

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 3 August 1994

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

MOUNT GAMBIER PRISON

A petition signed by 600 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to permit the new Mount Gambier Prison to open and operate under the originally proposed management was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

FILM AND VIDEO CENTRE

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the South Australian Film and Video Centre was presented by Mr Andrew.

Petition received.

TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 49 952 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow general Sunday trading where restrictions currently apply was presented by Mr Condous.

Petition received.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The level of noise in the Chamber is so high that I cannot hear the petitions that the Clerk is reading.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is having the same difficulty as the member for Ridley. I ask members to show their respect to the people who have lodged the petitions by listening to the reading of them.

MURRAY BRIDGE COUNCIL

A petition signed by 764 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide funding to the Rural City of Murray Bridge Council for road repair and maintenance was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

STATE FINANCES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In the past five months, longer term interest rates in world capital markets have increased quite dramatically, especially in Australia, where the 10 year Commonwealth bond rate rose from 6.4 per cent in February to 8.4 per cent prior to the May statement. The bond rate is now standing at 9.5 per cent—an increase of over three percentage points. The State Government borrows at a margin above the Commonwealth bond rates. The rises, in part, appear to be a fallout from the move by the US Federal Reserve to raise interest rates, which in turn triggered a rise in yields globally. The increases are also due to the Federal Government's inability to reduce public sector spending. At a State level, South Australia is the victim due to the failure

of the previous Bannon/Arnold Labor Governments in the area of financial management.

As I pointed out to the Parliament in February this year, the high levels of debt caused by past losses of the State Bank and SGIC have left South Australia with a very significant exposure to movements in interest rates. The exposure arises because interest rates are volatile and, essentially, unpredictable. The markets generally did not anticipate recent movement in rates. The exposure has been compounded by the previous Labor Government which deliberately allowed the borrowing authority SAFA to move from the relative stability of a longer term debt portfolio to a very short-term portfolio.

Since this Government has taken office, SAFA has moved to lengthen the average maturity of its debt to a position that is more in line with general portfolio management practices. Projections in the non-commercial public sector deficit contained in the May statement were based on prevailing longer term rates and a forecast significant increase in shorter term rates over the forward estimates period. As a result of further long-term rate increases since May and a more pessimistic outlook on interest rates in the future, the State budget is coming under significant pressure because of the high level of State debt that has to be serviced from current revenues.

The provisional estimate of the net interest bill for the general Government sector for the past financial year was \$455 million. In the 1994-95 year, the net interest bill for the general Government sector is now projected to increase by \$160 million to around \$615 million in 1994-95. For the non-commercial sector, which includes subsidised and social policy oriented trading enterprises, the net interest bill is projected to increase by \$165 million to around \$730 million for this year. I make the point that the interest bill of \$730 million is more than double what it was before State debt soared as a result of the State Bank and SGIC losses. That is nearly \$2 million a day that this Government has to find to pay the interest bill largely left by the previous Labor Administration. It is the costly legacy of a debt trap left to South Australians by the previous Labor Government.

In fact, the total public sector interest bill is now estimated to be more than \$900 million in 1994-95. It confirms the astuteness of the Audit Commission's advice on the essential need to eliminate the non-commercial sector deficit and thereby reduce debt in real terms in a sustainable fashion. It confirms the Government's decision to act upon the Audit Commission's advice.

Finally, interest costs are manageable, but tough decisions will be required in the State budget to be introduced into Parliament later this month if South Australia is to be dragged from an economic basket case, which nearly drowned in debt under Labor, to a vibrant, stable and prosperous State under this Liberal Government.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the first report (1994-95 second session) of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CUMMINS: I bring up the second report (1994-95) of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):

My question is directed to the Premier. In the light of his many broken promises to date and the statement made just now by the Treasurer that tough decisions will be required in the State budget, does the Premier agree with the comments and stand of the member for Unley, who said, 'Our job as backbenchers is to ensure promises are not broken', or does he expect all Government members publicly to support the policies and direction of his Government? This morning's press contains a report on comments made by the member for Unley, and I quote:

In a scathing broadside, the member for Unley, Mr Mark Brindal said last night: 'To hell with economic rationalism. We must ensure the Government keeps on track and that the Public Service does not slash, burn and bury to meet its budget targets.'

To add weight to his position, the member for Unley added today, on radio, that 26 backbenchers beats 10 Ministers in the House of Assembly. These views are supported by the hapless member for Lee, who in his election platform as a former Independent candidate for Henley Beach—that is, 'Joseph P. Rossi is a truly independent candidate'—stated that allegiance to a particular party should be outlawed and that individual candidates should express their individual policies and be compelled to stand by these in Parliament.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I cannot think of a more inappropriate question to ask on a day when the Treasurer has just highlighted to the people of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —that they will be paying an extra \$165 million on the debt created by the Labor Party and the Labor Government over 11 years in South Australia. For the Leader to stand up and talk about the difficult decisions that this Government must take to rectify the financial plight that South Australia now faces highlights the total lack of accountability by the former Government and the former Premier to come to grips with the financial problems they have created—a debt of \$8.4 billion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —for which we will pay in net terms this coming year \$730 million in interest.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Naturally, I have looked at the speech which the member for Unley made in the House yesterday, and I am delighted that he made a couple of very pertinent points. Let me highlight those pertinent points. The member for Unley highlights the legacy left to this Government by the former Government. In fact, he went even further—although I am modest when it comes to such things—to say:

I think the Premier is doing very well given the legacy he has inherited.

He went on to say also—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —that he was particularly heartened by the fact that I had stressed that, despite the economic problems South Australia faced and despite having

to make some budget reductions, we would look at how we could deliver the same service more effectively and efficiently and, where possible, improve the quality of service delivery. That is the crux of the points made by the member for Unley. Every time it made a cut, the previous Labor Government simply sliced a bit more off here and there and made no attempt to do things more efficiently. Therefore, South Australia has suffered, whereas the point that the member for Unley is making and the point that I have constantly made is this: what we need to do is what every other Government of Australia and every private company has had to do, and that is to be smarter in the way in which services are delivered.

Look at some of the initiatives that this Government has taken to do that. In the IT area, for instance, over large Government areas we can save up to 20 per cent of the cost to the Government. Through outsourcing some areas of Government we can make savings of about 15 to 20 per cent. Look at the savings that even the former Government acknowledged we would make in public transport by putting it out to competitive tender—a saving of \$30 million to \$35 million a year. Despite the fact that the former Government took South Australia to the edge of bankruptcy, what did it do to introduce those sorts of efficiencies? Absolutely nothing! We know about its three failed attempts to try to bring about some efficiencies in the IT area. I will not go into all the details, but it was an absolute disaster.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it the member for Hart would like to ask a question today. He knows of the indication I gave to the House yesterday.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stress equally the way in which the former Government failed in areas such as construction and many other areas of Government such as health where it could have taken the initiative to introduce casemix funding 12 months ago, but that was left to a Liberal Government to do and to bring about those savings.

I give an assurance to the people of South Australia and certainly this Parliament: the Liberal Government in this State, despite the absolute debacle of the financial situation left to it, is working overtime to make sure that it brings about a more efficient delivery of services to the community; that, where possible, it will maintain or improve the delivery of those services, and that it will put the community first.

That is what this Government is about, and that is why we as a Government are working so hard to put this budget together. We are not just blindly accepting any advice put to us—we are systematically working through so that we deliver the best service we can afford for the people of our State. It is unfortunate that the Labor Party of South Australia, having created the problem, is not even willing to work with the Government of the day and with the community to bring that about. What we have is a Leader of the Opposition who decided to take four years long service leave—and that speaks for itself.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Premier. What trends in South Australia's manufacturing industries have been identified in the latest quarterly survey by the Australian Chamber of Manufactures?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The September survey results from the Australian Chamber of Manufactures, which give a forecast for the whole of Australia, are out. This is the

first year that this has been done on a national basis so, for the first time, we have a fair comparison across each State in terms of how industry is looking at the next three months. I must say that the figures for South Australia are very encouraging. Those figures show that, for the June quarter, 37 per cent of companies in South Australia intended to increase production over the next three months; and, for the September quarter, the figure has gone up to 46 per cent intending to increase production, while another 33 per cent expect to remain unchanged. We are well ahead of New South Wales at 40 per cent and Victoria at 38 per cent so, compared to the other major manufacturing States of Australia, we have the brightest outlook over the next three months.

It is also interesting that almost 20 per cent of the companies surveyed expect to increase their employment over the next three months; again, I think, a very optimistic outlook. But the important thing is that, even if you go back and compare the figure for South Australia with where we sat in the September quarter last year, we have lifted from 36 per cent last year to 46 per cent now, which highlights the significant lift in optimism and confidence in this State and highlights the packages this Government has put in place. We have two clear objectives, as everyone understands: first, to rebuild our economy and to help create job opportunities; and, secondly, to fix up the financial problems that the State Government has, created by the former Labor Government. On both those counts we are taking the difficult decisions and getting on with the job. This is clear evidence that the results are starting to come through in a very positive way.

TRADING HOURS

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Industrial Affairs admit that, in a meeting held just before the shopping hours inquiry was announced, he guaranteed the Small Retailers Association that, regardless of its findings, there would be no Sunday trading? If he did so, why did he proceed with the inquiry at all, and will he guarantee that there will be Sunday trading only over his politically dead body?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I suggest that the member for Goyder listen to what the Minister himself has been saying and doing before he comes in like that. The newsletter of the Small Retailers Association in March 1994, just a few months ago, reported as follows:

Just hours before the announcement of the 'new' inquiry we [the association] were called into Minister Graham Ingerson's office for a 15 minute discussion—and left over an hour later. The Minister emphasised that his previous comments made publicly about opposing Sunday trading still stood. No change from the present conditions.

Based on the Minister's guarantee, the association included the following in its submission to the inquiry:

As the Minister...indicated Sunday is 'not negotiable', we have not included it as a day when any change in the current trading rules is contemplated.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Well, what a mob of hypocrites!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order. I recall from personal experience, Sir, that you have ruled on

previous occasions that the word 'hypocrite' is unparliamentary. I ask you to confirm your earlier ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. The Chair points out to the Minister that it is not in the best interests of the House if comments are made that would not be accepted outside the Chamber. I suggest that the Minister answer the question and not make any reflections on members opposite.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will put it in a different way: what a group of individuals who are hypocritical in the way that they are going about this whole discussion on shop trading hours! Here is a Leader of the Opposition, then Premier, who sat down with a group of people made up of representatives of the STA, a large union and large business in this State and said, 'We do not care one damn about small business in this State. We will open up this State to five days of continuous trading Monday to Friday, and we do not care one damn about any small business in this State.' The gall of the ex-Premier to stand up in this place—

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, regarding the issue of relevance. The Minister has been asked about the truth or otherwise of his comments to the Small Retailers Association and the way in which he appears to have led it up the garden path.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The manner in which the Minister answers questions is entirely up to the Minister.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The gall of the previous Premier to stand up in this place, after no consultation at all with the Small Retailers Association, and to say that I, as Minister, have not sat down and talked to small retailers! It is absolute nonsense. Here we have a former Premier who was prepared to wipe out all those in the small food industry. He was not at all interested in sitting down and talking to the Small Retailers Association.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Give me time and I will finish the lot. The mates of the honourable member opposite who just interjected happen to be the union leaders of the STA. He was one of the people who, through his mates, was deliberately wiping out the small business operator. He is an ex-member of the same union that tried to destroy small business. He is sitting in this Parliament now trying to get back the small business vote. He is the very member who, I understand, took a group of individuals—the small STA union and the big operators—along to the Premier so that he could wipe out all the small business people in South Australia.

In January, this Government made a promise that we would have an inquiry into shop trading hours. We have had that. This Government has had discussions not only with small retailers but with large retailers and with anybody who had an interest in shop trading hours. If members opposite are patient, in the next few weeks they will find out every single thing about shop trading hours in this State.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Premier advise the House of priorities set by the Economic Development Advisory Board to develop a long-term economic strategy for South Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As members of the House would realise, a few months ago we appointed a new

Economic Development Advisory Board in South Australia under the chairmanship of Mr Ian Webber, probably one of the most distinguished and outstanding company directors in the whole of Australia and certainly outstanding in South Australia. I say from the outset that we were very fortunate to get his services. He has resigned from a number of major national boards specifically to take up the appointment here in South Australia. He does so on only a part-time basis and on no more than a token fee compared with what he has given up. Together with the other members of the board, they have had the chance to sit down and set out what they see as the priorities in terms of what the longer term strategy should be for the economic development of South Australia.

I draw to the attention of the House a number of those priorities. First, regarding mining and exploration, through the mining sector—the private sector—we can further significantly enhance the total investment in exploration. In the information technology and science area, the State's technological and scientific base can be used as a lever to achieve new economic activity within the State. To give one example, with IT they want to develop for each major industry sector in South Australia a strategy whereby information technology can be brought up to world standard within that sector. As the member for Elizabeth would know, I spoke this morning on that matter before Comtec.

The third key area is value adding to primary products produced in South Australia and to identify opportunities for both the wine industry and the agri-food industries for increased opportunities and the development of a strategy, particularly for the wine industry, for the next 10 to 15 years. Similarly, the aquaculture sector can identify what sort of policy framework it needs to develop a major industry in South Australia.

I draw to the attention of the House that tuna farming in South Australia will this year account for \$55 million of production. The oyster industry, despite the slowness and, in fact, the refusal of the previous Government to get in and commit to things such as clean water certification—and the new Minister for Primary Industries has put that in place quickly—is now poised to attack export markets within 18 months.

The fourth key area is looking at emerging businesses and identifying constraints to the establishment of new businesses in South Australia. Another key area is in manufacturing—a strategy to further improve the competitiveness of South Australia, looking at the whole of Government.

Finally, in the services sector there is emphasis on how we attract increased tourism activity for the whole of South Australia, particularly in the international area. They will be working closely with each of the relevant Government agencies in developing medium and longer term strategies to bring about these seven key areas. The new Economic Development Advisory Board, under the chairmanship of Ian Webber, is now clearly focusing on those areas in South Australia in which we are winners or can be winners and making sure that the right policy framework is there from Government to allow that full expansion to occur.

TRADING HOURS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Premier act strongly, as a Leader of the Liberal Party, and enforce Party discipline when this House votes on his amendments to the Shop Trading Hours Act and, if not, why not? In this morning's press, the member for Colton again indicated that

he would cross the floor if the Government moved to introduce Sunday trading.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: One fundamental philosophic issue has always separated the Labor Party and the Liberal Party: if you are a member of the Labor Party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—regardless of your personal beliefs, you must vote with the Party.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They line you up against the wall and they shoot you in the head if you put one foot wrong in terms of how you vote. They even force you to sign a pledge before you come into Parliament saying, 'I will subvert my personal views to those of the Labor Party.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In the Liberal Party we have a basic philosophy—that individuals have a fundamental right to vote according to how they believe they should vote. Just look at the numerous occasions on which members of the Liberal Party have followed that philosophy. Whilst in the Party room we come to a consensus view, anyone who feels strongly about an issue always has the right to inform the Party room and the Minister concerned and to vote against it. There is nothing secret about that whatsoever. I think that is a very important and fundamental difference between our two Parties. That is why I am a Liberal and that is why you, over there, are members of the Labor Party in Opposition.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Ross Smith to order. The honourable member for Mawson.

GAMBLING, MINORS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Can the Treasurer update for members his investigations into the sale of Lotteries Commission products to minors? In this House on 12 April 1994 the Treasurer gave a commitment that he would investigate allegations of the serious problem of minors purchasing Lotteries Commission products, particularly Club Keno and instant money or scratch tickets.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: There has been considerable press speculation about the issue of minors involving themselves, in a fairly substantial way, in the various gambling products provided by the Lotteries Commission. In response to the issues raised in a very public fashion by one newspaper and on other occasions on radio and television, the Government decided that it would look at this matter very seriously given that the Labor Government in 1991 had had a recommendation to introduce such a restriction. The Labor Cabinet of the day—and I would say wisely—at that stage said 'No' (and I say 'wisely' after, rather than before, the event).

In response to concerns raised, and because the present Government wanted to get on top of this issue to ensure that no problem was being created, we took a number of steps. On 15 April, just a few days after the statement in question was made, a member of the Lotteries Commission contacted five welfare agencies to determine what evidence they had of widespread abuse by young people in the purchase of the various Lotteries Commission products such as X-Lotto, scratch and Club Keno tickets. The authorities contacted included the Adelaide Central Mission, Port Adelaide Central

Mission, St Vincent de Paul, Salvation Army and Mission South Australia (formerly known as the Adelaide City Mission). With the exception of the Adelaide Central Mission, no problems were being experienced by any of the agencies. They had never had anybody present to them a case that under-age people were spending large sums of money on X-Lotto, scratch or Club Keno tickets.

However, in response to the request for information from the Adelaide Central Mission, a letter was written to the then General Manager of the Lotteries Commission by the organisation's Group General Manager of Family and Community Support Services expressing some concerns and stating that it had evidence that it would like to make available.

We had asked for written detail so that the response would be documented, but no evidence was provided at that time. In response to that letter, the General Manager and his assistant left a number of telephone messages with the Adelaide Central Mission, but none of those messages was responded to. I do not know who was available at the time, but we were anxious to satisfy our concerns about the matter.

Because we got no response, we then determined that we needed to do an independent survey. The survey, which involved more than 12 000 people, was conducted at times when we believed that young people might be buying tickets, for example, in prime time after school. It was determined that less than 1 per cent of lottery product purchasers were under the age of 18. Over 90 per cent were in the 16 to 17 years age group, and many of them had their own resources and were working. The survey revealed that on average \$2.80 was being spent on those various products, and we could ascertain no evidence that there was widespread abuse of the sort that had been alleged to us.

We do not discount some of the claims that have been made: despite a very thorough and expensive effort on our part, we simply have not been able to ascertain whether there is a problem. We have done everything in our power to ensure that we have the right information available upon which to make a decision and, quite clearly, from the information that was provided, the decision was one along these lines: 'No, you should not be providing a restriction in this area, because there is not a widespread problem.'

I have now had another letter from the Adelaide Central Mission, which did not respond to our previous request for substantial information, inviting us to come and talk to the people within the organisation who are involved in counselling in respect of gambling. All I can do is express my disappointment that we have spent an enormous amount of resources tracking down the problem, and I believe that we have covered this area more than adequately. There will be one or two exceptions to the rule—we know that—but catering for one or two exceptions does not make for good law making. That is why the Government made the decision not to impose a restriction on minors.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Is the Premier concerned at the escalating legal costs relating to the Government's information technology outsourcing tender between IBM and EDS? Will he confirm that there is significant concern within the Government bureaucracy at the risks associated with this proposal? In the Economic and Finance Committee today, the Crown Solicitor, Mr Brad Selway, stated that 'legal costs to date relating to this project have already reached \$300 000

and the Government is still weeks away from signing a contract'. Mr Selway stated that he had thought it necessary to recruit lawyers from 'Washington DC, interstate law firms, the Australian Government Solicitor, and local law firms' because 'we are looking for whatever comfort we can'.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member is quoting from evidence that was given before the Economic and Finance Committee today.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The evidence was public but, as it probably will be the subject of a report made to this Parliament, I ask whether he is not anticipating a debate in this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is not aware of the evidence given to the Economic and Finance Committee. The honourable member should not anticipate any future debate that may take place in respect of the matter in question. It is the view of the Chair that evidence which has been given to the committee should not be used in this House prior to its being tabled and a report made. However, I am prepared to allow the question.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this question, because it just shows the former Labor Government's complete lack of understanding of basic economics. Here we have the man who advised the former Premier on what to do with IT, and failed on three occasions.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Whilst I advised the former Premier on a number of issues, they did not include information technology.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Too many frivolous points of order have been taken during Question Time and it is wasting the time of the House. The Chair will deal firmly with any future abuses by members' taking frivolous points of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I know that the honourable member advised the Premier on a whole range of things, including IT, and also on State debt. During the election campaign, he somehow missed \$600 million of debt. Let us look at his fundamental economics on this matter. We have spent \$300 000 on legal expenses in an attempt to save—and this is what most people say we can save—eventually between \$20 million and \$40 million, and perhaps as much as \$50 million a year. I would have thought that it was a pretty good investment to spend \$300 000 on some good legal advice.

