

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 February 1994

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

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

A petition signed by 12 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to phase out intensive animal husbandry practices was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

MILK BOTTLES

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow the use of plastic milk bottles was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

WOODCROFT POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 694 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at Woodcroft was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

STATE FINANCES

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. S.J. BAKER**: I wish to make a statement to the House on the State's finances—the present position and the outlook for the next few years. It is a statement which also signals new approaches by this Government to the provision of financial information to the Parliament and to the public.

1993-94 Budget and the Underlying Deficit

At the time of the budget a surplus in the Consolidated Account of \$120 million was projected for the financial year, due largely to some one-off items to which I will refer in a moment. The result for the six months to 31 December 1993 is broadly in line with budget projections. Tax receipts are projected to be up by \$24 million while the fall in interest rates could produce interest savings of some \$12 million.

However, offsetting this, South Australia can expect \$13 million less in its Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grant, because of the drop in the inflation rate. Extra payments of \$8 million are likely to be required under Special Acts, including \$5 million for the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund. There is also likely to be a requirement for additional payments of about \$10 million to cover additional costs incurred by some departments.

The Government's commitment to improving the quality of information is evidenced by the revised format of the monthly statement on the Consolidated Account. The December statement, which I now lay on the table, reports payments down to an agency level compared with the previous highly aggregated form. I would stress, many uncertainties remain and the outlook for the end of the year budget position could change during the final months of the 1993-94 year.

It is important, however, to look beyond these figures to understand the underlying budget picture. The following chart shows the real picture. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to have this statistical table inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

BUDGET-TIME ESTIMATES OF NET BORROWINGS 1993-94

	\$ million		
	Consolidated Account (120)	General Government	Total Public Sector
As Published		338	286
Adjusted for Following 'Abnormal' Factors			
Special Commonwealth Grant	+ 150	+150	+150
Return of Capital from State Bank	+ 160	+ 160	+ 160
Guarantee Fee from State Bank	+ 30	+ 30	+ 30
Separation Packages	-	- 210	- 210
Payment to GAMD	-	- 87	- 87
ADJUSTED 'UNDERLYING' RESULT	220	381	329

These figures show 'adjusted' net borrowing levels of \$220 million for the Consolidated Account, \$381 million for the general Government sector and \$329 million for the public sector as a whole. The figure of \$381 million for the general Government sector possibly overstates the underlying problem because of a largely 'one off' run down in cash balances in departmental operating accounts which has been assumed. Nevertheless, it is clear that the position this Government has inherited is one of the operations of the public sector in this State running at a substantial underlying gap between expenditures and revenues—that is, a deficit or net borrowing.

This is the fundamental financial position which this Government will tackle. The State cannot afford to continue to run up deficits of this magnitude. We will be planning, over the next two years, to eliminate the underlying recurrent deficit in the public finances of this State. Our predecessors promised the same result, but their plan to contain spending and reduce debt was simply not achievable.

Further details of our strategy to achieve a recurrent budget balance by 1996 will be discussed in a special financial statement to be delivered by the Government following the Audit Commission's first full report into the financial health of the State, in April.

Forward Estimates Outlook

Shortly after taking office I was presented with a paper on the forward estimates prepared by Treasury. These estimates were prepared on a basis that sought to project into the forward years the implications of a continuation of the existing policies of the previous Government as understood by the Treasury. The preparation of these kinds of estimates always involves forecasts and assumptions about a wide range of economic and other variables.

The forward estimates are based on further savings, including a continuation of the previous Government's policy that there will be no budget supplementation for increases in wages and prices and a continuation of the plan to phase in funding for accruing superannuation liabilities.

Even assuming these measures, the State was projected to have a significant underlying public sector deficit over the forward period under a continuation of the former Government's policies. The result would have been that, aside from the impact of major asset sales, debt levels would have

continued to increase by over \$1 billion in nominal terms by June 1997.

This would mean, once again, aside from major asset sales, including the sale proceeds and compensation for the State Bank, that debt would not fall in real terms. This is inconsistent with the economic development objectives, in that it does not represent a restoration of the State's financial viability that is sufficiently convincing to sustain business investment confidence.

Public sector net debt, aside from the 'one off' effect of asset sales or self-financing business infrastructure projects, needs to be set on a lower trajectory than that implicit in the present forward estimates provided to me by Treasury. This is because the State still has a massive exposure to interest rates. A two percentage point per annum increase in interest rates would take an extra \$160 million per annum out of the State's revenue collections before funding of community services is even budgeted for.

This Government has committed itself to a number of major asset sales as an important plank in an overall program designed to reduce its exposure to interest rate pressure and to restore the State's financial strength. We must remind ourselves of some important financial facts from recent years. The impact of the losses from the State Bank and the SGIC on the State's finances is well understood. The problems with the State Government's finances, however, are not just due to the ongoing interest effect of the assistance provided to both.

Recurrent Expenditure

The belated restraint in spending that commenced in the 1993-94 budget essentially only begins to 'claw back' the significant increase in spending, particularly recurrent, over the preceding years. The level of restraint needs to be intensified, while service provision is maintained in the most cost effective manner.

Taxation

To keep pace with higher spending and reduced Commonwealth grants in the period between 1989-90 and 1993-94, taxation revenues increased by 9 per cent per annum on average—well in excess of the rate of inflation. Over the 11 years of Labor Government, taxation increased by 178 per cent in real terms.

South Australia's per capita growth in taxes, fees and fines is estimated to be 7.3 per cent per annum during the five years to 1993-94—the highest of any State. These are the trends that we will stop.

Wages Policy

Despite the lower cost of living in South Australia, the average wage for public sector employees is 2 per cent higher than the national average for State public sector employees. It will be essential that there is restraint in public sector wages in the years ahead and that any enterprise bargaining or other wage increases are offset by savings made in agency budgets.

Forward Budget Planning and Targets

This has been another area of neglect by the former Government—avoiding accountability to this Parliament and to the public. The first attempt to publicly provide even limited information on the forward budget position came during the final stages of our predecessor's term in office with the delivery of the economic statement last year.

South Australia has lagged behind the other States in budget transparency—that is, in providing financial information. This Government has made a commitment to publish its forward estimates and it will do so for the 1994-95 budget.

The forward estimates will provide the direct basis for budgetary and financial planning over the medium term. By being made public, they will provide a clear picture for the South Australian community and for the financial commentators of the Government's policies in a medium term context.

Asset Management

In 1987 the Public Accounts Committee drew attention to potential major funding problems and to the need for substantial effort in refining estimates and developing strategies for sustaining the State's infrastructure and services. In 1992 a report of the Economic and Finance Committee showed agencies had paid insufficient heed to the earlier PAC report. It is also clear that there has been neglect of maintenance of major assets and, as a result, the standards of significant numbers of public assets are below levels acceptable to the community.

Two measures are being implemented by the Government as a matter of priority to redress this situation. First, a comprehensive asset management policy which will clearly define the requirements of agencies in managing their assets is under development. This is the first time such a comprehensive policy has been produced in South Australia, and it will be rigorous in demanding standards of excellence in asset management to secure the State's basic foundations for further economic development and community service delivery. Secondly, the Government will deliver a comprehensive estimate of the future funding requirements needed to ensure the State's infrastructure base and service delivery are sustainable on a stable, ongoing basis for the longer-term.

I have provided today only an outline of the State's financial position and some of the areas in which the former Government's policies and practices have contributed to the financial difficulties we face in this State. We look forward to receiving the Audit Commission's report, which will provide an historic opportunity for the Government to make the further and very necessary changes required to secure the State's financial position. The opportunity is there for major improvements in public sector performance. The State Government must live within its means. It will do so with this Government, but it will do so in a way that minimises the impact on service provision.

CAVAN CENTRE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have significant concerns regarding the Cavan Centre's suitability as a high security facility for very serious young offenders. Over many months I have received representations regarding the security arrangements, the quality of programming for the young people in detention and the level of staffing for the centre.

Since my appointment as Minister I have had the opportunity to personally visit the centre, speak with staff union representatives and meet with many of the young people. The construction of Cavan Centre was the first stage of the previous Government's two stage plan to replace the existing two secure care centres. Cavan was to be the replacement for the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre (SAYRAC) which housed the younger and less serious offenders. The second centre was to be built over the next few years to replace the South Australian Youth Training Centre

(SAYTC) which at that time accommodated the older, more serious offenders.

Unfortunately, at the point that the construction of Cavan was virtually completed the previous Minister decided that Cavan should accommodate the older, more serious offenders and not the younger offenders that the centre was designed to manage. Whilst considerable work was undertaken by SACON to 'toughen up' the centre, it was not possible within the limited time available to make Cavan 'escape proof', and there is no doubt in my mind that this late decision by the previous Minister contributed to many of the difficulties experienced at Cavan in the early months.

Had I been Minister at the time I would have left Cavan for the young people it was designed to accommodate. However, at least for the immediate future Cavan must remain as the facility for the older more serious offenders as the building has now been considerably strengthened. Significant work has been undertaken to upgrade and remodel the Magill facility and, though not purpose built, it will be used to accommodate the younger age group. Reversing the decision at this point would result in a considerable cost to the community, and I believe it is now more important to maximise the use of these resources.

In line with this, I have done a number of things to ensure that Cavan is able to function as a secure and productive centre for young offenders. As I have mentioned, considerable strengthening of the building has occurred in recent months to ensure that any opportunities for escape are absolutely minimised. Additionally, I have approved an independent review of the facility so that I can be advised on the extent to which the facility is now adequate for the client group and what additional changes may be required. In relation to providing useful and productive activities for the young people in detention, I am keen to enhance programming in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse, education and training, and specific programs for Aboriginal offenders. Over the next few days I will be writing to my ministerial colleagues seeking their support to speed up the processes for providing these much needed services for the residents to add to the specific program initiatives already in place.

Youth workers in detention centres have a difficult and demanding job, and I have examined staffing issues very carefully. I am confident that with recent changes to the level of staffing, improvements in worker training and better safety procedures staff are now much better equipped to provide this very valuable service. I believe that these measures will greatly improve the level of confidence of both the community and the staff within the Cavan facility.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

AYTON REPORT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier cooperate with Federal authorities, whether it be the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Crime Authority, the Federal Director of Public Prosecutions or Federal Police, to ensure that any criminal offence that occurred in the release of the Ayton submission is fully investigated? On 4 March 1993, the Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition, asked a question in this House in which he quoted from a submission prepared by Assistant Commissioner Ayton of the Western Australian Police to the Federal Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Crime Authority. Disclosure of this document was not authorised by the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Following a formal complaint from Assistant Commissioner Ayton to the Joint Parliamentary Committee about this illegal disclosure, the committee sought an opinion from the Acting Commonwealth Solicitor-General. The Acting Solicitor-General found that a criminal offence had been committed, in particular against section 13 of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Privileges Act, even if it were intended by both the provider and the recipient that the document be tabled and read in State Parliament. A breach of this section attracts a penalty of \$5 000 or imprisonment for six months.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A reply has already been sent from the State Government, through the Attorney-General, back to the relevant Federal authorities. In particular, that response highlights that there was no requirement whatsoever for the then Opposition to provide the information requested, because it is privileged information of this Parliament. However, I can indicate that the Federal colleagues of the Leader of the Opposition, the Labor Party in Canberra, have been trying to suggest that the leak has come from a South Australian Federal member of Parliament. I can assure the honourable member that our source of information was not the person who has been suggested by the Federal Labor members of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is a black and white issue, which has the privilege of the Parliament, and we have indicated that to the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): When the Treasurer was contacted and given a copy of the Ayton submission to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the NCA, was he aware that it had been illegally released in contravention of section 13 of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Privileges Act, and will he cooperate with Federal law enforcement authorities, including the Federal police, to ensure that this matter is now fully investigated and to avoid any charge that South Australian parliamentarians are attempting to use parliamentary privilege as a shelter against police investigation?

In a speech to this House on 4 March 1993, the Treasurer referred to a submission from Assistant Commissioner Ayton of the West Australian Police which had been illegally released from the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Crime Authority. As a result of this and other disclosures by the Premier, the Attorney-General and the Treasurer, Ms E.F. Nelson, QC, was appointed by the

previous Government to investigate allegations against Genting, advisers to the Adelaide Casino. At paragraph 1.51 of her report, Ms Nelson states that she was unable to secure from Assistant Commissioner Ayton copies of any of his material but that his 1991 report to the NCA was supplied to her by the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Ms Nelson's report refuted the allegations made against Genting and the then Labor Government.

The Deputy Premier will be aware of recent public and media criticisms that, on both the NCA and the country living allowance issues, members of Parliament must not be seen to and must not improperly use parliamentary privilege as a cover-up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The question asked was along the lines of whether I knew that the information had come from a particular source and that it was privileged. The House would be well aware that we receive a variety of information from a variety of sources. We do not necessarily judge the privilege or the confidentiality associated with that source.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am amazed that members of the Opposition have asked this question. Given the sensitivity that they should have in terms of their running of the Casino, I would have thought they would keep quiet about this matter. It is a matter that will be revisited shortly. When I have some time away from other duties, we will discuss in this Parliament the activities of the previous Government in relation to the running of the Casino. However, that is for another day. Right now, all I can say is that I received that information; the information was from a substantive source, as everybody here would recognise; and it was not indicated to me at the time whether or not there was a confidentiality associated with that information which would reflect on its use. So, my conscience is clear. We used the information in the way that it should have been used, and we have nothing to answer for on this particular matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARY DEDUCTIONS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): What action has the Minister for Industrial Affairs and his Government taken to ensure that union dues deducted from the payroll of Government employees are, first, properly authorised and, secondly, subject entirely to employee choice?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: From 1 April 1994, each State Government employee will be able to choose—I emphasise the word 'choose'—whether or not they wish to continue the practice of the automatic deduction of their union subscriptions from the Government payroll. The Government will continue to deduct union subscriptions from the payroll where the employee authorises this method of payment. In confirming its willingness to maintain this practice, which benefits public sector unions, the Government is maintaining its pre-election commitment on this issue. Public sector employees will also be required to reauthorise the automatic deduction of their subscription every 12 months.

The reason for these administrative decisions is to ensure that employees have the choice of whether and how their

union fees are to be paid. This proposal is consistent with the Government's union membership policy, which emphasises individual employee choice. In addition, where automatic payroll deductions of union subscriptions occur, a 3 per cent administration fee, which is applicable to most other payroll deductions by Government, will apply.

An exemption from this fee had been granted by the previous Labor Government as a demonstration of the former Government's action of providing preference to the union movement which deductions for other bodies such as insurance funds and health insurers did not receive.

This Government does not believe there are grounds for obvious preferential treatment of union deductions. The Government of South Australia and the South Australian community should not be expected to provide membership collection services for public sector unions free of the charges that apply to most other payroll deductions. These actions further reaffirm the Government's commitment to ensuring that union membership and the automatic deduction of union subscriptions are matters of choice not of compulsion or preference.

As a side issue, this Government when it came into power also rescinded a practice which enabled unions in this State to receive, on a three-monthly basis, all the members of the Public Service who were not members of the union—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: What an incredible set-up. What we have done now is to enable every single public servant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—from 1 April to make the choice as to whether they want an automatic deduction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith has had sufficient to say by way of interjection.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Is the Premier aware of any attempt by the former Government to conceal any legal obligation to Westpac arising from its decision to build a bridge between Hindmarsh Island and Goolwa?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, there is clear evidence that the former Premier deliberately concealed from this House, from me and from a deputation that I took to see him about the Goolwa-Hindmarsh Island Bridge information about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Premier that under Standing Orders he is not allowed to impute improper motives to another member; that must be done by way of substantive motion. I therefore ask the Premier to couch his words carefully in response.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I will certainly do that. However, I highlight to the House that information was given to this Parliament which I find incapable of corresponding with the facts that happen to exist on Government files. Let us go through just some of the detail of the extent to which I believe the former Premier deliberately concealed vital information. First, I took a deputation to see the then Premier in February last year. At that meeting a number of specific questions were put to the then Premier. The first question was whether there was any liability between the State Bank Group and Binalong, and the answer was 'No.'

In fact, I can recall quite clearly then Premier Bannon also making similar claims. Now I find that there is a financial liability from Binalong to the State Bank Group. For reasons of confidentiality, I will not disclose the extent of that liability, but it is important that this Parliament realise that several statements have been made which are entirely false.

The next question that was put to the then Premier in February last year, on three occasions during that deputation, was whether there was any financial obligation by the State Bank to the Westpac Banking Corporation. I found, much to my amazement—because after that deputation I received in March a letter back from the then Premier—that nowhere did that letter refer to this very specific question put to the then Premier about a financial obligation or commitment from the State Government to the Westpac Banking Corporation. I have since found on file a minute, which I think is worth quoting to the House. Addressed to the then Premier, dated 1 March 1993 and signed by Mr B.C. Lindner, Assistant Under Treasurer, the note states, in part:

I would remind you that we have a Crown Solicitor's opinion to the effect that correspondence between the former Premier and Westpac gives rise to a binding obligation on Government to build the bridge as soon as practicable.

That minute acknowledges that that commitment was specifically omitted from a reply that was sent to me as the then Leader of the Opposition. The then Premier was asked specific questions about a financial commitment or obligation from the State Government to Westpac, and he deliberately decided to omit that from his reply to me. To take the matter further, on 17 August last year, in this House, the then Premier had the following to say:

The reason why there was a denial of any obligation to Westpac is, in fact, that there was not an obligation to Westpac.

We have found that there is an obligation, that the Crown opinion is that there is a legal obligation, and that that legal obligation extends very considerably, literally beyond \$10 million in terms of an obligation if the bridge is not built.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, the Leader of the Opposition says I am not telling the truth. The man who has been caught not telling the truth is the former Premier. He not only deliberately omitted, from a letter to me, that obligation between the State Government and Westpac—

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that to allege untruths is also a matter for substantive motion in this House, and the inference clearly there is that the Leader has lied to the House. I ask that you rule on that matter and that the Premier be made to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is somewhat technical; therefore, I cannot uphold it. The sort of accusation that has been hurled across the Chamber from both sides of the House so far during Question Time does nothing to enhance the standing of this Parliament or improve the reputation of members. I therefore ask members to be more cautious in their comments. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will certainly be very cautious. I am simply laying the facts before the House. The facts are that there is clear evidence of a financial obligation which was deliberately withheld from this Parliament and from me and the deputation that visited the Premier in February last year.

It highlights the decision-making process of the former Government in relation to the Hindmarsh bridge. I finish on this note: we all know of the disaster involving the State Bank but, having now had the opportunity to look through the heap

upon heap of Government files relating to the Goolwa to Hindmarsh bridge, all that I can say is that the Labor Government's decision-making process on that matter was even worse than that involving the State Bank Group.

AYTON REPORT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier ask the Attorney-General to table tomorrow any and all responses sent to the Federal Government and/or Federal authorities relating to the matters raised today by my Deputy and me, matters that clearly indicate that the Government has offended in a criminal offence and, if not, why not?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will discuss the matter with the Attorney-General and ascertain whether I can get those relevant documents.

PUBLIC ENTERPRISES

Mr BECKER (Peake): Following the Treasurer's ministerial statement to the House on the State's financial position, will he provide an explanation of the role of public trading enterprises in his plan to restore the State's finances?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously the role of public trading enterprises is critical to this Government's future and to the State's finances. Members do not need to be reminded that the State Bank cost \$3 150 million, and it is even greater than that, as members opposite will recognise. The \$3 150 million is the bail-out figure and, of course, there are mounting interest costs above that. I do not have to remind the House of the role of SGIC and the \$350 million bail-out associated with that organisation. I am pleased to report, however, that SGIC is now on the way back, as will be revealed later today. Thirdly, members would well recall the Scrimber debacle and the financial disaster suffered by this State involving SATCO and the Woods and Forests Department.

Public trading enterprises have played a critical role to date in our finances because these are the areas in which great losses have been sustained due to the lack of accountability and lack of effort made by the previous Government in terms of its responsibility for ensuring that those agencies operated in the best interests of the taxpayers of South Australia.

In our new directions for Government, obviously the public trading enterprises, as long as they remain in the hands of Government, will be under the control of Government to the extent necessary to ensure that we get decent returns and accountability. We guarantee that their progress will be monitored and they will not be left alone to their own devices. We guarantee accountability in the process and, importantly, we guarantee that the quality and membership of the boards directing these organisations will be of the appropriate calibre to ensure that they operate in the best interests of South Australians. Public trading enterprises are vital to the future of our State. Unfortunately, in recent times they have not served us well, but I can guarantee that under this Government they will in future.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARY DEDUCTIONS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Does the Premier still intend to honour his promise, given before the election, to the Public Service Association and other public sector unions such as the Police Association that a Liberal Government had no intention of changing the current arrangements for payroll

deductions of union fees and, if so, will he please explain why the Minister for Industrial Affairs announced yesterday major changes to the system of payroll deductions for union fees without any prior discussion or consultation with any of the unions concerned? Further, why was the arbitrary date of 1 April 1994 chosen for the commencement of these changes to the payroll deduction system? As 1 April is April Fool's Day, is it a reflection on the Minister for Industrial Affairs and his handling of his portfolio to date, which has been characterised by deceit in breaking pre-election promises on industrial matters generally.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: I—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, not only is the honourable member indulging in comment but is again attributing motives in the way in which he has asked the question.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the member for Ross Smith that it is the second time today that a member has continued to talk when the Chair has called for order. I ask that there be no further comment or improper motives attributed.

Mr CLARKE: The Premier on a number of occasions gave his word to the Public Service Association and the Police Association, to name but two, that a Liberal Government had no intention of making changes to the current system of payroll deductions for union fees. In response to a pre-election survey prepared and published by the Public Service Association and dated 9 December 1993 the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition) categorically stated:

As previously advised to the PSA, we have no intention of changing current arrangements—

for payroll deductions of union fees. In answer to the Police Association and its then Secretary, the member for Florey, he stated:

The status quo will be maintained.

Yet, in a statement made by the Minister for Industrial Affairs yesterday, the Government announced that from 1 April 1994 State Government employees will be required to choose whether or not they wish the practice of automatic union deductions to continue, that they must reauthorise the automatic deductions and payments every year thereafter or the payments will cease, and that the Government will impose a 3 per cent administration fee for such deductions. These changes will impose an enormous administrative cost on public sector unions and their members and will be seen by the public sector unions as a form of harassment and intimidation of their membership.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is clearly commenting and he knows that that is contrary to Standing Orders. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us be absolutely clear: the Liberal Party gave a commitment before the election that we would continue automatically to deduct union dues. That is the commitment that we gave. The question put to the Liberal Party before the election was whether we would continue to automatically deduct union dues, and the reply was, 'Yes, we will.' I do not know what the honourable member is getting excited about. However, I say from the outset that we found on file this abhorrent policy of the Labor Government that every quarter of the year it acted as spy for the union movement and gave the unions the names of those working for the Government who were not union members.

Can one imagine a more undemocratic action or policy of any Government? It was spying on its own employees to see whether or not they happened to be members of a union and secretly telling the unions whether or not they were union members. I find that abhorrent. So, we decided that we would adhere to our pre-election promise of deducting union dues, but the first thing we needed to ensure was that those who were having dues deducted wanted to have those dues deducted in light of the policy of the previous Government, and we have done that.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition says that we did not tell them that we would do that. He did not tell employees that the Government was secretly telling the unions whether or not those employees were union members.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Here is this clandestine policy of the Labor Party, telling unions of those who were not union members. The very fact that we have a chorus from members opposite today shows the self-interest of the Labor Party in this issue. From where does its campaign funds come? From the trade unions! Why do they want maximum union membership? To maximise their campaign funds! Here is the self-interest bubbling forth from the members opposite, particularly as they probably overspent their campaign funds trying to win the last election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I could not think of a worse investment by a union than putting election campaign funds into the Labor Party before the last election.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Premier has gone far enough in his answer.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They got their due dividend: 10 members thinly scattered on the Opposition benches.

Mr QUIRKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, this is clearly debate now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Premier has adequately answered the question.

SUBMARINES

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Is the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development aware of speculation that there are construction difficulties with the HMAS Collins class submarine? What explanation can be provided to prevent damage to this vital new industry in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am aware of some—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call and is entitled to be heard in silence. There have been too many interjections.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am aware of an anonymous letter, which makes some allegations, and which has been distributed to some sections of the media. I am aware of a report in one newspaper relating to the supply of steel to the Australian Submarine Corporation that has drawn some question, added to the rumour mill and created some concern. On the clear advice that has been given to me by the Australian Submarine Corporation there are no major difficulties in relation to the submarine project. Concern has been expressed in the media over the apparent delay in undertaking

some of the sea trials for the Collins class submarine, but those concerns are somewhat out of context.

For example, it was suggested that it had been lifted out of the water because of 'leaking problems'. The reason the submarine has been lifted out of the water is to undertake the final fitout, the installation of periscopes and other equipment on it, and it is easier to do it out of the water with scaffolding around the submarine than to install that equipment in the water. The sea trials are clearly in place for the latter part of this year. However, something needs to be borne in context with this project. It is an important project for South Australia. Getting this project was a great win for South Australia, but international experience clearly demonstrates that significant defence construction and manufacturing projects such as the submarine project seldom go exactly to plan, particularly with the first type.

Those who want to question ought to understand that the project is highly sophisticated and involves a broad and significant range of contractors and suppliers, and there will be modifications as the project continues. I hasten to add that the first submarine was launched on time and within budget, an achievement not matched by many international defence projects. If we look at the international defence projects record, it does not meet that standard. As a small State we are highly dependent on significant investment projects such as the submarine and other major defence projects, and to draw undue public attention and concern to operational matters out of context places at risk further, continuing efforts of the Government in this State to secure other defence projects for the economic development of South Australia.

