$360 000. So parents and friends groups, such as that of my son's primary school and those in my local electorate, had to go out and borrow money to provide computers. I am pleased to see that, as a Government, we have said, 'Okay, we will set up an IT program for schools.' We have started a \$15 million program, and I think that is excellent. I am also pleased that extra funding is provided for speech pathology and early intervention programs in the education budget. My second son has had speech pathology through the system. I am pleased see that there is extra money for those programs to help those children who need a little extra help to get the correct start in life.

I must take up a couple of points made by some of the Labor speakers. I am a bit humoured by this point about how we should have made some allowance for the expected cuts in the Federal budget. No State Treasurer in his or her right mind would draw up a State budget which allowed for Federal cuts, because that is only inviting the cuts to occur. There is no way that you would signal that you expected that to happen. We have said, 'This is our State budget. If the Federal budget cuts some of the jointly funded Federal and State programs, we will not carry that program.' So the Federal Government should carry the political flak for any cut in Federally funded programs. I support that concept, and I do not have a problem with that. There is no doubt that, if it does cut a Federal program, it is the Federal Government that should wear it.

I was particularly pleased to see that a comment on trails was made in the sport and recreation area of the budget. I have a particular interest in recreational trails. I was pleased to see the comment that the budget would address recreational trails and help develop their economic and tourism potential. That is important to me. We have the Heysen trail, the Tom Roberts trail and a number of others. I am pleased that we have about 3 000 kilometres of recreational trails in South Australia. There are about 350 000 recreational walkers, runners, bike riders and horse riders, and I am pleased to see that the Government will finally address the development of recreational trails in South Australia. That is an important area in which we can become involved.

As a long-time Hills resident, I am delighted with the announcement that we are funding the improvement of water quality in the Adelaide Hills over the next 12 months with some filtration plants. That is good news for those people who on occasions have experienced some of the poor water quality in the Adelaide Hills area. We are absolutely delighted that now when we wash our shirts they will come out cleaner than when they went in.

I have mixed reactions in respect of the announcement of a \$360 000 major track upgrade of the Belair line. While I am absolutely delighted with the upgrade of the line, because it will provide greater passenger comfort—and that is an important point, of course—I am concerned that we may end up having what is happening now, namely, the upgrade happening at night. For those who have not experienced a track upgrade at night, when they upgrade the track, they have a gantry that moves and lifts the sleepers, and the equivalent of a football siren goes off every time they pick up a sleeper or move the gantry. About 12 times an hour, for the whole night, a football siren sounds. So while the people of Glenalta, Hawthorndene, Blackwood and Eden Hills are delighted that their train service will ultimately be upgraded and they will get a better ride, unfortunately they are not getting a lot of sleep. I am concerned that, when we get this \$360 000 upgrade, that disruption may happen again. I just hope that the upgrade occurs during the day.

The member for Napier spent and inordinate amount of time talking about the Housing Trust. The only comment I would like to make about the Housing Trust is that, if my memory serves me right, when we took over as a Government the former Labor Government left us a debt of about \$1.2 billion in the Housing Trust area alone. For the member for Napier and the Labor party in general to stand up and criticise us over making decisions to improve the administration and efficiency of the Housing Trust smacks of hypocrisy. It is time that that \$1.2 billion debt was addressed. I believe the general public in South Australia accept the fact that this Government has the job of tidying up that debt. With those few words, I support the Bill.

Mr ROSSI secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 5 June at 2 p.m.