I, along with the other members of the IT Cabinet subcommittee, was the one who insisted on making sure that we had the best available legal advice. We do not want to go into the sorts of contract the former Government signed—contracts such as those involving the Hindmarsh Island bridge, Marineland, and all those other contracts that got South Australia into all sorts of trouble. We want to make sure that we have good lawyers there and, if a good lawyer needed to come from the Federal Government—because the person concerned had had experience in IT outsourcing—we requested that that lawyer be obtained. We encouraged them to get a lawyer from Washington DC, because we believed that that lawyer was one of the most experienced available in the world.

In terms of the so-called risks, let us take not my advice or that of anyone in the Cabinet subcommittee but the advice

of the world authority that the Government has obtained on this matter—Nolan Norton. Nolan Norton is an international company which has been involved in computer outsourcing throughout the world, particularly in the United States of America, and which has been working closely with the Government since about May this year. It has written a series of documents which highlights to the Cabinet subcommittee the fact that the course of action now being taken by the Government is the low risk option. We have bent over backwards to identify where the risks are and to eliminate or reduce them. You can never completely reduce risks but you can try to identify the risks and cover them. That is exactly what we have done.

It is the reason why, for instance, the four key members who are involved in computer outsourcing at present have travelled overseas to look at the sorts of contracts that have been written in other computer outsourcing operations throughout the world, particularly with Government, and also to look at why Government has brought in companies such as Nolan Norton and the best lawyers to advise on the technical aspects. If only the previous Labor Government had had the same wisdom to go out and get some good legal advice specialising in the area with which it was dealing, this State would be literally thousands of millions of dollars better off than we are now.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Minister for Health advise this House whether the former Government had taken any action in relation to the possible privatisation of Modbury Hospital? At a public meeting on Tuesday 19 July, the shadow Labor spokesman for health indicated that the previous Labor Government had not taken any steps towards private involvement at Modbury Hospital. The shadow spokesman also stated that the Opposition is totally opposed to any private involvement in Modbury Hospital. This advice conflicts with that given at the meeting by the Chief Executive Officer of Modbury Hospital, who indicated that the first moves towards private involvement in Modbury Hospital occurred more than 18 months ago.

The Chief Executive Officer also advised that the previous Government had reached the stage of calling for expressions of interest from private organisations that wished to become involved. The advice given by the shadow spokesman conflicts very strongly with that given by the Chief Executive Officer, and I believe it is important that residents of the north-eastern suburbs be made aware of just who is telling the truth in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister for Health that answers to questions have been very long. I ask the Minister to be as precise as possible.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It will take some time to bring out the exact involvement of the present Opposition and previous Labor Government in the Modbury Hospital exercise. However, I will be as quick as I can. In fact, the advice given by the Chief Executive Officer of the Modbury Hospital regarding the previous Labor Government's involvement in this project is completely correct, and I thank the member for Wright for the opportunity to put on record just what the previous Government did.

The intention to build a private hospital at Modbury was first made public in July 1989. For those of us who were lucky enough to be elected in November 1989, that is actually two elections ago. At that stage the previous Government

publicly called for expressions of interest for a new and/or expanded hospital service in the northern metropolitan area of Adelaide. In April 1990, a proposal was accepted in principle for a stand-alone private hospital facility on the campus. The developer was given 12 months to provide a detailed submission for consideration by the previous Government.

However, as happened with many similar developments at that stage involving the previous Government, nothing came to fruition, unfortunately. In May 1991, the approval was withdrawn due to the time lapse. In April 1993, the previous Government, not satisfied with dipping its toes in the water, thought it would jump in completely, when it asked the Modbury Hospital Board of Management again to look at the option of an integrated private hospital development at the Modbury Hospital site and some further private sector involvement in privatising some of the services at Modbury. Subsequently, a joint Government/Modbury Hospital committee was established to oversee this initiative.

A public advertisement calling for expressions of interest was placed in the local and national media on 4 December 1993. I remind the House, and particularly the Labor spokesperson for this area, that that was one week before the election. It invited proposals regarding the provision of a private hospital on the Modbury Hospital site, private sector funding for public patient facilities and proposals for mutually beneficial cross servicing arrangements between the public and private sectors. The 1989-91 proposal was limited to the provision of a private hospital and did not invite submissions regarding cross servicing arrangements, but clearly the much wider 1993 proposal did just that. Of course, all of that is completely contrary to the spokesman's statement, which is as follows:

The Opposition is totally opposed to any form—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am going to get this on the record, Mick, so you might as well keep quiet. He stated:

The Opposition is totally opposed to any form of private involvement in Modbury Hospital.

I will conclude by indicating that the members in that area—the member for Wright, the member for Newland and the member for Florey—have been assiduous in their representations about what will happen in the Modbury Hospital area. I point out to everyone, including the Opposition spokesman, that the options for Modbury Hospital are still as wide as they can possibly be. All the opportunities are being explored to maximise the greatest possible benefit for public patients.

At the end of the day—and it will be three or four weeks before the tenders are called—all possibilities between a full private and a full public option are still on the drawing board, just as occurred under the previous Government with Mount Gambier Hospital. I conclude by assuring the people in the northern suburbs that this exercise is being undertaken by this Government with the same aim as that of the previous Government: to maximise public patient services.

REPUBLIC

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier clarify his Government's current position on the republic, does he agree with Alexander Downer that the Queen is 'quaint and irrelevant', and will he support a select committee of this Parliament's being

established to examine the constitutional and other implications for South Australia of any national move to a republic?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe questions may be asked of Ministers in relation to matters for which they are responsible to this House. I ask whether the Premier is responsible to this House on the matter of a republic?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not need any assistance from the left. I cannot uphold the point of order because the matter has been widely canvassed and has been raised in this place. Therefore, I believe that, in view of the fact that we are a sovereign State, the Premier is entitled to answer the question.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I was under the impression that under our Standing Orders it is improper to reflect in an adverse manner upon the Crown.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gordon is quite correct: it is contrary to the Standing Orders to reflect upon the Crown. However, the honourable member is asking a direct question and I do not accept that it is a reflection.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Will the Premier support the establishment of a select committee to examine the constitutional and other implications for South Australia of any national move to a republic, including what would replace the Governor's position if a republic were supported by a clear majority in a referendum? It has been reported in the media that there is considerable division amongst Liberal ranks, not just referring to the current Minister for Employment—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member continues to comment, I will rule his explanation out of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Opposition Leader, Alexander Downer, is being criticised for moving from a pro-monarchy and pro-constitution position to attacking the Queen in a most offensive way.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will not continue to speak whilst the Chair is calling on a point of order.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would say that the Deputy Leader has defied your ruling, Sir, on at least three occasions during his contribution. He has commented, debated and, in fact, broken every rule in the book.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. Leave is withdrawn. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The South Australian Liberal Party's position was enunciated by me last year. I will repeat it, given that the honourable member obviously has a very short memory.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The South Australian Liberal Party supports a national convention on the whole of the Australian Constitution, looking at not only the monarchy/republican issue but also at the broader issues of Commonwealth-State relations, some of which I canvassed yesterday in my ministerial statement. We also have the view that, if there were any proposal to make any change, that should be decided only by a referendum of the people of South

Australia in terms of this State and, obviously, across the whole of Australia if it were to apply to the rest of Australia. That is clearly our position and it remains our position; it is as simple as that.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

PRAWN FISHERY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House when the results will be available of the latest review of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery? The Minister would be aware of the great interest in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery and concern for its stocks following his decision to reopen the fishery earlier this year. That decision was taken on the advice of the Gulf St Vincent Management Committee supported by research from the South Australian Research and Development Institute. I understand that the fishery was reviewed recently to check the basis of this scientific advice.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this matter. I also hope that the interest of the member for Napier is aroused again, because I have not heard a question so far, and of course the interest of the Shadow Minister in another place who seemed to ask a lot of questions during the last session of Parliament. There has been a review by the internationally recognised fish biologist, Dr Gary Morgan, who looked at what happened when the fishery was opened in February this year and on what basis it was opened. I handed the report that I received to the Department of Fisheries. It has now been returned and sent to SARDI, and it will be tabled as soon as it is returned from SARDI. I will quote from two pages in the conclusion of the report so that the House and members opposite will not run away thinking that this report has been buried by the Government.

An honourable member: At the bottom of the sea.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: That is right, at the bottom of the harbor. Dr Morgan states:

There does not appear to be any immediate concern regarding the health of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery in 1994, and that catches, catch rates and sizes are entirely consistent with the level of effort applied.

He goes on to say when talking about SARDI that the research has been 'competently performed and accurately and appropriately analysed'. I think that says a lot for the Chairman (Mr Ted Chapman) and the committee who managed the fishery when it was opened—and, in fact, at each stage it was opened—because it was done in a very sensible manner. It seemed to me that some people, including some members opposite, thought that it was done in an irresponsible manner, and that is why we called for an independent report. I will have pleasure in tabling that report, and I will personally deliver a copy to the member for Napier and the Opposition spokesperson on primary industries.

ASBESTOS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs explain to the House why an interstate company without a valid asbestos removal licence has been awarded a lucrative contract to remove asbestos from ETSA's Torrens Island and Northern Power Stations when several local companies with valid licences were overlooked? Bells Thermolag is part of the Bains Harding Company. As

recently as last Friday week its South Australian representative failed the test set by the Mineral Fibres Branch of the Department for Industrial Affairs. Passing that test is an absolute condition for any company to obtain a licence to remove asbestos in South Australia. Despite this, Bells Thermolag was awarded the contract by ETSA even though it did not and still does not have a valid licence.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am not aware of this situation, and because this is a very serious accusation by the honourable member opposite I will obtain a report and bring it back urgently to the Parliament.

HOUSING TRUST REFORMS

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations say how South Australians will benefit from reforms that are taking place in respect of the South Australian Housing Trust?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: Members would have learned from the media recently that I am about to undertake a major and significant reform of the South Australian Housing Trust and, indeed, the whole of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

An honourable member: Significant in your own mind!

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The honourable member might say that that is significant in my mind, but I think the House would be interested to know the circumstances which exist in this State and which brought about this review. We inherited a Housing Trust which, whilst it had an asset base of some \$4 billion, also had \$1.3 billion worth of debt on which we were paying an interest bill. We inherited a tenant base, three-quarters of whom were on subsidised rents. We also inherited a situation where the Federal Government was cutting back on funding. The result is that cash flow within the trust has reduced to a stage where the State is having great difficulty, as the Opposition would know, in commencing new dwellings and refurbishing existing dwellings.

The triennial review, which I will be able to release to the Parliament shortly, will also show without any doubt—and it is just one of many financial assessments that have been done—that the trust, if it had continued in its present form, would be technically insolvent. There is no doubt about that—the triennial review shows it as do other tests that we have had applied. On that basis, we undertook a review of the total portfolio and of the Housing Trust. We are now about to bring in some significant changes.

The first significant change, of course, is the separation within the Housing Trust of the area that is involved in development. I am about to form a new urban projects board which will attend to the development side of the Housing Trust and place all major projects and the South Australian Urban Land Trust under one organisation. The other significant change is the separation of the landlord and tenancy operations of the Housing Trust into two entities. Members would be aware that the Industries Commission brought down this recommendation as did other organisations that have been involved in assessments. We have adopted it in the same way as it has been adopted by the National Housing Ministers' Conference.

I think it is important that members realise that the reform agendas that are now being implemented in South Australia are also being adopted nationally. The honourable member who puts out the 'Clarke Times' may also take on board some of these reforms. Before he becomes too critical in the next edition of the 'Clarke Times' of issues such as market rents

for those who are on non-rebated rents, he should remember that this is also being embraced by the Deputy Prime Minister and by the Premier of Queensland. I think it would be wise for everyone in this State to understand that this agenda, which we have implemented to bring about reform and to do something about containing future blowouts of costs in the Housing Trust, is now being endorsed on a national housing agenda.

It would not be appropriate for the 'Clarke Times' next time around to run an article on market related rents, which is now supported by the honourable member's own Deputy Prime Minister, and also this other reform. Every reform agenda which we are now implementing has been picked up by the National Housing Ministers' Conference, including the Labor States. The net result, of course, is that we will contain rentals and very shortly we will end up with a strong public housing sector in this State. I hope that within 18 months we will have it back in the black. The alternative was to continue with a non-viable housing sector which we inherited from the former Labor Government.

NATIVE TITLE

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Does the Premier know and can he detail which sections of the Commonwealth Native Title Act will be challenged by the Government in the High Court? What advice does the Government have about the effect of this challenge? Could it lead to invalidity of the Act? Who provided this advice, and will the South Australian Mabo legislation be introduced before the High Court decision?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should be more precise in asking his questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need assistance from my right.

Mr CLARKE: Yesterday, the Premier's ministerial statement said that South Australian intervention would focus on several important constitutional points directed at the power of the Commonwealth, but it did not explain which sections would be challenged or how the challenge would differ from that of Western Australia. The Premier also failed to explain how this challenge would affect the program for the reintroduction of South Australian Mabo legislation or how this would differ from that which was introduced in May this year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will obtain an answer to the six questions that were asked. In particular, I will obtain details of each relevant section that is expected to be challenged in the High Court. The advice came from the Solicitor-General.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It appears that members are going to defy the rulings of the Chair. I warn the member for Ross Smith. The honourable member for Davenport.

YOUTH ENVIRONMENT FORUM

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Does the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources intend to hold a youth forum this year, given the success of that held last year, and

what has been done to establish a youth secretariat, given the Government's environmental policies?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to inform the member for Davenport and other members that it is my intention to hold another Youth Environment Forum, which will be held in this Chamber next Sunday. Last year as shadow Minister I had a very successful environment forum, which provided the youth of South Australia with the opportunity to debate environmental issues and to bring these issues to me for further reference in policy. I undertook at that forum to hold another one within six months of coming into office, and that will be held this coming Sunday in Parliament House between 2 p.m. and 4.30 p.m., hosted by me and the Minister for Youth Affairs.

The forum will give the youth of South Australia the opportunity to debate important environmental issues and to present their views to me and to the Government. We are doing this because it is important that such opportunities be given to our young people and that we embrace their enthusiasm and vitality. The Government's environment policy states that it will fund a secretariat to coordinate, advise and assist youth groups engaged in benefiting the environment, and I am pleased to announce that I have set aside \$10 000 per annum for the next three years to fund the secretariat, and I am in the process of discussing with both my department and the Conservation Council the most appropriate way of establishing that secretariat. It is important that we listen to the views of young people. It is my intention to do that on Sunday, and I look forward to as many young people as possible being able to attend.

COLD STORE FACILITY

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What consultation took place between the Government—

An honourable member: You're talking to a vacant space. He can't hear you; there's a vacant space.

The SPEAKER: There will be two vacant spaces in the Chamber in a moment. The member for Giles.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: My question is directed to the Treasurer.

An honourable member: There's still a vacant space!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Giles will ask his question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What consultation took place between the Government and the Safrate Society Limited, which is made up of hundreds of South Australian farmers, prior to the sale of the cold storage business at Export Park? What compensation has been offered to Safrate for the \$506 000 that it has invested in the development of the facility, and what inquiry has the Treasurer ordered regarding the serious concerns that have been expressed about the tender process? It has been reported in various media outlets that the Treasurer has organised the sale of the cold stores at Export Park against the very clear wishes of the farmers of South Australia. A newspaper article stated:

SA Farmers Federation Chief Executive and a Safrate director, Mr Mike Deare, said there were also serious concerns about the tender process in which Safrate had been treated unfairly.

Mr Deare said:

This whole deal has a bad odour and makes us uncomfortable about our future dealings with the State Government.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am surprised that he is asking it, but I will respond.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It is my constituent.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I could reflect on how well the honourable member has supported his constituents in the past and how well he has treated the farming community in the past, and it does not bear reflection, because I could be here all day talking about the pain he and his Government inflicted on rural communities, so I will not: the issue is the process that was followed to sell the cold store facility at Export Park. That process was followed very diligently over a three month period, involving not only the GAMD operating on its own behalf but also discussions with the Government and a number of Ministers. The process, during which we laid down certain conditions, was thorough.

The GAMD, as was its right, could sell that property under its charter. However, we said that there had to be some pre-conditions placed on any sale so that, when the tender was opened up, all persons responding to that tender would be aware of the rules. The rules were quite simple: we wanted to improve our export effort out of Adelaide; we wanted free access to that facility for our export effort; and there was to be no restriction on that export effort by any new owner of that facility. Tenders were received, one of which gained the approval of the GAMD, subject to scrutiny by the Trade Practices Commission.

That was never denied. In fact, in discussions with the South Australian Farmers Federation it was made quite clear that, if this body were successful, the process would still need to be scrutinised by the TPC. As I said, the process was very open. There was a number of discussions, and the process was not closed within two weeks as is quite often the case with the normal tender process: it continued over three months with a number of discussions. The basis on which that tender was agreed was: first, simply, it was the best tender available (that is, the taxpayers of South Australia got the best result); secondly, we were assured by Swire and its principal, Cathay Pacific, of an increased effort through Adelaide, which would assist the export effort; and, thirdly, we received assurances that it would be a facility for export purposes that would be open to any person or company who wished to use those facilities for export out of Adelaide.

That process was followed very diligently, took a long time and involved a number of discussions, and is still being looked at by the TPC. We expect the TPC to get back to us within the next two weeks. In relation to the claim made in the newspaper article that was quoted, I suggest that the honourable member get hold of the list of items in that claim and then come back to the Parliament to see whether he agrees with that list.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES COSTS

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Correctional Services explain what steps are being taken to reduce the cost of correctional services?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member, of course, has the Yatala Labour Prison within his electorate and is very concerned about the costs.

Mr Foley: Elliott Ness!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Hart interjects 'Elliott Ness'. I remind the member for Hart that Elliott Ness and his group were dubbed 'The Untouchables' by a mob of gangsters, and there is no doubt that there is a

strong similarity between the way in which the Labor Party ran the prison system and a group of gangsters, because it fleeced the taxpayers left, right and centre. On page 320 of volume 2 of its report, the Audit Commission reveals that in 1992-93 South Australia spent about 25 per cent more on correctional service activities than was required to provide the same level of comparable service across all States.