It has been a major success and demonstrates our ability to undertake major, sophisticated, world class manufacturing projects here in South Australia, and it is something that we ought to be proud of and supporting and encouraging, and not giving any credence to rumours or unsubstantiated allegations in anonymous letters that are floating around the community. I have no doubt that when the Premier participates in the keel laying ceremony tomorrow he will re-emphasise the point that the submarine project is important, is a major defence project and is the forerunner to a number of other major defence projects that this State would like to have put in place in South Australia for the spin-off benefits that by and large they create in the economy.

In summary, there are no major glitches, problems or difficulties with the submarine project. It is on time and on budget. There was some steel delivered by BHP that it acknowledged publicly had imperfections in it. I do not know many projects in this State that have a full batch of products delivered to site that are always 100 per cent all the time. That is simply not the case. It is unrealistic to expect it to be so. This project, as I said, with the Premier participating in the keel laying ceremony tomorrow, is a further continuation of an important world class manufacturing project for the benefit of South Australia in the future and we ought to support it to ensure that international investment attraction to South Australia is enhanced by projects such as this, and not put in jeopardy as a result of unsubstantiated allegations.

PUBLIC SECTOR SALARY DEDUCTIONS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. Will the Government also be requiring public sector employees to choose whether health benefits, superannuation and insurance premiums continue to be deducted from their pay as of 1 April 1994 and

every year thereafter? The Government has stated that from 1 April public sector employees will be required to choose whether their union fees continue to be deducted from their pay, and they must renew their commitment every year thereafter. Public sector employees have many other deductions, such as health benefits, taken from their pay. Unless the Government is deliberately singling out union membership, deductions for health benefits and insurance should be subject to the same conditions.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The answer is that there was no policy decision on either of those issues.

BEACH EROSION

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): What action has the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources initiated to investigate the reported loss of sand at Christies Beach around the boat ramp, and is this loss linked to sand dredging at O'Sullivan Beach? Recently, the ramp to allow sailing boat access to the beach at Christies Beach was repaired and replaced by the Noarlunga council. It has become apparent that there is significant loss of sand around the ramp, and some of my constituents have asked whether this sand loss is due to the dredging at O'Sullivan Beach.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have received a considerable amount of representation from people regarding this matter, and I know the concern that has been felt by the honourable member and her constituents. I will ask the department to provide full details, but I have been able to ascertain that the Coastal Management Branch is aware of the complaints concerning low sand levels in the vicinity of the Christies Beach boat ramp. I am informed that this problem is periodic, and the Coastal Management Branch file shows very clearly that the problem was reported to it previously and prior to 1989, which is 18 months before dredging commenced in the area.

At this stage there has not been detailed investigation of the problem, but it appears that the ramp is located on a section of beach subject to regular but natural changes in beach levels. The ramp, I am also informed, may also contribute to the problem by causing localised sand loss around the structure. I understand that members of the Coast Protection Board have met with the Noarlunga council regarding this issue, but I will provide more details for the honourable member.

I am also informed that the dredging site is located outside what is referred to as the active beach zone to avoid any impact on adjacent beaches, but I recognise the concern that is being expressed. I have received representation from a wide cross-section of people, not just her constituents adjacent to this area. I recognise the concern and I will seek further information for the honourable member.

AYTON REPORT

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Did the Premier receive a stolen copy of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member is cautious in how he addresses his questions, and also he should address his questions through the Chair.

Mr ATKINSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Did the Premier receive a stolen copy of Assistant Commissioner Ayton's submission to the NCA directly or indirectly from

a member of the Federal Joint Parliamentary Committee on the National Crime Authority?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No. First, I did not receive a stolen copy; and, secondly, I have already indicated that the document I received did not come from a member of the Federal committee.

BUILDING STONES

Mr EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Minister for Mines and Energy. Is there an increase in demand from overseas markets for natural building stones mined in South Australia, and what initiative is the Government taking to boost the State's export income from this source?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for the question and for his interest in this matter. I guess members would think it unusual that there is a demand for building stone for export from South Australia. In fact, it has received a great boost in the past 12 months. A company called Finska, which is one of the largest quarriers of granite in the world, has opened an operation in South Australia, and many of the shares are owned by the Government of Finland. Finska Pty Ltd has opened two green granite leases at Padthaway in the South-East of South Australia, and it is expected that it will produce some of the best granite in the world. Members will agree that the area will produce not only the best granite in the world but also the best wine.

Finska has already exported quite a bit of this granite overseas to Thailand, Taiwan and Japan, and some 4 000 tonnes are expected to be exported per year. The Department of Mines and Energy has a representative in Italy looking at the use of this granite on some of the buildings in that country, and it is envisaged that if that is successful there will be further value adding opportunities to process that granite in South Australia and export it in a further value added form.

The Government is very pleased that Finska has decided not only to have its head office in Adelaide but to develop further leases in South Australia, and we will encourage it to do so and give it whatever support we can.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Does the Premier stand by his election promise to employ people in the Public Service based on their talents regardless of their political beliefs? The Liberal Party's code of conduct policy released during the election campaign last year states:

Ministers will ensure that departments and agencies for which they have responsibility will employ the talents of public servants to their fullest, notwithstanding the political beliefs of those public servants, provided only that those public servants behave in accordance with the Westminster convention of Public Service neutrality.

Despite this policy, the Government has terminated the contracts of over a dozen senior and middle-ranking public servants who were engaged by the Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections on my right.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes.' I stand by my policy. However, I highlight the comment at the end of the question, even though there was not supposed to be any comment. The suggestion is that the former head of the Department of Premier and Cabinet and other people who held the position

of Chief Executive Officer and who were terminated, were terminated for political reasons. Of course, that is not the case at all.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It's just accidental that they were all Labor people!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Oh, they were Labor people.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What an admission!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What an admission from the former Premier: that every one of those people who had their contract terminated were Labor people. What an incredible admission! It appears that the honourable member should talk to her own Leader, because it appears that he does not abide by the policy of the Liberal Party and this Liberal Government. It would appear quite clearly from what the Leader of the Opposition has just said that the former Government appointed all its people on the basis of their political affiliation. There was no acknowledgment of ability at all. From what the former Premier just said, every one of them appointed under his Government was apparently a member of the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections, and I will be forced to take action if they continue.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I suspect that, if the media asked each of those people whether they were members of the Labor Party, they would be insulted by the Leader of the Opposition's comments. I believe the admission by the Leader of the Opposition stands by itself in condemning him and his former Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, I could not misrepresent that. I would not even attempt to misrepresent that. If that is the basis on which the Leader of the Opposition appointed staff when he was in Government, he does not deserve to sit in this place, and his former ministerial colleagues do not deserve to sit in this place. Shame on them!

FROGS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Are South Australian frogs protected? If not, does he share some biologists' views that some species are endangered, and is he concerned about the transfer of frogs from one ecosystem niche in which they are indigenous to another in which they would be feral?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the House should give the Minister the opportunity to answer the question without all the assistance.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I think there are a few endangered species on the other side of the House. In answer to the honourable member's question, amphibians are not protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Frogs do not have any protection. I am aware of the concern with which the honourable member raises the question, because I have received representations from a number of people about this matter, and they have asked me in the short time that I have been Minister whether I would be prepared to take some action in regard to this issue and the need to protect frogs.

There is no doubt that, as many members in this House would know, there is concern about the fact that some species in this State and in Australia are becoming endangered. As the honourable member would know, as a result of the review of the national parks and reserves in this State there will need to be significant changes to legislation, and it would be my intention to amend the current Act to ensure that amphibians are protected under legislation. We have the ability at the present time to protect them under regulation, but I do not believe that that is totally satisfactory. It would be better to amend the legislation and that is something I will be doing at the appropriate time

ALLIED ENGINEERING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Did the Premier or any of his Ministers, prior to or shortly after the State election, have discussions with an Adelaide political lobbyist, Mr Terry McEwen, representing an Adelaide engineering firm, Allied Engineering, and did he or any of his Ministers promise financial support to that company? I have been advised by reliable sources that the new Government—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I have a few reliable sources, I might add, in the Government.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr FOLEY: I have been advised by reliable sources that, shortly after winning office, the new Government had discussions with Mr Terry McEwen and Allied Engineering and indicated that it would provide financial assistance in excess of \$1 million to that company—this is despite advice from Government officers and the MFP board that financial assistance to the company was neither warranted nor appropriate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have had no discussions whatsoever with Mr McEwen; I have had no discussions with Allied Engineering—

Mr Foley: Have any of your Ministers?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will need to have that matter investigated for the honourable member. But I know of no discussions and I know of no commitments given whatsoever. So let us be quite clear: I certainly have had no discussions and I know of no discussions, either with Mr McEwen as a lobbyist or with the company itself.

IDEAS AND INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Mr WADE (Elder): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. Will the State Government continue to fund the Ideas and Investment Program? The Ideas and Investment Program is currently funded equally by the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing and the Department of Regional Development. I understand that the funding is due to run out on 17 March this year.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, funding is due to conclude on 17 March. However, as with a range of programs, we are waiting upon the Commonwealth Government's industry statement to see what funds will flow from the Commonwealth Government to supplement those funds in South Australia.

It is a worthwhile program and one that the State Government would want to see continuing. The question of funding is another matter that is being addressed by my department. We are having ongoing discussions and consultations with the Federal Government in relation to the industry statement, which is due to come down in April or May and which has been deferred somewhat given the change of Minister on the Federal scene. However, I would hope that we would be in a position to continue funding, but I cannot give an absolute commitment at this stage.

GULF ST VINCENT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for Primary Industries ensure that no fishing for prawns in Gulf St Vincent takes place tonight, and will he make available the so-called survey results for the catch taken in December last year for assessment prior to further surveys being undertaken? If the survey is to proceed tonight, will the Minister give instructions that only one net be used for survey purposes and not the multiple rigs?

In 1991, the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery was closed due to the depleted catch and declining prawn stocks. Industry sources have advised the Opposition that on 17 December last year, just a few days after the State election and at the height of the spawning season, the Minister for Primary Industries opened the fishery for an extended survey for five days and 13 tonnes of prawns were removed from the fishery. Industry sources believe that the catch rates in pounds per minute trawled in 1993 have halved compared with those in 1991. Fishermen have been advised that another survey is to take place tonight; however, industry sources advise that April is a much more suitable time for the survey.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I am tempted with such a lengthy question to say that I will bring back an answer tomorrow, but I guess I cannot on this occasion. What is going on this evening is another survey that has been authorised by the Chairman of the management committee. It is ongoing from the extended survey that we did for five nights just before the end of December and it is part of the evaluation of the long-term viability of that fishery.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): In view of recent actions by the Federal Health Minister, Senator Richardson, to promote the view that he is a champion of Aboriginal health, will the Minister for Health say how Aboriginal health in South Australia has fared in recent years under Federal and State Labor Governments?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I was surprised to see what can only be described as very much a 'Johnny-come-lately' attitude on the part of the Federal Minister for Health—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: 'Graham-come-lately', indeed—so publicly identified on the front page of the *Weekend Australian*, because this has been a problem for far too long. For the Federal Minister for Health suddenly to realise that continued neglect of Aboriginal health by him and his State Labor colleagues is now a matter of concern quite frankly is reprehensible.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Indeed, as the member for Gordon says, he is crying crocodile tears. The Federal Labor

Government has had 11 years to achieve something; he has done nothing. Aboriginal health care, both nationally and in this State, quite frankly is deplorable; it is third world stuff.

The latest standard measures of health reveal that South Australia's Aboriginal communities continue to suffer high rates of death and sickness, and those indicators put them well below the levels in the rest of the community. I recognise that there are major problems to be overcome in matters such as hygiene and housing before those figures could even approach what would be regarded as recognisable community standards. The Aboriginal Health Council, which represents Aboriginal community controlled health services in South Australia and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, is presently preparing a paper entitled 'Dreaming Beyond 2000'.

There is no question that at present Aboriginal health in South Australia has lost its way. The Governor's speech identified that this Government intends to make it a focus of its policies. It has thus recently created the position of Director of Aboriginal Health, which will be filled by Mr Brian Dixon, who is an Aboriginal person from the Northern Territory with many years experience in senior health positions. He will take up that position in early March. This Government will take action on Aboriginal health and will not suddenly develop an interest in it far too late, as is quite clearly the case with the Federal Minister.

GULF ST VINCENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. On what date did the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Management Committee determine to recommend that prawning take place in Gulf St Vincent; on what date did the Minister receive the recommendation; and will he provide a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Management Committee that made the recommendation and a copy of the recommendation to this House?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I do not have those figures available, but I will bring back a report tomorrow.

TROTTING

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I direct my question to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What decisions have been made in relation to the calendar for trotting club meetings in country areas? In particular, will the Kadina Trotting Club retain the same number of meetings it currently runs?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for his question; I know of his ongoing interest in harness racing in the copper triangle. My colleague the Minister for Regional Development also has raised this issue with me on several occasions when there has been some public discussion over the future of the Kadina harness racing track. The issue has been generated in the public arena by the release of the Evans and Mules report, which was commissioned by the Harness Racing Board for the purpose—

An honourable member: Mules!

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: You might say mules, but in this case it is trotting horses. The report has been commissioned by the Harness Racing Board to look into the structure and viability of the harness racing industry. The 13 clubs that are involved in harness racing at the moment are still feeling

the aftermath of the last two or three years when a downturn occurred in the racing industry. Other forms of gambling started to erode into the three codes of the racing industry, and the on-course patronage was dropping off dramatically, particularly because of Sky Channel and the fact that people could go to the pub for Pub TAB.

The Harness Racing Board had some concern and asked the Evans and Mules inquiry to prepare a report. That inquiry presented to the board a set of recommendations, which are to be circulated around the harness racing code shortly. The tracks that the report looked at in particular were Kapunda, Kadina, Port Pirie, Gawler and Globe Derby, and the recommendation is that nine Tuesday night meetings in winter that have been identified as uneconomical in terms of conducting a race meeting should be deleted. The board has suggested that the breakdown be as follows: Kapunda will have to give up four Tuesday night meetings in winter but will gain two afternoon meetings in lieu at Globe Derby; Kadina will give up two Tuesday night meetings in winter; Port Pirie will give up one Tuesday night meeting in winter as well as two Saturday night non-TAB meetings; Gawler will give up one Tuesday night meeting in winter; and Globe Derby will give up one Tuesday night meeting in winter.

The issue is really about non-attendance of patrons. However, I emphasise that these recommendations are just that. They are being distributed by the board, and all clubs will be invited to have an input back to the board, the board eventually reporting to me. I can assure members that I am not in the business of closing down country racing tracks, although I know that the board has some difficulty with trying to get the code back onto an economical footing.

I refer briefly to the Franklin Harbor track, which has been closed as it has been declared unsafe by the stewards, the two race meetings being transferred to Whyalla. The club has asked me to look at its future and we are in the process of doing that at present.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 15 February. Page 62.)

The SPEAKER: I point out to the House that this is a maiden speech and I ask that the normal courtesies apply.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I commence by congratulating you, Mr Speaker, on your recent election to the position of Speaker in the House of Assembly, which is a position of the greatest importance within the Westminster system and one which needs a strength of character to show impartiality and fairness in the guidance of the House.

I also thank Her Excellency the Governor for her speech when opening the Parliament, and I congratulate her on the dignity with which she has carried out her role as the representative of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to all new members of the House, particularly to the class of 1993—18 of us who have worked together for some 18 months sharing the highs and lows of being a political candidate, finally seeing the results of those efforts culminating in our election as

members of Parliament. I advise the member for Ross Smith that we did consider for some two seconds the possibility of his joining the class, but it was rejected unanimously.

The seat of Colton takes in part the old seat of Hanson, which was so well served by Mr Heini Becker, and I thank him for his support during the election campaign. The seat of Colton also takes in the old electorate of Henley Beach, for which Mr Don Ferguson was the member. Although he was unsuccessful in gaining a seat in the Upper House, I know that he served his people well during his adversity of having to fight a serious illness. However, on a personal level I wish him and his wife a happy and long retirement.

I feel honoured and I thank the people of my electorate for their confidence in electing me as the first member for the new seat of Colton, the seat showing the two Party preferred Liberal vote of 60.5 per cent. I am also honoured that, in this year, the year in which all South Australians will be celebrating the Centenary of Women's Suffrage, the electorate is named after a woman. Mary Colton was born in London on 6 December 1822, the daughter of Hannah and Samuel Cutting. She came to Adelaide with her widowed father in 1839 at the age of 17 years. In December 1884, she married John Blacker Colton, who was the owner of a prospering saddlery and hardware business. John Colton was Mayor of Adelaide from 1874 to 1875 and was a member of Parliament from 1862 to 1887, including two periods as Premier of South Australia.

Mary and John Colton had nine children. She was a staunch Wesleyan Methodist and a devoted Sunday school teacher at the Gawler Place, and later, Pirie Street Wesleyan Methodist churches. She was concerned with the welfare of women and children and was vice president of the Nursing Sisters Association and Maternity Relief Association which assisted poor mothers in the city. She worked with her husband in the Benevolent and Strangers Friendly Society and in organisations for the blind, deaf and dumb. She recognised the plight of the poor and worked to house elderly women; she served the Lady Kintore Cottage Homes Trust and the Home For Incurables, which is now the Julia Farr Centre.

In 1879 she began a city club for young women, and this ultimately became the South Australian Young Women's Association, in which she served as president until her death. Consistent with her care for the young, she was one of the founders of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and worked on a boarding-out society which placed orphans and neglected children in selected private homes instead of institutions. Her work with women saw her involvement in female refuge and from this seems to have emanated her work on women's suffrage.

Another lady, Mary Lee, whose work is also recognised in the recent changes to the names of the State electorates (the former seat of Albert Park, now Lee), worked with Mary Colton as secretary of the female refuge. The age of consent was raised to 16 in 1885 and Mary Colton saw an urgent need for women's suffrage. In 1892 John Colton was knighted, and Lady Colton became president of the Women's Suffrage League. One year later she became foundation president of the Women's Auxiliary of Foreign Missions. She saw the amalgamation of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Women's Suffrage League. This alliance seems to have grown from the determination of women to change the liquor laws by the influence of the women's vote and the installation of women in Parliament. Women's suffrage legislation was passed in South Australia in 1894 after a

campaign of extensive debate, strong opposition, and sustained and skilful input by the Women's Suffrage League.

Lady Mary Colton died on 28 July 1898 in her 78th year. Her name was given to the Lady Colton Hall in the YWCA building and to the Colton Ward at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Her work is now further recognised in the renaming of the Henley Beach State electorate. I must say that I am proud of the fact that my electorate is linked to such a remarkable woman: a worker for the rights of women, the needy, the neglected and the underprivileged. In my next newsletter I intend to portray the history of Mary Colton to the electorate, because I know that her name will be recognised during this the centenary year celebrations of women's suffrage. I am proud to say that I am the first member of this new electorate.

The electorate of Colton takes in the areas of Fulham, Fulham Gardens, part of Seaton and the beautiful seaside suburbs of West Beach, Henley South, Henley and Grange. As a former Lord Mayor of the city, I was always considered to be one of the most outspoken voices regarding the need for the preservation of the parklands, and I am proud that it was my actions that reversed the decision by the Bannon Labor Government to build the bicentennial conservatory in Botanic Park. I believe that would have brought about the destruction of 110 acres of one of the most magnificent English parks that exist in this country. As a result of my going on talk-back radio and raising the anger of the community, the Government decided, because of the public pressure I had created, to erect the conservatory on the STA bus depot land and then to give a guarantee to the community that the depot would revert to its original use as parklands.

I intend to continue to be vocal on the need to preserve and enhance the quality of water on the foreshores of my electorate ensuring that necessary action is taken to improve the quality of water emanating from the Patawalonga and, let us not forget something which is equally as important, the water from the River Torrens that flows into the sea through the Henley south-west beach outlet. I applaud the actions of the Premier in allocating \$4 million to clean out the Patawalonga, but I believe that additional funds will be required to address the need to clean up the River Torrens also. It is encouraging to note that the Hon. David Wotton, Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, has moved quickly in response to the Premier's action by forming a committee to address the stormwater management of the Patawalonga catchment.

Work has already been undertaken by councils to make their constituents aware of the disasters caused by throwing lawn clippings and other vegetable matter into the creeks, which eventually finish on the beaches of Glenelg and the coast as far north as Outer Harbor. It is a matter of concern that it has taken so long for any Government to act responsibly in working with local government to control the effluent and pollution entering the sea from both the Patawalonga and the River Torrens. Following heavy rains, the foreshore is littered with plastic bags, bottles, rotting vegetation, syringes and polystyrene containers which are swept down the waterways into the sea and eventually deposited north of the Patawalonga, especially on the Colton beaches of West Beach, Henley and Grange.

While standing on the Henley jetty I have noticed the discolouration of the sea from recent discharges of silt and clay, some of which originate from the quarries and the foothills.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: Yes. Even of greater concern than the discolouration is the stench which often accompanies such outflows. I think it is an injustice for councils to have to take water samples to determine bacterial levels and lead and toxic residues which eventually affect shore seagrasses, killing them off and thereby destroying our ability to allow our fish and prawns to spawn on these seagrasses. This means that, unless immediate action is taken and the problem overcome, our huge fishing industry will be placed in the same position as that of many other countries all over the world which import their seafood because their waters are so polluted that their fish catchments have deteriorated to a point where they cannot meet the demand of their local communities let alone the export markets.

There is an urgent need to introduce an educational program to advise householders and businesses how to retain rainwater that can be stored and utilised for the watering of gardens and in their homes. The attitude of most property owners now is to immediately release that water into the stormwater system because that is the cheapest and best solution. As residential properties become more dense, we are finding that the amount of water that is discharged into the stormwater system is such that the existing services simply cannot cope.

I also believe that the establishment by councils of wetlands is necessary and that the use of land for floodwater mitigation or holding areas that enable water to be reused at a later stage is essential. Some councils are already establishing their own wetlands. The Henley and Grange council has established its wetlands on the banks of the River Torrens close to the West Torrens boundary, but I believe that assistance must be given to encourage councils to establish wetlands as that will certainly go a long way towards improving the quality of water that emanates from the Patawalonga and the River Torrens.

My electorate of Colton is the most seriously affected electorate when it comes to water quality on suburban beaches and it is worst hit by poor practices of the community, residential and business alike. I would like to see assistance given to a program of dune care to allow the establishment of sand dunes to stop the continual movement of sand from south to north. Sand replenishment has become a necessary but costly exercise, one which was forgotten by the previous Government. Damage has also been done to the tourism industry through this continual pollution of the sea, and in this most recent holiday period people continually cancelled their holidays because they could not enjoy the clean waters of our beaches. I am sure that this Government will address more responsibly the quality of water that emanates from the Patawalonga and the Torrens and will achieve more positive results than the previous Government achieved.

Like all South Australians I am disappointed with the loss of the Grand Prix. I am sure that as the Parliament continues more and more evidence will emerge as to why we lost this event. However, for us to vent our anger on the citizens of Victoria is a fruitless and dangerous exercise, because the prosperity of both States depends so much on the tourism one State attracts from the other. Let us stop this childish and dangerous behaviour of abusing Victorians, because the only thing that will do is put many South Australians out of work and also spoil the friendly rivalry that has existed for so many years between our two States.

While the Grand Prix is a great loss, let us look at one of the quiet achievers, one of the great positives that we have

going for us in this State, and I refer to the Adelaide Convention Centre. The Adelaide Convention Centre has remained an industry leader within this country for the past seven years and is regarded as an Australian trend setter on the international scene. 1994 will be a record year for the centre with some 575 events booked so far, a massive increase of 22 per cent on last year. Some 26 meetings are already scheduled for 1 000 people or more. Just those 26 of the 575 events indicate a far greater financial boost for tourism than the entire Grand Prix. On top of that, there are 50 bookings for between 500 and 1 000 people and 499 bookings for gatherings of up to 500. In this year alone, convention business will generate 200 000 room nights for hotels, and since it was opened seven years ago the Convention Centre has pumped \$130 million into South Australia's economy.

While other centres around Australia are making only minor profits, the operating profit of the Adelaide Convention Centre is expected to be about \$1.3 million. Our Convention Centre employs 66 permanent employees and 180 casuals. However, even more interesting is the fact that it brings out the multicultural qualities of Adelaide. Those 246 workers come from 24 different countries, and their skills are fully utilised during international conventions. That is why overseas delegates say they feel more at home at the Adelaide Convention Centre than anywhere else in Australia. The Convention Centre is taken for granted, because it continues on in its quiet way, running its business efficiently. The single most important statistic and measurement of benefit is delegate spending, which, based on the average figures, shows that the average convention delegate spends five times more than the average tourist.

The reason for this is that convention delegates are usually fully compensated for their attendance at a convention arranged by their employer and, therefore, by the convention costs being absorbed, delegates have more disposable income to spend on entertainment, shopping and, in most cases, further travel within the State to other tourist attractions such as Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Ranges, the Barossa Valley and the Adelaide Hills.

The value of the Convention Centre is the delegate spending, for which the Adelaide Convention Centre can be measured only by the room nights booked at Adelaide hotels, which provide approximately 2 000 rooms in the CBD. It is estimated on average that conventions provide 21 per cent of the room business for the major hotels in Adelaide, and this equates to four Grands Prix spread over 52 weeks of the year. Few Grand Prix visitors take gifts back: they simply spend it on alcohol, food and souvenirs. This is not to knock the Grand Prix but just to try to put into perspective the value of the Convention Centre compared to that of the Grand Prix.

What we must do is realise the potential and our ability to sell conventions within the Asian communities. The Asian economy continues to grow more rapidly than any other. There is now an emerging middle class in Asia keen to spend their new wealth on travel to exciting destinations, and South Australia has some of the products they are looking for. We must forget about the disasters of the \$1.8 billion worth of lost tourism developments of the previous Labor Government and seek a record of tourism development growth that will provide thousands of jobs in the tourism and hospitality industry for the future of our young people.

We must tap into the Asian tourism market and see ourselves as part of the Asian/Pacific tourist boom. But it will happen only if we market ourselves aggressively and let the

2 billion people in the Asian community know where we are and what we are all about. The Asian tourism market is growing at an alarming rate. I am sure that, given assistance and support, the Convention Centre can continue to play an important role in the growth of the convention and tourist market in South Australia.

Finally, I would also like to congratulate Mr Pieter Van der Hoeven, Manager of the Adelaide Convention Centre, on his appointment to the ICCA's global board of directors, the first South Australian to hold that position and currently the only Australian on the board.

I should now briefly like to talk about small business, an area that has been sadly neglected by Governments in the past and a section of our business community that is given little support or incentive for expansion to play its rightful and major role in respect of jobs growth and development in our community. Only two months prior to the election we witnessed total disregard for the welfare of the small business community when the previous Government made a decision to allow the extension of trading until 9 p.m. for all supermarket chains, a move that would have eventually wiped out some 30 to 40 per cent of our small businesses in South Australia. Thankfully, the Liberal Government ended that farce on 4 January this year and returned some sanity to the small business world.

The people who run small business are of exceptional quality. They are resilient to adversities and are courageous in that they are always willing to give it a go and risk all that they have worked for over an extensive period. We need to identify the role played by small businesses in the economy and the community as a whole. Job growth in a buoyant economy is far more likely to emanate from small business rather than from large industries. Small business is the essence of any healthy, free enterprise economy and, in the final analysis, of a progressive and dynamic community.

Governments that destroy small business destroy the economy as well. Most small businesses do not have the resources and industrial muscle of the big corporations, and small business people have to work harder and longer with minimum profit margins in their struggle to survive. In many instances, they are called upon to pay a higher rental and higher overheads in shopping centres and, therefore, to subsidise rentals paid by multi-national companies which are given cheaper rentals because they are perceived to be the necessary key to the survival of the major shopping centres. In particular, small retailers in major shopping centres are called upon annually to pay increases of 10 per cent and more in rentals and overheads, whereas the CPI may indicate that the expansion of their businesses can be at a rate as low as 3 to 4 per cent.

Restrictive Government regulations and red tape, an unsympathetic and sometimes hostile community attitude, and the very strong and, most of the time, totally unfair and unjust competition from big corporations make the existence of small businesses difficult if not impossible. It is a miracle how many manage to survive. As we have seen in recent years, the decisions made by both Federal and State Labor Governments have ensured that many do not survive, with resultant record unemployment and further desperation in the community.

Small businesses employ some 61 per cent of the work force. They pay in excess of 50 per cent of the tax revenue and have the ability to reduce unemployment faster than any other section of the community. Their contribution is most important as they produce and sell most of the products and

services we depend on in our daily lives, as well as creating opportunities for the community. In short, they are the foundation and the cornerstone of a strong and dynamic economy. Their survival and growth are the basic condition. Small business is an absolute necessity if one wants to build and sustain a healthy, vibrant and well-balanced economy.

Small business is a self-controlled, self-disciplined and hard-working community, which not only receives little help but has even had its position and strength undermined despite the fact that the people involved work under the most difficult conditions with harder and longer hours than any other section of the community, and for what rewards? The fruits of their hard work, their determination and service to the consumers and the community, are brought about by a quality which makes them the outstanding achievers of the business world, even though they are probably the poorest paid members of the community when their remuneration is calculated on an hourly basis.

It was interesting to hear the Hon. John Olsen, the Minister for Small Business, when replying to a question asked last Thursday, state:

All in all, some 1 500 inquiries have been received from small business operators in South Australia wanting to assess the Government's job creation program to assist them with the employment of South Australians during the course of the year. I feel confident that this Government will open its doors and invite small business in from the cold to play a meaningful and vital role in the creation of jobs and to implement the Government's priority in addressing the levels of unemployment that we have had to sustain in this State over a considerable period and, by working with and assisting small business, the Government's policy in putting in place the \$28 million jobs package will create job opportunities for the young and unemployed through the vital small business sector.

I would now like to refer to the City of Adelaide, which occupied a large part of my public life as a member of the Adelaide City Council and as Lord Mayor of a city which is of interest not only to me but to all members of this Parliament whose electorates have some form of tourist orientation.

The city is the heart and nucleus of the State of the South Australia and, without a successful city, the entire State cannot work. A city must be the centre of activity. The retailing and entertainment centres are areas where people congregate due to the excitement they create. They provide the community with its entertainment, its ability to enjoy good food and wine, and a city must be alive and vibrant 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The only way of achieving this is by having a substantial residential population living in and around the fringes of the CBD. When I was a young boy living in the west end of the city in the mid-1940s, the population of this city was 42 500; I watched the decline set in during the post-war years as we bottomed to a residential population of just 10 500.

During my six years as Lord Mayor, I constantly reiterated the need for the city's residential growth and had the total support of my council in recognising that, if the city was to play its rightful role in attracting tourists and visitors, we would have to reverse the post-war residential decline of the city. For the past seven years, this has been a longstanding priority of the Adelaide City Council. In fact, the council's efforts have resulted in the city being one of the few inner-metropolitan municipalities to show a population gain in both the 1986 and 1991 censuses.

The council itself has been successful in offering incentives for people to return to the city and live, the most important one of all being that, if you own and occupy your own residence in the City of Adelaide, you receive a 45

per cent residential rate rebate on your annual rates. I do not think that this has been publicised enough to the community. In fact, a house of similar value in the City of Adelaide is now far less expensive in terms of council rates than a house in Norwood, Burnside, Enfield, Walkerville, St Peters and other such municipalities.

I am proud of the fact that during my six years as Lord Mayor I was able to increase the residential population of the city, but I believe that the Government can play a substantial role in providing incentives for people to give up the urban sprawl from Willunga to Gawler and in fact change their lifestyle from that of a quarter acre block to a residential apartment dwelling. All thinking people would agree that for Adelaide to become a viable city it must have more permanent residents. To achieve this it follows that the Government and the council must offer incentives to potential purchasers to encourage them to seriously consider a move back to city living. As I have outlined, the implementation of such policies not only reduces the pressure on the ever expanding urban sprawl but also decreases the cost to Government funding for the supporting infrastructure.

Inner city living also has the advantage of the existence of comprehensive community and social services, which are usually only thinly provided in fringe development areas, if at all. An opportunity exists for the new Government to develop and institute a new and better policy to provide an additional embryonic attraction to inner city, medium density living, which is beginning to emerge as people seriously consider the advantages of reduced travel time to work, opportunities for the use of public transport and the immediate availability of community and social services. To be within walking distance of the movie theatres, the Festival Theatre, the major hotels, the Central Market, Rundle Mall and the East End of Rundle Street makes city living an appealing alternative and places one within reach of anything exciting happening within the city itself.

We are asking people to change their lifestyle, to become acquainted with something that has been going on in major European cities for many centuries. If this is to happen, council rebates must be equally met by subsidies from the State Government, by the ability to purchase residential properties that are strata titled before development so that stamp duty is paid on the block of land and not on the completed development. These rebates must apply to the city only. People purchasing apartments in the City of Adelaide must be treated no differently from those people who purchase suburban land and pay stamp duty before construction is commenced, compared with purchasing the land once construction has been completed and thereby paying stamp duty on the full contract price. Government legislation would provide that stamp duty prior to construction commencing was calculated on land value only.

I recently looked at two developments in Victoria by Becton City Holdings Pty Ltd, which is responsible for developments in both East Melbourne and Jolimont Road next to the Melbourne Cricket Ground. A 958 square foot apartment on strata title, prior to construction, attracted stamp duty of \$450, compared with stamp duty, upon completion of the same unit (valued at \$285 000), of \$10 435—a saving of nearly \$10 000. If we want a city illuminated at night—and we will soon see the changes in areas such as Grenfell Street East and East Terrace with the new East End Market development—we must provide incentives to make people change their lifestyle.

The result would not be a downtown city situation where streets literally die at 6 p.m. when workers finish their duties and return home to the suburbs. This will be a city of great expectation, of *al fresco* dining, and it will be bursting with energy and life. The money we would lose in stamp duty would be far outweighed by the fascination of the city to tourists and the jobs that it would create. The 2 000 acres of parklands, which currently cost the council up to \$6 million annually to maintain, would be full of residents and people enjoying the open space. I ask the Hon. John Oswald, Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, to seriously consider putting before Cabinet an incentive program in which both the council and the Government can work hand in hand to bring about a rapid increase of the residential population in the City of Adelaide for the benefit of tourism and the future economic viability of the city.

Before I conclude, I turn to a subject close to my heart and probably close to the heart of many members of this Chamber. I thought seriously about this matter after reading the *Advertiser* a few days ago. I saw a photograph of Russell Ebert and some 30 young South Australian footballers who were going to compete in the Australian Commonwealth Bank Cup, previously the Teal Cup. When I looked at that photograph I wondered how many of those young boys I would have the satisfaction of seeing run out onto Football Park and playing for the Adelaide Crows. I believe that the Adelaide Crows will be successful in the next few years, which means that the application of the draft conditions will see the Brisbane Bears and the Sydney Swans each receive the first two draft choices and so on up the ladder from bottom to top. That means that, over three years, all of those young footballers will probably be taken up before we even have our first selection.

The AFL draft is probably one of the most uncouth and untrue pieces of legislation I have seen. It is not legislation promulgated by a Parliament: it is an agreement between the football clubs of Australia. It kidnaps and pirates the youth of South Australia to every other State in this country. Here in South Australia we have proven time and again that we are developing the cream of Australian football talent. We have done that simply because time and again we have won the State of Origin Championship, albeit with about a third of the population of Victoria. I am not advocating that we do away with the draft, but I believe that a different approach should be taken. The Sports Ministers of Australia should look at the issue, as young people are starting to drift away from the game because they are being dictated to and not being given the freedom and democratic right to choose for whom they play.

It takes an enormous amount of effort to develop a young champion. Many people in South Australia put in an enormous effort to produce these young footballers. They are nurtured from the age of about five when they start primary school and play under age football. Women dedicate themselves to washing dirty guernseys every week, and coaches, property stewards, spriggers and trainers give up their leisure time and put in anything up to 20 hours a week to develop a young boy into a future football champion. This State has produced the best football talent that this country has ever seen. Last year's Brownlow medallist was a South Australian.

South Australia continues to run an under 17s and under 19s competition, whereas Victoria has given that away as being too hard. Victoria believes it is easier to go into the

draft and take the cream of Australia's youth any time it wants. The draft was drawn up by Victorians to benefit Victorians. We have to realise that, and we must do something about it. Once this is reported, our dear old mate Ross Oakley, like the captain of the *Titanic*, will shift more chairs on the deck at a quicker pace than one could possibly imagine.

When taking a young boy out of this State the AFL and the Victorians do not care whether he has been an integral part of a family unit, whether he has friends he has built up over 20 years, whether he is going to university, has a girlfriend, is buying his first home or is recently married. The important thing for them is to be able to get their hands on young talent and be able to use it as quickly as possible in an endeavour to win a premiership. There is life after football. Young champions like Matthew Liptak realise that, whilst it is great to be a Crow, it is more important to graduate as a medical practitioner as it has far greater prospects.

Why should young men who have spent their entire life in South Australia be forced to leave the State and not be given the democratic right to choose which guernsey they wear? Let us look at the depletion of our local talent since the introduction of the AFL player draft. Of the 243 SANFL registered players who have been drafted, 180 have gone to interstate AFL clubs, and 83 have since transferred out of the State of South Australia. It should be remembered that there was a *moratorium* on South Australian players for the two years after the Crows entered the AFL competition. However, the law was changed, because when Western Australia entered the competition it was given a longer period. We were given a shorter *moratorium* because it was thought that, if we were given three or four years, we would become far too strong and we would be a danger to the AFL competition.

The AFL competition has been drawn up by Victorians and is geared to receive readymade players at any expense. AFL clubs are not concerned with the grass roots development of the game. Without the State leagues (especially the SANFL), which are the strong feeder competitions of this country, the AFL would eventually crumble. Let us remember that already at least four AFL clubs are in trouble: Richmond, Footscray, Fitzroy and Hawthorn are in diabolical financial trouble and could crumble.

I think that members on both sides of the House are interested in giving our youth the opportunity of putting on the Crows jumper. I would like to see someone introduce a private member's Bill aimed at setting up a committee of some six people to at least look into giving the youth of South Australia some opportunity to play for this State. Finally, I would like to say that I am honoured to have been elected as the member for Colton and I look forward to being a member of the Liberal Party. I believe that the challenges are vast and the rewards can be immense, not only for the Party but, more importantly, for the people of South Australia.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I support the motion, of course, and without reservation. I am not a republican and have absolutely no inverted snobbery whatever in laying quite clearly and plainly on the public record my support for the notion of a head of State being separate from the head of Government. Therefore, I am pleased that we still have a Queen and the Queen's representative to provide to the Parliament each time it is formally opened a statement of what the Government proposes to do. In other democracies, such is not the case. It is only in the Westminster Parliaments, and democracies that have developed on that model, that the Government gives that

insight to the program it proposes to deal with during the sittings of the Legislature in the ensuing weeks and months before the reassembling of the Legislature yet again.

We do this so that the public can know what the Government is doing and what the business of the Parliament will be, and we do this in an institution that is separate from Government. It has its own responsibilities and it makes its own decisions. Without a Parliament we would suffer the same excesses of abuse of power that have occurred in democracies that have disappeared before the eyes of their citizens, in which they have not had the benefit of the traditions of Westminster as we have here.

Notwithstanding the angst that some other members, even some in this place, feel about the continued presence of the royal family and its representatives, I have absolutely no reservations about the great benefit which the institution of the Monarchy brings to our society by providing us with that certainty of the protection of our freedom as citizens. It has evolved over a period of more than 750 years, since that day on Runnymede in the middle of the Thames when King John was forced to sign the *Magna Carta*.

I commend new members for the way in which they have addressed the topic in supporting the motion. I commend not only the way in which they have delivered their remarks but also the substance of those remarks. I have been disappointed somewhat by the views expressed by some members opposite. The member for Hart amazed me when he seemed to me to be attacking the new Government and laying a challenge before the new Government even after he had been a senior adviser to a Minister for many years and, indeed, to the Premier immediately before the election. So, if the need is there, the member for Hart should have been doing something about it before he was elected to this place.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Even though the honourable member interjects out of his place, I remind him that what he drew attention to, in the course of his remarks, was a number of programs upon which he urged the Government to embark. I point out to him that he was a senior adviser to a Government Minister and, indeed, to no less than the Premier prior to the election, yet he did not acknowledge that he was tempted to do anything about the problems he was addressing.

Mr Foley: Only an adviser.

Mr LEWIS: That is your misfortune, then. You draw attention to your own incapacity to communicate to your political master and, in consequence, to your own incapacity perhaps to communicate with the electors by so doing. Let me now talk about the man after whom the seat of Ridley, which I now have the honour and responsibility to represent, was named. John Ridley was an outstanding man. He came to South Australia at the very earliest time of European settlement of the province. It was not a colony. Colonies are established by military *fiat*: South Australia was established by an Act of Westminster and was a province as defined in that Act, and its responsibilities were also defined through a commercial company.

John Ridley was the man who took the notion, which had been around since before Christ's birth, of harvesting corn—that is, wheat or other cereals—by simply removing the ear from the stalk and placing it in a receptacle. It had always been the wish of those people who had that dream, I guess, to cut out the unnecessary (as it is these days) or excessive amount of labour involved in stooping to slice the stalks, put them into stooks, pitch the stooks onto wagons, remove them

from the field and then distribute them on the ground to be trodden under hoof or otherwise threshed and then winnowed to get the grain—a very arduous and painstaking job indeed.

As it turned out, in the early days of the province after the initial proclamation in December 1836, in the years that followed (1837 through to 1844) it did not take very long for the settlers to realise that here they had an excellent climate and, in the vicinity of Adelaide, good soil and rainfall on which to grow cereals. By the harvest period beginning in 1843 there were 23 000 acres of cereals to be harvested. That is a huge amount using the technologies of those days: it was 9 000 acres more than in the previous year. They wasted no time in clearing the land of its native vegetation, where they found that land suitable, and planting it to crops. It was 9 000 acres more, which meant that in the previous year it had been 14 000 acres. The enormous problem was that there was not sufficient labour to harvest that crop.

So the people living in the province set out to devise mechanical means of reaping the crop, and a competition was organised. Indeed, on 2 September a challenge was laid down by John Ridley, a flour miller and a share farmer, under the pen name of 'Wheat Grower', in a letter was published in the *Register* in which he challenged his fellow South Australians to put their minds to the construction of a reaping machine. It was only a matter of months afterwards that that he succeeded. A meeting was held, at which more than 100 of the settlers gathered to hear the explanations for the feasibility of a number of inventions. In fact, there were nine of them, and the meeting had to be adjourned because not all nine had the opportunity of presenting their inventions to the meeting.

A poem was written about the reaping machine by one who used the pen name 'Mercator', and I am compelled to acknowledge the outstanding and scholarly work done by John Willard Reddin, who wrote the book *The First Stripper*, settling an historical argument. That book was published in 1992 and I was fortunate to go to the launch. It is a fascinating read, because the title, as one would imagine, attracts the mind and attention of everybody to whom I have ever mentioned it, although it had nothing to do with Gypsy Rose Lee: it had everything to do with getting the province's crop off. And Ridley succeeded in doing that. He succeeded not only in taking off the ears of corn from the stalk but also in threshing the corn from those ears and collecting the grains of wheat, in this instance, almost clean and free of stalk and cocky chaff. They are the glumes around the seed in the ear. I think that is outstanding.

It was for that reason that the commissioners chose to call the electorate 'Ridley'. There has been an electorate in the past called Ridley. It was represented by the second longest serving member of any Parliament in Australia—indeed, one of my predecessors, in part—Tom Stott. He was the Secretary of the South Australian Wheat Growers, or Farmers Union I think it became, and was in this place for 35 years. Indeed, Sir, he occupied that very high office of Speaker. He was an Independent for the whole of that time. In the course of his contribution, he continued to draw attention to the plight of the people whom he considered he represented. In the minds of some people, he was a clever politician—another adjective they would have used was 'cunning'—to have survived that length of time and to have done what he did for the people whom he represented. But, unfortunately, he found that in the main the people whom he represented had more optimistic expectations of the capacity of the area to support a community than its rainfall in the longer term allowed it to sustain. In other words, it was a bit too dry in most of the

areas of the old seat of Ridley for the numbers of people who settled there to continue deriving a living from their efforts as farmers.

Nothing much has changed, except that now we do have population numbers which are sustainable, yet we have stupid policies, particularly from the Federal Government, that destroy the viability of those enterprises, in consequence of which we find further de-population below the point that is either necessary or desirable. I regret that very much.

I feel for those people, because they have had to continue to survive in very difficult circumstances: their average annual incomes have been negative, in the main, for more than four years, and I wonder just how much longer that can go on. It will have to be something which is addressed by this Government, and immediately. The community needs to be provided with support, support of a kind which I can best describe as social development—social development which enables those people who simply cannot survive economically, because of the impact of the policies on their fortunes and therefore on their ability to continue deriving their living from farming, to take stock of their situation and move on in life, finding other things they can best do. They will need counselling in that.

We already have rural counsellors, but they provide a service only to small businessmen and women and farmers. There are still other families who have been dislodged and displaced who work for those people or who are in the service industries on which they depended and who also have to find another place in the world and other means of getting their living.

Unless we do that, the already under-reported suicide rate will increase dramatically. I mean no disrespect whatever to any doctor or other person involved in preparing reports on the cause of death in some of those families, but, Mr Deputy Speaker, I can tell you and other members of the House that, out of respect for the feelings of the families, wherever it has been possible and in more than one instance well known to me, what has obviously been a suicide has been reported as having other than that cause of death. That is an indication of the tragedy which has occurred in those communities, and I know other members here represent communities in which similar occurs.

That tragedy is there, and we have to prevent it from continuing, because it is not just the loss of those lives: it is the loss of people's self esteem and the loss through that of their ability to educate themselves in the next generation. They lack no ability: they simply lack what they thought were the reasons for being, namely, to become good farmers or good business people as their parents and their grandparents before them had been. Where they see they have failed and where that tragedy I spoke of overtakes them, the children in turn have self-doubt and miss their opportunity to prove themselves to have the ability they obviously have. In consequence they are less likely to be as productive in supporting themselves and providing an additional slice to the community's cake than they could otherwise have been had we taken a more responsible view of their plight right now.

We desperately need a multi-skilled community development officer to address those problems—to identify how best such families can find assistance and new direction. This Government will inspire the kind of commitment which is necessary to achieve a recovery of confidence in business, both in the metropolitan area and in rural South Australia. The Governor's speech clearly defined that point.

So let me turn from what John Ridley did for the State and

the acknowledgments that I have given to the work of John Reddin in writing the history of that event, where he lays to rest forever the argument about whether it was Ridley or John Wrathall Bull who invented the stripper, and pass onto cereal marketing. It was in cereal marketing, in particular, that Mr Tom Stott first obtained his widespread support in the community. I recognise at this time that it is again on the agenda.

Let me draw attention yet again to the *status quo* in this Chamber. We have in this Chamber the only J-curve in the history of politics in this country that will do anything about restoring economic confidence. I refer to the configuration of the members on the Government benches, which provides us with a clear indication of the direction we need to take to achieve a recovery in this State's economy. That is the kind of J-curve that we can see at work. It has nothing to do with the figment of Keating's imagination which is now no longer popular, which he said would be our salvation when he was Treasurer but which we all know brought about the downfall of confidence in the corporate sector in this country. One would not think that anyone could get it so wrong for so long as has the Labor Party in this State and in this nation.

Let us look at South Australia. I quote *Baker's View* from our local newspaper of 17 November, wherein Baker states:

If the following mental game seems racist, so be it. Imagine the 1.4 million of us [here in South Australia, the whole population] change places with 1.4 million Singaporeans. How many Singaporeans would be unemployed in five years' time? Yet they are no cleverer than us; they are not physically stronger than us. Very well, if Singapore can do it with no more than a fetid little island, why can't we with all this?

I say to Baker that he got it right. The problem we have is the shibboleths of the old order, which the Labor Party seems to think are so relevant to decisions about the future; it still tries to tell the people that there is a class struggle and that they have to bring down the bosses—that is, the people who provide jobs—in order to elevate the workers—that is, the people who have the paid employment. That is crazy. Of course, the Singaporeans were not born in Ireland or in the UK whence that mistaken perception comes. It has no relevance today. It might have been relevant 100 years ago, when the Labor Party was born, but it has no relevance today.

Singapore and Hong Kong illustrate the point. They have nothing to sell but their labour; they have no mines and they have no agricultural wealth. Therefore, they cannot derive extra wealth from divine providence—from the sun and the showers that fall on their constituency: they must use their wit and their brawn to do it. If they can do it, why cannot we?

The only problem is that in our community there has not been a commitment to producing as much as we want to spend. We have had a constant argument that, because someone works for wages, they must be exploited by someone paying those wages. That is absolute, arrant nonsense; it is crazy. In fact, there is another aspect to the argument. It is a little more sophisticated and I do not expect all members opposite to understand it, although more of them these days are likely to be able to understand than was the case when I first arrived here 14½ years ago. In 1986, Singapore had a real wage overhang and it had people in jobs that had no future. So, by Government decision, Singapore immediately took a wage cut across the board. Within two years and eight months of taking that wage cut, the work force had recovered the pay rates, the economy had been restructured, and the labour force, the mix of skills and the productive enterprises in which people were engaged were redirected to the point where unemployment was again under

2 per cent—ahead of the rates of pay in real disposable spending power than was the case at the time the wage cut was implemented. We could do the same thing here in Australia if we wanted to and we would solve our problems, yet we seem unable to do so.

Of course, this Government is determined, within the framework of its responsibilities, to do its bit, and that was spelt out by Her Excellency in the course of the address to which we now reply. On 1 February, the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Minister for Infrastructure (the member for Kavel) announced that there was to be a restructured economic agency with a new CEO; there would be a re-arrangement of the way it is to be done. In addition, the member for Bragg today announced yet another initiative of the kind for which he is fast becoming renowned, that is, for a commonsense approach to industrial relations, so that the people who earn the money in the pay packets and the businesses that put the money into the pay packets are able to get along more sensibly with one another without the interference of some union power brokers who want a percentage of the action along the way and who make mischief in the process. So much for that.

Let me turn to the substance of the inquiry I made during Question Time today and its relevance to this process of economic recovery. First, I will deal with another matter immediately: we have never quite completely bothered to identify all the species of amphibians we have in this State, leave alone in any other State on this continent, and I think that is unfortunate. It is important, because it is part of the genetic bio-diversity of the area in which we live. If we are responsible stewards, we ought to know what is there and we ought to ensure that we do nothing that would detract from our ability to leave it for subsequent generations.