The Audit Commission report also revealed where some of that money was spent. It reveals on page 323 that 76 per cent of correctional services recurrent expenditure in 1992-93 was associated with the salary costs of its work force. On examining the size of that work force, the department found that, compared with the national average for the number of prisoners we have within the system, the work force levels were too high. For that reason, 125 correctional services staff accepted separation packages to leave the department, thus we commenced to bring that work force level down to more realistic and appropriate levels. The Audit Commissioner also found (page 324) that the budgetary costs of the provision of prison industries in 1992-93 was \$8.9 million with a revenue return of just \$1.1 million.

The commission recommended that the operation of prison industries should become more financially self sufficient with options being considered for greater private sector involvement in its management. It is for that reason that I have been pleased as Minister to announce that the department is in the process of establishing partnerships with the private sector in order to introduce industry into our prisons system. Those partnerships will ensure that the private sector gains by being able to compete with overseas imports and that prisoners gain by being able to become gainfully employed, thereby reducing incidents in our prisons.

Finally, the Audit Commission commented on the private sector management of the State's prisons and other services. Indeed, it recommended that the department consider the establishment of a new prison of 300 to 500 cells to be managed by the private sector as well as the outsourcing of those industries. For that reason, later this month I will have pleasure as Minister for Correctional Services in introducing legislation to this Parliament to enable the outsourcing of prison services and industries and the private management of prisons in this State. I look forward to the Opposition's supporting that legislation further to enable the continued cost reduction of correctional services in this State.

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. Has any evaluation taken place in relation to the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system put in place by the previous Government? If so, will the Minister make this information available to the Parliament and, if not, when does the Government intend to undertake such an evaluation? Anecdotal evidence from police officers and others involved in the system suggests nothing but praise for the working of the new system, and confirmation of this would be useful for all concerned and the community at large.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: An evaluation is taking place regarding the juvenile justice system and many of the recommendations of the select committee. It was a good select committee; it was strongly bipartisan. It resulted in two major pieces of legislation being brought down in regard to juvenile justice and to child protection. It is important that an

evaluation be carried out and, when further information is available to me as Minister, I will be happy to make it available to this House and to the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS INFORMATION LINE

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Can the Minister for Industrial Affairs inform the House of recent steps by his Department for Industrial Affairs to set up a 0055 information line?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: In the past week or so we have set up a very important advisory service under the 0055 system. It is a system that has been running in all States in Australia except South Australia; it was recommended to the previous Government but it did not see fit to use it, even though all the Labor Governments in other States saw it as an excellent service. This service enables the clerks award, the retail industry award, the delicatessen award, the unlicensed cafes and restaurants and the licensed cafes and restaurants award to be accessed on a 0055 number. It is anticipated that it will relieve about 25 per cent of the work load relating to calls presently made to that section of the Department of Labour. It is an excellent system which will help both employers and employees to adequately and quickly access excellent information on the awards system.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Ms HURLEY (Napier): What guarantees will the Minister for Health provide that waiting lists for the Royal District Nursing Society, Domiciliary Care and community health outreach services will not increase as a result of his Government's policies? Will he say how he will ensure that hospitals give adequate notice to these home and community care services about the early discharge of patients so that health units are not forced to play pass the parcel with sick South Australians?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is a very important question and I thank the honourable member for an opportunity to answer it. The whole question of casemix funding, as I have explained seemingly *ad infinitum* to the House (but I shall do so again), is based on the creation of a series of pools of money. One of those pools was specifically designated to look at primary health care initiatives. That included both ends of, if you like, the sausage machine of hospitals, in other words, the entry side, which included primary health care initiatives to keep people out of hospital and, importantly, the post discharge area to make sure that people were treated appropriately once they had been discharged. The previous Government had clearly left that area almost untouched, and there was a great area of need. We have addressed that by the creation of those pools of money.

The question addressed particularly the RDNS and the domiciliary care areas. It is a delight to me to report that, in the discussions I have had with key players in both the domiciliary care and the RDNS areas within the past month, there has been an acknowledgment that many of the services they provide actually dovetail. As is quite a view extant in the health community at the moment, people are not wishing to duplicate the administration of services or services as such. In fact, a number of the key players within the areas of RDNS and domiciliary care, and in other areas that provide post acute care, have come to me suggesting that at some stage there may well be considerable value in looking at a potential amalgamation of those services or their administration.

In the southern domiciliary care area, which looks after the south, those services are now collocated. I have been down there to visit them. They have a very good amalgamated service provision. There is clear cross-fertilisation as to the needs from the various departments, and even the people within the service provision admit that that is probably the way of the future.

TRAMS

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Transport in another place in response to a question asked by the member for Spence yesterday in this House.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I refer to a matter of great importance to the people in my electorate, especially those in Henley South and West Beach, that is, the curfew at Adelaide Airport. I strongly support the continuation of the curfew and will always do so. I believe that the electorate should be protected from heavy aircraft noise by that 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew. However, I am concerned about the curfew hours which allow light aircraft to land at the airport.

While the people in my electorate are quite sympathetic with the fact that business has to go on and the people in light aircraft have to continue using the airport between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., modifications can be made to make it far easier for the people of Henley South and West Beach to tolerate the situation. I am led to believe that presently about a dozen aircraft land between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. All of those light aircraft come in from the sea over Henley South and West Beach and land on the small airstrip at Adelaide Airport. My constituents have said that they would like to see an attempt made at using the major strip which, during the hours of operation at the airport, is used by the heavy jets. This would allow light aircraft to come in from the sea, over the Glenelg sewage treatment works and the golf course and onto the main runway, which would mean that nobody would be upset by such incoming and outgoing light aircraft.

One has to bear in mind that many people living in the area about whom I am talking are light sleepers, elderly, sick or suffering from insomnia and the slightest disturbance can wake them up at all hours of the night. I am also told that a newspaper delivery plane leaves at about 3 a.m. every day to service country areas, including Port Lincoln, with early morning papers and constantly wakes up the community. I am asking the Minister for Transport to review the situation. I intend to write to the managers of FAC and Adelaide Airport requesting that in future consideration be given to allowing all light aircraft, instead of using the small runway approached by aircraft coming in over Henley Beach, to use the major runway, which would cause little disturbance to people in the electorate.

That is a minor request from the people living in the area and one that I believe would get more support from the

airport and the 10 000 or so residents living nearby. They do not complain; in fact, they tolerate an enormous amount. The Federal Airports Corporation should do everything in its power to bring about a change in traffic patterns between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. so that the small aircraft in question can use the major runway and thereby cause little disturbance to residents.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Modbury Hospital has come under considerable strain in the past few months. Indeed, questions have been asked in this place about that hospital, and in the previous Parliament a number of questions were asked and speeches made about it by members on both sides of the House. I will put a few remarks on the public record today regarding my own recent experience with that institution. Indeed, I cannot speak more highly of an institution of such medical excellence in this State. Indeed, I had the unfortunate pleasure of requiring the services of Modbury Hospital throughout the bulk of last week and I can say to the House that the high level of service provided at that centre was something of which all South Australians, particularly people in the north-eastern community, can feel justly proud.

The nursing and medical staff and all of the various ancillary staff members in that organisation provide an excellent level of health care to the constituents I service as well as to the constituents in the electorates of Florey, Newland and probably as far away as Torrens and other areas in the north-eastern suburbs. That hospital is the primary centre for their medical care, but in many instances that hospital has been criticised when such criticism has been unfounded. In fact, I have eyewitness proof that the level of medical excellence at that hospital is something with which all South Australians can feel very comfortable.

Modbury Hospital is now in its twenty-fifth year, and one thing that needs to be said is that it is in desperate need of refurbishment. As with many other public hospitals in South Australia, much of the funding that goes into the organisation is used primarily to provide as much patient service as possible. A program has been proposed by various Governments in South Australia for the refurbishment on a rotating basis of most of our public hospitals, and I understand that in the normal course of events Modbury Hospital will see a major refurbishment in the not too distant future. However, in addition to referring to the physical state of the buildings, which is still more than adequate, I want to put on the public record here today the dedication of the staff at that hospital.

Modbury Hospital has provided medical procedures to many constituents of mine, some of whom have sought my assistance on all sorts of matters, including that of waiting lists. The hospital has always provided an excellent service with equity and should be commended for the work that it does in the north-eastern community.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I am astonished by some of the things that seem still to go on in dealing with claims made on WorkCover. It astonishes me that, whilst human beings like any other organism grow up and grow old and their body tendons, muscles and bones wear thin and wear out, the process should become part of a claim structure that is then visited on WorkCover, the expense of which is borne by all other premium payers in the industry concerned, more particularly by employers having to pay a penalty rate on their premium simply because they were employing an older

person whose ability to continue to perform some of the tasks involved in the work was impaired by the ageing process.

It is fair to say in the common vernacular that, like anything else, people just wear out; for example, in industries like the pastoral industry where one is shearing, sooner or later the cartilage, the point of contact between the vertebrae, called discs, wears out. When that happens it is appropriate for the workers in question, in my judgment, to be retrained, to find other employment or, more particularly, if they cannot be otherwise retrained and employed, to be given a sickness benefit for the rest of their life.

They are permanently incapacitated. It should not be a burden on the Workcover premiums paid by employers, and more particularly it should not be a penalty paid on the premium by the hapless employer at the time the worker finally decided that he or she was unable to continue to work in that industry which required such physical exertion.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The member for Ross Smith says that that is rubbish, but it is not rubbish; it is fact. If it is not possible for people to continue working in the manner in which they have worked because their bodies are not capable of doing so, it is not the fault of the person last in line who gave them the job, and it is not the burden of responsibility for employers alone: it is the fault of the system, if there is a fault. We all wear out, and the burden should be on the community at large. We provide for that situation in every other respect through disability pensions.

Mr Clarke: You want to knock through so many sheep a day.

Mr LEWIS: And if you do, you should be prudent enough to set sufficient aside to enable you to live at ease when you are no longer physically capable. I say that having been a shearer. The same thing applies to abalone divers. They are sensible enough to set money aside, and if they are not we still have the safety net—the disability pension. You do not tear yourself to pieces for 10 years and expect the system to continue to pay you \$1 000 a week for the rest of your life. You either do it judiciously and extend your physical life, or, if you do tear yourself to pieces, you set aside in savings some of the earnings you get and in due time—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Well, the member for Ross Smith is not capable of much logic. In another instance, WorkCover has not really risen to the occasion in the case of someone living in the country who cannot afford a new car, gets injured but still needs treatment, having had their income level reduced. After a year, they are unable to continue paying for their home and are unable to replace their car which they continue to need to obtain physiotherapy treatment, so they just go off treatment and remain crippled. That is the kind of forethought which this man, the member for Ross Smith, ignored his responsibilities in his former role when he advised the former Government what ought to be done. He did not care.

Mr WADE (Elder): I rise today to continue with chapter two. As members may be aware, chapter one was yesterday when I referred to the human catastrophe surrounding silicone breast implants in Australian females. Today I want to concentrate on the voluntary organisation set up in South Australia to cater for the needs and concerns of these women. Before I do so, I refer to the *Advertiser* of 14 July 1994 containing an article entitled 'Breast implants can cause cancer: study', which states, in part:

Mealey Publications said it had obtained a copy of the study, due to be published in the 20 July edition of the *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*.

Referring to the impregnation of mice with silicone gel, the article states:

... three injections over a 20-day period of 0.1 to 0.2 millilitres of this gel had an incidence rate—

that refers to cancer—

of 80 per cent.

There is no doubt as to the dangers of silicone gel and the dangers of silicone in the body after silicone gel breast implants have been removed. Over 1 800 South Australian women are members of MASICSS (Mastectomy Association and Silicone Implant Counselling Support Services), an unfunded voluntary organisation run by South Australian women catering for women who are suffering the debilitating effects of silicone gel.

The organisation has seven main objectives. The first is to actively provide support, counselling and information by consideration of social, economic and spiritual factors to all women who have impaired health due to silicone implants and the associated grief and loss due to mastectomy. This service extends to family, relatives, friends and associated persons. The second objective is to share information, advocacy and keep confidentiality with women who are congruent with each woman's personal values and beliefs. The third objective is to work towards and maintain an affordable service, so that appropriate treatments may be made available and be developed and accessed by all women who now and in the future require help and support due to silicone implants.

The fourth objective is to continue to work towards and establish further resource networks. The fifth is to share information in a confidential manner to improve the health and well-being of members. The sixth is to promote awareness and to affirm a public policy in its broadest sense. The seventh objective is the establishment of a toll-free number.

Unfortunately, even though MASICSS is recognised Australia-wide, it is unfunded and a voluntary organisation. It sought funding. Rosemary Crowley, the Minister for Family Services, wrote a letter to the MASICSS organisation stating that she had allocated \$153 000 over a period of 2½ years to the Consumer Health Forum of Australia to establish a support and information network for women and that she would not grant further moneys to other voluntary groups. As we are aware, the only thing that has come from this \$153 000 grant is a glossy brochure.

We have the situation where MASICSS will collapse; it will fold from lack of Government support, both Federal and State. I call on the Federal Government to move away from donating moneys to bureaucracies which spend it on glossy brochures and to give those moneys to the people.

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I would like to make a few comments on the announcement yesterday by the Minister for Health relating to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The need for a higher level of health services in the northern area has been acknowledged for a number of years. Issues such as the higher incidence in the community of a range of health problems, the rapidly increasing population base in the north and problems with attracting particular medical staff are some of the factors that have contributed to a less than adequate

health service provision to people in the north despite the best efforts of a dedicated and hard-working staff, administration and board. It has meant that people have had to travel long distances to get access to essential services like renal dialysis and orthopaedics, and for those who need access to speech therapy and cannot afford private health insurance it has meant going without.

The announcements made yesterday by the Minister are a welcome start in addressing the current health issues of the north. The increase in bed numbers and the addition of a teaching component should bring considerable benefits both to the quality of care and in attracting medical staff. However, the proposal is short on specifics concerning a number of critical aspects. We need firm undertakings about the time line to establish the future bed growth, guarantees that the next stage of capital works funding will be forthcoming to enable the stated expansion to be realised and guarantees that people who live in the north will not need to travel to the QEH or the RAH, but that appropriate medical expertise will be adequately provided at the Lyell McEwin, particularly in areas of need such as renal dialysis, orthopaedics and speech therapy. We also need assurances that the benefits of a teaching component are clearly evident and resources will be equitably shared between the two locations.

The management structure of the new entity will need to ensure that the interests of the people of the North are fully represented and addressed in a framework of cooperation and collaboration. The Lyell McEwin/Queen Elizabeth amalgamation needs to be a partnership and not a takeover, with the Lyell McEwin being a branch office or the poor relation of a dominant parent. This means that the process undertaken by the soon to be appointed joint steering committee will need to be thorough and fully consultative. It will need to work carefully through all the issues and tackle the specifics that have not yet been addressed. My experience in the amalgamation of schools has taught me that the process of amalgamation is critical to a successful outcome.

We will need to see the consultation and involvement of present board members, hospital staff and the wider community that has been lacking in the proposal so far. Indeed, it is unfortunate that the Minister was not prepared to show the trust and confidence in the Lyell McEwin Board and our community that would have enabled them to have had proper input into this proposal rather than an in-principle agreement of representatives of the board one day before the announcement was made. An announcement of such significance to health provision in the North is one into which the Lyell McEwin Board and the northern community should have had significant input at all stages.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It is very interesting to be part of the new Government and to identify the mass of things that were not attended to by the previous Government. We have heard of all the big things: how it virtually bankrupted this State and made many mistakes. However, there are many smaller items in rural areas that perhaps have escaped the attention of the average person living in the metropolitan area, and I guess that of many people in the country areas, too. When the previous Liberal Government left office, quite a few places in the rural area were to be supplied with reticulated water in the near future; for example, Moorowie on Southern York Peninsula. At Point Turton they needed to tap into more underground water, and again things were fairly far advanced in that respect.

In relation to schools, Riverton High School was in my electorate at that stage, and it was on the top of the list to be redeveloped. In fact, it was to be a new school—that was still the policy at that stage—and that simply dropped way down the list after the Labor Party took office. Likewise, Minlaton Primary School was to have been redeveloped. It took quite some years to get that done after the Liberals left office. Balaclava High School still has not been redeveloped after 11 dismal years of Labor Administration.

Another area that Labor neglected year after year was our arterial roads. It is interesting to see that there are still some 440 kilometres of unsealed rural arterial roads in South Australia. Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with representatives from the Brinkworth area on what is commonly referred to as the Snowtown to Magpie Corner Road—in fact, it is the Snowtown to Brinkworth Road—right where the bitumen finished. The representatives told me that many years ago the road had been prepared for bituminising—and it is still unsealed. The base had been put down not only on the Brinkworth to Snowtown Road but also on the Brinkworth to Blyth Road.

Mr Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr MEIER: The member for Custance well knows that road because, until 11 December last year, it was in his electorate. I know that he took up this matter with the former Government. I do not know how many times, but many times, and every time to no avail. I just saw again another classic example of wasted money by the previous Government. The base had been prepared for bituminising and, when Labor took office, it decided to put that on hold. The hold has now extended for some 11 years, so that we, the new Government, are faced with the massive bill of having to seal these roads. I am referring to only two out of many and, later, I hope to identify quite a few others in my area.

The Brinkworth to Blyth Road is particularly important, because every year the recognised carriers cart tens of thousands of tonnes of grain and super over that road, along with the huge tonnage of grain and super carried by farmers' trucks. It is the only unsealed road in the Wallaroo grain division, and that is a massive reflection on the former Government. It just would not spend the money; it did not recognise the importance of the rural sector to this State; and it was quite happy to let the farmers' and the carriers' trucks wear out as a result. The irony is that the Department of Road Transport's graders are too small to grade this road. In fact, every time it needs to be graded, the Department of Road Transport has to contract the council's grader, because that is a much bigger grader. It is the only one that can do the job satisfactorily. It can be done only after rain; in other words, when the road has sufficient moisture on it.

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

Mr BASS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the State of the House.

A quorum having been formed.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction of Government Bills before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve the 1994 Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States and Territories of the Commonwealth. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Bill approves a new Financial Agreement—the *Financial Agreement Between the Commonwealth, States and Territories*.

The new Agreement was signed by the respective Heads of Government at the 25 February 1994 meeting of the Council of Australian Governments.

The Bill approves the new Financial Agreement which provides for the continued existence of the Australian Loan Council with broadly specified role and powers, sets out certain obligations in respect of past Financial Agreement borrowings, and provides for formal membership of Loan Council for the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory.

The original *Financial Agreement Between the Commonwealth and the States* was made in 1927. The Agreement established the Loan Council and required the Commonwealth and each State to submit an annual borrowing program for Loan Council approval. The Agreement was last amended in 1976 and many of its provisions are now obsolete. In particular, Loan Council scrutiny of public sector borrowings has for many years taken place under voluntarily agreed arrangements rather than the provisions of the Agreement. On this occasion it is proposed that the existing Agreement, as varied since 1927, be rescinded, as provided for under the Constitution.

The Bill establishes simplified debt redemption arrangements, through the Debt Retirement Reserve Trust Account. This will replace existing arrangements handled through the National Debt Sinking Fund.

The new Agreement would remove the requirement for future Commonwealth and State borrowings to be approved under the provisions of the Agreement. This would reflect the reality that for many years only the Commonwealth's annual borrowing program has been formally approved under the Financial Agreement because only the Commonwealth undertakes budget sector borrowings directly rather than through a central borrowing authority outside the Agreement. From 1993-94, Commonwealth, State and Territory borrowings have been subject to Loan Council monitoring under arrangements agreed by Loan Council at its meetings in December 1992 and July 1993. These new arrangements, which superseded the Global Approach Resolution, reflect the common interest of the Commonwealth and States in ensuring that overall public sector borrowing in Australia is consistent with sound macroeconomic policy and that borrowings by each government are consistent with a sustainable fiscal strategy. The emphasis in the new arrangements is on credible budgetary processes, ensuring a high level of public understanding of public sector financing, and facilitating increased financial market scrutiny.

The new Agreement would also remove the Commonwealth's explicit power to borrow on behalf of the States. Reflecting the States' own borrowing activities outside the provisions of the Agreement, the Commonwealth has undertaken no new money borrowings on behalf of the States since 1987-88. Loan Council decided in 1990 that the States would progressively take over responsibility for debt previously issued on their behalf under the Financial Agreement. These arrangements place full responsibility on the States for financing and managing their own debt, thus subjecting their fiscal and debt management strategies to greater community and financial market scrutiny.

In addition, the new Agreement would abolish the restriction on States borrowing by the issue of securities in their own names in domestic and overseas markets. This would again recognise that the States conduct extensive borrowing activities through their central borrowing authorities outside the provisions of the Agreement. These borrowings are regarded by the financial markets effectively as sovereign issues and rated accordingly.

As noted, the proposed Agreement was signed by all Heads of Government at the Council of Australian Governments meeting on 25 February 1994. To become effective, the Agreement requires the passage of complementary legislation in the Commonwealth and all State and Territory Parliaments.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

Clause 3 is an interpretative provision.

Clause 4: Approval of the 1994 Financial Agreement

Clause 4 provides for the approval by Parliament of the Agreement—see clause 1(1)(b) of the Agreement.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES (PROHIBITION OF CROSS HOLDINGS, PROFIT SHARING, ETC.) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gaming Machines Act 1992. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This is a Bill to amend the Gaming Machines Act, 1992 to prohibit certain profit sharing arrangements, to prohibit the holders of gaming machine dealer's licences or their associates from holding gaming machine licences in this State, and to restrict the eligibility of the holders of general facility licences to hold gaming machine licences.

The Gaming Machines Act prohibits unlicensed persons from sharing in the proceeds of gaming. However, certain schemes have emerged whereby the holders of gaming machine licences structure themselves in such a manner as to distribute profits or a disproportionate share of the proceeds of gaming to a party who is to all intents and purposes simply an investor with no commitment to the hotel or club industries.

One such scheme involved the establishment of a unit trust with capital units, hotel income units which entitle the unit holder to the income from the hotel operation and gaming income units which entitle the unit holder to the income from gaming operations. The effect of this was to give the incoming investor the gaming revenue while the existing licensee was limited to profits from the hotel's other operations. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner refused the application but in doing so stated that he was not confident of the outcome of an appeal.

Schemes such as this are a blatant abuse of the philosophy of the Gaming Machines Act which was agreed to as a means of revitalising the hotel and club industries. These schemes which are designed simply to enable wealthy investors to profit from gaming without being genuine licensees must be prohibited. The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association and the Licensed Clubs' Association support the amendment.

Applications for gaming machine licences have also been received from the holders of gaming machine dealer's licences. Other dealers have made application to be approved as persons in a position of authority in companies holding gaming machine licences in this State.

The Gaming Machines Act currently prohibits the holder of the gaming machine monitor licence from holding any other licence under the Act. It also prevents the Commissioner from approving a person to act as an agent of the State Supply Board in its capacity as the holder of either the gaming machine supply licence or gaming

machine service licence if that person holds or is associated with the holder of a gaming machine licence or a gaming machine dealer's licence.

The clear intention of these provisions is that persons in a position of special influence, knowledge or access to the industry should not hold gaming machine licences. This should be extended to the holders of gaming machine dealer's licences or their associates.

This matter is of such importance to the industry that this amendment has been made retrospective with a transitional provision to ensure that a decision of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner made prior to the Parliamentary Statement of 19 April 1994 not be affected. The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association supports this amendment.

The Gaming Machines Act provides that the holders of hotel licences, club licences or general facility licences are eligible to hold a gaming machine licence.

The original justification for the introduction of gaming machines into this State was based on the need to improve the financial viability and stability of the club and hotel industries. The general facility licence category was only included because there were many premises which to all intents and purposes were hotels which had had their hotel licence converted to a general facility licence.

In an attempt to limit the range of general facility licences which would qualify, the Act provides that a gaming machine licence will not be granted unless the Commissioner is satisfied that the conduct of the proposed gaming operations would not detract unduly from the character of the premises, the nature of the undertaking carried out on the premises or the enjoyment of persons ordinarily using the premises.

Of the seventeen applications for a gaming machine licence from the holders of general facility licences all but two relate to premises which previously held a hotel licence and which operate basically as hotels. The two exceptions being Football Park and an Adelaide Restaurant.

The grant of a gaming licence to Football Park is consistent with the philosophy of including the club industry because Football Park is recognised as the State headquarters for football. The proposed amendment recognises this and retains eligibility for the holder of a general facility licence where in the opinion of the Commissioner the premises are recognised as the State headquarters for a particular sporting code or are major sporting venues and in the Commissioner's opinion the operation is similar to that of a club.

The second of the exceptions is quite a different matter. The premises in question can best be described as a cafeteria-cum-restaurant which has qualified for a general facility licence because of its tourist location. The grant of this application has the potential to open a "Pandora's Box" unless corrective action is taken. Accordingly, the amendment will restrict the eligibility of the holders of general facility licences to apply for a gaming machine licence to those premises which previously held either a hotel or club licence. The Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association and the Licensed Clubs' Association support the amendment.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause backdates the operation of all clauses of the Bill (except for clause 3) to the day on which the *Gaming Machines Act* came into operation. Clause 3 (which narrows the eligibility of the holders of general facility licences to obtain gaming machine licences) is backdated to 1 August 1994.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 15—Eligibility criteria

This clause provides that a gaming machine licence cannot be granted to the holder of a general facility licence under the *Liquor Licensing Act* unless the general facility licence was converted under that Act from a hotel licence or a club licence and the nature of the operation is still largely that of a hotel or club, or unless the premises are a major sporting venue or state headquarters for a sporting code and the nature of the operation is substantially similar to that of a licensed club.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 37—Commissioner may approve managers and employees

This clause provides that a person who is employed by a gaming machine dealer cannot be approved as a gaming machine manager or employee. The Commissioner can also refuse to give such an approval to a person who provides services under contract to a gaming machine dealer.

Clause 5: Insertion of Part 4A

This clause prohibits a wide range of relationships between gaming machine dealers and other licensees under the Act. Virtually any person who could be in a position to influence the affairs of a licensee is prohibited from holding a dealers licence or from being closely involved with the holder of a dealers licence, and vice versa. New section 44A(4)(c)(v) is a "catch all" provision that gives the Commissioner a discretion to determine that any relationship or connection other than those expressly referred to is too close, in that it could prejudice the proper operation of the Act or of the undertaking under any licence under the Act. (A decision of the Commissioner to refuse, revoke or suspend a licence or approval on this ground would, of course, be appealable).

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 68—Certain profit sharing, etc., is prohibited

This clause prohibits the profits from a licensed gaming machine venue from being distributed differentially to those arising from the liquor licence undertaking. A person who participates in such an arrangement is guilty of an offence, and the arrangement itself is null and void, whether it was made before or after the commencement of the Act.

Clause 7: Statute law revision amendments

This clause refers to the small list of statute law revision amendments contained in the schedule.

Clause 8: Transitional provisions

This clause makes provision for several transitional matters. Firstly, it is made clear that the prohibition of the links between dealers and other licensees does not invalidate any decision that the Commissioner may have made before 19 April 1994. Furthermore, the Commissioner is not prevented from approving an application that would otherwise contravene new section 44A, if the applicant can satisfy the Commissioner that, prior to 19 April 1994, the applicant was granted approval under the *Liquor Licensing Act* to assume a position of authority in a company that held a liquor licence and that, acting on the assumption that a similar approval would be granted in respect of the gaming machine licence, he or she (or some other person) incurred substantial costs or expenses that would not be recoverable in the event of the application being refused.

SCHEDULE

Statute Law Revision Amendments

The schedule deletes all references to a gaming machine technician's licence that were inadvertently left in the Act in the final stages of the passing of the Act in 1992. The technician's licence was replaced by the service licence (held by State Supply). The references therefore have no effect and should be removed from the Act.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

It gives me much pleasure to move this motion. First, I formally reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and to Her Excellency the Governor of our State. I congratulate Her Excellency on her speech in opening the second session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament, a speech which outlined the continuing vision and plan for the recovery of growth and prosperity of South Australia under this Liberal Government. I am pleased and proud to be standing here as part of the Liberal Government team to

report and make comment on the actions of the Government over the past months and on the Government's plans in its current legislative program as outlined by Her Excellency.

As we enter this second session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament, and after the recent recess, it is appropriate and fitting that I address a range of the areas of Government activity and progress since being elected to Government some seven months ago, whether they be the result of the formal legislative program of the last session, via policy, leadership, sheer hard work or by the example of the Premier, his Cabinet or the parliamentary members of the Government team.

I will be referring to aspects that are, of course, of significance State-wide. However, where possible or appropriate, I will choose some local examples of personal experience from my electorate of Chaffey to illustrate our current progress and plans in rejuvenating this State and, more particularly, in restoring its status as a State recognised for its productive, economic growth and its standards of excellence in the provision of services and facilities to this State.

This Government was elected with a substantial mandate to turn around this State's economy and to restore financial stability and prosperity to this State. The Government's objectives were clearly stated at the last election; they have not changed in the past seven months and we will not deviate from them. They are fundamental and clear.

I will reiterate these objectives today, because it is through them that this Government's performance will be measured and judged over the next 3½ years. These objectives continue to be, first, to rebuild the South Australian economy—to get out there and create jobs and increase economic activity once again. Secondly, we plan to put the South Australian Government's finances into far better order and, in particular, to do something about the debt problem that we inherited and reduce that debt in real terms. The third objective is to restore confidence and accountability in the whole system of Government and in Parliament itself. The fourth objective is to reestablish pride and standards in services, where Government itself has a role to play in areas such as education, health, public transport and public safety.

In reflecting on the successful performance of the Government over the past seven months, I want to indicate a range of the reforms and achievements to date. The first major area I turn to is that of economic activity and job creation. State-wide, an additional 7 200 full-time jobs have been created between January and June this year. This has been a direct result of having at least three Government mechanisms working in combination. First, there has been the Rebuilding South Australia Job Creation Program. Secondly, there has been improved confidence on the part of the business sector in recognition of the proposed legislative reforms set down by this Government. Thirdly, there has been the justifiable incentive packages that are deliverable to prospective investors in South Australia.

The jobs package initiative, launched after the Brown Government was elected, is by far the most extensive package of incentives ever offered to industry in this State to get out there and create jobs. It has a strong focus on the export market where, of course, the greatest potential lies for increased response to the economic activity before us.

Another example is the payroll tax initiative scheme, which offers those companies currently involved in exporting value added and manufactured goods from South Australia a 10 per cent rebate for all employees involved in these

exports. More particularly, from 1 July this year the rebate has been increased to 50 per cent for employees involved in those exports. This means that, as from 1 July this year, South Australian companies can get into new export markets with a 40 per cent wage factor advantage compared with our competitors interstate, whether they be from Melbourne or Sydney. This scheme does not apply just for a year or two: it is for the life of this Liberal Government. It is arguably the biggest incentive that any export manufacturer has received from any State in Australia.

I note particularly that in my electorate of Chaffey—to which I will refer later—there is tremendous expansion in the wine industry. This incentive package is being well received. It is a particular bonus and of value to my electorate. In addition, there are specific cash grants available for the employment of additional personnel experienced in engineering or marketing, as well as grants for assistance in the preparation of development plans for smaller companies involved in import replacement, new exports or value adding to agricultural products.

Another incentive is the WorkCover levy subsidy scheme under which the Government will pay WorkCover premiums for the first year of employment of any long-term unemployed person or school leaver who is first time employed. In the case of the long-term unemployed, employers not only have WorkCover premiums paid but also save the cost of payroll tax for the first year. In the first six months, 1 054 workers have gained work as a direct result of employers taking advantage of assistance available through the WorkCover levy scheme. In addition, a further 1 000 applications have been issued to employers who have inquired about the scheme. So, the number of successful applications and, therefore, the number of potential jobs created can be expected to grow steadily. Further, more than 3 500 inquiries have been received about the new rebuilding South Australian jobs creation scheme.

This Government is serious about export and job growth and it is proud of its record to date. The Government's legislative reforms have also facilitated the business confidence required for this improved economic activity. First, there has been the introduction of our industrial relations legislation during the last session as a real rewrite of the Industrial Act in this State with clear objectives for setting up enterprise agreements and, with those enterprise agreements, putting responsibility for management back into the workplace with the managers and the workers themselves. As a result of that we will be responsible for lifting productivity substantially as well as improving and providing for greater flexibility in the workplace and giving more opportunity for the rewarding of performance by employees.

There have been many other fundamental reforms, and I example simply the scrapping of compulsory unionism in South Australia. There has also been the Government's reform of the WorkCover system to put in an entirely new WorkCover board which is no longer representative of various selective groups within our community but has a direct responsibility to make sure it is running an efficient and competitive WorkCover system in South Australia. By restricting drug and alcohol related claims, by abolishing most journey related accident claims, by amending the scope for excessive claims under the stress criterion and by opening up the administration of WorkCover to competitive tender from a range of companies, real competition will now be built into the WorkCover system.

These WorkCover reforms as from 1 July aim at a likely saving of \$20 million per annum. Companies, large and small, within Australia and overseas are taking note of this new competitive economic climate that this Government is creating in South Australia. They are not just looking but are now investing here. I can give examples of many, but the record speaks for itself. From early in the year there has been investment by companies such as Mitsubishi, Motorola, Australis and BTR Nylex, the Aviation College expansion at Parafield, the Wirrina tourism development; in the past two or three weeks there have been announcements about AWA Defence Industries regarding the PC3 Orion upgrading involving investment of about \$105 million and the Defence Science and Technology Centre redevelopment at Salisbury of \$50 million, as well as the announcement a couple of days ago by BRL Hardy regarding a further \$30 million expansion investment injection into South Australia.

I turn now to the important arena of economic development in respect to major infrastructure. To facilitate and assist our economic growth, this Government will maintain a priority for infrastructure development in this State. I cite the Government's commitment to the upgrading of facilities at the Adelaide Airport as a means to attract investment, trade and tourism to this State. I have a particular personal empathy with this requirement. Through my past horticultural business involvement, at least twice over the past 18 months I have had experience of high quality fresh produce bound for Asian markets being off-loaded at the last minute at the Adelaide international air freight facility. A delay of two or three days not only jeopardises optimal quality and out-turn on arrival but this unreliability has threatened business relations that have been built up with the importer, perhaps from Hong Kong or Singapore, as in this case.

In my electorate of Chaffey, professional horticulturalists have been lobbying me for some time regarding priority in this area. Specifically, professional melon and tomato producers are forced, when the Adelaide air freight services do not suit their market schedules, to overnight road freight to Melbourne and use the Melbourne air freight facility to Asia. Not only is this logistically more inconvenient but it incurs an increased cost for those Riverland marketers of at least \$1 per tray to service those export markets.

The only way in which the Adelaide Airport runway is likely to be extended or the airport redeveloped is if it is sold to private interests. The Federal Airports Corporation's legislative charter to make a profit on its operations is the greatest restriction we have to getting urgent upgrade work completed at the airport to improve our capacity to provide a daily service to our Asian markets. The Adelaide Airport remains a poor relation in terms of aviation facilities and services in Australia, and the international airport in Adelaide does not provide a daily service to Asian markets. Our domestic terminals fail to provide customers with covered bridges and no long range plans have been developed to meet future demand at the Adelaide Airport.

In this area, the Premier deserves special congratulations for his negotiations and the announcement last week of the appointment of an international team of aviation project and finance consultants headed by AIDC Limited to identify and negotiate new ownership options and arrangements for the Adelaide Airport. For too long this State has had to suffer because of investment decisions that have been made elsewhere about one of the most vital pieces of infrastructure that this State has. Our target as a Government is to find an operator that can make Adelaide Airport a gateway into

Australia, one that is able to offer both visitors and exporters regular and direct air services into Asia. Such a move will undoubtedly have tremendous benefits for South Australian exporters and for tourism. Such an alternative ownership structure would have to be able to achieve, first, South Australian community input into key directions for the airport; secondly, a positive contribution to marketing the State in respect of the State's economic development plan; and, of course, thirdly, a net benefit to the State.

The appointment of the AIDC Limited team recognises this State Government's determination to ensure that it is prepared to capitalise immediately on any Federal Government decision to seek to sell any or all of Australia's federal airports. I seek from Opposition members in this Chamber and their interstate colleagues their full support at the forthcoming ALP national convention and the State convention in Adelaide, which I believe will be held this weekend—

Mr Lewis: A pity none of them are here.

Mr ANDREW: It is a pity that none of them are here to understand and appreciate the need, the priority and the importance of their decision at these forthcoming ALP State conferences to enable the potential sale of our airport to go ahead for the future benefit of our State.

Mr Lewis: A bit of bipartisanship.

Mr ANDREW: Exactly.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: The member for Goyder and the member for Ridley are quite right in their comments, indicating that bipartisan support is required to achieve this priority for South Australia. The upgrading of the airport must and will continue to be a major objective in terms of the rebuilding of our economy in South Australia. A change in the ownership to enable investment and marketing decisions more effectively to reflect the needs of the South Australian community will go a long way toward seeing the airport play a more positive and significant role in stimulating the economic growth of this State.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Premier, as he deserves, for the pressure he has put on the Federal Government, particularly in his negotiations with the Prime Minister on this matter last week. It is important to reiterate that the Premier indicated to this House yesterday that he obtained from the Prime Minister an understanding that the extension of the runway at Adelaide Airport by 500-odd metres from its current length of around 2 500 metres should proceed as a matter of urgency and priority and, importantly, before the possible privatisation of the airport. This recognises, of course, that we as a State just cannot afford to wait for the extension, either while the Labor Party argues over the principle of the sale or while there is a possibility of lengthy procedures for such privatisation to occur.

I am very pleased to see from Her Excellency's speech that the Government recognises public sector reform as an essential and integral part of rebuilding this State's economic and financial position, therefore I turn briefly to public sector reform. While this process has been proceeding where possible through administrative procedures, further efficiency, flexibility and incentive options will best be employed by the repeal of the Government Management and Employment Act and its replacement with new public sector management legislation to give chief executive officers substantially more authority for the management of their agencies. I note specifically that this will provide the means whereby Public Service chief executive officers will have the autonomy and flexibility to implement reforms and to improve service

delivery to both the public and the businesses of South Australia.