Frogs are an important part of that bio-diversity. It is not appropriate for us to continue thinking that it is okay for kids to go out and catch tadpoles somewhere in the South-East and bring them back, letting them go somewhere in the Gawler River or the Torrens River. Those frogs from one area transposed to another may, as feral frogs, displace the native inhabitants in that niche, where conditions favour them at the time they arrive, yet when we experience, for example, a drought in the Gawler River, they may not survive. Who knows? We do not know very much about them, and they are an important part of the ecosystem naturally.

However, more importantly than that, Mr Acting Speaker, if I told you that there was a market opportunity in which the growth of demand had been 100 per cent in two years, you would say, 'By jove, that is an enterprise in which I ought to be getting myself involved.' Yet that is exactly the case with frogs and snail imports into this country: the numbers have risen by 100 per cent in two years and they are still rising. However, we have the resources with which to produce them and export them to the rest of the world. They are efficient converters of feed. All we need to do is to put the waste water with the doggy poo and everything else in it into the wetlands. They do not have to be public wetlands: they can be private wetlands. We can also grow things such as the cresses and mustards and so on that they eat and allow the frogs and snails, in complete harmony with each other, to produce a saleable crop. That is what I have been on about for a long time—aquaculture.

In that case, we would be developing not only an import substitution industry but also an export industry, because the very low levels of chemical pollutants in our environment

would make those products attractive to the rest of the world. Instead of having to import them which we do at present and which to my mind is absolutely crazy, we could be producing them and exporting them. They would make use of vegetation which can be grown in fresh water or only slightly brackish lagoons from sewage effluent. There is no need whatever for us to create a greater problem for our prawn fishery and other fisheries in Gulf St Vincent by releasing that water into the gulf in the way in which we have been doing in the past. It ought to be used for the production of vegetation and for fish species of one kind or another, whether crustaceans, molluscs (included as a sub-order of crustaceans) or vertebrates.

Frogs' legs and the like were worth \$70 000 in imports in 1990-91 and, according to the 1992-93 figures, are now worth \$130 000. Snails were previously worth \$33 000 in imports and, according to the latest figures (1992-93), are now worth \$74 000. That is a shift of \$103 000 to \$204 000 worth of imports. If we put our minds to it we could be producing \$1 000 million worth of exports of vertebrates and crustaceans from this State by the turn of the century.

Furthermore, I draw attention to the problems we now face in cereal marketing, particularly in relation to barley where we have bunkers across the Mallee in places like Loxton and Tailem Bend with literally thousands upon tens of thousands of tonnes of grain stacked up under plastic, for which we have done nothing to find niche markets. Barley, for instance, ought not to be marketed just for malting; it ought to be marketed for feed and for human consumption.

We produce the best high protein barley on earth for that purpose and it is downgraded against the price we can obtain for malting purposes for no better reason than that there are blinkers on the people responsible for marketing barley. They think only in terms of selling it for malting, and that is crazy. It is about time they started to think laterally and do something about selling that high protein cereal for what it is really worth. At present overseas buyers of barley get it very cheaply compared to what they would otherwise have to pay for its substitute.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): As a former member of the 1979-82 Tonkin Cabinet, it gives me very special pleasure in being able to rise to support the Address in Reply motion with the Dean Brown Liberal Government firmly ensconced on this side of the House. It is indeed a very heartwarming experience, and I remind members who were on the former Government benches that twice in the last 20 years, twice while I have been in Parliament, they have remained on the Government benches when they scored well below the requisite 50 per cent of the electors' votes. Under former Leaders of the Opposition, John Olsen and Bruce Eastick, the Liberal Party scored well beyond 50 per cent of public votes, yet was unable to attain Government because of the manner in which the electoral boundaries were distributed.

The victory of the present Brown Government, of course, was in no way dependent upon the distribution of electoral boundaries: I would say that it was more a firm reflection on the manner in which the Labor Government conducted itself over the preceding 10 years.

I compliment Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on the admirable manner in which she continues to discharge her duties on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen. We are very proud of the way in which she departs herself in that position. I compliment Dean Brown and his Cabinet, in particular, for

the smooth, efficient and competent manner in which they have assumed the reins of office.

The Governor's speech, as members of the House would appreciate, reflects the long, detailed and meticulous work that has been carried out by former shadow Ministers and members of the Liberal Party in preparation for taking over Government during the last two or three years. The Governor's speech certainly demonstrates the intention of the Brown Government to implement policy commitments and it recognises the mandate of the electors for the Liberal Party to govern.

I think all members would quite readily admit that Government is not won: Government is lost, and that is an old adage. There is no question that the Bannon-Arnold Government collectively lost desperately and ignominiously. The electors themselves passed fierce judgment on the ALP for its past failures, errors and omissions, and they delivered strong retribution for the mismanagement of the State and for the huge debt which they, the South Australian taxpayers, have inherited. It was a just decision that the electors meted out to the former ALP Government.

I would like to advert briefly at this stage to the new members in the House. Having listened with considerable interest to the addresses of some eight, nine or 10 new members making their maiden speeches, I feel that it was wonderful to hear keen, intelligent debate. They are a credit to Parliament, all of them. They have a commitment to service. When I say 'all of them' I am referring to all those members on the Government benches whom I have heard. I will advert to members briefly and individually by reference to electorate shortly, but I would say that they are deserving victors and I hope that they will serve their electors well. One notable exception which will deserve comment a little later has to be made to my general remarks—my general enthusiasm—regarding the new 1993 intake into State Parliament. I am quite sure that they will acquit themselves extremely well in this House, and the refreshing character which they have brought into this place augurs very well for the future of Parliament.

The former State Government lost less for what it did than for what it did not do. It certainly did not heed the warnings which were being sent to it from the other side of the House by the John Olsen, Dale Baker and Dean Brown leaderships—warnings dating back at least to 1989 which were not heeded until two or three years later when a royal commission was appointed with the former Premier of this State being taken to the altar of the royal commission like a reluctant bride—he certainly did not intend to do it: he was forced to do it by public opinion and by pressure from members of the then Opposition in this place. Of course, the royal commission, followed by the subsequent Auditor-General's Report, handed down its own damning, condemnatory findings on the activities of the Government and of the State Bank, Beneficial Finance, SGIC in its own lesser turn and other Government organisations.

It is interesting to see members of the present Opposition waving their arms about at Question Time and at other times. I think that is probably because they have just found their arms once again after having sat on their hands for 10 years. I hope they realise there are other uses for hands rather than just waving them about in this place rather uselessly. It brings an element of comedy to the House proceedings.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without mentioning specifically one person for whom all members on this side of the House have a great affection, and that is John Burdett,

whose untimely death robbed the Parliament of a fine intellect. He was a fine lawyer, recognised Australia-wide as one who had contributed greatly to the knowledge as well as the practice of the law. He was unrelenting in his work for his colleagues and for the electorate at large, particularly for the electorate which one would normally have put into more a Labor supporting constituency, the less privileged for whom he had great compassion. That has been acknowledged by members on both sides of the House in the speeches acknowledging John's death.

Despite his terminal illness he refused to concede defeat. Instead, he worked towards a Liberal Party victory on the one hand, and he moved around the electorate at large trying to help the less fortunate. The fact that he was unable to savour the pleasure of the ultimate Liberal victory which he had sought for so many years is, indeed, a tragedy. He was a champion man. As I said, he had a fine intellect, and he was a fine family man. To Jean and her family I extend my personal condolences for the first time since he died. We will all miss him. Their family loss is also the State's loss and our Party loss.

With regard to the State Bank, to which I alluded a little while ago, it would be good if the marketplace began to pick up, and pick up quickly, particularly in respect of commercial, industrial and office premises in which the State Bank invested heavily. It would be good from the point of view of the taxpayer and the ratepayer, because it would give us all a chance to recoup some of the State Bank's massive losses, which are now lodged with the so-called bad bank under the management of the GAMD. It would certainly be a relief to South Australia's battered taxpayers if we could recoup substantial amounts of money on the sale of those properties.

While in Melbourne recently during a single day's visit to the Victorian Parliament House, I visited the Collins Street property in which the SGIC had invested. I had to express some surprise that someone had not realised that there may not be quite the value in that wonderful building that one would expect, because when one walks through the front doors one is confronted with a huge empty chamber about the size and height of this House of Assembly Chamber. On both sides of the building there are empty corridors linking one major Melbourne street with another.

So, literally for several storeys from the ground up there is no possibility of return by way of rental or any other purpose. Instead, the rental part of the Collins Street building starts in one or two small properties at the rear and on the higher storeys. The fact that SGIC was committed on a put option to pay so much money for the building came to me as a surprise once I had the opportunity to look at it and to see that the most important part of the building, the ground, shopfront level, which should command a high rental, was in fact hardly useable at all.

A passing comment came across the House during Question Time today. I think it might have been from the member for Ross Smith, who said to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, 'At least you can't blame the State Bank for this one.' I think the honourable member who interjected has lost sight of the game. The State Bank has incurred massive losses so far of \$3 150 million. Let me dwell a little further on that. That is a straight-out loss. The potential loss that we are looking at is about \$5 000 million to \$5 500 million. The amount of \$3 150 million has been paid to the State Bank to pay off the losses. There is no chance of that amount being retrieved: it is a straight-out loss to the taxpayer. What we are

hoping is that the GAMD bad bank assets awaiting disposal will realise that \$2 billion to \$2.5 billion, which is still potentially to be lost. We have an asset which, if it appreciates in value, will cover that debt; if it does not, we may be looking at a further payout.

The good news is that we are not expecting to pay out the additional \$100 million which we envisaged having to pay out in the near future, but more of that a little later. So, the honourable member who interjected has lost sight of the fact that the State Bank loss of \$3 150 million affects every facet of the life of every single person in South Australia and beyond. It cannot be ignored: it affects everything we do.

Late news which arrived since the election, which would certainly have had a tremendous impact on the result of the election had these three little snippets been divulged before the election date, concerned the loss of the Grand Prix. That was a shattering blow to most of South Australia, which had become quite affectionately disposed towards the Grand Prix, whether or not one lived in Adelaide.

Mr Foley: You spent 10 years in this House criticising it. That's why we lost it.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member, who has come to life for the first time today—I thought he was asleep during Question Time—says that for 10 years we criticised the Grand Prix. He fails to realise that for 10 years we criticised the management of the Grand Prix and his own Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee (not only the past Chairman but the Chairman before that, who subsequently became a Minister—Lord knows how; he managed to exert some influence on the honourable member's Caucus)—both those people were responsible for taking part in the inquiries of the Economic and Finance and Public Accounts Committees into the management and administration of the Grand Prix. The reports of both those committees were released to the public of South Australia and welcomed by them for the revelations they contained.

The former Public Accounts and Economic and Finance Committees are bipartisan committees. The criticisms that were levelled at the Grand Prix board and administration were, I suggest, justified but they were not directed towards the Grand Prix as a potential source of revenue to South Australia, *per se*. The actual source of revenue or income we do not know: it may be \$30 million or \$35 million, but that is a hypothetical figure. The actual loss to South Australia is quite clear and unequivocal: it is the cumulative annual costs that were not paid by the Grand Prix board and committee but by the taxpayer of South Australia.

Mr Foley: A good investment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the honourable member says, it was a good investment, but that will go to Victoria maybe this year or next year. The honourable member should realise that bipartisan committees of this House passed judgment on what they thought were some mismanagements of the Grand Prix. Perhaps those criticisms were justified when one considers that neither the Grand Prix board nor the Government was able to retain the Grand Prix for South Australia. There must have been something wrong for it to go. If the honourable member can explain how it happened, perhaps he will take the time to do that during the grievance debate. I cannot think of a good reason, although I can think of plenty of bad reasons.

Other issues include the Hindmarsh bridge, which had not just one but two binding clauses in contracts—one with Binalong Pty Ltd and one with Westpac—under which we will spend \$12 million whether or not we have a bridge

because contractually we are bound. The going price if we say, 'Right, it goes and doesn't get built' is \$10 million to \$12 million. We might as well have something as nothing, so the Brown Government in its wisdom has decided to take positive action and is currently negotiating to have a bridge built rather than having two ferries with an annual recurrent cost of as much as if not more than the cost of building a bridge.

Mr Foley: Then he wasted \$60 000 on Sam Jacobs.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, I don't know that it was wasted. In fact, I do not know how much was committed to the Jacob's inquiry. Some people might say that the \$20 million or \$30 million that was spent on the royal commission, which was set in train by the former Labor Premier of South Australia, was also wasted. But, from my point of view, the figures that came out of that inquiry and the Auditor-General's inquiry were certainly not wasted. They were major revelations. I think people in Government the world over should take heed from what was divulged in the very extensive, comprehensive, informative and accurate reports that were handed down. They are classics of their kind. If one looks at them as a world investment towards better Government, one sees that they probably came cheap at the price, but nobody else will give us money for them.

Had the situation in respect of the Hindmarsh bridge been divulged before the election, it might have had an impact on the final result. Of course, the other thing that could certainly have had a major impact on the seat of Giles was the Government's failure to divulge that there was a major leakage—not just a leakage, but a major leakage—of fluids from the Roxby Downs tailings dam. There was a period between September and November 1993 of masterly inactivity, when ironically enough an election was called in South Australia. It really was: it was a masterpiece of inactivity. I can imagine that, had those three pieces of information come out before the State election, I might have been talking to myself on this side of the House with one compulsory person sitting on the other side to interject. As it is, I am enjoying the presence of at least a handful of members.

It is not very often one can say 'decimated' in the knowledge that 'decimal' and 'decimated' do have a connection. With 10 members on the other side of the House, the mathematics are quite sound. I think 'decimated' really means to cut into tenth parts, but we do not use it in that sense. By usage, it generally means to cut something to pieces or cut to ribbons. Really, 'decimated' means to cut into tenths, and that is precisely what the electorate did. Their mathematics was very sound. They must have had a good image in mind when they said, 'We will decimate this lot.' The three little snippets of news—and I have no doubt that other revelations will be brought to the attention of the South Australian electorate over the coming months—

Mr Quirke: Every day!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, the honourable member says 'Every day!' He is in a far better position to know the extent of the troubles than I am. Standing on this side of the House, I get the impression that disasters were queuing up and waiting to happen under the Labor Government. They were just queuing up and waiting to happen. There was not enough time in the day for all of them to come out at the same time, so here we are finding out about the full extent of the problems. They really did have worries and, while I find it unforgivable that those matters were kept from the South Australian public, the fact that an election was imminent

makes it perfectly explicable. Survival was the order of the day.

Another thing that surprised me was that a list of non-union members was provided to the unions. It sounded like a hit list and that big brother was involved. That, too, I regard as unforgivable, when you look at all the time that a former Labor Minister spent trying to persuade the whole of this House and the other House that privacy legislation should be introduced and that privacy and prevention of intrusion on personal affairs was the order of the day. I suppose that, when you look at it collectively from the point of view of the joint members of that committee, we spent hundreds of hours listening to evidence and deciding collectively within the committee that we should introduce legislation. That legislation was not introduced in the Upper House, although it had been promised, and maybe this is just one more reason why it was not introduced. The Government was already intruding upon privacy in its own right and handing over information to the unions which should have remained confidential. As I said, it is not forgivable but, in a way, it is explicable.

I would like to refer to individual contributions. I do not have time to do full justice to the contributions made by all members. The new members on both sides of the House have contributed well. The member for Flinders, who was given the onerous and responsible task of proposing the response to the Governor's address, I thought gave an eloquent speech, which was really a yardstick for the rest of us to follow. I feel that I do not live up to it, because I am responding to interjections which, of course, new members do not have to do—they live in a silent world. They are in a monastic or convent environment. That ceases after the first speech, of course, and mine has long since passed. It was an impressive speech, well put together, comprehensive and intelligent, and it displayed an awareness of all aspects of life within the honourable member's local community in Flinders.

The member for Reynell backed up that speech and seconded it with another succinct and constructive address, showing again a fine appreciation of electorate issues. When I was sitting in the Chamber and listening to all the speeches, I found that I was running out of adjectives and superlatives—a pleasant experience indeed when listening to addresses in this House. The member for Norwood displayed a fine appreciation of the technological potential of South Australia's industries. Again, he found himself in an unusual situation where he had to defend himself against the maiden speech of another member on the other side of the House. Very unusual! I will advert to that shortly, too.

The member for Elder made a fine parochial dissertation and I, like other electors, think he should be proud of the contribution he has made and will make. His electorate will be well-served. The member for Kaurna's speech was interesting, well-delivered and well-structured, and local interest was again obvious. The member for Florey contributed equally with the others in showing his additional personal expertise in union and police matters in a nuggetty, well-informed address. I thought that the member for Hart, the first speaker on the Opposition benches, gave a sincere, well-structured and well-researched address. I congratulate him on that.

Mr Foley: I apologise for my interjections.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, that is quite all right. I would be very sorry if nobody did it. It would be a sign that nobody was listening. The biggest insult to the member for Gordon would be if nobody interjected. I turn now to the

member for Ross Smith, but I do not really know what to say. All members heard it. He is not here to listen and to interject, and I was sure he would be. He is probably running down the stairs now. However, I question his intent. Did he really expect that the House would take him seriously when the first thing—not the last thing—he did was to have a go at the press in the left and right galleries overlooking the House? He gave them an undeserved salvo. He really pasted the press. I thought, 'What's this fellow about?' He must have got the wrong corner. But no, 10 minutes later, in case they missed it, he had another go at them. So, his intent was patently obvious.

An honourable member: What did he say?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He said, among other things, that they were sycophantic. I cannot repeat the rest. I probably do not understand them, anyway. However, if I were a member of the press, I would be thinking long and hard about this one. Having given the press two salvos, he still had a few more nine-inch guns. He criticised almost every member on this side of the House by direct inference. He said, coming back here, we did not understand why we had won. I think the electorate understands why we won the election. I wondered whether he read the newspapers for the first week after the election—he probably did not. He also got stuck into not only South Australia but the United States. He does not like people with guns in America. He was very cross about the United States riflemen. So, what did he do? He shot them all down indiscriminately—bang, bang, bang! I just could not believe it—another salvo.

The honourable member made quite a few former ALP members look very good. I am wondering whether the ALP selection procedures are being overhauled, even at this very minute. I waited 40 minutes to see whether he would say anything. I decided that he had not said anything and, what is more, that he was not going to say anything—and I was right. I will get away from the member for Ross Smith. He is obviously an experienced fellow who wished that we would interject on him. We wished that we could interject on him, too, but we were too nice to do so as it was his maiden speech. However, it is open season now. I compare his speech with the pragmatism and generosity of spirit, coupled with the confidence, competence and refreshing approach that did not hark back to doctrinaire Liberal or Labor politics or policies but which looked refreshingly to the future from almost every other new member who has spoken. They are looking to build up this State once again, to make South Australia great as it indeed can be. I really look forward to working with this class of '93, wherever they may be sitting, with a view to helping the whole of the electorate of South Australia rebuild the State.

I have about 40 other things that I want to talk about, but the pity of it is that they are all good. It is a list of 40 things that are happening and for which the Liberal Party does not take all the credit. A refreshing spirit and a new feeling of confidence is abroad in South Australia, and I hope that all new and old members on both sides of the House will quit carping, as did one member, and get together to rebuild South Australia to make it the wonderful State that it surely is.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell. I remind the House that this is also a maiden speech and ask members to extend the normal courtesies to the honourable member.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I pledge my loyalty to Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia, Her Majesty

Queen Elizabeth II and the Australian flag. I formally congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to high office. I have every confidence that you, as one of the longest serving members of this Chamber, will grace the office of Speaker with distinction, impartiality and wisdom—qualities that you have so obviously displayed during your time in this Chamber.

I had written out my speech in full in my office on a very large whiteboard, which I intended to use for other matters. However, I could not find a vehicle big enough to carry it, and I doubt whether it would fit into this Chamber. I called into a sandwich shop called 'Above the White Line' to have lunch and make a few notes. However, all tables were being used. In one corner a pig farmer and a blonde-headed person were busy completing application forms for some sporting events, and in another corner was a person with a lot of frozen chooks spread all over the place. He was practising running a chook raffle. I decided that it would be more appropriate to leave them alone and retire to my spacious parliamentary office to complete my speech.

In addressing myself to this motion for adoption I am very conscious of the people whom I represent in this Parliament. I take this opportunity to thank those who supported me, first, in preselecting me as the Liberal candidate for Mitchell and, secondly, those who worked tirelessly for a Liberal member for Mitchell and a Liberal Government for South Australia. Special thanks go to my campaign manager, all our helpers and friends. To my wife Sue and to my two boys Adam and Darren, I extend a special thankyou for their support and guidance during the campaign and in the period afterwards. I extend thanks to my parents in Queensland and to my wife's parents, particularly my father-in-law Allan Malcolm Bayliss who passed away in July 1993. I thank them for their support and encouragement.

I also acknowledge the former member for Hayward, now the member for Unley, for his guidance and contribution towards my being elected the new member for Mitchell. This is an opportune time to mention him in my speech. The seat of Hayward was won by Mark Brindal and the Liberal Party in 1989. The Labor Party then believed that it was its seat, having always been a Labor seat. There was consternation and perplexity amongst the ALP Caucus when the now member for Unley made the seat Liberal. Over the past four years the member for Hayward was the recipient of numerous jibes and innuendo from the Labor Government but, to his credit, he gave better than what was thrown at him.

The ultimate travesty occurred when, in the redistribution, Hayward was abolished and three quarters of the old seat of Hayward was incorporated into the new seat of Mitchell. Mark Brindal went on to represent Unley and, to the consternation of some members of the water polo team in that quarter of the House, Mark Brindal won Unley and won it well. Now, as the member for Unley, history will record him as being a truly honourable and worthy member of this House. For your assistance and guidance, the constituents of the new Mitchell and the old Hayward and I say to the member for Unley, 'Thank you.'

The new Mitchell incorporates the suburbs of Oaklands Park, Warradale, Dover Gardens, Seacombe Gardens, Seaview Downs, Seacombe Heights, Marion and Mitchell Park. The seat lies fully within the local government area of the city of Marion, one of the more innovative and forward thinking city councils in South Australia. Like Hayward before it, Mitchell has always been Labor and, whilst the electorate contains some affluence, it is predominantly

characterised by areas of modest private dwellings and Housing Trust accommodation. It is an elderly and stable electorate, the residents of which generally measure their association with the district in decades rather than in years, with a large number of the residents having moved into that area since the last world war.

Issues important to the constituents of Mitchell then and now include jobs, Government debt, law and order, health and education. I have talked about the nature of the electorate and, by doing that, hope that I have indicated some of the interests of my constituents. I make one important point regarding them and my constituency: I was elected not due to my personal popularity as a former councillor for the city of Marion but as a member and representative of the Liberal Party of South Australia. The confidence of the people of Mitchell in me as a member for Mitchell will depend more on the abilities, the program and the policy of the Dean Brown Liberal Government, of which I am part.

It is important to remember that the Liberal Party campaigned as a Party with a message. That message was a program of job creation, reduction in debt, accountability and delivery of services, and we who represent specific individual electorates are the messengers of that Party. It is our duty to restore confidence in our community and the businesses of South Australia, a confidence badly eroded over the past 10 years by the divisive and incompetent past Labor Government.

I turn now to the speech of Her Excellency the Governor at the opening of the forty-eighth Parliament on Thursday 10 February 1994 in which Her Excellency stated, under the subheading 'A new era for South Australia':

During this session of Parliament, my Government proposes to introduce a number of measures to signal a new era for South Australia. My Government received the very strong support of the people of South Australia at the December 1993 election to implement four priority programs to rebuild the State's economy, its finances, and confidence in our future. These programs focus on: rebuilding jobs; reducing Government debt; returning standards of excellence to key community services; restoring community confidence in the institutions of Government and increasing individual freedoms.

The past was full of divisiveness and incompetence. As a small business person I, more than anyone, realise that now is the time to rebuild. Now is the time for good news stories. Now is the time to instil confidence within the community and small businesses, because it is with this confidence that we will create the climate that businesses need to employ new full-time employees. Jobs will not be rebuilt by taxing the living daylights out of small businesses: jobs will be rebuilt by reducing debt, by reducing Government costs and by equitable taxation.

The new era for South Australia is a Government working with the community—an efficient, competitive South Australia working to develop new opportunities for investment and, therefore, jobs for South Australians. The challenges of returning standards of excellence to key community services in Mitchell are not dissimilar to those in the rest of South Australia. Reduction in our waiting lists for surgery in public hospitals is a high priority. What do you say to the aged constituent who broke his arm just below the collar bone and had to wait to have an operation? What do you tell his family when he is admitted to the Julia Farr Centre because he can no longer stand the pain and it will be at least another three months before they are able to operate to pin the arm together?

What do you say to the husband of a wife who cannot walk due to a fall in which she injured her spine and who has to wait for a vacancy to have a bulge removed from a lower vertebra? The ultimate insult is: what do you say to the constituent who has finally been admitted for open heart surgery and a triple bypass; who has been shaved, prepared and told everything that is about to occur; and then in comes the nurse who says, 'I am sorry, but your operation has been postponed. You can go home. Ring us in two months time'? The casemix policy recently announced by the Minister for Health, the member for Adelaide, will go a long way to alleviating these delays in the electorate of Mitchell as well as in all other electorates. But as we all know—and if only the water polo team adjacent had the common decency to admit it, they would help send the message to the Canberra dugout loud and clear—there is a need for a change to allow tax deductibility for private health insurance. Our health system needs a strong private health insurance operation.

The Federal Minister for Health stated that it is not on, as it would create two classes in the health system—the haves and the have nots. It is high time that the Federal Minister removed the cotton wool and the wax from his ears, because there is no correlation between the level of income and those who have private health insurance. If there was a correlation, we would not have a Prime Minister with no private health insurance and pensioners and superannuants of Mitchell struggling to pay private health insurance so that they do not have to wait for the services they so rightly deserve.