I also place on record my public respect and acknowledgment for the vast majority of public sector employees, who are not just prepared to be part of this reform process but keen to contribute positively to the demands and challenges this Government is now putting before the whole State. I am pleased that this Government, as indicated by Her Excellency's speech, values and appreciates the important role the public sector must play in the rebuilding of our State and, because of this, the Government understands the need to provide quality and rewarding career opportunities in future in the public sector. Notwithstanding this fundamental support and contribution required by the public sector, I believe this Government's mandate is to provide the best quality services in the most efficient and effective way. If that means by effective tendering, outsourcing, departmental restructuring or departmental corporatisation, we must all be alive to the options and get on with the job.

As part of this continuing process, I am pleased to note the reform of ETSA, which is continuing to streamline and refocus its operations and service delivery to ensure that South Australia has a sustainable and viable electricity industry to be competitive with the national electricity grid, which is due to be in operation by July 1995. Similarly, the E&WS Department is being corporatised, and a major reorganisation is under way by the Department of Housing and Construction's becoming the Department of Building Management, to focus on asset management as a core function and with a separation of policy advice functions from the provision of services. I have already had pleasing responses from tradesmen and allied companies in my electorate who are generating greater employment for their firms in response to more business opportunities in this area.

As an example of public sector reform, I am pleased and proud to cite the launch a month ago of TransAdelaide. With the legislative reform of the Passenger Transport Act in the last session of this Parliament, we as a Government are now in a position to offer a faster, safer and more efficient public transport system in metropolitan Adelaide. Sadly, but again just another reflection of the past Government's mismanagement, over the past 11 years the old STA lost about 30 million passenger transport journeys and cost South Australian taxpayers over \$1.3 billion in operating subsidies. The launch of TransAdelaide as a competitive, efficient and customer based organisation and the creation of the Passenger Transport Board are the first visible signs of significant and long overdue change within the State's public transport system.

In the months to come, TransAdelaide will be tendering against private sector companies to retain control of services that it currently operates. Where TransAdelaide fails to be competitive, a particular service will be taken over by the private sector. Also, taxpayers will benefit through the competitive tendering of services, which is expected to effect savings of about \$34 million annually. I remind the House that the old STA's operating deficit last year was approximately \$134 million—a sad reflection, again, on the mismanagement of the previous Government. These savings will enable the delivery of more frequent services throughout Adelaide, innovations such as mini-buses and the operation of new forms of guards on our trains.

As part of this reform, it is reassuring to appreciate that, led by the knowledge that TransAdelaide will need to be competitive by 1 March 1995, already renewed confidence

and spirit is evident amongst staff throughout the new organisation. I can personally endorse that after travelling on TransAdelaide to Parliament House yesterday morning.

I refer now to the Audit Commission. Since the release of the Commission of Audit report in May and the Government's response with its financial statement setting out the broad financial parameters for each department for the coming State budget, I would say that the public's initial reaction and response, understandably, was one of apprehension. Some union responses have been unreasonably alarmist and intentionally targeted to be divisive.

With the country electorate being well served by all sections of the media, I was well aware of some of the unreasonable and misleading claims used in campaigns by the staff of unions such as SAIT after the release of the Audit Commission report and the financial statement. I presume that, when the Government delivers its forthcoming State budget, the public will further appreciate the degree of financial control and responsibility that will be required to progress this State into the future, so reducing the debt we have inherited. However, it is important that I report that, in light of the Commission of Audit report and the financial statement, I hold a firm conviction that out there, in the hearts and minds of our fellow residents of this State, there is a real understanding and appreciation that, as a State and as a community, we have to take stock, to make the hard decisions, to take the medicine and to work ahead positively with the challenges now before us.

We all know that this State's mismanagement by the past Government was out of control. As a State we have been living beyond our means, as indicated by the nearly \$350 million deficit in recurrent spending from last financial year. In other words, we have not been putting away for our future liabilities: we have been selling our assets to pay for the annual accounts and letting the infrastructure of this State run down.

I illustrate an example of this belief from my experiences with the local communities in the education area in my electorate over the past two months. In my electorate of Chaffey I have something like 22 Government schools, and during the winter recess I visited many of these in various forums ranging from school staff meetings, school council meetings and public meetings of school communities. Naturally, with the proposed \$40 million cuts in education over the next three to four years, there is concern about the effects and the impact that may result from the priorities to be determined. There are concerns with class sizes, curriculum choices, potential and possible school closures, potential problems with the school card, the issue of devolution, staff pressures and conditions, and the whole gamut of issues which affect the future of quality of education provision in South Australia.

However, through all of this concern and discussion, and while initially not wanting any cutbacks, I believe there has been an underlying and common thread of understanding and acceptance that for the medium and long term we will have to work together through the current cuts. What has even been more heartening and encouraging to me is that this pressure—and it is unfortunate that it has had to come to this—has extracted many positive suggestions from school communities on where and how savings can be made to reduce costs and improve efficiencies. The examples from here are wide ranging and will be reflected in the Government's formal response to the recommendations of the Commission of Audit.

At the other extreme it has been particularly disheartening to learn, for example in the utilities area, how it is often usual and standard practice in some school facilities to leave the lights on or leave the tap running just to maintain the current budget allocation. The public can be reassured, as I am pleased to note from Her Excellency's address, that the Government regards the improvement of the quality of our education not just as being vital to the State's longer term economic needs, but importantly to serve the real aspirations and opportunities for all young South Australians in this State. To this end I am delighted to note that the Government, in its first budget, will be honouring a key education commitment to allocate additional funding to a priority area, that is, the early years of education strategy. The Government also wants to improve learning outcomes for students in the early years of schooling. In addition, feedback to me from parents is that many people eagerly support and await the introduction of the skills test in literacy and numeracy which I am pleased to see will be commenced in 1995 for students in years three and five. Similarly, I have found parents very supportive of an improved disciplinary code which will be trialled in a number of schools in 1995.

I turn to the subject of rural industry. I would like to give special emphasis to the Government's role with the rural sector because of the importance of rural industries to our State, to the nature of my electorate, to my rural involvement and, importantly, to many members on the Government side of the House. Thankfully, the rains over the past few days have removed the immediate threat of drought to farmers in this State. Notwithstanding this, the Premier has been actively pursuing the urgent need for the Federal Government to reassess its criteria for determining an area's eligibility for special assistance. Pleasingly, the Premier reported to this House yesterday, following his representations to the Prime Minister on this subject last week, that the Prime Minister has made a commitment to give this requirement fair consideration.

Last year, as a rural Liberal candidate, I was pleased to be a member of the then Opposition's rural committee which formulated rural policy for the election and was thus able to contribute to a range of initiatives which were well received during the past election campaign. The first session of Parliament contained a significant number of legislative changes of direct benefit to the rural community. The most important of these were the election promises to provide, firstly, the exemption of stamp duties from inter-generational farm property transfers; secondly, the exemption of mortgage stamp duty for rural debt refinancing; thirdly, the exemption from stamp duty for registration of tractors and farm machinery; and, importantly, the young farmers scheme enabling young farmers under 30 to receive a generous interest rate subsidy to assist in the purchase or lease of land to enable them to enter primary industry.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: Unfortunately, I am a little over that age. Notwithstanding that, I have had a tremendous reception in my electorate and from around the whole of the rural areas of South Australia in the endorsement of and support for that scheme that has been introduced. In relation to this scheme it is important that I reiterate to the House the Premier's announcement last week that the Government had acted on concerns raised with it that the scheme was not made retrospective to the beginning of the year. With the support of the Minister for Primary Industries (Dale Baker) the Government has now decided to make the young farmers

scheme operative from the day this Liberal Government was elected: 11 December 1993. All young farmers who have purchased property between December and May I urge to again contact the Rural Finance and Development Division of the Department of Primary Industries for reassessment of their application.

The Government has provided funding for these initiatives despite the very serious financial situation it inherited. This includes the allocation of \$7 million over three years for the young farmers scheme and will forgo revenue worth millions of dollars on the exemptions of stamp duty. New agricultural and veterinary chemical legislation was introduced for the first time. A single national system for the registration and use of farm chemicals and increased scrutiny of agricultural chemicals prior to release was also introduced. New meat hygiene regulation has brought self-regulation into the meat processing industry so that quality assurance is now part of the processing industry resulting in greater efficiencies and a long term increased competitiveness with our trading neighbours. I can report that within my electorate alone the changes to the meat hygiene legislation have already brought about significant plans for increased investment at the local abattoir level. Local abattoir proprietors now have greater flexibility in self-regulation and have the ability to trade and make sales across council boundaries.

All these measures underlie the Government's commitment to the rural sector and its determination to give financial assistance to the family farm to help it remain viable. In response to this, the Government has developed a package of assistance measures in addition to the stamp duty policies I have indicated. There will be an increased level of funding from \$2000 to \$3000 to enable farmers to seek expert financial advice to develop property management plans incorporating Landcare initiatives. Three coordinators have been appointed under the South Australian Rural Industry Training Committee. Seminars are being arranged to inform farmers and their families of the current range of Government and non-Government service schemes and resources available to them. In addition, a rural book is being published to offer a directory of State services to the rural community.

Last week, in relation to the South Australian Farmers Federation's Polish wool processing enterprise, the Premier announced an 11 per cent interest rate subsidy which would be offered on commercial borrowings by the State Government of up to \$300 000 through the Department of Primary Industry's Rural Finance and Development Division to help get this venture off the ground. This subsidy will not only help the processing in Poland but will also assist the South Australian Farmers Federation's plans to develop markets in other eastern European countries which are now emerging as important buyers of our rural products.

Also, importantly, a complete review of the Department of Primary Industry's Rural Finance and Development Division is about to begin to ensure that the future focus of rural finance and development activities takes account of the results of the rural debt audit. I understand, of course, that the Government will continue to provide existing support to the rural sector under the rural adjustment scheme, which is jointly Commonwealth and State funded. Discussions are already in place for the future direction of the rural assistance scheme.

As just mentioned, members of this House will be aware that the Government instituted a farm debt audit, carried out earlier this year. Importantly, the Government was reassured to learn that the audit found that the gross South Australian

rural debt was viable when measured against the net rural income for the whole State. The audit did, however, highlight the serious rural debt problem confronting a significant number of primary producers in this State. It made clear that debt is the significant problem for some producers in some regions—four in particular: the Riverland, Kangaroo Island, the Murray Mallee and Eyre Peninsula. They have been particularly hard hit by a combination of low commodity prices, adverse seasonal conditions, a severe mouse plague and the high interest rate policies of the Federal Labor Government in the 1980s.

The audit looked only at the financial dimension of our State's farms and, as we are well aware, the human suffering in the bush is substantial. I personally await the formal report from the Social Development Committee's inquiry into rural poverty. The principle remains. The majority of these farmers have historically contributed significantly to the growth and development of our State and country. It has not been through their poor management that they find themselves in the position in which they are now. In fact, if it was not for the quality of their management and for their perseverance, they would have been long gone now and the State would have been much poorer for it. These people deserve support and assistance for their own sake and for the sake of the country.

In the time available today, I will specifically mention two rural industries: the citrus industry and the wine grape industry. They are both dear to my heart and palate, dear to my electorate and to the state of our State. South Australia's citrus industry is the largest of any in the Commonwealth and the largest exporter by far. Despite the industry being world competitive in terms of quality of product and efficiency of production, indeed at this very time, after nearly 20 years of attempting to penetrate the North American market, charter ships of our navel oranges are currently being unloaded on the East Coast of the United States of America, representing a doubling of exports there every year for the past three years.

As well as our regular exports to Asia and despite the fresh fruits success, the industry's stability and very viability is undermined by its nexus with cheap low cost of production imported concentrate. This, coupled with the progressive reduction in tariff assistance by the Federal Government, is having a disastrous effect on an industry reeling from the falling juice prices from more than \$150 a tonne to about \$50 a tonne for juice oranges at the farm gate.

The major issue currently under the spotlight is the Federal Government's involvement with the industry in the sales tax arena. The Federal Government is proposing to further penalise, discriminate against and disadvantage the citrus industry by almost doubling the tax from 11 per cent to 21 per cent on fruit juice drinks containing more than 25 per cent juice and, in addition, fresh orange juice already has a significant sales tax imposition. This fresh juice—juice not made from concentrate—should be exempt, not because it is now generally regarded as a basic food item but because tea, coffee and unflavoured milk are currently sales tax exempt. Orange juice is substantially disadvantaged and discriminated against in this area and costing the industry tens of millions of dollars a year.

I suspect, coming out of the Riverland and out of South Australia's citrus industry at the moment, is a collection in the order of \$20 million direct to the Federal Government that is otherwise not going back to the industry, or the pockets of producers or growers. The industry is serving as nothing more than a tax collector for the Federal Government. I particularly thank the Premier for his support on this issue

and his willingness last week to put these aspects to the Prime Minister, particularly for the abolition of tax on 100 per cent pure fresh orange juice.

I turn now to the wine industry. It could be fairly said that more has been written and said about the positive future of the wine industry in the past seven months than in the preceding seven years. It is not my intention today to reiterate all the facts and figures or to expand on the reasons for the current success and continuing potential: that is well documented and recorded and indeed I presented many such points to this House in the previous session of Parliament.

However, I remind the House that South Australia, as the leading wine producing and exporting State, has the most to gain of the many hundreds of millions of dollars of investment that must be further injected into this industry over the next few years. From my own general background in the industry and my direct involvement through my Chaffey electorate, producing around one-third of Australia's wine grapes (and quality ones at that, which members know I will continue to promote), and from representations made to me, I flag some areas on which I have been working with the relevant Ministers.

Most importantly, I advise the House of both recent action and the proposed direction by the Government with respect to the following three aspects relevant to the future expansion and growth of the wine industry. I acknowledge from the outset Government action in relation to reducing power costs, port restructuring, WorkCover and industrial relations legislation, which are all having a positive impact on the influence and growth of the industry. However, at vineyard development level I want to instance three areas of importance. First, I refer to the availability of irrigation water, particularly relevant to my electorate, where the greatest potential for expansion exists.

I was pleased to contribute to the outcome of the new Irrigation Act passed in the previous session of Parliament. This Act will in a number of ways facilitate further irrigation development, in particular by providing the framework for which all water allocated for irrigation in South Australia is to be used for primary production. It will increase the ability and opportunity for the transport of irrigation water between irrigation districts and between individual irrigators. It will allow the exclusion of land from irrigation supply systems where the land is not suitable for primary production or is likely to create drainage problems. Such measures will also directly encourage the most productive and efficient managers to be the responsible irrigators. In addition, irrigators in Government irrigation areas will have the mechanism available to take control by self-management of their own districts. These procedures will allow for unused water allocations to be released for increased production within existing irrigation area boundaries using existing infrastructure and for the development of new areas. I could go on.

Over and above these measures I note from Her Excellency's speech, and consistent with our pre-election commitment, that the Government is proceeding as quickly as possible with a South Australian water plan as an audit and policy framework for the most efficient use and maintenance of the State's water resources. The issue of potential interstate water transfer must be further pursued. The second aspect of possible constraint is that of land availability in the broader sense. This may seem unlikely to some but is intrinsically related to soil types and the availability of irrigation infrastructure. The current rigid control of the Native Vegetation Act may be over restrictive in some cases. Some weeks ago

I was surprised and concerned to be made aware of a rejection for clearance for vineyard expansion of land previously cleared and land adjoining a current irrigation area ready to be serviced from the existing infrastructure.

I also found it interesting that, under the Act, currently there is no mechanism for appeal. While I am a conservationist at heart and would naturally be very concerned at the threat to endangered species, I believe that, in certain circumstances, a more pragmatic approach may need to be taken.

I am particularly pleased to note, from her Excellency's speech, that after thorough consultation amendments will be considered to the Native Vegetation Act. Another aspect, though often less apparent, which can impinge indirectly on the current availability of land for both vineyard and winery expansion is the sometimes inflexible and slow process that is required for planning changes and approval. I am aware of specific situations where current land use, under existing supplementary development plans, may need to be changed, for example, from general agriculture to horticulture or to provide for a winery expansion. Invariably both situations involve specific subdivision requirements which may be at variance with existing supplementary development plans or historic SDPs.

Although a new Development Act was proclaimed in January this year, I believe that local planning authorities are still retarded as to the efficiency they can deliver in attempting to encourage greater and easier investment into their local areas. I am conscious that the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations is currently seeking public submissions on the Development Act as part of an overhaul of the Act and its regulations.

Undoubtedly the South Australian development assessment system must be made clearer and more efficient. Better mechanisms must be provided for planning authorities to streamline changes to their SDPs. Consultation with the public, interested groups and other Government agencies must continue. Obstructionist minorities and over-cautious and controlling bureaucracies cannot be permitted to retard valuable and required investment development. I welcome the Minister's proposal for the overhaul of the development legislation and urge all interested parties to make specific submissions.

The final brief reference I want to make to the potential limitations on maximising the State's return from the wine industry is the threat of phylloxera. Phylloxera is a vine aphid pest which has the potential to devastate the future productive health of any grapevine it attacks. Currently it does not exist in South Australia. Phylloxera is a soil-borne pest and, as such, its introduction into South Australia from infected areas interstate is only likely via new propagating material. However, with the demand for new wine grape propagating material currently outstripping supply, the threat of possible introduction has never been greater. This threat has been exacerbated by the fact that, in late 1993, the prohibition on the movement of rooted grapevines into South Australia from a proclaimed phylloxera-free area was challenged with respect to consistency with section 92 of the Australian Constitution (in relation to free trade between States).

Not surprisingly, I have received various representations of concern from the industry. I am aware that the Minister for Primary Industries recently reported on a white paper on the review of the Phylloxera Board and Act, and it will form the basis of drafting amendments to the phylloxera legislation. I will not go into those specific recommendations today.

Conditions for the movement of grape material into South Australia are currently provided in the Plant Quarantine Standard of the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1992. The Chief Inspector, under that Act, is responsible for the standard and implementation of policies of the Phylloxera Board and interstate quarantine.

I also support the possible progression for a uniform protocol, for the movement of grape propagating material between South Australia and the proclaimed phylloxera-free areas of Victoria and New South Wales, to be adopted by the three States. This should also include the movement of vineyard machinery between States. With the Murray River passing through my electorate and being the lifeblood not just of the Riverland but our State as a whole, it would be remiss of me, in speaking to the Address in Reply, not to make brief mention of the Murray River being a natural resource never to be undervalued or taken for granted.

Unfortunately, the impact of severe and sustained drought in the north of the Murray Darling Basin, reducing the Darling effectively to a no-flow river at this time, is exacerbating the current threat with respect to blue green algal bloom. I congratulate the Premier and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources on the initiatives and progress they have achieved in this area since the Parliament last sat. Late in May the Premier took South Australia to the lead in the campaign against toxic blue green algae with the announcement of a national blue green algae action plan. This emphasised that the algae was a national problem that was having a disastrous impact on the economy in terms of water quality and the consequences for agriculture and the environment.

As South Australia is particularly vulnerable to toxic bloom outbreaks from upstream pollution, it is vital that all States work cooperatively to solve the problem. More recently, at the end of June, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, at a meeting of the Murray Darling Basin Ministerial Council, was able to achieve consensus on the thrust of this action plan. It will build on the work already undertaken by the Murray Darling Basin Commission, and it specifically calls for greater emphasis into blue green algae research. It also highlights the vital importance of achieving sustainable flow regimes and flow management. This Government's case for the restoration of the Murray Darling system by the year 2001, as a centenary of federation project, deserves bipartisan and maximum public support. I turn to the single most pressing priority for my electorate of Chaffey—the need for a bridge over the Murray River near Berri.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr ANDREW: I thank members for their endorsement of support in that acknowledgment. I remind members that the saga of this proposed bridge is a long and political one, and it will continue to be one of my greatest single priorities for the Riverland region.

Mr Ashenden: The Tonkin Government actually approved it.

Mr ANDREW: Certainly the Tonkin Government did approve it, but it was scuttled by the Bannon Government when it was elected at the end of 1982. Members may recall that last session I placed a private members' motion on the Notice Paper, calling for support for our State Minister for Transport in her endeavours to seek a position, time scale and financial commitment from the Federal Government on a Berri bridge as part of the Sturt Highway upgrade to national highway status. Unfortunately, time did not permit this motion to be formally presented and debated, and conse-

quently it is now somewhat outdated. What is more unfortunate is that since then it has become apparent that the Federal Government now or in the near future is not prepared to foreshadow any financial priority for a new bridge as part of the Sturt Highway upgrade.

In parallel with this objective, I was pleased earlier this year to organise and support a deputation to the State Minister for Transport (Hon. Di Laidlaw), from the district councils of Berri and Loxton, to put the option of building a commuter bridge between Berri and Loxton. This option was put on the basis that the community would accept a commuter bridge to replace the existing two large ferries at Berri, using the existing causeway to the south of the ferries and so accepting the possibility that a one-in-20 year flood may put the causeway out of action. Such a proposition provides the option of reducing significantly the total cost of bridge works and is an effective alternative to the current ferry operations at Berri.

Consequently, Minister Laidlaw invited the respective councils to prepare a detailed submission. I commend and support the determination, initiative and unity which has developed in the Riverland community in the past few months in response to this invitation and offer. The district councils of Berri and Loxton, together with the Riverland Development Corporation, tendered for consultants to carry out an independent study into the need for and economic viability of a bridge at Berri. Together they have invested many thousands of dollars in this study. The successful tenderer was the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, which has been conducting its studies and assessment recently and expects to bring down a report in the next two or three weeks. I eagerly look forward to this independent assessment and, in anticipation of some positive outcomes, look forward to assisting the Riverland community in moving into the next stage towards achieving this bridge. Before concluding on this subject, I want to briefly update the Parliament on the current status of the river crossing at Berri.

In recent months, I personally have spent some time at the riverfront observing the growing queues of vehicles, the frustration in lost time and increased business costs, and the traffic problems in the streets of Berri as the waiting times at peak periods continue to grow at this crossing. With the recent restructuring of Government departments and, more particularly, with the recent restructuring of the Riverland Fruit Cooperatives creating a two-way movement of citrus between Loxton and Berri, and the continuing growth in horticultural development, traffic volume across the river is continuing to increase. Apart from peak times, it has now reached a stage where a 20 minute wait may be possible at almost any time of the day.

Currently there is public pressure to install a third ferry to cope with current and future traffic volumes until a bridge can be built. Indeed, when I recently organised the itinerary for the Premier when he visited the Chaffey electorate towards the end of May, I recognised the need to use his time in the Riverland effectively and I made sure that, when we crossed on the ferry, it was not at the peak time. However, despite not having to wait for 45 minutes at a peak crossing time, the people of the Riverland can be assured that the Premier fully appreciates the current need and public feeling on this issue. I will continue to give this project my utmost commitment and support.

In 1994, being the centenary year of women's suffrage in South Australia, it has been appropriate that a South Australian woman was recently named ABC Radio's Rural

Woman of the Year. I specifically congratulate Deborah Thiele from Loxton on winning the award last month against six other finalists. I commend her, and I also commend the other finalists, namely, Sharon Bell from Dulkaninna Station, Sue Holt from Eden Valley and Chris Oldfield from Greenways. I commend these women on their willingness to enter not just for the award but, in so doing, for having, by their example, represented and assisted to highlight the ever-increasing and often under recognised role of our rural women. I wish Deborah well in her continuing aim of lifting the profile of rural women.

In conclusion, I have attempted to touch on a few of the major issues which have a common thread for the whole State and to my electorate. At the same time, I have attempted to reflect and project on some of the Government's actions and plans for the future growth and prosperity of our State under this Liberal Government. In the seven months since being elected, this Government has jumped across the gaping chasm that was left as a growing legacy from the previous Government. There are more bridges to be built. However, this Government has designed, is building and is smartly travelling along a new highway of development and prosperity for this State. There are still some rugged hills to cut through; there are still some well known snipers out there who have their own agendas; and there are a few who do not want to see this new highway progress. However, I believe the vast majority of South Australians are on board and, with the Brown Government's leadership, will cooperatively work together to make this State great again. I have much pleasure in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It gives me great pleasure to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I would like to acknowledge the work of Her Excellency in the support that she has given to celebrating the centenary of women's suffrage, as well as to the celebration of the International Year of the Family. The South Australian economy bears many similarities to the patient who had a persistent problem and who needed surgery but who avoided it by putting it off until there was no alternative. Once the surgery took place, there was post-operative trauma. But, after a while, the patient wondered why they waited so long. So, too, the State's economy has been sick. For 11 years under the previous Labor Government report after report was made on which the previous Government failed to act, the most notable of which was the Arthur D. Little Report. That report was commissioned, but the previous Government failed to implement the necessary measures to restructure the economy.

On 11 December 1993, members of the public had had enough and made their decision. They entrusted the Dean Brown Government team to act. Like any other business, the incoming Government had to take stock of the state of the economy. The independent Commission of Audit was the starting point. The prognosis was not good but action was needed, and that is what has been happening—action. There is no doubt that in some cases the transition will be difficult, as it was for the patient who waited a long time for medical treatment. But change is necessary, and this Government has shown that it has the will and also the compassion to nurture the State through the transitional process.

We will no doubt be judged on implementing change, but we will be implementing it with care and sensitivity. My contact with the public at functions, schools, school councils, shopping centres and consultation with my electorate, from Campbelltown to Erindale/Wattle Park, has indicated that people are ready for change. Members opposite need not peddle fear, gloom and doom: members of the public know that change is needed. They no longer want immediate gratification. They want to be part of a plan, a plan which will provide a future with long-term employment for themselves and their children. They want a vibrant State and a Government with a vision and vitality, a responsible Government that is not afraid to act in the interests of the whole community and the State, and to promote economic development.

In the short time that we have been in Government, progress has been made. The past cannot be corrected overnight. Dean Brown and his team are determined that, with the support of all South Australians in both the public and private sectors, we will succeed. We are providing leadership by creating incentives which did not exist under the previous Government's administration. Economic development is taking place. There is a huge difference between growth and development. Key development indicators, which will be a base to launch growth, are evident, and they include Motorola, Mitsubishi, the Warrina tourist development, and developments in information technology, an area in which we can compete successfully not only in Australia but throughout the world. There has been an increase of 7 200 full-time jobs since January. I can hear members opposite asking, 'Well, what about the jobs that have been lost?' But they use statistics like a drunk uses a lamp post—not for elimination but for support.

Any first year economics student will tell you that, as business confidence improves, there is a greater participation rate in the work force, particularly those who gave up looking for employment under the previous Government. Those who are now actively seeking employment provide the increase in numbers of the total unemployment rate and make the South Australian situation look worse than it is. That camouflages real development. In fact, the Federal colleagues of members opposite understand too well the increase in the participation rate, for they use it to justify the national unemployment rate. The key factor is not whether there is a slight increase in economic growth but whether there is a change towards development, and not the glasshouse initiatives which overstate growth for the sake of statistics and which have been so characteristic of the Federal Government and the previous State Government.

The public sector is being reformed. Contrary to those who criticise the current reforms, the public sector has been sadly in need of reform for the past decade. Critics should not concentrate on the present Government's action but on the Government which failed to act and to initiate reforms which would have made it viable for the 1990s. The public sector has been ailing for a very long time, and the process of rebuilding the State's economy is vital. ETSA is continuing to streamline its operations to ensure South Australia has a sustainable and viable electricity industry, with a competitive national electricity grid due to begin operating in 1995.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department will also become more efficient as the reforms initiated by this Government take effect. The new Department of Building Management will focus on asset management as a core function, with the separation of policy and advice for the provision of services. The appointment of an asset manage-

ment task force and a panel of public and private sector specialists will ensure that community assets are not under sold and that proceeds benefit the people of South Australia and reduce the crippling State debt which was brought about by the incompetence of the previous Government.

Progress has been made in education. I know only too well some of the concerns expressed by teachers and parents about the directions of education in this State. As a practising teacher until December 1993 and as a father of three children, I am aware that some issues have needed examination and review for the past decade. Morale has been low for many years—well before the Liberal Government came to office. The changes that are now occurring will once again invigorate the profession. Education will be focused back into the classroom. Priorities will be set and South Australia will be the envy of educational institutions outside the State.

A new fair discipline policy is being finalised and guidelines are being formulated incorporating fair discipline codes and contracts, including changes that will give principals greater powers to deal with the students. The Government's early years of education strategy will provide a commitment to improving the learning outcomes for students in the early years of schooling and additional resources will be allocated. We will not wait to see them fail when it is too late.

South Australia's adaptation of the nationally developed statements and profiles will provide the curriculum framework for students in compulsory schooling. The focus of the curriculum directorate will be changed to place greater emphasis on producing quality support materials for classroom teachers in key learning areas. Basic skills tests in aspects of literacy and numeracy will commence for students in years 3 and 5 in 1995.

Let us not kid ourselves: the scrambling for positions, teachers pulling against each other and the over-burdening of non-teaching related activities on staff has not made for a healthy education environment. Teachers to whom I have spoken, although concerned, are only too aware of the need for change and are prepared to change. We are doing only what members opposite failed to do—to act—to the detriment of our children.

There has also been considerable progress in further education and training. The Government is seeking to optimise funding, employment and training opportunities arising from the Federal Government's recent white paper. It will liaise closely with local government to ensure a State-wide approach to obtaining maximum benefit from negotiations with the Commonwealth. The administration of contracts, training, course accreditation and recognition of private training providers is being streamlined. Development of links between TAFE and other education sectors is continuing, with the latest moves involving further cross credit arrangements with upper secondary schools and better relationships between TAFE and university. Education is a life-long process to which we are committed. The Department of TAFE will offer new employment initiatives, including the employment broker scheme, the group training scheme and the greening urban South Australia scheme.

Significant progress has also been made in the health arena. The Government is continuing to emphasise enhanced service delivery, efficiency and productivity with the introduction of casemix funding. There are now bonus funding pools for hospitals to undertake more elective surgery over and above that performed in 1993. This will significantly reduce hospital waiting lists for all South Australians.

The Government is responding to the needs of older patients following the introduction of these policies in public hospitals. The changes are succeeding in providing for improvements in health and community services, especially for older people. As outlined in Her Excellency's speech yesterday, screening clinics will be made available for women in both metropolitan and country areas.

The primary sector will continue to play a key role in the recovery of our State, and reforms will ensure that this takes place. Eligibility for the Young Farmer Incentive Scheme has been extended. The Government stamp duty relief policy for intergenerational transfer of farms and for rolling over rural debt is in place. This has already assisted many family farms and kept them viable as they recover from the rural recession.

The Government has given financial support to the marketing initiatives of the South Australian Farmers Federation. In excess of 250 landcare groups have been formed in rural communities and city-based groups are now working on the Adelaide Hills catchment area. The Department of Primary Industries is continuing to support sustainable production of cereal and other crops with a variety of programs, including crop rotation and the nitrogen 600 system, which are both aimed at improving the quality of our cereals.

There have already been significant developments in the aquaculture industry, in particular, in the tuna farming and oyster industries. Good progress has been made on the clean waters program and the shellfish quality assurance program, which are essential in establishing South Australia as an exporter of high quality oysters.

The progress is significant. Keeping families together should be a priority of all Governments, and it is certainly a priority of this Government. This Government is not only committed but has already set up reforms in the International Year of the Family. The Department of Family and Community Services is maintaining its commitment to intervention that is focused on keeping families intact and children out of departmental care. The keeping families together program, a major initiative undertaken in partnership with the private sector, is to be extended and commended. Members opposite say that we are not active. This program is allowing more sustainable intervention to occur when families are in crisis. It will also operate in the rural area, where the recession has taken its toll on families.

The Government must be commended for establishing the Office of the Family. The office will provide advice on the needs of families and the types of programs and services that will be most useful in promoting family life in South Australia. Initiatives such as the 24-hour free domestic violence phone service and the Domestic Violence Zero Tolerance Campaign will also give added support to families in crisis.

South Australia is an ageing society. The Government sees the need to cater for our elderly citizens. I look forward to the release of the health of older persons policy, which will occur this month and which will promote public debate about health services planning for the aged. It will assist in the delivery of health services to improve the health and well-being of our older people and work towards creating a greater independence for them. We have seen the establishment of the Seniors' Information Service, and the new seniors' card directory includes an additional 50 businesses. These moves are of benefit to business, the community and the aged. This is another example of the cooperative projects which have

been initiated by this Government and which benefit the community.

In relation to consumer affairs, the Government is committed to regulatory reform that ensures that the State maintains a regulatory system that includes the introduction of Bills designed to streamline the regulation of real estate. It should provide benefits to the consumer and quite clear parameters for the industry.

This is the centenary year of women's suffrage and the Government has continued to support its celebration. The establishment of the South Australian Women's Advisory Council is an example of that support: it strengthens the Government's commitment to women's policy issues. The council will focus on four main areas: women and representation; women and the economy; women and violence; and women in regional and rural areas. It is a comprehensive way to ensure that women have greater representation in all spheres of public life. Celebrations of the centenary of women's suffrage are continuing across South Australia, with widespread involvement by the public, the private sector and individuals.

In the emergency services and correctional services areas, changes are also taking place which again illustrate the capacity of this Government to find creative solutions. The resiting of fire stations to provide improved response times and the upgrading of facilities are in the final stage of implementation in the metropolitan area. Planning continues on the redevelopment program for selected country stations.

The establishment of partnerships with the private sector will allow the establishment of industry in our prisons, thereby assisting to generate meaningful work and rehabilitation opportunities for prisoners. The launch of Task Force Pendulum on 28 July 1994 and the joint operation between a police task force of 90 hand picked officers and Neighbourhood Watch groups is targeting the high crime rate resulting from years of neglect. The new ambulance board is working towards a further fee reduction in 1995-96 following the first phase of fee reductions announced for 1994-95. The Government is committed to protecting the existence of CFS volunteers, a priority which values the Australian tradition of volunteering.

In the environmental area, economic development unlike economic growth must take into account the effect of growth on the environment. The Government knows too well that, unless environmental factors are taken into account, in the long term costs can outstrip short-term benefits. There must be clear parameters. Developers must know where they can develop and where they cannot. Developers and environmentalists need not be poles apart, as has been the experience in the past. There are jobs in ecotourism and there are savings in promoting environmentally conscious production methods. It is a matter of pulling together in a holistic way that makes sense to all and promotes cooperation not confrontation.

The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, Hon. David Wotton, must be congratulated on his commitment to reducing energy costs. His belief that the relationship between energy and the environment will grow stronger not weaker and in the need for mutual reinforcement between the two policy sectors with the aim of reducing the impact of energy use and achieving an ecologically sustainable future is to be commended.

Nothing is possible without a focus, without a vision and without a commitment. This Government has a vision to promote the well-being of all South Australians. The time has come to stop tinkering around the edge as has happened for

the past 11 years. We are setting in place real reforms which will provide a solid future for our children and grandchildren. As an Australian with a migrant background, one who came to Australia to seek a future that offered better opportunities, I am grateful for what I have achieved, as have many other Australians with an ethnic background.

But what does the future hold for our children? Are we to start the migration process again? Australia and South Australia with all they have to offer must provide our children with opportunities within the State and not with passports to leave the State and the country. We must create a competitive edge, and the promotion of export is the answer. This must be a top priority for any Government, and I know that it is a top priority for the Dean Brown Government. I am honoured to be part of this team and the process of change, a change for the better not just in the short term but in the long term—our future.

We are a diverse people. We must utilise this diversity. This Government has led Australia in providing a platform for ethnic chambers of commerce to launch export programs which will provide benefits for all South Australians. We must aim to be the Switzerland of the south. South Australia is not unlike Switzerland in its population diversity and assets. Switzerland has Italian, German, French and Romanesque people. Its religious diversity and tolerance is exemplary. It has not involved itself in wars; it has one of the highest standards of living in the world; and it has a population of just under 7 million. Switzerland has been known for its excellence in medicine, education, banking and finance, and niche markets.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Well, the clock has been ticking for 11 years. We, too, have a tradition and reputation for excellence in these areas. We have been pioneers in medical technology: the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Cranio Facial Unit are just a few examples. As some of the following newspaper headlines illustrate—and I have the whole package here—the similarities between our two multicultural countries are there, as follows:

‘South Australia underselling high technology’—South Australia is underselling the State’s thriving high-technology industry, according to the Managing Director of Adelaide based British Aerospace Australia.

‘SA to stay top wine producer’—South Australia will continue to dominate the national wine industry with 65 to 70 per cent of the anticipated growth.

‘IVF’—Women around the world are being helped to conceive children using vitro-fertilisation techniques invented and perfected in Australia, many of them at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

‘South Australia can become technology town.’

‘SA has high-tech future.’

‘Robots with sense of smell "world first".’

‘National trial for unique SA-made system.’

‘Local scientists in radar coup’—A sophisticated defence radar system which cost the United States military \$280 million to produce is being made locally for just \$1.5 million.

‘SA may export farm technology to China.’

‘Surgical first developed in SA.’

And in sport:

‘SA inventor scores world tennis coup.’

The list goes on. Our universities are renowned throughout the world. I recently undertook a tour of The Levels campus of the University of South Australia. As I am a member of that university’s council, I am more familiar with developments in that university, such as the success of its offshore education programs and its links with industry and other educational institutions. Unlike in some overseas countries,

in keeping with Australian tradition all these developments are part of our equal opportunity policies and provide access for all Australians.

We must have as our goal the export of products and services produced by our brains and not the physical departure of our brains from this country. We must provide opportunities for our creative talents to realise their potential in the State of South Australia. We must also aim to export more processed primary products as well as primary resources. We must export our technology: for example, we must try to make the most of space technology by providing satellite services for our region. All this is possible if we plan and work together.