In the area of law and order, the perception in Mitchell is that the incidence of so-called juvenile crime is on the increase. Her Excellency has outlined in her speech the Government program on justice and community safety. I look forward to being part of that policy-making process and putting forward my views and those of the constituents of Mitchell on what has to be done in this area to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime.

The southern electorates such as Mitchell have for too long had lip service paid to their transport needs. The Diagonal Road/Morphett Road rail crossing, the bus and rail interchange, the third arterial road and improved passenger transport services are all included in this Government's policy of returning standards of excellence to key community services. In Mitchell we need to work closely with the Corporation of the City of Marion on issues of transport and the future of the Marion regional centre.

The City of Marion has been an innovator in the area of caring for the environment in relation to recycling and waste management. The previous Government for too long had dropped the ball, being unable to pick it up and run with it, and had failed to give local government any guidance in this area. It allowed a myriad of schemes to be introduced by local government, some of which have raised concerns of health, safety, and operational and economic viability. We now have a need for a comprehensive and coordinated waste recycling program. Her Excellency outlined the environment program of this Government, some of which has already been implemented by the Minister. Positive steps have been taken with respect to the Patawalonga catchment. This is not just a Glenelg issue: it is one for the whole catchment.

Most of the residents of the City of Marion are looking forward to opportunities for multi-objective stormwater management along the Sturt River. The City of Marion and the residents of Mitchell welcome wholeheartedly the policies and directions of the Minister and the Government on important issues regarding the preservation of the environ-

ment. I acknowledge the past assistance and guidance of the members of the Marion council and the council administration, and I look forward to working with them in the future. Tourism is an area that is close to my heart but, unfortunately, it is one that the previous Government preferred to ignore. The building of the Adelaide to Darwin rail link will open up the outback of Australia, enhancing tourism and trade in this State. The completion of this rail link must be one of the highest priorities for this new Government, and I look forward to having input on this subject.

Kangaroo Island, our premier tourist destination, is subject to continued promotion by Tourism SA, yet a report on infrastructure needs of the island gathers dust on the Parliamentary Library shelf. When I wrote that speech, I believed that that report, which was prepared in 1991 by KPMG and PPK Consultants in conjunction with Tourism SA at a cost of \$180 000, would have been in the Parliamentary Library. I went to the Parliamentary Library to obtain a copy of this report, which was produced at a cost to this Government and State and dealt with roads in South Australia, but it had not been presented to the Parliamentary Library. It has been logged into the Parliamentary Library of South Australia only as at 16 February 1994 at 2 pm.

There is some very interesting information in this report on our premier tourist spot that should have been addressed on an ongoing basis. It is unbelievable and shameful that this report was not here for members to read, digest and implement. The report mentions that the cost of sealing these roads is \$27.5 million. Rightly or wrongly, we have agreed to build a bridge to nowhere. The financial impact on this State could be as high as \$12.5 million if we do not build that particular bridge. But how many tourists go to Hindmarsh Island compared with Kangaroo Island? Where are the previous Government's priorities? The previous Government's priority with regard to Kangaroo Island was \$200 000 through Tourism South Australia as an extraordinary grant towards the roads. At \$75 000 per kilometre, \$200 000 will not build many kilometres of roads on Kangaroo Island.

The previous Government paid \$400 000 per annum to a franchisee in Los Angeles to promote this State. Yet we hired an outside consultant in the State to prepare a report on ecotourism at a cost of \$300 000. This report on ecotourism was supposed to be before this Parliament in July. It has only just been received. This lady spent six days on Kangaroo Island, our premier resort, but was unable to complete an ecotourism report on the main national park on Kangaroo Island. However, in her report, she said that for the benefit of Kangaroo Island the roads should remain unsealed. She said that we should not seal the roads on Kangaroo Island; they should stay the way they are. Yet this report, which was never submitted to this House or the Parliamentary Library, suggests that if we do not seal the roads on Kangaroo Island we shall have a number of losses.

This report states that the initial loss will be an input of \$3 million in tourism in this State, which reflects in a \$6 million output and 84 extra jobs in the tourism industry on Kangaroo Island. The report also mentions that if we do absolutely nothing and sit on our butts for the next four years, which the Labor Government did very well in the last 10 years, there will be a turnaround, tourism in South Australia, and on Kangaroo Island in particular, will go backwards and we will lose \$6 million of net income into this State. We are talking about a turnaround of \$12 million because we cannot spend \$27.5 million sealing the roads on Kangaroo Island, our

premier tourism area. But we spent \$400 000 with a franchisee in Los Angeles who did not even have the decency to put an advertisement about South Australia in the *Los Angeles Times* when they were doing a spread on tourism in the Pacific.

He could not find his way clear to put in an advertisement and to show off South Australia. When the article appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* (and I do not have to remind members how many people would read that newspaper) it was stated that the premier wine district in this area of the world was in New Zealand. The article mentioned the outback but said nothing about the Flinders Ranges or about what happens in this area of the world. When one reads the ecotourism report—which cost us \$300 000—it basically mentions all those things that the representative in Los Angeles should have been doing in the past two years, yet we have been paying that office \$400 000 per annum.

I am sure that we are going to hear more about tourism in this State and the changes that need to be made to promote tourism. One wonders where the priorities of the Labor Government have been in the past 10 years in regard to the tourist industry.

Members should try to hire a car in Adelaide to travel to Kangaroo Island. Why cannot you do so? It is because, after 10 years of neglect of the road infrastructure, no-one in the car hire industry will allow anyone to take a vehicle onto Kangaroo Island, as the roads are an absolute disgrace. It is not the fault of the District Council of Kingscote but more that of the previous Government of South Australia in not recognising the importance of this area as a premium tourist area, as an export earner for this State and its needs for special funding.

I refer to part of this report, which no-one has seen because it has not been supplied to the Library, as follows:

As with the State, the nation as a whole derives benefit from tourism to Kangaroo Island. To the extent that the island is a/the reason for overseas people visiting Australia or extending their visit, then tourism expenditure associated with the island makes a positive contribution to national income. Furthermore, Australians may opt to visit Kangaroo Island in favour of some overseas destination. To the extent that such visitors spend their holiday dollar at home rather than overseas, Kangaroo Island contributes further to the national income. In this sense, the island could be thought of as both an export and an 'import replacing' industry.

As a backbench member assisting the Minister for Tourism, I will be putting forward the case of Kangaroo Island and the special need for funding of its roads and its treatment as a special funding project for the upgrade of those roads.

South Australia is the best kept secret that tourism has in this country. Besides Kangaroo Island and the wine regions, the grace of the metropolitan area, the beauty of the Fleurieu Peninsula and the rare and wonderful scenery of the West Coast of South Australia, with its magnificent cliffs and beaches, the whales seeking shelter during the winter and the beauty of the outback, are all hidden treasures of this State.

I look forward to working with the Minister to enhance the effectiveness of tourism and the Tourism Commission and to create a new climate for private sector investment in tourism projects in South Australia and the promotion of this State as a tourist destination.

In conclusion, I wish to quote from the maiden speech of the former member for Hayward on 15 February 1990. He stated:

So I come to sit down, conscious of the fact that in the Government ranks few have heard and even fewer will have listened. But there will come a time—a time that is not long hence—when the wheels shall begin to turn and they shall listen, for on this side of the

House we shall speak with one voice, and it will be the voice of the people of South Australia.

It will say you have tarried in this place too long. Get you gone! Well, the people of South Australia have spoken and they have gone, and we can all look forward to a new era for South Australia.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the Address in Reply and I compliment Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell on the speech that she gave to the Forty-Eighth Parliament. I also compliment Dame Roma on the excellent work she is carrying out as Governor of this State. I have had the pleasure of having Dame Roma in my electorate twice in the past two months. The first occasion was before Christmas when she came over to Yorke Peninsula. I was with her at a luncheon at Port Vincent and I know how impressed everyone was with the way she handled her responsibilities, the way she has become one of the people and the way she is able to mix so freely and take the opportunity to see the various things that are going on in the rural areas—and she takes a genuine interest, too. I really thank her for that.

The second occasion was recently when she paid a visit to the District Council of Wakefield Plains and again had a tour through rural areas. I was able to join her at the Balaklava Institute for a luncheon, and then at the school, the art gallery and later at the Port Wakefield proof range. Again, on each occasion, I could not help but admire the way Her Excellency is carrying out her duties. She really is a credit to the office of Governor and it is a pleasure to be a member of this House and to be serving under her as Governor of this State.

I would like to congratulate the 18 new members on this side of the House and say, 'Well done, well deserved and welcome to Government.' I also welcome the three new members of the Opposition benches. I had the pleasure of being able to help, to some extent, the member for Florey in his campaign and I could not help but be impressed with his organisation. Very early in the campaign, in fact even before the campaign started, I felt that there would be a Liberal win there, and indeed it was—it was a Liberal landslide. Likewise, I had the opportunity to assist the member who has just given his maiden speech, the member for Mitchell.

Mr Brindal: Very well, too.

Mr MEIER: Yes, I compliment the member for Mitchell on his maiden speech. There is much food for thought in that speech. In fact, while I am complimenting members, I compliment all members on this side of the House who have given their maiden speeches. I believe that their electorates will be exceptionally well served by them. Their innovative ideas and understanding of their electorates, even at this early stage, augurs well for the future. I cannot over-emphasise to the new members that we are the servants of the people and if we continue to reflect the views of those people, if we bring those views forward into this Chamber, then there will be good Government in this State. On many occasions the problem has been that former Labor members who served some of these areas either did not want to put forward what they knew to be the case or were not able to bring forward those ideas to the Government; a Government that ran out of energy, ran out of steam and unfortunately bankrupted this State.

I am reminded of the time I gave my maiden speech, and that goes back too long now. I remember that I identified various features in my electorate, amongst other things, and I was thinking of the number of schools. I have in my

electorate 26 public schools, four private schools and one TAFE college, which in fact is a branch of the Spencer Institute, formerly known as the Goyder College of TAFE. My electorate has five public hospitals and three private hospitals—although it should have been six public and four private hospitals—and contains nine local government areas. For the past 11 years many of those schools have suffered because of the lack of maintenance and Government inaction, and I found it incredible that the previous Government was having a go at the Liberal Party for its school policies during the election campaign, particularly when they tried to imply that our spokesman, the Hon. Rob Lucas, had said that schools with fewer than 300 students would close.

Mrs Kotz: It was a disgrace.

Mr MEIER: Yes, it was a disgrace, an absolute distortion of the facts, an absolute lie. When they kept saying it one eventually had to go to the shadow Minister, as he then was, and ask 'Where on earth are they getting this sort of rumour from?' Rob Lucas told me that it was very obvious. The then Labor Government was going to close Ethelton Primary School. Rob Lucas considered that to be an outrageous move and he went in to bat for Ethelton Primary School, as any Liberal member would do. Of course, we know the Labor Party and how it operates. Members of the Labor Party could not care less about schools, in many cases.

Rob Lucas was interviewed on the radio, and one of the questions he was asked was why he believed Ethelton Primary School should remain open. Rob Lucas replied that any school with 300 or more students should certainly not be closed. Why did he use the figure of 300: because Ethelton Primary School had 300 students. He was referring to the 300 students in that school, and he said, 'Look, any school like this with 300 or more students should not close.' If it was a school of 50 he would have said, 'Any school of 50 or more should not close.' The Labor party decided to latch onto that comment and tried to make an issue of it.

There is no doubt that I was concerned during the campaign that a similar scenario to what happened in the Federal campaign might occur: namely, lies, lies, lies, or perhaps I had better say untruths, untruths, untruths. People said to me during the campaign, 'Are you going to win Government or not?' I replied that I personally believed we had every chance of winning Government, but that the 'untruths campaign' was gathering momentum and I wondered to what extent people would believe it. I also said to the people that if we did not win Government this time I would lose faith in the judgment of people in this State and that we would never win Government under our present democratic system. My faith in people was restored and my faith in the democratic system was restored, because did we ever win Government, and how! My only disappointment was the extent to which we won Government.

I believe that, because of the misdoings of the previous Government, the massive debt that it imposed on this State, the way that it has virtually ruined South Australia, it was not entitled to have 10 members elected. I would have been generous and allowed two: a Leader of the Opposition and a Deputy. However, fate played into the Opposition's hands and it has 10 members, and nothing can change that at this stage. I thank the people of South Australia for showing their wisdom, for recognising the wrongs that have occurred, and for being able to see through the campaigns of untruths that continued week after week.

At the end, when the Labor Party realised that it would be defeated, there was a type of campaign I had never seen

before. Candidates started writing personally addressed letters to people saying, 'Look, we realise that we will be defeated. Can you please ensure that you vote for us so that we are not decimated altogether?' I wondered whether people would be that mad to be swung by that sort of letter. Thankfully, my faith was again restored in people—perhaps it even had the other effect of making sure that they voted against the Labor Party.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Ten electorates got it wrong, though.

Mr MEIER: Yes, 10 electorates got it wrong, but there is always the next election. We have a very clear aim, and that is to whittle that Opposition of 10 members down to a single digit number. Only time will tell to what extent we can do it.

We have many new faces here and, as I commented earlier, it is great to see the talents of all those I have heard so far on this side of the House, and even those who have not had a chance to give their maiden speech.

It is time to reflect briefly on those members of the Parliament from my side who are no longer with us. I would like to pay my respects to the family of the late John Burdett. It was very sad to see John pass away during the election campaign. I had a lot to do with John because we both served on the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which then became the Legislative Review Committee. John gave me considerable advice during that time. I learnt a lot from John and I came to know him as a very wise, intelligent, clear thinking, level-headed person. He was also President of the Parliamentary Christian Fellowship, and for some of that time I had the privilege of serving as his secretary.

Again, he was an excellent organiser. He could make decisions very quickly as to what direction we should go in, and as the secretary he soon had me making sure invitations went out for whatever function was to be held. I guess I remember John most for the way that he conducted himself in the latter weeks and months of his life. Those of us who knew him saw John going down in physical health. It was always hard to know what to say. One could understand that John may not have been feeling that bright, but every time I spoke to him he was a happy person who gave a positive answer. I well remember the last time I saw him—two days before his death.

I went into the Florey electorate office at about half past eight, 9 o'clock in the morning and John was sitting in a chair. When I came in he said, 'Well, well, look who has arrived, John Meier.' I said, 'John Burdett, how are you today?' He said, 'Yes, I am fine thanks; how are you?' He threw it straight back on me, and it was some moments before I was able to say, 'John, how are you, really?' From John's answer I knew and John knew that it was not long to go, although he was still in a very positive frame of mind. I was very sad when I learnt two days later that John was no longer with us. He is a man who will be remembered for many years by all of us who knew him, and I extend my deepest sympathy to Jean and her family. I trust that we will be able to reflect some of the attributes that John exhibited over so many years.

I also want to pay my compliments to other former members such as Bruce Eastick, who is now well represented by the new member for Light; Peter Arnold, who is well represented by the new member for Chaffey; Jennifer Cashmore, who is well represented by the new member for Coles; and Stan Evans, who is well represented by his son, the new member for Davenport—all great replacements. I am

pleased to have the opportunity to serve in this Parliament in the position that Stan Evans formerly occupied; namely, as Whip. I thank him for the advice he has given and for what I have learnt from him over the years—I will seek to do my best in that area. To all those past members, we on this side of the House will miss you; however, we have great talent, and we are looking forward to getting on with the task of Government.

It was interesting when the former Premier, now Leader of the Opposition, came to office. He was written up in the *Advertiser* in various ways, including being identified with the concept of 'Arnoldspeak'. That was a political comment by Rex Jory. 'Arnoldspeak' is something on which I interjected from time to time during questions in this House, because I felt that the then Premier (now Leader of the Opposition) did not get over his own particular way of speaking. As the shadow Minister of Agriculture for two years I came to know his way of speaking to a fair degree. I knew the degree of respect in which he was held in the rural sector, but I could see beneath the facade: that so much was said but almost nothing was done.

Mr Brindal: Are you saying that he was a victim of his own mouth?

Mr MEIER: The interjection from the honourable member perhaps summarises it. It is interesting to note from the Rex Jory article of 3 September 1992 an example of 'Arnoldspeak', as follows:

Asked, when he became Premier, if he would take the Treasury portfolio, Mr Arnold said, 'I think those points will have to be taken into account when I am doing—if I am elected by Caucus tomorrow—the major revamp of the portfolios after the Estimates Committees. There are pluses to the Premier being the Treasurer, but there are also some minuses to that. I will have to weigh up what I think is the best deployment of the talent in the Cabinet with the various responsibilities.'

I will not go into further examples of 'Arnoldspeak', but I wonder how long it will be before the Shadow Treasurer (the Deputy Leader of the Opposition) makes his move to become Opposition Leader. Members on the other side know that it is only a matter of time. From the way in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition started this session last Thursday, it is quite obvious to me that he is an impatient person, that he cannot wait to take over as Leader of the Opposition and that he will bide his time.

I think that we could see the glee in the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's eyes today when the Leader of the Opposition made that big gaff when he said, with reference to Public Service appointees, 'They were all Labor persons.'

Mr Brindal: It was like a dog waiting to pounce on a bone.

Mr MEIER: Exactly; like a dog waiting to pounce on a bone. I had to smile. It was difficult for me to see the Leader of the Opposition's expression, although I noticed that he looked down as if to say, 'Why did I say that?' The Deputy Leader was saying, 'Good, one more tick for me as deputy.'

The Hon. H. Allison: One down!

Mr MEIER: 'One down; only a little while to go.' Talking about Deputy Leaders, whilst they had their problems with the Leader, they certainly had their problems with the Deputy Premier who is now member for Giles, the Hon. Frank Blevins. Do we remember when he became Deputy Premier? I think we do. As the *Advertiser* of that time reported:

In a stumbling start for the new look Labor leadership under Premier-elect Mr Arnold, Mr Blevins said, 'None of our employers are geniuses. I can tell you. Far from it. They are too stupid to cross the road, some of them.'

Mr Clarke: He was right.

Mr MEIER: Now the new member for Ross Smith says that he was right. It looks like we have another fellow who is prepared to put his foot in his mouth. If that is the attitude towards employers in this State, it is no wonder this State went downhill in the way that it did. It is obvious that the only way we can create jobs is by employers employing people, but the previous Government, the now Opposition, including the member for Ross Smith, indicates that employers are the stupid people around here. In other words, get rid of them. Where, then, would people obtain employment?

I would like to advise the member for Ross Smith and all members opposite that I have a friend in the business world who rings Melbourne and Sydney every morning to ascertain the markets, etc., and who told me during the election campaign, 'We are the laughing stock of Australia. South Australia is just so far out, it is a joke.'

Mr Ashenden: Under a Labor Government.

Mr MEIER: And under a Labor Government. He said, 'John, if we do not have a Liberal victory, you will see an exodus from South Australia the likes of which you have never seen before.' Thank goodness for all people in South Australia, and all of us being South Australians, that we did not have a Labor victory but a Labor slaughter. It gives hope for the future. It is great to see this Government up and away, right from the word 'go'. It is also disappointing to see that so many of the things that have gone wrong definitely had gone wrong and are being added to all the time.

Whilst we all knew about the State Bank, we did not know about the Grand Prix, but it was interesting to hear the then Premier, in the last week or so of the campaign, throw out this scenario: 'If the Liberals get into power, Jeff Kennett will grab the Grand Prix.' I thought: what a stupid statement to make. He is going slightly around the bend. Why would he want to say that? What gives him the impression that that would occur? Well, of course, we found out eventually that Mr Arnold sipped tea in London as the Victorians were signing the agreement for the Grand Prix to go to their State. A tragedy of the first order; an absolute catastrophe!

It is interesting to read a quote relating to Mr Ron Walker, the Chairman of Melbourne's Major Events, in the *Sunday Mail* of 19 December, as follows:

Mr Walker told me an extraordinary story about walking into the reception of a London hotel earlier this year and seeing Lynn Arnold. Mr Arnold was on his way to meet Mr Ecclestone for a chat and a cup of tea. Mr Walker said that same day he had an appointment with Mr Ecclestone to work out the fine details of the contract for the Australian Grand Prix.

Enough said on that—another loss by Labor. Yesterday, we had the Olympic Dam scenario. This Government knew about it last year. How much did its members tell the people of South Australia? Nothing! As today's newspaper said:

The former Labor Government was aware as early as last September that the tailings dam at the Olympic Dam uranium mine was leaking.

They were not prepared to say a thing, because they know, of course, that the 10 members opposite would have been reduced to something like two or zero.

With regard to the Hindmarsh Island bridge, we had indicated our concerns for month after month. We were told, 'Don't be concerned; you know, there's not the tie-ups that you believe.' What did we find out yesterday? If this Government did not want to build a bridge it would cost up to \$12 million, because of all the fine details of the contracts that have been let and the comeback to the Government. I guess we are left with no option but the cheap option to build

a bridge at \$6 million. The former Government was prepared to do anything, and its members could not have cared less about the consequences to South Australia.

An honourable member: They probably thought, 'What's \$12 million in \$100 billion?'

Mr MEIER: Exactly! It shows again that they were prepared to do anything to get back into Government, too, and they could not have cared less whether they bankrupted the State doing it: they simply wanted to stay in office at any cost.

With regard to the arterial roads, for example, the road down south, I remember when the Tonkin Government had, year after year, bought land so that we could have a major highway down through South Road, and I believe it went right through to the Port down to the south. The Tonkin Government spent so much money buying all that was needed. Then what did the Bannon Government do (and I cannot remember whether it was in its first or second term of office)? It sold it. For about how much? The sum of \$20 million. Peanuts! That is just over double what it would cost us to get out of the Hindmarsh Island bridge, for virtually nothing. Now, every time I drive on that South Road, I think of the Bannon Government and all the Ministers and members who sat in that Government, and I say, 'You sold South Australia down the drain; you don't deserve to be in government. It's a pity that there isn't a greater retribution than just simply throwing you out of Parliament.'

I could also mention the scrimber project and the money that went down the drain there. The MFP, this pie in the sky, eventually gelled down to the fact that there was going to be a housing development on the Gillman site. Thank goodness the new Liberal Government will put some real oomph into the MFP, and we will see the MFP centred not around a housing development but around a high-tech development, as was the original concept.

Her Excellency, in her speech delivered when opening Parliament, summed it up well when she said:

My Government received the very strong support of the people of South Australia at the December 1993 election to implement four priority programs to rebuild the State's economy, its finances and confidence in our future. These programs focus on rebuilding jobs, reducing Government debt, returning standards of excellence to key community services, restoring community confidence in the institutions of government and increasing individual freedoms.

She then went on to detail that:

In the first eight weeks of its administration, my Government has already taken significant action to implement these programs.

Members are all aware of the many things that have been done already, and members know that they will continue to hear on a monthly basis and over the years—not just for the first four years, but for the next four years and the four years thereafter—how South Australia will once again be built up to the central State, to a State to which other States will look with respect and confidence, so that we will not be laughed at any more. The sins and mistakes of the Labor Government will eventually be built over and we, as South Australians and, more importantly, our children, will have a future in this great State of ours.

[Sitting suspended from 5.55 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Four years ago yesterday I rose for the first time in this place to deliver my maiden speech as the member for Hayward. If in the months that followed anyone had speculated that I would be standing here this evening delivering my first speech as the member for Unley, I would have believed that they might have taken leave of

their senses. All sitting members at that time would have been equally convinced, had we speculated that John Bannon would no longer be leading the Labor Party and that Norwood, Mawson, Elder, Kaurina and indeed all but 10 seats in this place would be Liberal and that Dean Brown would be the Liberal Premier of South Australia, leading a very capable Liberal Government. None of us could have foreseen that.

With the benefit of hindsight we can all look back and say that we saw the signs but, in truth, between then and now lay the State Bank. However, if we would seek an answer to what happened, to just point to the State Bank is as simplistic as it is wrong for those who seek to lay the blame solely at the feet of the former member for Ross Smith. In this place we quickly forget Shakespeare's words, 'Tis a cruelty to load a falling man', preferring instead to remember the more quotable quote, 'His promises were, as he was then, mighty. But his performance as he is now, nothing.'

What so many would have us believe of the former member for Ross Smith is not true. I believe that each of us, regardless of our political persuasion, comes here because we believe in a political philosophy and we believe that through that philosophy and our contributions here we can make this State a better place in which to live. Hopefully, behind the circus that can sometimes characterise this House, we all have a level of commitment to the people of South Australia, and we on this side as well as members opposite would do well to remember Shakespeare's lines, 'Evil men's manners live in brass. Their virtues we write on water', and be somewhat less anxious to act like Romans at the Colosseum baying for blood than we sometimes are.

That does not excuse the necessity for our accountability before the people. We can truly say, 'Where the offence is, let the great axe fall.' Indeed, it is tempting to believe that South Australia remembered what Walter Raleigh said as he felt the blade that would soon descend on his neck, because he said, 'Tis a sharp remedy but a sure cure for all ills.' Many in South Australia would believe that that was what the people did in making their judgment on the Labor Party in the last election. My friend and colleague the member for Mitchell, whose gracious comments I acknowledge, reminded the House before the adjournment that I concluded my maiden speech by saying:

There will come a time—a time that is not long hence—when the wheel shall begin to turn and they shall listen, for on this side of the House we will speak with one voice, and it will be the voice of the people of South Australia. It will say, 'You have tarried in this place too long. Get you gone.'