South Australia under Sir Thomas Playford’s Government was transformed from a rural to a manufacturing economy. I look forward to seeing South Australia being transformed from a static economy to an out-looking State, one that can be an equal participant in information technology with an economy of the future. We have to have a dream. If we dream alone, it remains a dream; if we dream together, it is no longer a dream; if we share that dream with others, it is progress. A former Premier, Don Dunstan, wanted to make Adelaide the Athens of the south. What he failed to realise was that Athens developed its art and culture and, for that matter, its democracy only when it had developed a vibrant economy based on commerce and trade. It is the same story for Florence and Venice and any other national or city-state that has succeeded in providing benefits for humanity. In the 1990s we must aim to make Australia the Switzerland of the south and South Australia its capital.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This morning I had the pleasure of attending the Australian Small Business Association’s breakfast addressed by the Chief Executive Officer of the Economic Development Authority, John Cambridge. There is absolutely no doubt that small business offers the greatest and fastest chance to generate jobs and wealth in this State, yet too often the importance of small business to our economy is overlooked by Government in the hot pursuit of getting alongside the big end of town. This does not make sense, because the majority of jobs in South Australia is in the small business area. Small business faces special problems as well as opportunities. In every report that I have seen about the future of small business the centre of concern has been on access to finance. We have a risk-averse financial sector and there is no doubt that banks must be better educated about the needs of small business.

Access to capital remains, in my view—and, obviously, in the view of John Cambridge—the principal obstacle to small business progress in this State. This is an area that needs to be addressed by the Economic Development Authority as a matter of priority, particularly in light of the Brown Government’s decision to sell off enterprise investments and to remove the State Government totally from the venture capital market. As Minister of Business and Regional Development in the former Government, I proposed the expansion of enterprise investments through private sector involvement to ensure that South Australian small business had access to a slice of the growing venture capital market in Australia. I have been concerned since the change of Government about what appears to be a significant feature of the Brown Government to ignore the needs of small business in preference for an alliance with big business.

We saw that demonstrated most clearly in the breaking of the categorical promise to small business about shopping hours. I am also most concerned at rumours that the Small Business Corporation may lose its independence and be absorbed into the bigger EDA or merged with the Centre for Manufacturing. There is a different culture that affects small business, and it would be foolhardy for any politician or policy maker just to assume that a small business is simply a smaller version of a big business. Small businesses have different problems as well as being flexible enough to have different opportunities. That is why it is vitally important that the axe does not fall on the Small Business Corporation. It has achieved a high level of acceptance and service since the Bannon Government established it soon after being elected. That followed an investigation by Jack Wright and me of small business advisory services around Australia and after talking with many people involved in small business.

In the 1992-93 financial year alone, more than 38 000 small business people were assisted by the Small Business Corporation, and I understand that this year there has been a 20 per cent lift in demand for its services. According to a survey of client responses, the corporation was rated as being 85 per cent to 98 per cent effective in the advice and assistance it gave. I believe that much of the corporation's success can be traced to the fact that it has an independent board, made up of people experienced in small business, led by Chairperson Fij Miller. The corporation has been perceived over the years as being user friendly and client focused, rather than being just another branch of the bureaucracy, and this has been of critical importance to its success. The same is true of our Centre for Manufacturing. The \$15 million manufacturing modernisation program has been extremely well received by small and medium sized manufacturing enterprises around the State.

The centre has assisted some 1 400 companies, many of them small and medium sized agencies. It is not a collection of bureaucrats telling private enterprise what to do, and that is why it has been so successful and will continue to be successful. Essentially, the Centre for Manufacturing ensures that high levels of expertise from the private sector itself are made available through consultancies to assist manufacturing companies in South Australia to be competitive and up with the best in terms of export. But it is vitally important that we keep updating the services of both the Small Business Corporation and the Centre for Manufacturing. That is what we tried to do in Government.

Last year as Minister responsible for small business I launched the Business Licence Information Centre to assist small business to cut through the red tape that afflicts enterprises that are buried under a sea of forms and paper. In its first few months of service, thousands of inquiries have been made through our Business Licence Information Centre. I was also pleased to be able to announce the elimination of a swag of regulations that in my view had become redundant. The task must continue apace and should be driven by the private sector, not by bureaucrats. Our highly successful Business Asia conference late last year set in train millions of dollars of export business and convinced many South Australian small businesses that export to Asia was not only desirable but achievable.

We must break the vicious circle of low self-esteem that convinces so many small businesses in South Australia that they do not have the expertise to export. That is why we introduced two export assistance programs, which were aimed at the very smallest of businesses to ensure that,

together with the Commonwealth Labor Government's assistance through Austrade, no South Australian business would be prevented from getting into export because it was too hard or because the business was too small. We also undertook a major study into maximising opportunities for import replacement, particularly for small business. I look forward to the report of the study and the increased opportunities it will identify for small businesses.

But enough of the past. We are now in Opposition, and it is vitally important that Labor continues to have a close association with small business. It is important for small business itself to help us develop policies to ensure that we are informed when we vote on issues affecting small business in both the Lower House and the Upper House, where the Brown Government does not have a majority. At recent forums I have told small businesses that I am keen to meet with them, not only to hear their concerns but also to hear their positive ideas for policy and opportunities. I strongly believe that an Opposition must be more than a negative, carping force that always lines up against every Government initiative, good or bad. We saw that from the Liberals in this State for many years.

That does not mean that I intend to be a doormat for the Government. We will oppose when we need to, when we feel it is right. But we will also be patriots, putting our State's interests before Party concerns. That is why I offered my support to John Olsen and the Government in lobbying my Federal Labor colleagues to support South Australia's bid to win an important share of the \$1 billion Orion project for the RAAF. Both Government and Opposition worked in tandem on behalf of the State, and that is the way it should be. That is why we recently offered our support to the State Government in lobbying the Federal Government in support of the bid to revive Woomera and its base for a revitalised Australian space industry with its heart in our State. We will continue to support South Australia, but we will also continue to insist that promises made to small business before the election are honoured.

I am seriously concerned, as I mentioned before, about the future of the Small Business Corporation. I am also concerned about the extraordinary back flips from the Liberals' clear commitment to small business on shopping hours. Shopping hours is an area where the Brown Government is floundering. Members opposite found it all too easy in Opposition to come up with press releases and announcements designed to win the massive small business vote but, once they won Government, they immediately began to back away from their pre-election promises. That is because the Liberals in Opposition also made categorical promises to the large shopping chains.

The Government made clear commitments through the Minister for Industrial Affairs to two groups that were and are diametrically opposed, and now it wonders why it is in a fix. Now it wonders why it has to spend so much time debating in its Party room about what to do on shopping hours. It promised both sides of the argument that it would fix the problems and never the twain shall meet. Now it wonders why it is in a fix. The Minister is now faced with a report, written by people of his choosing, recommending the complete deregulation of shopping hours. The search for a compromise goes on. Let us not kid ourselves. Sunday trading in the city will also damage many small businesses and alienate the large chains with their big shopping malls in the suburbs. Total deregulation would spell disaster for thousands of small businesses by removing totally their major

area of competitive advantage. The ALP will fight this move all the way and will continue to work closely with all sectors, particularly small business, to achieve a consensus position which is in the best interests of all South Australians.

There are other initiatives I am keen to propose: one is concerned with improving the relationship and understanding between business and Parliamentarians. I am most impressed with the scheme in New Zealand that encourages members of Parliament to spend time in industry and business in order to have a better understanding of business problems and opportunities. In New Zealand, a Business and Parliament Trust was established several years ago to encourage better links between all members of Parliament and the private sector. The trust was established with a board comprised of six members of Parliament and seven representatives from supporting companies. During the past two years, 22 New Zealand MPs have gone out into companies. Each MP spends between five and 10 days during the course of a year attached to a company which is a member of the trust.

The responses from both MPs and the companies concerned has been overwhelmingly positive. Last year, New Zealand MPs spent time in a range of enterprises including well-known business names Comalco, Air New Zealand and Brierey Investments. I am told that these visits have helped give members of Parliament a bird's eye view of business objectives and strategies for achieving those objectives from the shop floor to the boardroom. The visits also help improve MPs' understanding of how Government economic and financial strategies, legislation and regulations affect business. I am informed that the visits also show how a professionally managed enterprise tackles planning, budgeting, investment, overseas training, training issues and other decision making activities. During the visits, MPs see first hand how decisions are reached. MPs also have the opportunity to talk with management and employees about industrial relations issues.

However, the scheme is not a one way exercise. The Business and Parliament Trust in New Zealand is also keen to improve the business world's understanding of Parliament. Intensive one day seminars are arranged at Parliament House in Wellington to enable business participants to hear from members of Parliament, including Government Ministers and Opposition representatives, about how the system works. The object is to provide business people with an insight into the practical world of Parliament, the effectiveness and limitations of committees, the processes involved with legislation as well as a better appreciation of the work load, constraints and problems faced by MPs. Again, there has been strong, positive feedback from business participants involved in these seminars.

Similar voluntary schemes are currently operating in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States. In each nation the schemes have strong bipartisan support and involvement. In each nation they have the strong support of the business community. I believe it would be most worthwhile for a national business and Parliament scheme to be established in Australia involving Federal and State members of Parliament. I am sure it would be of great benefit for our State and nation to encourage MPs from all Parties to spend some quality time seeing how modern business and industry works from the inside. In New Zealand, MPs have tended to spend time in larger enterprises. I think it is vitally important for small business to be involved in any similar program established in Australia.

For such a scheme to be successful it must have the backing of all political Parties as well as the strong support of business. I have written to the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, the Federal Small Business Minister, Chris Schacht, the South Australian Industry Minister, John Olsen, the President of the Business Council of Australia, John Ralph, and to Lindsay Thompson of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce seeking their support for this proposal. Of course, there are other initiatives that should be pursued. Indeed, if this scheme is established and is successful we should look at similar schemes to encourage involvement and dialogue between members of Parliament and the voluntary and welfare sectors and of unions.

There are other issues that I want to pursue today. I think it is very important that a comprehensive audit of South Australian industry competitiveness be carried out as a matter of urgency. A detailed audit would provide an invaluable snapshot of how local institutions shape up against global competition. It would help provide the tools for the State Government, and most importantly industry itself, to better understand the opportunities and overcome the problems associated with becoming globally competitive. We must continue to move from a 'hand out' to a 'hand up' culture in dealing with industry. Industry assistance must not be determined by the squeaky wheel syndrome where those who scream loudest are propped up. That approach reinforces both dependence and inefficiency. There is no doubt that we need to benchmark our industries across the board before we can move forward to improve competitiveness. That way we can assist industry in a strategic, coordinated way rather than using an *ad hoc* approach.

I recently visited the United Kingdom where the British Government has just completed an audit of manufacturing competitiveness. It has provided this industry with an invaluable picture of how British manufacturing companies, small and large, shape up against their competitors. The British Government has now prepared a white paper from Minister Heseltine with new initiatives to increase industry productivity. I am not talking about another broad based or theoretical study, as important as it was, like the Arthur D. Little report. I am talking about an assessment of the specific attributes and needs of our business sector in individual enterprises compared with its competitors overseas.

The world is changing rapidly, bringing new opportunities but also, of course, new competitors. Barriers to trade are falling and capital is being transferred increasingly to where returns are greatest. That is why last year, as Minister of Business and Regional Development, I introduced enterprise zones giving companies a 10 year exemption from State taxes in order to kick start investment and jobs growth. One of those zones was at Technology Park and another at Science Park. I am disappointed that the Liberal Government has abandoned enterprise zones, which have worked so well overseas. Indeed, I was briefed on the success of a number of enterprise zones in Britain during my recent visit.

Competitiveness is the key. Improved living standards will depend on our ability to raise productivity and adapt our skills, the way we work and our goods and services to new circumstances. Ultimately our quality of life will depend on competitiveness. There are no short cuts to improving competitiveness. Through South Australia's outstanding Centre for Manufacturing a great deal of assistance has been given to help make companies in key industries internationally competitive by adopting world's best practice. Many hundreds of South Australian companies have been assisted

through our manufacturing modernisation program backed very strongly by two former Premiers in this State. We need to continue and expand this approach if we are to develop further our high-tech, high value added industries. Again, I stress that I am keen to assist the Government, as are all of my colleagues, in pursuing major projects from our Federal Labor colleagues.

There is a range of defence projects currently up for grabs. In talking about large projects, I am not forgetting small business. A number of us were part of the team that worked on winning the giant submarine project for South Australia. The present Leader of the Opposition was a key part of that team, and so was I. When one thinks of this \$5 billion project, one thinks of big ticket companies and large-scale industry. In fact, there are scores of small business contractors and enterprises also involved in the submarine project.

The key task for the Economic Development Authority in this State is to ensure that there is maximum spin-off for small business from each major project won. It is vital that the EDA, supported in a bipartisan way by Government and Opposition, can live up to its mission statement of achieving, in partnership with the private sector, the growth and development of internationally competitive businesses throughout South Australia. However, it is especially important that at every step along the way we remind the Economic Development Authority that its mission is not just about big business and large manufacturing companies. Ultimately, South Australia's future prosperity and careers for our kids will depend upon a dynamic and flexible small business sector.

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): It is with pleasure that I endorse the Address in Reply that was brought down in the other place yesterday. One of the issues that I intend to address in my speech is small business, and I will certainly do that later. However, I think it is imperative at this stage that I indicate that I have just heard the most hypocritical and cynical exercise that this Parliament has had to put up with from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition because of his crocodile tears with respect to small business. Let us never forget what the previous Labor Government did to cripple small business in South Australia when, at the behest of big business, it brought in unrestricted trading hours which virtually destroyed small business.

I suggest that, if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not believe that, he should get out, as I have, and speak to small business operators in my electorate who have given me chapter and verse of what the actions of the Labor Government did in terms of their viability and employment opportunities. One small business operator in my electorate, with whom I have had close contact both before and after the election, pointed out that, because of the change in trading hours brought in by the previous Government, he had no alternative but to lay off staff. He has now advised me that, with the change in trading hours that this Government brought in immediately it was elected, all those staff have been re-engaged. I make the point that it was a most cynical exercise on the part of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because the Labor Government did a lot to destroy small business in this State and it is only now that small business is recovering. I will address that issue in more detail later.

I want to take this opportunity to address some of the misleading and inaccurate attacks that the Opposition has been making on this Government in relation to the actions that it has taken in the past six months. If we believe the

Opposition, we have no alternative but to think that absolutely nothing has been done and that the State has gone from bad to worse. Having been in Parliament before, I am only too well aware that Labor Party tactics are to get out and say anything, whether it is true or not, but mainly to throw a lot of mud in the hope that some of it will stick.

We have been told that under this Government there has been a loss of jobs in consequence of its actions. Of course, the Opposition says that the Government has not been taking any action. I would point out that since this Government has been elected, between January and June, the first six months of this year, 7 200 additional full-time jobs have been created in South Australia. Yet this Government has allegedly done nothing! If the Opposition thinks that 7 200 additional full-time jobs are nothing, that confirms what I have said about the Labor Party in this State not worrying about the truth.

Where have those jobs come from? They have come from major investment decisions to bring new enterprises into South Australia. As members opposite seem to have tremendous difficulty in understanding that in six months a lot has occurred, let us go over the new enterprises again. They are Motorola, Australis, a big expansion in Mitsubishi, and the Wirrina tourism development which will have tens of millions of dollars invested from overseas. Information technology is another. In fact, the Government will be making a number of other announcements in the next few weeks and months which will show quite clearly, as the Minister has indicated, that South Australia is at last again open for business.

I also address the creation of the Economic Development Advisory Board under the chairmanship of Mr Ian Webber. I was extremely fortunate to work under Mr Webber as a senior executive at Chrysler Australia Limited. I can say without a shadow of a doubt that Mr Webber was by far and away the best 'boss' I have ever had the pleasure to work for. I have never known a man with such an incisive mind. I could go to him, talk to him, raise issues with him and he would analyse what I was putting to him and would make a very quick decision indeed. No doubt the re-establishment of Chrysler Australia and the takeover of that company by Mitsubishi was in large part due to the work done by Mr Ian Webber. He then moved interstate, where he headed up another company, and has now returned to South Australia. I have no doubt at all that his chairmanship of that board will lead to even further business development in South Australia. I certainly know of no South Australian who has higher credibility in the business community than Mr Webber.

Other initiatives the Government has introduced include the exporters challenge scheme to assist new exporters entering overseas markets for the first time. Already 27 small businesses have been assisted. I refer to another business that I know has already received some Government assistance and I am fully confident will be in receipt of further Government assistance. This company has developed a process in respect of raw fine wool such as alpaca and superfine merino wool. No other company has been able to develop this process which has absolutely amazed overseas interests. American and Chinese interests have indicated that they will purchase all the production that they can get their hands on from this small business.

One of the principals of this business is a constituent of mine, and I have been delighted to work closely with him and ensure that the full force of Government assistance is made available to him. I also stress that he and his colleagues are certainly not standing back and waiting for Government

assistance. They are typical of the small business people out there in the community in that they have developed a process, poured in their own funds and are now at the stage of the first production. The assistance that I am sure this Government will be able to provide will ensure that yet again another multi-million dollar export business will be available to South Australia.

I point out that the Government has undertaken a number of deregulation initiatives through the establishment of the Business Regulation Review Committee and I have no doubt that this, along with other initiatives from this Government, will assist the vital small business sector. The Government has already undertaken a number of industrial relations initiatives to facilitate enterprise bargaining and end compulsory unionism. I am pleased to speak as chairman of the Minister's backbench industrial relations committee and as a former group human resources manager heavily involved in all aspects of industrial relations, including appearing before both the State and Federal Commissions. I have seen first hand the impact that the previous Government had and the disastrous effects on business, with people having to put up with the type of nonsense that the previous Government imposed by way of compulsory unionism.

From my experience at a previous place of employment, I know how much employees resented unions, because they would come to me and say, 'Why must we have the union representing us when we are very happy with what you are doing? We would like to enter into an enterprise agreement with you.' Because of the actions of the previous Government in its pay-backs to union colleagues, members opposite would know that it was impossible for employees to be represented before the commission unless they did so through the union. I was forced to work with the Metal Workers Union, which in many cases abused its power unmercifully to the detriment of the employment that my company was trying to offer.

The initiatives that this Government has introduced will allow direct negotiations to occur between employers and employees, without the interference of the unions, which will undoubtedly lead to agreements that will be to the benefit of employment in South Australia, and very much to the benefit of the employees. I would like to go into chapter and verse but I believe it would be a breach of my previous employment confidentiality. However, I do know that many of the initiatives that we tried to introduce for the benefit of the employees were trodden on by the union.

Additionally, the Government has introduced well overdue WorkCover reforms. Again, as a previous group human resources manager, I saw first hand the abuses that WorkCover suffered as a result of the actions of the unions. I know of instances where employees had no intention of lodging a WorkCover claim but, because of pressure applied by the union, they lodged claims against our company and, although the money came from WorkCover, this was reflected in the payments that had to be made to WorkCover for insurance. If it was happening to us, I can guarantee that it was happening to other employers.

I cite one example where an employee, who had made two or three previous claims and therefore knew what he had to do to be eligible for a WorkCover claim, allegedly injured himself the day before he went on leave. No claim was lodged. He returned from leave some weeks later, the union got into his ear and he lodged a claim way outside of the claim period. The union said, 'Look, here is a chance for you to get another quid.' We appealed and appeared before the tribunal and, despite the fact that the tribunal acknowledged

that the employee had not lodged a claim as required under the Act and despite all sorts of other issues that this employee had not correctly done, including failing to present a doctor's report, 18 months after the alleged injury the person hearing the appeal said, 'Perhaps you had better get a report now.'