None of us knew of the coming catastrophes but all of us—and I suggest even the members who sit opposite, if I interpret correctly the words spoken by the member for Hart yesterday in his maiden speech—knew that we faced a Government tired and worn out by a decade on the Government benches, a Government that was bereft of ideas, a Government that knew the price of everything and the value of nothing.

I believe the beginning of its end lay not in the State Bank but in the Labor Government's 1985 election victory. If we look at that election victory and the characteristics of the Governments which successively followed that election victory, we see there is a profound lesson for all members of this House, not the least for those who now sit on the Government benches.

Few of us are ever accorded the privilege of representing an electorate in Parliament; even fewer are accorded the privilege of representing two different electorates in consecu-

tive Parliaments, and I am most grateful to be one. I record a debt of gratitude to the electors of Hayward who trusted me enough to elect me as their member. I am most pleased that they continue to be represented in the new seat of Mitchell by a member of exceptional talent and a Liberal member to boot. The people of Unley had enough faith in my abilities to allow me to speak for them in this Parliament as the first Liberal member for Unley in over 30 years, and for that I am most grateful.

The Liberal Party claims Unley and Norwood quite rightfully as the jewel in the Liberal crown, for we were well reminded by the Electoral Commissioner in delivering his judgment that the Liberal Party cannot be expected to be expected to be given the seat of Unley or Norwood on a plate, especially when they were held by high profile Ministers who were doing so well in their jobs. The Boundaries Commission quoted the personal following calculated for the member for Unley at 4.8 per cent, and the member for Norwood's personal following was calculated as being even higher.

The Liberal Party fought hard in Unley, and our winning margin is 15.5 per cent, so if the Electoral Commissioner was right, or if indeed our Deputy Leader is right in calculating the former member for Unley's percentage as being about 3.5 per cent, the swing we got in Unley and the similar swing in Norwood, Elder, Mitchell and other places amounted to something between 18 and 20 per cent, and that is a resounding victory for the Liberal Party and a clear statement from the people of South Australia about the values which they seek in this place and about the type of people they seek to represent them.

The victory in Unley, as I have just said, is not my victory: it is a victory for the Liberal Party and it is a victory for the people of South Australia. We on this side of the House and people such as yourself, Mr Speaker, with much more experience than I have all knew what the polls were telling us. Quite frankly, colleagues of your calibre, Sir, were saying to me and to others that the polls could not be right: this never happens. You cannot blame anybody for making that assessment, and it was something of a delightful shock to us all to realise that the polls indeed were accurate, if anything underestimating the strength of the feelings of South Australians.

So the victories for those who sit here and so proudly represent the first Brown Liberal Government are not personal victories but victories for the people of South Australia and for the teams who worked so hard to represent our interests and to help put us into this place. I have heard member after member in making their maiden speech acknowledge with gratitude the teams that have assisted them to occupy a place in this House, for each of us represents more than 20 000 people. The tragedy in a democracy is that more people cannot be here; you have to distil 20 000 voices into one in each case, and we are the fortunate few who represent in each case some 20 000 people. As I said, I claim no victory for myself: I claim a victory for the exceptionally talented team that I had to support me, and I want to pay tribute to the people of exceptional calibre, dedication, talent and persistence who saw that for the first time in over three decades Unley was changed into a Liberal seat.

I will not mention names, because quite rightly those names belong in Party forums, and in Party forums I will acknowledge those who helped and who formed such an important part of the victory in Unley, but I will in this place on my behalf and on behalf of all my new colleagues acknowledge the part played by the Liberal secretariat—

people such as Graeme Morris, Joan Young and those who are our full-time workers, as well as the Premier himself, his shadow Cabinet and the team of workers whom he has in his office and who, as you know, Mr Speaker, spent not only the six weeks leading up to government but months, weeks and years beforehand preparing for government.

I note that the shadow Minister of Housing and Construction, Sport and goodness knows what else has entered the Chamber, and he knows, as I know, the amount of work that he and all shadow Ministers put into preparing the policies that they presented to the electorate of South Australia. All members in this place, when they are thanking their team, should also thank—and I know they do—the team of shadow Ministers, the Premier and his staff who worked so hard at a State level to ensure that that swing rightfully came our way.

The Hon. H. Allison: Not to mention the backbenchers.

Mr BRINDAL: As my friend and colleague, the Chairman of Committees, said, even the backbench—

The Hon. H. Allison: No, I said not to mention the backbenchers!

Mr BRINDAL: I will mention the backbench, because I believe that everyone on the team played a part, and a disciplined part, at that. I want to place very clearly on record that members opposite have made much of the fact that between the last election and now we had two leadership decisions to be made in this place. Members opposite chortle across the benches that I was an Olsen supporter. I have never, ever tried to hide what I do and I try not to be ashamed of what I do, and I quite willingly and honestly in this place put on the record that I supported John Olsen for the leadership of the Liberal Party, and I am not ashamed to have done so. I did at the time what I considered to be right, and I do not regret that decision. But I would say to members opposite that Alexander Pope once wrote an epigram—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Alexander Pope. I would not expect the member for Hart to know that he was a fairly famous poet who used to live in England. He once presented a dog to the Prince of Wales, and on the dog there was a collar. On the collar there was an epigram that said:

I am his Highness' dog at Kew; Pray tell me, sir, whose dog are you?

At least on this side of the House we are not ashamed—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir, I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on either other members or on members of the royal family, because, if he is, I take gross exception.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot uphold the point of order. I am sure that the member for Unley does not intend to reflect on any member; otherwise he will have an early minute. He knows that. The honourable member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: I assure you, Mr Speaker, that the only person I knew who called anybody a drover's dog as a result of the last election does not sit on this side of the House. I was not reflecting on any member opposite, but merely quoting an epigram from Alexander Pope. However, the point I was trying to make is a valid one. It might be better for this State if members opposite were slightly more honest in their allegiances and the political games they play. I acknowledge who I voted for and I am not ashamed of it. That does not detract from my loyalty to the current Premier or to every Minister, or to this Party or this Government.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: On a point of order, Sir, I believe the member for Ross Smith is once again interjecting out of his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Ross Smith that all interjections are out of order but that it is completely out of order to make interjections out of his seat. The only exception is if a member is occupying the Leader's seat, leading for the Opposition. That would be acceptable.

Mr BRINDAL: As I said, I am not afraid to stick my colours on the mast and it is a pity that some of those opposite were not equally as honest in their dealings with members on their side. It is also worth putting on the record that my preselection for Unley followed a long and detailed discussion with the current Premier and I only preselected for Unley with his help, encouragement and support. I want to put my appreciation for that on the record.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Why isn't he promoting you?

Mr BRINDAL: Let me again edify the erstwhile Deputy Leader, who apparently believes the only way to get preferment in this place is by treading on everybody's neck on the way up.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: As opposed to licking their boots, which is what you're doing right now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: Let me state quite clearly that on this side of the House preferment is according to merit. The Premier assigned me a task. I remember the same Deputy Leader chortling that we would not win Unley or Norwood or a few others. I see 10 people on that side, I see 37 on this side, and I do not see the Deputy Leader chortling quite as much.

An honourable member: Give us your views on prostitution.

Mr BRINDAL: If the Deputy Leader—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have a point of order, Sir. The interjection from whoever the new member is over there is quite out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The member for Wright did not directly make his comments in relation to any particular member. All interjections—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will not interject while the Chair is addressing the House or there will be some firm action taken. The member made a general interjection, of course, which is out of order anyway, and I would request members to allow the member for Unley to complete his contribution.

Mr BRINDAL: The Deputy Leader opposite should learn that on this side of the House preferment is in terms of merit. The Premier gave me a task to do, which was win Unley. I have performed that task for the Premier. The Premier gave shadow Ministers on this side of the House tasks to do and those tasks were to formulate policy, to put that policy before the Party room and to present that policy to the people of South Australia. Those shadow Ministers did that. They are now Ministers of the Crown and they are rightfully enjoying the chance to prove their performance as Ministers of the Crown.

Members opposite should not judge our Party by their standards. To have shadow Ministers work hard for two or three years and then be cast aside like rubbish because greedy and ambitious people want their jobs is not quite the way the Liberal Party works, much as it is the way the Deputy Leader—because he can see through no eyes but his own and

can think with no Machiavellian brain but his own—would wish it to be on this side of the House. It is not, and long may it be not, because that is the very reason why he and his Party are over there and me and my Party are over here. We stand for something; they stand for nothing. They are a Party who, as I said, knows the value of everything and the worth of nothing.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is not an Alexander Pope. If the honourable member wishes to interject, tell him to learn his Oscar Wilde from his Alexander Pope. He is obviously illiterate.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It was John Stuart Mill.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest that the member for Unley address his remarks through the Chair and not invite interjections.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: You see what I mean, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has the call and I suggest that he should proceed. The Chair will have no hesitation in dealing firmly with members if there is a continued attempt to disrupt the member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir. As I said, the members who worked hard and put forward our policy are now Ministers of the Crown and they have the right, deservedly, to implement that policy. I am sure that all members on the back bench would quite rightly prefer ministerial responsibility, and that is a natural ambition, yet none of us wishes it at their expense.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: There is a new member, Sir, who has already been referred to in this place as the groper, because he is all mouth, but I will not offend you by naming him.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member does not.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir. I will take your wise advice. As I said, none of us would wish it by trampling over our colleagues, especially if it meant other than good government for the people of South Australia. I, the members for Newland, Bright, Fisher and the others—the six of us who joined this place in 1989—really saw what it was like to have a Government that was out of touch, arrogant and tired. The people of this State have suffered for the past four years while so many people just waited in the wings. It was like waiting for a death. The Public Service was paralysed, the teachers were demoralised and the schools were falling to bits because the Government was tired and could not make a decision. The Government was paralysed by its own ineptitude. If anyone thinks that any member on this side of the House is prepared to allow this Government to be like the former Labor Government, they have a new lot of thinking to do.

I suggest that Opposition members take some of their own advice. They were very good in Government at telling us how to be an effective Opposition, how not to carp and criticise, how to be constructive and how to help with the business of government. They were telling us that day after day, yet we are back here three sitting days, with a mandate from the people of South Australia such as has never been accorded to any Government, and they are looking not to make constructive criticism, not to help, but to white ant and bring into this place things which are largely irrelevant and to look for moles. The *Advertiser*, so beloved of members opposite, in January quite rightly commented, ‘Where is the Opposition?’ because they were still on holiday. We did not see any

Opposition members in January. They were all having their rest and recreation leave.

Mr Venning: Where are they now?

Mr BRINDAL: They are still on holiday. We are very worried because there will be a huge responsibility on members on this side of the House to act not only as a constructive Government but to see if we are doing anything wrong and to act as an effective Opposition, because it is already obvious that there will be no Opposition worth noting coming from the other side of the House.

The Opposition has two or three talented people. Unlike the Deputy Leader, I have never been afraid to get up in this place and give credit where it is due, and not in a malicious way. Ask the former member for Norwood (and several of his colleagues), whose loss I appreciate—because he was not a Liberal—yet regret because he was a decent person who tried to contribute to good government in this State and lost.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is quite obvious that this is an unfair reflection on me, because I praised the honourable member several times in his efforts to support John Olsen.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is taking frivolous points of order. If the honourable member has a genuine point of order, he is entitled to draw it to the attention of the Chair; he is not entitled to disrupt the member for Unley. The member for Unley.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That applies also to the member for Custance.

Mr BRINDAL: The face is the cherub; the rest is reptilian. The electoral victory in Unley was not for me without its personal costs. I would like to conclude on that remark, because I think it is something that bears reflection by us all. Before the last Parliament rose, some unfortunate remarks were made by a then member in this place with which I will have to live for the rest of my life, because some things, once said, no matter whether or not they are retracted, can never and will never be forgotten. If that was well done then those members opposite who think it was well done can go out afterwards and chortle. However, there are people, believe it or not, about whom I care and care very deeply. I do not intend to drag them into this place and to discuss them or my relationship with them for the edification of this House, or to try to defend myself against accusations that are indefensible. In the end we all know how the lift strategy works and who were the masters of that strategy. That was done and I cannot undo it, and I cannot in this place pretend that it was well done or pretend that it reflects well on those who perpetrate that sort of politics.

I would also like to mention that on the first day of the election campaign a sign stating that ‘Mark Brindal shops here’ was plastered all over the Pink Pussy, and none of the members opposite will realise that that is my local sex shop. I did not think that was well done, either, because I can assure this House that I have never entered that establishment—not because I have anything in particular against such establishments (and that is my business entirely). If anyone wants to give my endorsement to a shop, I suggest that they ask for a licence fee first, because I object to being told where I shop or being told to endorse things that I do not endorse.

I had comments put on election posters and things like that. I have just this to say: I am very human and I have more failings than most, and I do not pretend to be otherwise. The only thing that I will attempt while I am here is do a good job by my electorate. I hope that every member in this House,

including every member on the other side, would seek to do likewise.

If some members opposite or, indeed, some members on this side of the House want to descend to that sort of politics then it is no wonder that we are held in disrepute by the public of South Australia. Those who want to do that, be they on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, should sooner be gone. We all enjoy a woeful reputation in the community, because there are some who would sooner win at any cost and bring anyone into the gutter than be honest or reputable.

As I said, I hold myself up as no paragon of virtue; I certainly am not. However, I do not go looking in people's bank accounts; I do not go peeping through their toilet or bedroom window; I do not do any of the things that some people seem to want to do. I do not believe that is what politics is about, and I hope that none of my colleagues would ever do that, because I am proud to be a Liberal and I would be very ashamed if anyone on this side of the House would do that.

So, in concluding, I record that this occurred at personal cost. I deeply regret that those about whom I care may have been affected by the sort of slur and innuendo that is perpetrated by some. I raise this issue because I would hope that the last election might be some sort of watershed and that we might see a new approach to politics in this State.

I heard the member for Hart; I listened carefully. I thought that he made some very good points in his speech. He said that he had heard the lesson of the past four years. The lesson of the past four years was not just for the benefit of the then Government: it was for us all. It was about accountability and good government, and we must heed that lesson as much as the members opposite, and I hope that we will. I am sure that the backbench and the Executive Government will try to heed the lesson, and the job of the members opposite is to ensure that we do.

It is not some great game. It is \$4 billion a year that in the past four years we are all guilty of mucking up and mucking up rather badly. This Government should be about good Government and this Opposition should be helping this good Government. I am proud to be the member for Unley and I make the House this promise: I will retire as the member for Unley and it will not be for many, many years.

The SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Hartley I point out that this is a maiden speech and I request that the normal courtesies of the House apply to the honourable member.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I would first like to congratulate Her Excellency on her memorable speech at this historical opening of the South Australian Parliament. The opening of this Parliament has been a memorable occasion and marks the beginning of a new era for South Australia. Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your election to this important office. You enjoy immense support from both sides of this Chamber. Your down-to-earth, fair-minded manner has been evident even in this early stage of the South Australian Parliament and is highly regarded. I also congratulate other new members on their electoral victories and their maiden speeches.

For the first time in 11 years we have a new Government with a fresh and dynamic vision. Its vitality and commitment will prepare South Australia for a new era and the twenty-first century. It is important to note that South Australia is

celebrating the 1994 Women's Suffrage Centenary Year which recognises the importance of women's rights to vote, to actively participate on the political stage and to make vital and substantial changes within the community.

South Australia was the first State in the nation, and amongst the first in the world, to give women their rights, emphasising that South Australia has the ability to lead the nation, if not the world. As we celebrate the Women's Suffrage Centenary it is important to note that this Parliament has much to be proud of. The Governor of South Australia, Her Excellency the Hon. Dame Roma Mitchell, has had a distinguished career of firsts: the first woman QC, the first acting Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the first Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission and, of course, the first woman Governor in the Australian Commonwealth. It is appropriate that Her Excellency should have opened Parliament in this historical year which also carries the distinction of having the highest number of women members in the South Australian Parliament. Although the number of women MPs is still far from ideal, it is important that we reflect on and acknowledge the progress we have made. Currently we have a total of 47 members in the House of Assembly: six are women—five in the Dean Brown Government and one in the Opposition.

In this historical year, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague from the Opposition, Annette Hurley, the new member for Napier, for having been elected to this House under difficult circumstances. From a total of 22 members in the Legislative Council, seven are women: three from the Government, three from the ALP and one from the Australian Democrats. Again, in this historical year of the Women's Suffrage Centenary it is important to recognise that the Government takes the lead in the number of women MPs. However, in recognising these important achievements we must not forget the unrecorded successes of those women who have worked without pay and who have achieved without recognition.

They have enriched the human condition. Their work has not been measured in terms of gross domestic product, but I am certain that if we had a measurement of gross social product then they and their achievements would rate very highly. We will never really value and empower the majority of women if we do not, as a society, value the unpaid work and contributions that women make in the family and in society. It is not from the position of a male executive that I recognise the accomplishments of women who choose to work in the home, but from the perspective of a single parent who has done much of the work that men take for granted.

We also enjoy the distinction of having preselected members from diverse backgrounds: in the Legislative Council, the Hons Dr Bernice Pfitzner and Julian Stefani and in the House of Assembly, Joe Rossi and Steve Condous. The inclusion of women as well as those of non-English speaking backgrounds in the Government truly reflects our ability to embrace diversity, equity and social justice, which are necessary steps for South Australian government and, indeed, the nation. I, too, am an Australian from a multicultural background. The late Sir Billy Snedden, former Leader and Speaker of the House of Representatives, had this to say of the migrant experience in 1977 as it related to a friend of Italian background:

A friend explained the anger he had held because of the prejudice he had constantly run into in Australia. This struck me as very surprising because this man is a very successful businessman who speaks very good English. Yet deep within him he still retains a

feeling of being separated from the mainstream of society simply because he is Italian. He expressed it in this way: 'I do not know whether I should be buried in Australia where I lived for 20 years or in Italy with my father.' He had not then made up his mind whether he was Australian or Italian. This is the sort of tug a sensitive person feels. It is not possible to suppress memories of the homeland.

I, too, like Sir Billy Snedden's friend, am a sensitive person, but unlike his friend I took the important step when I chose to become a citizen of this great nation. As a migrant it is momentous to have been elected in a time which has much historical significance and which marks the beginning of a new era for South Australia. There are many opportunities in this nation for all Australians, including those who were not born here. When I was a boy I sold newspapers on the corner opposite Parliament House. It is certainly an honour and a privilege to represent the people of Hartley as their member of Parliament. I believe that MP stands not only for member of Parliament but also for 'member by privilege'.

I take this opportunity to again thank the people of Hartley and my many Liberal campaign supporters who have dedicated years of time and effort to my campaign, therefore enabling me to serve the community at this level. I give special mention to Max Arthur, my campaign manager, who worked hard for me in two elections. Many of my supporters, especially my immediate and extended family are here today, most notably my three children, Cassandra, Luca and Joel. Without their support it would not have been possible. To my mother, who celebrated her 80th birthday on the morning after the election, I too regret that my father who migrated to Australia with a suitcase four years before the family, in 1955, is not here to witness this event.

Mr Speaker, not long after my preselection a Party supporter said to me, 'Joe, I do not mean to be rude, but do you think your height is a disadvantage to you as a politician?' I looked at him and replied, 'No, it is an advantage.' He looked puzzled, and I said, 'You know how people complain about politicians looking down at them—well, I don't have that problem!'

Regrettably, the public, the people to whom we are ultimately responsible, do not regard us very highly. We merely have to glance at a daily newspaper and read a few letters to the editor or look at some approval surveys to ram home the fact that we, who play an essential role in people's lives, are considered to be the least trustworthy members of the community. This should be of major concern to all of us. We have record levels of unemployment, particularly amongst the young. I am pleased that the Premier has given this issue a top priority. We need to restore the public trust in Government and to re-establish moral legitimacy.

A member of Parliament is no different from a teacher in the classroom. A teacher can have degrees and letters after his or her name, along with a multitude of qualifications and theories, but unless that teacher establishes trust and respect very little learning takes place. Likewise, a member of Parliament can have the finest policies and the best intentions—and I acknowledge that we often do—but we cannot achieve anything if South Australians do not trust us. Our ability to deliver is directly related to the public's perception of politicians and Government departments.

There is a need for both sides of this Chamber—and this was evident from interjections in the last speech—to meet the public's expectations, to earn their trust and to restore faith and pride in South Australia. Sadly, the public's lack of trust and widespread cynicism is not limited to politicians and Governments but has unfortunately permeated the community at large. Community groups must be prepared to contribute

to the recovery. We are all aware of the disastrous 1980s when Government instrumentalities as well as the private sector failed all of us. The years of the high flier and the decade of greed has contributed greatly to our current situation. It is therefore essential for us to encourage the private sector and to assist with this desperately needed recovery.

These are actions which a Dean Brown Government will work towards. However, no Government can heal South Australia's economic woes without the assistance and cooperation of the private sector. Governments alone cannot nourish the economy and should interfere only when it is necessary for the community well-being and to provide essential community services. A primary aim of Government must be to ensure that business stays in business and that the private sector bears the ultimate responsibility for providing employment and widespread prosperity.

In the past 10 to 15 years South Australians have witnessed unprecedented changes in the workplace. We have undergone rapid structural changes and have survived the social consequences of the information revolution, just as workers in earlier times endured the industrial revolution. No longer can a school leaver, if he or she is fortunate to get a job or a tertiary placement, hope to follow a specific career path. On average a school leaver in 1994 is expected to change his or her career path four to five times, resulting in great challenges for all of us. If we have an ambitious education system, these challenges will materialise into opportunities.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. Rob Lucas) must be congratulated. His strategy to lay the foundation for our future workers to meet the challenges of tomorrow is highly regarded. No society should tolerate a 40 per cent youth unemployment rate, and we are all aware of the great social consequences if this is ignored. The massive youth unemployment rate has reached epidemic proportions. At 40 per cent it doubles the jobless figure of the general work force during the Great Depression. This detail is hidden by the welfare system and appears to be lost even by the media.

The welfare system plays an important role—and that must be the case. However, it camouflages the problems that exist. Welfare should be a short-term right for all those who need it. It should not be a sentence, for no amount of welfare, unemployment benefit, Austudy, family supplement, etc, can give the young self-esteem and a sense of belonging. It should not be a substitute for a job or a career. You cannot plan for a family on social security; you cannot borrow for or put a deposit on a home on a job search allowance. Our Premier is correct in emphasising the importance of creating a fertile climate for growth, especially in the export sector.

It is pleasing to see the commitment Mitsubishi Motors Australia has made to South Australia. For only when we grow and our exports generate wealth will we give our young people a positive future and the opportunities in their lives that they deserve.

There has been much talk about the introduction of non-compulsory voting by the Dean Brown Government and the suggestion that it would benefit one Party and not another. Non-compulsory voting at the local level of Government is already in existence. South Australia is just one of the few places in the world that forces people against their will to vote in a State election. In fact, the United Kingdom, from which we inherit our successful democracy based on the Westminster system, permits people to make the choice of

whether or not to exercise that democratic right. No-one should be forced to vote if it is a right in itself, and I believe that there is an element of freedom in exercising our rights. At the same time, however, we should introduce non-compulsory voting together with suitable education programs to inform youth about the complexities of Government structures, political systems, voting and citizenship. Education in this area will empower people to contribute to our democratic society.

As a teacher, I have witnessed at first hand the lack of knowledge that young people have about Government. Naturally, this has contributed to the general malaise and apathy about Government and voting. With education, compulsory voting would no longer be necessary. Feelings of helplessness which envelop the fabric of democracy would fade as people became concerned about the effect of Government on their life. It is as true today as it was in 1982 when Dr Mo Frankel, a visiting academic, said:

Democracy cannot survive for long if its citizens do not have a basic understanding of economics coupled with a sense of compromise.

I believe that citizenship must be given a much higher priority in education. Permanent residents should be encouraged to take up citizenship and fully participate and contribute to the community as Australians, for today more than ever we are not simply facing individual problems but community, State, national and, indeed, world problems, especially when it comes to the environment. Fortunately, Australia is one of the few privileged places in this troubled world that enjoys the freedom that most take for granted.

This is the International Year of the Family. Therefore, it is fitting to reflect upon the importance of the family in society and the value of its traditional structures. I acknowledge that the conventional ideal family is not always attainable or, indeed, in a permanent state. This has been the case since biblical times. Because of structural changes and pressures today, more than ever the ideal family appears to be in a state of flux. No society can hope to survive socially or economically without acknowledging that most people are attempting to aspire to this ideal. This does not imply that individuals within the ideal, if they are fortunate to be part of it, should be given preference over others and elevated to a higher status.

I know only too well how difficult it is not to be part of that ideal. Equity in and access to Government should always be based upon the individual rather than the group. He or she should have rights and responsibilities simply because they are citizens; and individuals who are not fortunate to be part of the ideal family should be assisted by the State in order to maximise their potential. Most importantly, individuals should always be recognised and assisted independently of the group or association. Otherwise, we may fall victim to the tyranny of pressure groups.

It is obvious that the ideal traditional family is facing difficult times. However, promoters of alternatives to the ideal should bear in mind that, if there are difficulties with something that has been sought after for generations by the majority, how much more difficult would it be for individuals to survive and maximise their potential in alternatives that are not accepted by the majority and have not been tried?

The diverse electorate of Hartley is comprised of nearly three-quarters of the old Hartley before the 1991 redistribution and part of the old Coles. I have lived in this area since childhood and have attended the local schools as well as having taught many of the students. It is a privilege to

represent an area that I know well. Hartley has a significant proportion of Australians from a multicultural background and has grown rapidly as a result of post-war migration. In fact, it is not unlike South Australian society in general as 25 per cent of its residents come from various non-English speaking backgrounds.

Many of these Australians are now facing special difficulties. However, they are fortunate to have community organisations to address their needs. It is pleasing to see the diversity of age care within Hartley which is considered to be a major priority within the electorate. The two major councils of Payneham and Campbelltown are responding to the needs of both the elderly and the young, as well as to local environmental problems. It has been a pleasure to work with both councils as candidate since 1989 and more recently as the member for Hartley. Hartley is indeed fortunate to be part of these local governments. Programs such as Youthspeak have also been essential enabling young people to establish a sense of belonging, enabling them actively to participate in and contribute to the life of the community.

The major environmental concern in Hartley is the River Torrens. It is obvious that the cooperation of the local government bodies with the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. David Wotton) is essential. Furthermore, I also look forward to working with the councils of Burnside and Kensington and Norwood which oversee parts of the new Hartley, formerly part of the Coles electorate. The new areas of Hartley, contrary to some perceptions, are not inhabited by the well off. They have a significant number of senior citizens, superannuants who have looked forward to a comfortable retirement, who are still feeling the pain of increased rates and charges and, more recently, the steady decline of interest rates. This has drastically reduced their real disposable income and purchasing power.

As the member for Hartley, I think it is encouraging to see local businesses growing. One such business is Fasta Pasta located in Glynde. Not only is it doing well in South Australia but also it is expanding interstate. In Magill, the Galligans Mattress Factory is manufacturing custom made mattresses for the local and interstate niche market. There are also general retailers, food processors, building and construction companies which can provide opportunities for export. All these businesses will play an important role in the recovery under the Dean Brown Government.

It has been an honour to meet the constituents of Hartley over the years as candidate, and I look forward to serving them as their representative in this House. Being a local member is about diverse representation and being the voice for our constituents. The strength of the single member electorate should not be lost, for it empowers the individual, whether he or she is a resident or part of a business or community organisation. I will strive to be their voice in Hartley.

I believe that it is appropriate for me to acknowledge the work of those members of Parliament who have well represented the general area before me: Justice King, the Hon. Des Corcoran, the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore and, of course, the former Independent member for Hartley, the Hon. Terry Groom. I am aware from my door knocking that they have taken good care of Hartley and are still held in high regard and with much affection. I must compliment the Hon. Terry Groom specifically for his valuable work with the senior citizens. I will certainly continue to voice their concerns in this House.

I am certain the new member for Coles would agree with me that, in this centenary celebration of women's suffrage, the contribution made to this State by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore must be praised. There is no doubt that she has successfully represented her electorate as well as South Australia. We will all suffer a great loss now that she has retired from Parliament. It was the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore who was partially responsible for my being here today. It all began with a matter she investigated for me and resulted in my request for an application form to join the Liberal Party.

Jennifer Cashmore has taught us that you can have fire in your belly and seek the truth without being dressed in tattered clothing. She has shown us over the years that you can care for the environment without falling victim to the stereotype. I believe that she has played an important role in helping to bridge the forces of development and the environmental movement, for ultimately it is in the community's interest and in the interests of the future that they work together. They need not and should not be poles apart.

When it comes to multiculturalism, it is evident that Dean Brown's Government is committed to encouraging the community to be accepting of all people regardless of cultural background. As Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, the Premier has given this portfolio a high priority. Part of the reason I entered politics was that there is and always will be a need for politicians who can understand and identify with people from diverse backgrounds.

I believe that Australians from multicultural backgrounds should become involved in politics not only to represent their specific group but others as well, for I believe that Australia is a mosaic of which we are all a part, but we must have a vision of one community and break away from the 'us and them' mentality. Without a vision of one community, society would become a collage of pressure groups, in danger of falling apart in difficult times. I want not to be part of a pressure group but a bridge for all Australians, a bridge that promotes two-way traffic. I represent the whole community of Hartley. I want to assist Australians from multicultural backgrounds to feel empowered and more Australian. I want more traditional Australians to be more accepting of all Australians, regardless of background.

We must not forget that Australian history goes well beyond 1788 and that the foundation for the mosaic was laid in the dreaming. We must also acknowledge the fact that traditional Aboriginal Australians have a different view of the land. Europeans think they own the land, but the Aborigines know that the land owns them. It saddens me that Australians of Aboriginal background in 1994 still suffer from high infant mortality, low life expectancy and low participation rate in the decision making within the community. We must do our best to empower them as we must with all groups of Australians.

Mr Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to be part of a Government that is well aware of the richness of South Australia's mosaic and has a vision and commitment to create a better picture for us all. I look forward to participating in and contributing to the process of building a better future and life for all South Australians.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the member for Light, I remind members that this is the member for Light's maiden speech and should be heard in silence.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I support the motion moved by the member for Flinders and congratulate the Governor on her speech to Parliament. I would also like to record my con-

gratulations to the member for Eyre on his elevation to the role of Speaker in this House. I am sure he will act with diligence and fairness to all concerned.

In my first speech in the Parliament, I would like to say that I am very proud to have been elected, and I thank the electors of Light and trust that my contribution in this place will be beneficial. I would first like to thank, though, the supporters that I had during the election campaign. I had a very diligent campaign committee that worked extremely hard, and as a new member, following one who had been in this place for 23½ years, it was a matter of raising my profile as against somebody who had been there for a long time. I particularly thank them for their work. I also thank my wife, Kathryn, and family members who helped me in achieving this position.

It would be extremely remiss of me if I did not at this stage mention the former member for Light, Dr Eastick. He served this Parliament for a period of 23½ years, entering in 1970 and, of course, leaving at the last election. His commitment to the community in Light and particularly to Gawler was second to none. He represented that community and all members in Light in a very dutiful way, and he was probably quite unique in the fact that he was Mayor of Gawler in 1970 when he entered this Parliament and again he was Mayor of Gawler in 1993 when he left this Parliament.

I might add that there was quite a time in between when he was not Mayor. However, it shows his commitment to the community of Gawler and Light. As members well know, he was Leader of the Opposition in the 1970s and he rose to be the Speaker of the House from 1979 to 1982. I think I am correct in saying that Dr Eastick was respected by all members of this House for both his intelligence and his ability to judge issues as he saw them and in a truthful way.

Of course, no member can enter and stay in this House without the support of their spouse. I should say that Dr Eastick's wife Dawn has been an exceptional supporter of the former member for Light over a long period, and we have been extremely lucky to have had her support and commitment. I pay a sincere tribute to the former member for Light, Dr Eastick, and his wife Dawn, and I am sure that everyone in Light and in this place would concur with those sentiments.

I would now like to say a few words about the electorate of Light. The original inhabitants of Light were Aborigines of the Kaurna tribe, after whom an electorate in this House is named. The Kaurna tribe inhabited the Adelaide Hills and the Adelaide plains. The geography of the District of Light has changed somewhat over the years. When Dr Eastick first represented Light, it took in Kapunda and areas just below Clare going right out to the river: it now consists of the district councils of Mallala, Light, Barossa and Wakefield Plains and the town council of Gawler. This is quite a shift over the years, and in the last redistribution we lost the area of the District Council of Tanunda and Angaston, so part of our beloved Barossa Valley is now in the safe hands of the member for Custance. I inherited part of the member for Kavel's district—Williamstown—and also part of the member for Goyder's area—Mallala and the area running out to the coast. I can now go for a swim in my own electorate, even though I might have to walk a mile to get there.

The history of the name 'Light' obviously relates to Colonel William Light, who passed through Gawler with Mr Finnis in 1839. They went through Deadman's Pass, where they found the skeleton of a white man in a tree, obviously the result of some previous altercation; the name 'Deadman's Pass' remains in Gawler to this day. Colonel Light went on

to plan the township of Gawler and other areas such as the Barossa Valley, but I will refer to that later in my speech.

The electorate of Light has been represented by only four members since 1955. The first of these was Mr George Hambour, followed by Mr Nicholson, Mr Freebairn and, of course, Dr Eastick. Similarly, when the electorate encompassed Gawler it, too, was represented by only a few members. Previous to Dr Eastick winning the seat it was held by two Labor members, Mr Les Duncan from 1938 to 1952 and Mr Jack Clark from 1952 to 1970, when Dr Eastick won the seat by a narrow margin.

Light is a diverse electorate but one that is most productive. It hosts primary, secondary and tertiary industries. Its primary industries consist of cereal grains, wool, fat lamb and legume production; in the mining industry, sand mining and Gawler River loam supplies; and, in the animal industries, cattle, beef, dairy and intensive poultry for both meat and egg production and many intensive piggeries.

It is also an area which is diversifying. We now find that there are deer farms within the electorate of Light as well as such things as alpacas and finally—something that was bought to my attention the other day—we are now producing snake antivenene. Of course, it would be very wrong of me not to recognise the wine production of the area. While I have lost some prime wine growing areas to the member for Culance, the electorate of Light still has Greenock, Roland Flat and Lyndoch, through to Williamstown. It is an extremely productive area, where without doubt some of the best wines in Australia are produced, a major proportion of its wines being exported. Further, timber is produced at the Mount Crawford State pine forests.

The value to the State of this primary production is significant: \$82.3 million worth of agricultural production comes from Light, it encompasses a large number of establishments with some 57 500 hectares planted to cereals, 9 000 cattle and 150 000 sheep. Needless to say, I have had some interest in the agriculture industry by starting off on a farm and moving on from there.

The electorate of Light is also steeped in the history of secondary industries. One might remember that back in the 1860s James Martin's foundry was located there and it was the producer of many steam engines; it was a great event in Gawler each week to see a new steam engine roll out of James Martin's foundry and move down the main street via the railway line to the Gawler station. At the height of production the foundry employed about 700 men.

Other secondary industries in those times involved May Brothers, who produced many strippers for the grain production sector, and Duffield Mills, which ground a lot of the grain produced in the area, in the 1860s grinding some 140 000 bushels a week. Gawler also hosts the oldest country newspaper in South Australia, perhaps in Australia. It was started by the Gawler Humbug Society, the first edition was released out on 5 September 1863. It was started and owned by the Barnet family and is still held by that family today. The original price of the paper was sixpence and it is now 60¢; considering inflation over that time, I think we are getting extremely good value.

The District of Light also supports much secondary industry, which in turn supports the agricultural hinterland—agricultural engineering establishments, building establishments, and supplies of and repairs to much of the machinery in the agricultural sector. Of course, again I cannot forget the wine industry, which is probably the major secondary industry in the electorate. As many members in this place

would know from recent publicity, Orlando Winery's Jacob's Creek brand is now one of the top selling wines in England, and that company has achieved record export sales. It was particularly pleasing to see a recent expansion at Orlando, so the future looks very good for that company and also for the employment that it is providing within Light.

Many other names, of course, come to mind when talking of wineries in my area that contribute to the export program: those of Grant Burge, Yaldara, Settlers, Krondorf, and I could go on with a large number of small wineries that are now producing boutique wines, supplying the market and providing employment within Light. Light, of course, is host to what was the Roseworthy Agricultural College and is now the Roseworthy campus of the University of Adelaide. Roseworthy is the oldest agricultural college in Australia. It is the only college that has provided an oenology course, and I remember when I spent a large amount of time in Rural Youth that many Roseworthy College students came along to Gawler Rural Youth club.

They came from far and wide, from all States in the country, to study oenology at Roseworthy College. It has an excellent name. It has produced many wine makers who are at the top of large companies, both in Australia and now overseas. Not only has Roseworthy produced many wine makers but it has also played a significant role in agriculture within South Australia. It has produced a number of varieties of wheat that have both improved our production and increased the income of South Australian farmers.

The electors of Light, finally, this year will enjoy a new hospital. It has been somewhat of a fight over a long time to get this hospital, and with the growth of the area it is now coming to fruition, and I should commend both the hospital committee and its board, have persevered for a long time, but stuck to their task. We will see the benefits of that, hopefully, in September this year. Other smaller hospitals in the area are at Hamley Bridge and Mallala.

Light also supports a number of primary schools. I have 14 in my electorate, varying in size from approximately 40 to 750 students. Light also supports the Gawler High School, and might I say that the disrepair this school has fallen into through lack of action by the previous Government is something of a shame. I estimate that there are many thousands of dollars worth of repairs to be done at the Gawler High School, and it has been through sheer neglect, not on the part of the high school but on the part of the previous Government, that this work has not been done.

I look forward to pushing the cause of the Gawler High School to the Minister for Education and Children's Services, and trust that we can improve the school. Light also supports Trinity College, probably one of the fastest growing schools anywhere in the State. It currently has 1 300 students and, basically, you must put your name down when your child is born to get a place in the future. I now turn to a subject that I believe is of great concern, that is, our agricultural industry. The first thing I would like to talk about is the education of our farmers. In 1967 I came home and, like many other young farmers, relied on the knowledge of my father to gain experience within the agricultural industry. He did a good job but, of course, times change, and one of the most important things that any young farmer can do now is to undertake some tertiary education to equip himself or herself for the role of farming. Farming has changed in that we are now dealing with many chemicals that make the job far more complex than it was back in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

It has changed in relation to the large number of different varieties of wheats and barleys that can be grown, which require suitable soil types and suitable rainfalls. It has changed in the fact that previously one could budget on the back of one's hand or by the chequebook, whereas now it requires a cash flow and, like any good business, to sit down and work out exactly where your highs and lows of the periods of the year will be.

Farming has changed because of the fact that, instead of working perhaps 500 acres as was the case when I came home, one person now works three or four times that amount due to the additional and more sophisticated machinery. It all boils down to the fact that each farmer is in many cases now controlling a multimillion dollar enterprise. It means that the people who are coming home onto the farms must—and I say 'must'—have some tertiary education to equip them for handling that type of business.

I realised that I was lacking a little in this area and returned to study for a degree at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, and I must say that that institute (or what is now the Waite Campus) is a very fine institute and of world standing. During the time I spent there I was able to rub shoulders with not only teachers but also researchers, and the knowledge that I gained there in agronomy and agricultural economics will be of benefit to me for the rest of my life. I must say, though, that I found it disturbing that the researchers have to basically struggle for every research dollar that they get. I concur with the member for Norwood who spoke the other day about the inadequacy of medical research funds from the Federal Government: the same thing applies to agricultural research funds. Much of the researchers' time, when they are not teaching students, is spent writing research papers and applying for funds. The Waite Campus is conducting much research which is at the forefront of agricultural technology. In this field it is one of the leaders in the world and it will require further injections of funds to stay that way.

My second point in relation to agriculture refers to the age of the farming population. As we all know, it is rising to somewhere near 57 or 59 years of age. I find this very alarming. I was therefore pleased when it was announced in the Governor's speech that this Government will provide a young farmers' incentive scheme which will provide for up to 50 per cent interest subsidy on the purchase of land for farmers who are less than 30 years of age. That is a particularly good idea. It puts the support right at the base, and that is where the main problem occurs—meeting interest on farm loans.

A further point in the Governor's speech related to the exclusion from the liability of stamp duty when transferring farming properties within a family and the re-financing of rural loans. The transfer of land is a particular problem in the farming community. Parents build up a stock of land over a period of years hoping that it will be of sufficient size to support their son or daughter who comes home to the farm. Of course, the problem is that when they wish to transfer that land to a son or daughter it costs them a considerable amount of money in transfer fees. This Government's policy will aid the movement of land from parents to sons or daughters and will provide a particularly good shot in the arm, so to speak, for the agricultural industry by releasing that burden. Since I was elected, 15 people have come to me expressing interest in this scheme, as well as in the young farmers' incentive scheme. So there is great interest in both schemes and I know that they will be of benefit to the farming community.

I could not finish this speech without saying something about the economics of this State. Having worked for the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies as a research economist for the last three years, I watched with great interest the slowness of economic development in this State. It is a pity (and I am sure that Sir Thomas Playford would be shocked if he were here) to see the state that South Australia is now in due to the debt that we are carrying. Of course, we are carrying that debt because of the ineptitude of the previous Government in not monitoring the State Bank in a concise way.

The challenge to us is to reduce that debt and turn this State around. In doing so, we must see where the comparative advantage lies within this State. Naturally, it lies in one particular case with the agriculture industry, because we have some of the most efficient farmers in the world. However, I must commend manufacturing industry on changing its practices over time because we are now becoming world competitive in many industries in this State. It will be for this Government to enhance that movement: to move us towards enterprise bargaining and better work practices, to move South Australia away from demarcation disputes and into a far more productive, competitive and vibrant industrial climate.

I believe that the incentives that this Government is offering will help industry within this State and especially create an increase in the number of people employed in the manufacturing sector. Only the other day I was approached by one of our largest agricultural manufacturing people. I asked him whether they were considering expansion and what was happening, and he said that they were but the previous Government had not entertained their plans or shown a great deal of interest in them. I was pleased to be able to guide him towards the member for Kavel, and I can report that the EDA is now considering expansion plans for that particular business. The person concerned was considering going offshore had we not had that conversation. I can only say that obviously the previous Government could not have paid much attention to his requirements. This debt will take us some time to reduce. At the same time as reducing that debt we will have to aim towards encouraging enterprises to come to this State. That really will be a challenge, but I am sure that this Government will accept and enjoy.

The electorate of Light is one of the fastest growing areas in this State. Large numbers of people are moving out of Salisbury/Elizabeth. When I was door-knocking, I found that about 70 per cent of the aforementioned people who are moving into new housing estates within Gawler and the Light electorate. They are coming to Light because of what is perceived to be and I know is a wonderful lifestyle. It has the benefits of being close to the City of Adelaide and having a country atmosphere: it is somewhat unique. The challenge for local councils and for me, as the population grows over time and Gawler expands, is to keep that identity, to keep that atmosphere and to maintain that high standard within the Light electorate.

When I first entered this place it was on a Young Liberals meeting 16 years ago, in 1978. I actually sat in the Speaker's Chair that night and was the Speaker for a debate between the Glenelg Young Liberals and the Davenport Young Liberals.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BUCKBY: Davenport won, I might add. I had the feeling at the time that, if ever I felt as though I could make a contribution or if ever I had the qualifications and capability, I might return to this place one day on a formal basis.

I have the honour to represent a particularly productive area of the State. May I say here and now that my door is open to all constituents in Light. I will do my best to represent them ably and they will be the judge of my contribution. I support the motion.

Mr VENNING (Custance): It is a pleasure to be here this evening to speak to this debate, and I fully support this motion. I rise to speak on a very historic occasion: as a member of the Government I stand on your left, Mr Deputy Speaker. How far back in history would we have to go to see when that situation may have existed in the past? When I was asked to sit on this side of the Chamber initially I was quite cut up and concerned. But I am really on the front bench. I sit here on the front bench as part of a monstrous J-curve that now accommodates a Government that has a majority of 27 seats. This situation bears a lot of reflection in terms of how long it has been since it existed previously and how long it will be before it arises again. I am confident that at the next election there will still be quite a few of us over here.

An honourable member: More!

Mr VENNING: Probably more. But this is a very historic point. In fact, if we were to encourage two or three more members to sit over here we might decide to become the official Opposition, partaking of some more privileges that my new colleagues and I on this side of the House would like to enjoy.

I join previous speakers in mentioning the death of two former members of this Parliament. I extend my condolences to the families of those members. I had the pleasure of serving with the late John Burdett, who was a great help to me as a new member. I was shocked to hear of his passing. Many members have spoken very highly of the late Jessie Cooper, the first woman to be elected to this Parliament. Of course, she worked with my father in this place.

This is the third occasion on which I have had the pleasure of supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Once again, I would like to congratulate Her Excellency on doing her job so well. As a 48-year-old person I often feel the stress of my age, but when one considers the Governor's age one sees that she does the job of a 50-year-old. Her Excellency has incredible stamina, doing the job she does and getting out into the far flung regions of this State, having to contend with tight and long schedules. Her performance in the job is a credit to her, and I commend her.

Of course, my greatest thrill last year was winning the election, although the second biggest thrill was having dinner with Dame Roma, along with a few other chosen guests. It was a most memorable evening.

An honourable member: Did you have your camera?

Mr VENNING: No, I did not take my camera. That is another story for another day. However, it was an enjoyable evening, and I advise all the new members of the House to look forward to the privilege of one day possibly receiving the Governor's invitation to dine. I suggest that whatever they may have planned they cancel it, because it is an occasion they will always remember, and Dame Roma is an absolutely magnificent host. I congratulate her on the job she does.

I hope that she has many years to continue doing that. I also congratulate the Speaker on his elevation to high office. I say to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that if ever determination and long service was rewarded, it is in your elevation to this office. I offer you my full support in whatever you wish to do as Chairman. Further, in congratulating the member for Eyre on his elevation to Speaker, I would also like to mention the

elevation of the Hon. Peter Dunn to President of the other place. It is a magnificent reflection to realise that both of these men come from what we affectionately call the West Coast. I hope that no member takes offence to that, but I mention that term very affectionately, because the people over there have an extra zest for life because unlike those on this side of the Gulf they do suffer the penalty of distance. You are never made more welcome than in the home of a west coaster. It is a great reflection on how things change: both the Speaker and the President in this Parliament are from the West Coast. That is a real fillip to me as a person from the country.

My congratulations go also to the new members of this Parliament whom I look forward to working with. Their speeches have been brilliant. I am sorry that I have not been able to listen to all of them but I have to say that the standard has been excellent. I am saying that not to canter any favours, but all of them really ought to have gone for the full hour to which they are entitled, and then by the time they were finished Dame Roma would have been back here to do the next opening! We have 21 new members, which must be a first for this Parliament. It is unusual to have so many maiden speeches. They have all been different and those members have done their electorates proud. Members need to be reminded of the histories of electorates, of the members who went before them—irrespective of their political persuasion. I look forward to those speeches that are still to come, and it is an extremely enlightening time.

I particularly want to pay a tribute and to congratulate heartily the new Premier. He was leader of the Liberal Party and he is now Premier of South Australia. I offer him publicly and on the record my total support and hearty congratulations on the way he achieved this job and on the way he has started. Not everybody can enjoy 100 per cent support, but people in my electorate have told me in no uncertain terms that Dean Brown is doing a fantastic job—and hasn't he grown into the mould, hasn't he grown into the job. I look forward to the next four years, at least, under his stewardship, and I think probably for the next 12. He has certainly started well and I am glad that he came back to this Parliament from the outside world and quickly assumed the leadership.

My father is particularly proud because he did share an office with Dean Brown when he first came into this Parliament. Two or three years ago he said to me, 'Son, you watch young Dean, he has got what it takes.' My dad has always been a good judge of character and I will always remember that. My father, as many would know, is suffering and languishing in hospital at the moment, but he realises that Dean is the Premier and that the State is back in safe hands.

May I again refer to the results of the 11 December poll, not to gloat at such a famous victory but to point out that the people of South Australia have given us all a clear message—not just the Labor Party—concerning the accountability of government to the people.

The results of that poll show quite clearly the truth of the saying attributed to one P.T. Barnham: you cannot fool all the people all the time, even though Labor was blithely unaware of that fact. I have some mixed feelings about the scale of our victory, particularly in relation to the fact that, for my part, I am unable to refer accurately to the rump of the Labor Party that remains to make up the Opposition as 'the members opposite' because I am over here with them, and I am very proudly a member of the Government.

Mr Lewis: You are part of the J curve.

Mr VENNING: I am part of the J curve; that is right. I am over here controlling the Government rump. I take this opportunity to thank those people who supported me during this campaign, especially my campaign committee which worked to secure my return to this place with a significant increased majority. The Hon. John Olsen was the member for Custance before me and I had one ambition: I had to beat that very strong vote that he had. I have done that, even though John was the Leader. I have to say that there may have been other influences, but I will reflect in that glory and I pay tribute to him for the work he did before me in my seat of Custance.

I pay tribute to the work of those parliamentary colleagues who have left the Parliament. The honourable member for Light spoke a few minutes ago about the Hon. Bruce Eastick, who served with my father. He has been a great help to me, and I will always remember the advice he has not only given me but also my new colleagues and the members of the club that we then affectionately called the mushroom club. The mushroom club was exterminated because it was seen as a fungus in the Party and we did not need that, but those were great days, Sir, and I will always remember them with fondness. It is great to see that Stan Evans' son, Iain, is now with us. I will always remember the support that Stan Evans gave me and the Parliament, and the cunning of the man and the planning of the man. He, too, served with my father. My father always said, 'If you want any advice ask Stan Evans and you will never be far from the action.'

I pay tribute to Peter Arnold from the Riverland. What Peter Arnold did not know about the Riverland and rural areas generally was not worth knowing about. He will be sorely missed. Jenny Cashmore has already been mentioned this evening by the member for Hartley, and she will be missed. She certainly was of great help to me, particularly in my early days of speech writing and questions, to shape that stray diction into some sort of order, and I valued that help. Jenny also worked with my father.

Lastly but by no means least, I want to pay tribute to the ex-member for Flinders, Mr Peter Blacker, because he is no longer with us. He was a rural member, as I am, and I pay tribute to the work that he did, the way he represented his people and the way he put his best foot forward. On many occasions I told Peter, 'Look, you are one of us; you should come on board and be a member of the Liberal Party,' because many years ago, as the history books will relate quite clearly, my great great grandfather played a large part in getting the parties together to form the original Liberal Union and then the Liberal and Country League, and we know how successful that was under Premier Playford. So, I tried at great length to convince Peter Blacker to come on board, but to his credit he stayed with the party he led, and I am afraid, like the captain of the *Titanic*, he went down with it.

It is a sad reflection on the Labor Party to see that there is not a single one of the 10 Labor Party people here to listen to me tonight. I was sure that the member for Ross Smith would be here to have a go at me, because I had to button my lip during his maiden speech. I do not think I have heard quite such a provocative maiden speech in my time here. But there are no members of the Opposition here. From where I sit in the Parliament I look down the Opposition benches and I see not a solitary sole. However, when I look opposite I see the benches crammed full of enthusiastic Liberals. It is a true indication of what has happened in this State that only one Opposition member has returned. I also want to pay tribute to those former members from the other side of Parliament.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I will not say good things about you now. I want to pay tribute to those former members from the other side of the House whose contributions will be missed. I refer to the member for Albert Park, Kevin Hamilton. We had plenty to throw at each other, but I will always regard Kevin Hamilton as a friend. He paid the price of being a member of the Labor Party. It was not his fault. If he had jumped ship years ago along with the Hon. Terry Groom he might still be here. He went down with the ship because the people rowing his boat did not know how to do it.

It is sad to realise that honest and hard working people who represent the electorate well pay the price for the shortcomings of their front bench. The member for Albert Park did that, but he is a friend and he will be missed. The same can be said of Paul Holloway, a young one term politician. It was unfair that he had to pay the price, but he did. He is gone, and it is sad that he had to pay the price. There is one other person to whom I will refer, although there are others who will be missed for different reasons. I make no apology for mentioning the former member for Napier who, if nothing else, kept us entertained. He befriended me, and he gave me advice—some useful and some not. I will miss him. I often wondered what tricks he would get up to next. After hearing the member for Ross Smith today I think that we have not lost him at all; we have a member who is probably worse. I hope that the ex-member for Napier, the Hon. Terry Hemmings, will continue to seek my advice on the running of his farm, and I look forward to offering that advice.

In the short time since the election I have been absolutely amazed at what the change of Government has done for the optimism of the people of South Australia, even though, in many respects, things have only marginally improved. The great tragedy is that the Labor Party was not thrown out of Government in 1989. That is what should have happened. Just contemplate what would have occurred if we had been elected to Government in 1989. We would be so much further down the track. The decline of the State Bank would have been halted immediately. Instead of a \$4 billion debt, we might have lost only \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion. Put the calendar alongside the chain of events and see what might have happened.

South Australia was robbed in 1989. Even though 52 per cent of the people voted for a change in Government, they did not get it. We have heard members opposite say that Playford had a gerrymander and all the rest of it. Playford gave this State the best Government. Dean Brown will now emulate that and return this State to the same values and the same greatness it used to enjoy. People in rural parts of the State share in this new optimism.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Unley is interjecting out of his seat.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member is interjecting out of his seat, I suggest that, first, he ceases to interject and, secondly, he returns to his seat as a matter of formality.

Mr VENNING: While reflecting about former Labor members I point out that I never agreed with their politics, but I found them entertaining. I will miss them as people but I never agreed with their politics, particularly the member for Albert Park who bashed the old union card as hard as he could. Several times I said, 'This is a return to the 1930s.' However, he represented his electorate to the best of his

ability, and I respect him for that. However, in respect of his politics, he and I were miles apart.

People in the rural parts of the State share in this new optimism. The harvest for 1993-94 was excellent—at least in the paddocks—but low world food commodity prices mean that that good crop is reflected little in their bank balance, and that is a sad reflection. There is still much hardship in my electorate, and for a wide range of reasons. The Riverland, which now includes part of the electorate of Custance as far as Morgan and Cadell, has had its fourth flood in five years. That is creating much hardship, and many people are asking whether those floods could have been avoided. The question needs to be asked: are those communities that rely on the tourist trade suffering because of the four floods in five years?

An overview of the rural industries shows that all industries except the wine industry are still at a low ebb, and that the rural industries associated with them are almost at the end of their resources. Recently I returned from the National Rural Outlook Conference in Canberra where I heard outlined a varied and sometimes uncertain picture of future prospects. I will give a brief resume. The outlook for wheat will be good after the changes to the GATT provisions come into effect, but until then—a period of two years—the position will be uncertain.

There has been only a gradual improvement in the wool industry, and basically there is no good news. The outlook for the barley industry is gloomy. There is grave concern for this industry's prospects because of the world glut of feed grains. There is a positive outlook for the legume industry: farmers must be educated to grow more legumes and more varieties. There is a positive outlook for the beef industry. I urge every farmer in South Australia who can grow beef to do so, because in no way could we create a glut on the world market as it is short of beef.

The wine industry is the most positive of all. I am pleased to have two wine regions of such importance in my electorate: the Barossa Valley and the Clare Valley. Today, even the grapegrowers are smiling as the demand for their grapes brings good prices. It is unbelievable to realise that last year alone wine sales increased by 39 per cent over the year before. I say that again: a 39 per cent increase over the year before, which is a 32 per cent increase in the actual dollar over the year before. The wine industry is a fantastic industry, and it made me extremely cross and anxious to see what the Federal Government was trying to do to this industry *viz-a-viz* the wine tax. Thank goodness commonsense prevailed.

This is our prime industry, the one we should emulate to be market driven, to produce a product of world standard and sell it on the world scene. We have heard it before: this is the optimum value added quality Australian product. I want members to reflect at times that this is a key industry. I want members to become aware of this industry, of the product we are selling, and to become wine conscious. I want the support of all members to bring the wine expo to South Australia. I am confident that it will replace a lot of what we have lost with the Australian Grand Prix going to Victoria.

I renew my pledge to my electorate to represent their interests to the best of my ability. I assure them that those projects and issues that I pushed as an Opposition member I will continue to promote and work for, particularly the Morgan-Burra Road. You have heard this before, Sir. As members will know, on my first day in this place when I made my maiden speech I delivered to every member a stone from that road. I still have that bag of stones right here in the

Parliament. If anyone would like a stone from the notorious Morgan Road, I can happily furnish it. It is an ongoing project, one that I now share with the new member for Frome, who has the first half of the road in his electorate and I have the second. I am sure that together we will achieve. It is great to see in the Liberal Party policy the promise that within the first 10 years of a Liberal Government that road will be sealed from end to end. That promise has been made in this House for 60 years. A major east-west road, a major link between Perth and Sydney, is still a dirt track. I am prepared to ride that road on my pushbike to highlight the problem. I am in training.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I challenge the member for Peake to ride with me across that road to highlight to the people of South Australia what an absolute disgrace it is that this major road is still not sealed. It will push on. I am heartened by our policy to review these roads in the first two years of our government.

I am also very heartened by the policies of the Liberal Government towards regional or country people, the farmers of this State, particularly in relation to the stamp duty exemption on the transfer of land. As so many members, including the member for Flinders, have said today and yesterday, the transfer of land from one generation to another should never have been subject to stamp duty. What it has done is keep the land in the hands of the older people. I say to the new members here that the average age is between 57 and 58 years, and it is increasing. Why? Because it costs \$16 000 on average to transfer a farm from a mother or father to a son or daughter. So, guess what? They do not do it. So, usually the father or mother dies owning the land, and then they can transfer it for \$4.50, but often it is too late, because the son or daughter have gone. The number of phone calls I have had in recent weeks on this issue has been incredible.

I thank the Treasurer most heartily for lifting the stamp duty on the transfer of farm or industry finance from one institution to another. This money was already subject to stamp duty the first time it was taken out as a loan. Why should it be taxed again when a farmer wishes to take it from one bank to another? All that does is ensures that it stays in the original bank and people cannot get the cheapest interest rate. It is a ridiculous situation. It is not costing the Government anything, because the money into the Government coffers is zero. I welcome that as a real step forward. It is a positive move that the Government is recognising a problem and actually doing something about it.

I am pleased to be no longer the new boy in this House. With every speech I made last year or the year before, I was the new boy. I notice in the members lounge, where my photograph is the last, that there will be now 21 behind me. Rapidly I am no longer the new chum in this place. Never before in one change of Government have there been so many new members. I am one of the oldies, so I will have to lift my game in many ways.

The name Custance is not exactly pleasing to the ear. I have been called anything from custard to other unmentionables. I have also been called the member for customs. That is unusual and almost a true reflection. As this is a representation in the Parliament, I have come to appreciate that it is a most appropriate sort of name. It has a certain grittiness and determination about it. I think it sits well with the nature of the communities that I represent.

Listening to the speech of the member for Light, one realised that Professor Custance was the first headmaster of

Roseworthy College and had a lot to do with the introduction of superphosphate in South Australia.

As I end my speech, I would like to thank very much my electorate assistant, Mrs Kay Nicholson, for the work she has done for me. My heartfelt thanks go out to my family who have supported me, especially my father and mother. My father was the member for Rocky River, affectionately known as the cocky from the Rocky.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: All your colleagues would be akin to that. It is hard to follow one's father into Parliament. I left it for some years before I took that step, but people resist this dynasty of Parliament. I did appreciate, as a young Liberal, working with my father in those days.

I am very grateful and I thank God very much for allowing my father to have his memory long enough to see me in this Parliament, to realise I am here, and for the events of recent days, namely, that we now have a Liberal Government and that Dean Brown is the Premier. It will be a matter of only another few more weeks before he will not be able to recall any of this. However, I am glad that we had time to do that. I am also grateful that we have four other new country members in this House. I wish them well, and I offer them all my support, as I do all the new city members. It is great to see them here, and long may they be here.

Finally, I want to thank my wife Kay for all her support because, as all members would realise, one needs a partner in this job, and my partner has been exceptional in putting up with me and in running the farm because I am never there now. I vote one for my wife as being probably the—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: She would; I've heard that before from a lot of people, and I give her that credit. I wish that I had more time with her, but that is part of being a country member. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Australia, and more importantly South Australia, is now out of recession and moving into a period of growth. As we begin an upward movement in the economic cycle, it is important to acknowledge that this had begun under the former State Labor Government and is not some miracle performed by the recently elected Liberal Government. I would like to take this opportunity to provide the House with some commentary on the key economic indicators released in the February edition of the South Australian Bureau of Statistics Report, 'South Australian Economic Indicators'.

Whilst trend estimates show that the rate of growth in gross State product continued to slow in the September quarter 1993 after the more substantial rises recorded in the previous December and March quarters, the growth rate over the year to the September quarter was 5 per cent above that for Australia of 4.7 per cent. The growth rate of State demand continued to increase in the September quarter rising by 1 per cent, significantly higher than the Australian average of .3 per cent.

In the private sector strong growth was recorded in dwelling and non-dwelling construction, increasing by

5.6 per cent and 4.2 per cent respectively. Private consumption increased .9 per cent in the quarter, marginally higher than the Australian average of .6 per cent. Trend estimates indicate that retail sales growth for South Australia has shown an average growth rate of .4 per cent over the past three months, compared to an average for Australia of .6 per cent. Growth in sales has been experienced in grocery stores, hotels, liquor stores and licensed restaurants, electrical goods and furniture stores, while sales are declining in butchers and other food stores.

The retail turnover estimate in original terms for South Australia was \$666 million for November, an increase of 4.1 per cent on the October level of \$639 million. When the September quarter 1993 is compared with the September quarter 1992, one sees that the number of holiday flats, units and houses available for short-term letting increased by 6.5 per cent, from 1 279 to 1 362 unit nights, representing an increase of 9.1 per cent, from 40 039 to 43 696.

The unit occupancy rate consequently rose from 34 per cent to 35.2 per cent. Accommodation takings increased by 15 per cent, from \$2.2 million to \$2.6 million, while the average takings per unit night occupied increased by 5.6 per cent. Private new capital expenditure for the September quarter was \$422 million, an increase of 5.8 per cent from the previous quarter.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I don't expect members opposite to understand all these figures, but I am sure the Deputy Premier is appreciating the speech.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I did, actually. The estimate for the 12 months ended September 1993 was \$1.529 million, an increase of 9.4 per cent over the 12 months to December 1992. The Australian estimate for the same period showed an increase of 9.6 per cent. The number of dwelling units commenced in South Australia has been steadily increasing throughout 1992 and 1993. In the September quarter 1993, nearly 4 000 dwellings were commenced, an increase of 5.8 per cent from the June estimate of just over 3 000. The value of building work commenced during the September quarter 1993 was \$338 million, more than 78 per cent being directed towards residential buildings. It is interesting to note and it is of some concern that prices of house building materials in South Australia have increased by 3.3 per cent over the three months to October 1993 compared with a 1 per cent increase nationally. In recent months prices have consistently risen at a greater rate in Adelaide.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I agree completely with the member for Ridley. On an annual basis Adelaide prices have increased 12.4 per cent compared with 5.4 per cent nationally. This would indicate that the building supplies industry is lifting margins and taking advantage of a very active domestic building sector. I suggest that the Government take note of this and apply some pressure to ensure that we do not fuel inflation through the lifting of prices.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am fortunate to have members on my left helping me with my speech. In the area of employment, the underlying trend estimate for employed persons in South Australia increased slightly to 648 600 in December 1993 after remaining relatively unchanged in the previous six months. The underlying trend for employed persons in Australia has been upwards since February 1993, and that is

an important fact. The full-time employment estimate has been increasing since July 1993 and is at its highest level since May 1991. This shows us that the normal pattern is that South Australia is the last State to enter into recession and the last State to come out of it. This is due to the nature of our industry, which is predominantly servicing the consumer markets of the Eastern States.

The percentage of employees who worked overtime in South Australia in November 1993 was 18 per cent, compared with 17.8 per cent in November 1992. Over the 12 month period to November 1993, significant increases in the percentage of employees working overtime occurred in the construction, wholesale trade, transport and storage, communications and, needless to say, public administration and defence industries.

Whilst there was a slight increase in the number of days lost through industrial disputes in South Australia in September 1993 when compared to August, at only 4.3 per cent of the national total, South Australia has a relatively low level of industrial disputation. This has been a major achievement of the former Government and I urge the present Government to continue a constructive working relationship with the trade union movement to ensure that this low level of disputes continues.

I refer briefly to the wine industry. Although domestic sales of wine have shown little movement over the past few years, the volume and value of wine exports have increased markedly with about two-thirds of wine exports being produced in South Australia. The value of wine exports in 1988-89 was \$115 million, including \$71 million from South Australia, and by 1992-93 the value had increased to nearly \$300 million for Australia and \$192 million for South Australia. The most recent monthly export figures suggest that this rate of increase is likely to continue in the immediate future.

The wine industry is an important one for South Australia, providing us with a strong and growing industry that has matured into a truly globally competitive industry sector. It is an example to all South Australian manufacturing industry on how to be world competitive. The importance of this industry was clearly recognised by the former Labor Government, which provided substantial financial support directly to the industry as well as major funding to the vitally important areas of research and skills development in the area of viticulture, where the former State Government led the charge. The former Labor Government also showed strong leadership when it joined with the wine industry in opposing the Federal Government's sales tax increases on wine in the last Federal budget.

What I have just presented to this House are economic indicators showing that tentative signs of improvement are here as we come out of this recession. Our State's economy is linked directly to the health of our national economy and, as I said earlier, because of the make-up of our industry base, we are going into the recession last and consequently we are the last coming out of it. Whilst there may be stronger growth indicators in other States, the lag effect that South Australia suffers means that we are perhaps six months or more behind the national pick-up. The newly elected Government will no doubt attempt to claim credit for this economic upturn, but I point out that it had already begun well before the election. It is only now beginning to show visible signs to the community.

I look forward to congratulating the Government on constructive new initiatives which it implements and which

assist in reviving our State's economy, but I want it on the record that the recovery has not simply been waiting for a Liberal Government to be elected. Whilst I am sure the Government will present itself as the economic miracle maker of this State and may well be joined in that by one or two media outlets, it has a long way to go before it can claim credit for the recovery in this State. To me it has shown little to date that indicates that it is prepared to make the tough decisions necessary to continue this State's economic restructuring. We have already seen the Premier attack the former Government's economic development program, and more recently the Treasurer has criticised the former Government's allocation of substantial funding to this program.

Much has been done to assist in the restructuring of our State's manufacturing industry, and much of that credit can go to the Centre for Manufacturing and the former Labor Government. I hope the new Government is serious about assisting our State's industries to restructure and to grow. To do that, it will need to provide substantial financial support and, whilst that may not appeal to members of the Government with rural backgrounds, our State's economy needs a productive and efficient manufacturing sector as well as an efficient and productive rural sector.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): As a new member in this House and having now given my maiden speech, I would like to respect the tradition of the House that from now on we should not read speeches. I have, however, made some copious notes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will enforce that Standing Order.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I do not mind: I will not read a speech. I would like to refer to a couple of issues which I raised in my maiden speech and on which I did not take the opportunity to expand; I will do so now in the form of a grievance, because I have a grievance on those issues. The background of the first issue to which I refer is as follows. A group called the wetlands committee was set up some years ago to investigate ways of dealing with the Onkaparinga estuary in the electorate of Kaurana and perhaps of improving water quality. At that time the Labor Government saw fit to support that committee, and \$36 000 was granted on behalf of that committee to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for the purpose of doing an Aboriginal dig, cataloguing Aboriginal heritage items and presenting a report on behalf of the wetlands committee.

Unfortunately, very soon after the \$36 000 was granted to the National Parks and Wildlife Service—I say 'unfortunately' because of where the money has gone, and that is the issue of my grievance—the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs was set up and the \$36 000 was transferred to that department. At that time, Neil Draper, who is currently the archaeologist with the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs, was given the consultancy to do the dig, to catalogue the Aboriginal finds and to report to the wetlands committee and, of course, to the Government. Bearing in mind that this money was allocated in 1990, some four years ago, I have contacted several people who were part of the original wetlands committee, one of whom has confirmed to me that no report has been forthcoming. I then contacted Neil Draper, the archaeologist with the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and asked him how far he had got with the consultancy.

I was informed that he had completed the dig at this stage but that no cataloguing has taken place and no report

therefore has been submitted. My question would have to be: what has happened to all the money? I have also asked what has happened to all the materials that were found during the dig. The answer was that at the moment all that material is being housed at three places: first, at the Underdale campus; secondly, in the home of Neil Draper; and, thirdly, in the shed of Neil Draper. These items are obviously of great significance to Aboriginal tribes and should also be of significance to the general public in South Australia and, indeed, in Australia. For them to be treated in such a way, I believe that the past State Labor Government has really just paid lip service to Aboriginal affairs in South Australia.

What it has actually done is create an Act under which the department has been set up but, unfortunately, has not bothered to resource the Act or the department. That is why I say it is purely lip service. I say that because much of the material that has been taken from the dig has not been catalogued, since the department does not actually have laboratory facilities under which this can be done, and I put to the House that this is probably giving the archaeologist an impossible task. The other issue, of course, is that at the moment, because there is only one archaeologist working in the department, all he basically does is move from one emergency to another and does not actually get to do the work that is needed on the backlog. I believe that his current backlog dates back to 1987. Without a lab facility and without additional archaeologists I put to the House that this department will never act responsibly and will never be able to catch up on emergency situations. With the need for the investigation of more and more Aboriginal sites, we will no doubt need more archaeologists in that department.

I would also like to comment on the potential development of an area known locally as Moana Sands, which sits between Moana and Moana South, particularly because this was raised in the *Advertiser* quite a few months ago as a potential fertility site for the Kurna Aboriginal tribe.

Mr Lewis: Does it work for other people, too?

Mrs ROSENBERG: It probably does. This piece of land is under pressure to be subdivided. The land belongs to a developer, and the Labor Government had prepared a ministerial SDP which, I believe, is on hold at the moment. I would also like to put on notice publicly in this House that I will support that piece of land remaining undeveloped in relation to housing development.

The third issue I would like to raise as a grievance is that of teacher displacement. I think that education in South Australia has lost its way, quite frankly, and I talk particularly of the displacement of a teacher at Aldinga Primary School. The school is asked in October to estimate the number of children that will be enrolling in the following February, and then the school goes through quite a long process, I believe sometimes up to 50 hours work, trying to determine class sizes and therefore the number of teachers required, so it comes as a rude shock when, two weeks into the school year, that school is informed that it is 12 children short, and will therefore it will lose a teacher.

I am particularly aggrieved in this case because Aldinga Beach represents an extremely fast growing area, and I have no doubt that within the next three or four weeks we will find those 12 children, and then what happens? We get another teacher and all the classes are messed up once again. I would need to ask the question: is teacher displacement for the educational benefit of the children of South Australia? I am afraid my answer would have to be 'No.' I cannot understand the document under which displacement is decided, and my

arguments over the next four years will be to support a situation where, when a school in all honesty puts forward its potential children's class sizes and child enrolment for the next year and the Education Department makes an agreement with that school that this is the number of teachers it will require for the year—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs ROSENBERG: It is not to the advantage of the school to claim anything. But I put it to the House that once that agreement has been made that budget line has been set and it is of no advantage to education or the children within that school to then suddenly change that agreement. My suggestion is that there would be no extra cost to the State to let that agreed arrangement go for the first two terms of a school year.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs ROSENBERG: I am not here just to support the ideas of my Government. I am speaking in a grievance debate as the member for Kurna, and I will put forward the issues that are of concern to the electors that I am here to represent.

The last issue I want to raise is one that I raised during Question Time today. I place on notice that I am extremely pleased to hear that the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is already aware of the sand problem on Christies Beach. I am also particularly pleased that his department has the ability to take care of the process and answer the question to the satisfaction of the community. The community deserves that and I am very pleased that he and his department have taken on that responsibility. Sand movement has always been an issue in that particular region.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): First, before I get on to the main topic of tonight's address may I congratulate you formally, Sir, on your election as Speaker—this is the first opportunity I have had to do that—and say I look forward to working with you. In fact, so far during Question Time I think you have been very even-handed and you have done an extraordinarily good job. It is a difficult job at this stage because, with the new Government which has been elected (and elected, I admit, with a very large number of members in this House), you have the particular task of defending the 10 of us who have survived. However, the 10 of us who have survived will be raising a number of issues in this House not only in the interests of minorities but of other people within the community in South Australia. Indeed, it is on that topic tonight that I want to return to Question Time this afternoon when a question was asked—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Speaker, could you find out what is wrong with the member for Ridley? He seems to be in a bit of trouble tonight; I am not sure what the problem is.

The SPEAKER: He is certainly out of order interjecting and I suggest he allow the member for Playford to continue.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection and wise words. During Question Time this afternoon—

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Sir, I think you should also point out to members that they should interject from their chair rather than someone else's that they may fancy in the future. During Question Time this afternoon a question was asked about the number of personnel who are either no longer with the Government or soon will no longer be with the Government. In fact, they are euphemistically known as those who have been sent to the departure lounge. I heard the estimate this

afternoon that 12 people have gone—it may well be more than that have gone but not in that sense of the word—although, as I understand it, there are many more than that. It was alleged this afternoon by those on the other side that those who had gone were all members of the Labor Party. That is not so.

The hit list which this Government launched immediately it was sworn in seemed to have three main bodies of people that it wanted to dispose of in one form or another. The first group comprised those who had upset the Government at one time or another. Another group comprised some whose politics are representative of this side of the House. It is useless to deny that some civil servants have for many years voted Labor, and many of them will continue to do so. It is their right to have whatever politics they wish in a democracy; it is not just for members of the Liberal Party to have that right in our society. The third group consisted of unfortunates who just happened to get in the way.

Twelve were alluded to this afternoon, but the number really far exceeds that. Indeed, I understand that the cost to the taxpayer for sackings—I understand there have been sackings—and for people who have been sent to the departure lounge, who are now performing no useful functions in their departments and who have been replaced by cronies of the likes of the member for Ridley, is considerable.

I understand that in the weeks before the State election a number of civil servants visited Liberal Party headquarters on Greenhill Road. I also understand that some have received senior promotions within the Public Service so far, and one or two were associated with the Labor Party until quite recently.

Mr Lewis: Name them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ridley will not continue to interrupt. The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I understand that it did not do much good for one or two who went there because they had too much karma in the bank as far as the Liberal Party was concerned and they went to the departure lounge very quickly.

It is unfortunate that the Government should have started by attacking civil servants who do not have the right of self-defence in a Chamber such as this. I speak on their behalf

tonight because a number of them have been wronged. I read in the paper today about Mr John Brown of the STA. Indeed, that matter is on its way to a different jurisdiction to debate that point. I think that was a very mean exercise in the circumstances. I believe that such actions do no credit at all to the new Government. There is no doubt that it was elected with a mandate to rule. There is also no doubt that the things that it has done to ordinary civil servants and the way it has dealt with them is not only very unfortunate but reflects no credit on the Government.

I think that a number of questions need to be asked about this matter. First, how many people have been summarily removed by the Premier or other Ministers of the new Brown Liberal Government in South Australia since it was sworn in on 14 December last year? Indeed, I think the next question that should be asked where that is concerned is: what is the cost to the taxpayer of these shifts so far? In addition, because I understand it is going on all the time, what are the continuing costs of further purges in some of these departments?

Recently when I opened a copy of the *Adelaide Advertiser* on a Saturday morning I saw what was one of the largest advertisements and, indeed, one of the most expensive for a ministerial staffer position for any Government in Australia. That advertisement, which I understand referred to a senior position in a Minister's office and would have cost in the region of \$1 000 or so, was inserted by a head hunting company. I think a number of questions need to be asked here, given that the Deputy Premier made a number of statements in this House about how the Government was going to accept the findings of the Economic and Finance Committee in relation to salaries.

As we understand it, there have already been huge increases in salaries, particularly in the ministerial offices. We will be pursuing these matters, whether or not the members concerned like it, in grievance debates, and in questions on notice and questions without notice, and the carping of members such as the member for Unley will make no difference whatsoever. The issue is quite clear cut: there has been victimisation of Public Servants in this State; a victimisation that members opposite can well decry.

Motion carried.

At 9.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 February at 10.30 a.m.