We had no hope of getting an unbiased hearing before that person. At the outset he said to the employer, 'For goodness sake, it is not a big claim; you can afford to pay this person's bills.' It was appalling. Another example involved one of our employees who went shopping at lunch time, fell down some stairs in a retail store and claimed against us and not the retail store for that injury. We had no control over that injury, as the injury did not happen in the workplace. Thank goodness that sort of nonsense has been disposed of. Similarly, the abuse that travel claims were subjected to under WorkCover had to be seen to be believed.

At long last we have a Government taking action, a Government that has removed journey accidents and has removed accidents over which employers had no control. This will undoubtedly assist the employer. It will reduce the costs of employment to employers and assist in employment within South Australia.

Let us make the point that it is only those employees and the unions who want to rot and abuse the system who will suffer from the changes that this Government has introduced. The genuine employee will not be in any way disadvantaged. Once again, this Government has introduced a major reform which is so long overdue.

We have also seen the Government's plans to ensure that the major infrastructure in South Australia will be upgraded. I heartily endorse the actions of the Government in its attempts to have the main runway at Adelaide Airport extended. There is no doubt whatsoever that when that occurs we will be able not only to attract more tourists to this State but also, more importantly, to handle the exports from this State that are so badly wanted overseas.

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

Mr ASHENDEN: Before the dinner adjournment, I was addressing a number of issues in relation to which the present Government has taken steps to ensure that the economy of South Australia is put back on the straight and narrow. I was addressing the upgrading of the facilities at Adelaide Airport. I know from my experience in private enterprise that there is no doubt at all that the extension of the runway at Adelaide Airport is absolutely essential if we are to be able to provide the incentive to overseas airlines to bring their jumbos into Adelaide and to enable them to be able to take off with full loads.

That does not necessarily mean that I am referring only to tourism, as I also include the produce that comes from South Australia. At the moment, our exporters are severely limited in the space that they are able to obtain on overseas airlines. The extension of the runway will ensure that we offer overseas airlines and companies the opportunity of taking the produce from our State.

I would like now to address the area of public sector reform. There is no doubt that this Government's actions have had a major impact on the public sector. I know this from my own electorate of Wright, where 20 per cent of the residents are public servants. So, my electorate, far more than any other—and I know the Public Service Association figures show this—has more public servants residing in it than any other electorate. So, I am in a position to be able to speak

with some feeling about the steps this Government has taken in relation to public sector reform.

There is no doubt that employees within the Public Service play a major role in the development of South Australia. It is unfortunate that, at the moment, morale in the public sector is undoubtedly at a low point. It is again unfortunate that it is this Government that has had to bite the bullet. But when we consider that the interest payments alone that we are forced to pay because of the actions of the previous Government are almost \$1 000 million a year—I repeat that: \$1 billion a year—it means that we do have to look at ways in which we can cut costs.

I am also aware from my own electorate that one of the major problems with those employed in the public sector involves not those who are unhappy that the Government has offered them packages but those who have not been able to obtain packages. So, it is obvious that the majority of public employees do understand what the Government is doing and appreciate that the Government is making them an offer that is assisting them in perhaps entering other areas.

I know we are not supposed to refer to the gallery, but I am aware of at least one person in the gallery who has made the step from public sector employment to operating his own business. I certainly hope that the package he has been able to obtain from the Government is of assistance to him in his new venture.

The point is that this Government has had to bite the bullet. It has had to take steps which have been forced upon it, because the previous Government just did not take the necessary steps to control the burgeoning debt. When we consider that the former Government was spending \$1 million a day more than it was gaining in income, we realise what an absolute indictment it is of that Government, and, of course, the present Brown Government will have to take the necessary steps to solve those problems.

I want to stress a point which was made in Her Excellency the Governor's speech that this Government regards the public sector as a vital part of the reforms that it will be bringing about over the next three years. I also note that there will be improvements in the way in which ETSA operates.

Unfortunately, in the past the Electricity Trust of South Australia has been a very uncompetitive organisation. When one compares the cost at which it produces electricity with that in other States, one realises just how poorly ETSA has been performing. I am delighted that ETSA has also bitten the bullet and is now becoming competitive.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member who interjects knows that the State Government has had no alternative but to go into the national power grid. Unless ETSA is able to produce power at or below the cost at which Victoria or New South Wales can produce it, our industry in South Australia will be buying its power not from ETSA but from Victoria or New South Wales. ETSA again has bitten the bullet and is now taking major steps towards becoming cost competitive with other States.

I refer now to education. I have 22 schools in my electorate and I am sure that members will appreciate the importance of education as far as I am concerned as a local member of Parliament. I have been very happy to work closely with the school councils within my electorate. I know that those school councils are well aware of the huge problems which we have in South Australia and which we have to address in terms of costs.

I, more than anyone else in this Parliament, would be delighted if the Government were in a position to be able to say, 'We will not have to reduce costs in education.' However, when one considers that over 25 per cent of the State budget is allocated to education, one sees that obviously it is an area that will have to be affected. However, despite the fact that it is the biggest department and that it is allocated the greatest proportion of the budget, the important thing to note is that, of all the departmental areas, as the Government has made quite clear, education will be the least affected. I am delighted that the Government has recognised the importance of education in our community and that it will be least affected.

However, again, let no-one make any mistake that the only reason cuts will have to be made in the education budget is the economic irresponsibility of the previous Government. It is the current and future generations of school students who will have to suffer.

I know from my own electorate that it is still recognised that the reason why cuts will have to be made is the horrendous debt that this Government has inherited from the previous Government. Do not let any member of the Opposition point the finger at this Government when it makes minor cuts in the education area in relation to other areas: the fault rests entirely with the member for Ross Smith and others like him who led this State into the present situation.

Despite the fact that the Government is forced to make cuts, I am delighted that this Government has allocated more than \$5 million to the building of a new school at Greenwith. As members probably know, my electorate is the most rapidly growing area in South Australia. When I went to the electorate—

Mr Clarke: Pretty marginal.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am happy to respond to that. From 1979 to 1982, members opposite continually said to me, 'You are a oncer. You are in a marginal seat.' I remind them of what happened in 1982. I am looking forward very much indeed to the election in 1997, when I am confident that we will repeat the dose.

Let me return to the issue of education. The Government will spend \$5.4 million in developing a new school in Greenwith. As far as the developing areas of the State are concerned, this Government is putting its money where its mouth is. It is saying, 'Yes, it is a young area; it is a growing area; it is an area in which education is absolutely vital.' As I said, by the time the new school year commences in 1995, we will have at Greenwith a magnificent new primary school, which can be utilised by the parents and students of the Golden Grove development, as have the Golden Grove, Wynn Vale and other primary schools in that area.

So, despite the fact that this Government has inherited huge financial problems, it is still prepared to ensure that, in the developing areas such as Golden Grove, education facilities will be provided. We well know that this Government has looked at a number of alternatives in relation to the provision of health care in South Australia, and it is unfortunate that the Opposition has attempted to distort grossly the present Government's approach on that issue. I would like to address particularly the Modbury Hospital, where I—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I am glad that the honourable member has interjected. I was hoping that he would, because the public meeting that I attended at the Modbury Hospital was nothing but a meeting of the Labor Party of the north-eastern suburbs. As I looked into that audience, what did I see? I saw

the people who were handing out the how-to-vote cards for the Labor Party; I saw the Labor Party apparatchiks; I saw the Labor Party represented in no uncertain terms. Of course, the unions were well represented too, and I give full marks to the Labor Party: it does know how to organise a stacked meeting.

After that meeting a number of people who attended it came to me and said, 'When we came here we had no idea that this would be a stacked meeting, but we do appreciate very much the way in which you put forward the Government's point of view.' Even when I stated that the Minister himself had indicated that the likelihood of the total privatisation of the Modbury Hospital was virtually zilch and that in fact the Government was looking at ways in which it could provide both public and private health facilities at the Modbury Hospital, which means building a wing for the use of private patients, all I heard was people who did not want to hear that and who did not want the others present at the meeting to hear it either, so it did not really matter much what I said on that night. It is most unfortunate that members of the Party opposite attempted to use that occasion as a political exercise rather than one for imparting information.

I was bitterly disappointed in the approach that the Federal member for Makin, Peter Duncan, took at that meeting. I represented the Minister, who had accepted another engagement long before that public meeting had been called. I indicated to those present that the Minister apologised sincerely because he could not be there. I also apologised on behalf of the local member who could not be there, and it was most unfortunate that the Hon. Peter Duncan took the opportunity to score political points by standing up and saying, 'I had other engagements but I put them aside to be here tonight.'

I would remind the Hon. Peter Duncan that I have attended many functions in my electorate at which he has apologised because he has not been able to attend. It is most unfortunate when members of Parliament try to score political points when they know full well that on many occasions they, themselves, are not able to attend. Of course, the cheers confirmed for me that the meeting was an exercise organised by the Australian Labor Party. One thing I will always acknowledge is that members of the Australian Labor Party are absolutely past masters at organising public meetings.

I now address the importance that this Government attaches to women. The Government has established the South Australian Women's Advisory Council, and one of the areas that will be specifically addressed by the council is women and violence. My wife is a counsellor at a school in the northern suburbs and she comes home and often talks to me about the very serious problems that the mothers of children attending her school and that the children themselves face because of the violence they are subjected to within the home.

Frequently, it is not caused by the husband or father of the children but by other men who come into the family and also from within the family itself. This is an area on which I commend the Government. I know from the advice that my wife has been able to provide me with that legislation in this area is absolutely essential. I hope that the legislation that this Government introduces to protect women and children from the violence they suffer within the community works, because some of the violence that my wife has outlined to me I cannot believe any human being would inflict on another. I hope and pray that the action that this Government has taken in relation to protecting women and children from that sort of violence will be effective and that the powers that we give to the

police, which have not existed in the past, will enable the protection of those innocent victims within our society.

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

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I appreciate the opportunity to support this Address in Reply motion, and once again I take this opportunity to express my loyalty to the Queen of Australia and her representative in South Australia, Dame Roma Mitchell.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: I remind the member for Ross Smith of a saying which was taught to me a long time ago but which obviously has fallen on deaf ears in his case: it is better to keep your mouth shut than to open it and let everyone know you are a fool.

Since this Government came into office in December 1993 it has moved to place this State in a position to generate new economic opportunities. Together with obtaining these opportunities, let us not forget our financial position which was inherited from the former Government, which was led by the previous member for Ross Smith. It is imperative that we remember the base from which we started: the previous Government spending \$350 million more than we earned each year; a State Bank debt which should never have been allowed to occur—I note the silence from the member for Ross Smith when we speak of these particular issues; an interest bill in excess of \$700 million per year; a Government that was definitely not business friendly; a tourism industry which did not exist, let alone on its knees; and a Public Service of health, education and housing that was destitute. South Australia was seen as a place to retire but definitely not as a place to visit or to go into business. In considering change, this Government has found that it is imperative that we remember our agenda; that is, the agenda of development, growth and jobs. In line with that agenda, change has been and will continue to be effective and efficient, careful and creative.

We started our term in Government—I was about to say our first term in Government—with the Commission of Audit. Despite claims from the Opposition, the Commission of Audit was required to establish a base situation and assist in charting an economic course. The response of some union bodies was understandable: they saw themselves as the new Opposition whilst the elected Opposition was on long service leave. They believed it was their obligation to defend the indefensible. However, it is interesting to read press releases of their comrades in other places, such as Federal and Queensland Labor Governments which have implemented or are proposing to implement similar reforms. I will refer to a few of those later. Suffice to say that some of the local comments have been no more than humbug: a puff of wind trying to hold back the winds of change. Some of the responses to the Commission of Audit, as I have said, were understandable. They saw their empire building and inefficient operations were about to be blown away. Some community concerns were also understandable, but they were realistic and they came up with positive alternatives and options.

They realised that we could no longer continue on the course of financial degradation we had been on for the previous 10 years. In developing its response to the Commission of Audit, the Government has taken note of the advice that the public sector reform will restore confidence in the community and that the financial affairs of the State are

under control. Further public sector reform initiatives will be included in some of the major legislation to be introduced during this session. In basic terms, the Government agencies will be managed responsibly like any other business. Public sector employees will join the real world. The public sector will be efficient and effective, thereby reducing the costs of Government. As stated in the Hillmer report, commissioned by the Federal Government, we are also required to refocus the operations of ETSA and EWS. Reforms of these two organisations will ensure that services which are important to the State's economic well-being are provided efficiently at a competitive cost. The issue of wage restraint has been raised as part of that public sector reform.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Some people with a vested interest during the Opposition's long service leave tried to promote this as a wage freeze, as the member for Ross Smith has stated. I take this opportunity to read out a letter which I sent to the Premier and the Treasurer and which answers the questions that the member for Ross Smith has just raised, as follows:

Dear Premier, I have concerns over recent press coverage on public sector wage freezes with respect to the financial statement which was delivered on 31 May 1994. Page 27 of the statement deals with public sector wages policy and, in particular, wage restraint. Although the statement mentions that no wage increases are budgeted for 1994-95 or 1995-96, the statement does not say 'a wage freeze'. Wage freezes over past years have not been shown to work, and only lead to immediate catch-up increases following the end of the restraint period. Wage freezes tend to alienate rather than motivate.

It is my belief that the policy of nil budget increases in wages over the next two financial years is a correct policy. However, wage increases should not be ruled out, especially for those who are receiving below average wages. Wage increases should be based on the new industrial legislation of enterprise bargaining in that they be aligned directly to departmental cost savings—whether by improved financial management or by further work force savings.

As a result of that—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The member for Ross Smith is quite well aware that at no particular stage has anyone been sacked, except for the fact that people have fallen over trying to get their hands on the TSPs, but the honourable member has never let the truth get in the road of a good story. The reply from the Premier was to say that my interpretation of the financial statement was 100 per cent correct, that the policy that was included in the financial statement of 31 May did mention wage restraint, and that is the policy of this Government.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Wage restraints are important and, if the member for Ross Smith is prepared to keep quiet for at least two minutes, and I know that is an extremely hard job—nearly impossible—he may well learn something, but that would amaze a lot of people.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: You wouldn't learn a thing; that's for certain. Wage restraint is important. It is a responsible and mature approach to our immediate financial problems. Filibustering by the member for Ross Smith is something we have become used to. It is opportunist and totally irresponsible, but can you expect any better from a member of this Parliament who completely misrepresents the situation whenever he gets the chance?

Members interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Is the member for Ross Smith biased? Is the Pope a Catholic? It can be said of the member for Ross Smith that he never lets the truth get in the way of a good story. Reform in all areas of Government services will occur, and one area—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: I sometimes wish that the member for Ross Smith was dozed out; that he was half asleep. Reform in all areas of Government services will occur, and one area with which I am pleased is the South Australian Housing Trust. The Housing Trust in future will cater for the needy and not the greedy. The member for Ross Smith would rather have it the other way round, because that was what happened with 10 years of the previous Government.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: If the member for Ross Smith was listening he would realise that I said 'needy', not 'greedy'. The member for Ross Smith was obviously looking after the greedy people when he put into Housing Trust homes people who had two incomes, two cars, and who did not require any subsidy or assistance. While he was stacking Housing Trust homes with people who did not deserve to be there, people who needed assistance were put into the private rental market and having to pay 30 per cent more for their rent than the people who were in Housing Trust homes on assisted rentals. Because of the policies of the previous Labor Government, the people who needed homes were paying 30 per cent more for their rental. That was the policy of the member for Ross Smith, the former member for Ross Smith, and that is why members opposite supported the greedy and not the needy.

The situation has turned around completely and now, as I remind the member for Ross Smith, we are supporting a Housing Trust policy for the needy and not the greedy. The aim behind that is to put into public housing more people who deserve to be put into public housing, to reduce the waiting list. If the member for Ross Smith could read, he would see that the waiting list for the past 10 years has been consistently 40 000 people.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call members to order. This is developing into a four way debate, which is most unusual, but the member for Mitchell is obviously inviting his colleagues to join him. The member for Mitchell has the floor.

Mr CAUDELL: It is good that I have your support, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member should not misinterpret my fine sense of humour.

Mr CAUDELL: In the Housing Trust there will be reforms on bond assistance, reforms with regard to rental debt, repairs and recovery associated with those repairs. We will have greater care of the financial responsibilities of the South Australian Housing Trust and greater care of its physical assets, providing housing for those who need it. As with the member for Ross Smith, the member for Playford never let the truth get in the way of a good story.

An honourable member: Or the member for Spence.

Mr CAUDELL: The member for Spence is only the junior. He is still in training; he is the apprentice.

Members interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The member for Playford continually tried to misrepresent the situation, but he got it slightly wrong. The member for Playford in the first session of Parliament—

Members interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Just listen. He referred to rents increasing by 30 per cent, but he read it wrong. As I told the House before, as a result of the former Government's financial policies and financial mismanagement, people who needed public housing were put into the private rental market and were paying 30 per cent more for their housing because of the policies advocated by the member for Playford. It was amazing. Because of the financial mismanagement of the previous Government and the South Australian Housing Trust, they allowed the rent debtors to blow out by 400 per cent between 1986 and 1993. That debt blew out four times in that period despite the \$10 million written off during that time, and the member for Playford as the Chairman of Economic and Finance Committee turned a blind eye to that financial mismanagement. That same member is the shadow Treasurer, but what are his qualifications? No wonder he shaved off his beard—he does not want to be recognised or seen around the place.

Members interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Obviously. The project of asset sales will continue in order to reduce debt and interest bills. Sales will include the Pipelines Authority, parts of the State Government Insurance Commission and the Urban Land Trust. Private enterprise has always said that people should stick to the business they know and the Government has no business being involved in business. Unfortunately, the Opposition ignored that advice of private enterprise and has ignored the lessons of the past and burnt its fingers. It is a pity that no-one burned the honourable member's fingers.

This Government will ensure that the philosophy of sticking with Government business—and Government business only—will be followed. It will leave business to the entrepreneurs. In the area of economic development this Government has already attracted a number of new enterprises. Decisions over the past few months have created opportunities for new full-time employment. Opportunities have been provided with enterprise bargaining for which legislation was introduced and passed in the first session. I remind the House that the member for Ross Smith ridiculed the idea of enterprise bargaining.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: If the member for Ross Smith would be quiet for just a few seconds, I will read him an extract from a press release involving one of his union colleagues. The transcript is as follows:

Union official: Oh, no, I mean, one must consider that there are horses for courses and, I mean, the wage fixing system that was in place some 10-15 years ago—dead and buried. We're in a new ball game now. Total different set of circumstances. The ball game is enterprise bargaining and we have to do the best that we can, by and for our members.

Paul Lyneham: So you're giving qualified support?

Union official: Well, as I say, we do not make the rules. The rules have been made for us. We're part and parcel of the game. We're going to be the players in the game.

That was John Hogg, State Secretary of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association. If the House is patient, I will give it more charming quotes from the union secretary in Queensland.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: A great guy! Remember the words of the member for Hart, who says 'a great guy'. That union official said he was totally in support of enterprise bargaining and the member for Hart agrees that he is a great guy who supports enterprise bargaining. Not only is he a great guy but he also comes out and supports something else. I will mention that

later on as well. Anyway, we get on to those other areas. As I said, the member for Ross Smith had a much different response. The microeconomic reform of business also includes the fact that legislation will be introduced into this Parliament on shop trading hours.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: If the member for Ross Smith would just bite his tongue for five seconds—hopefully he will bite it off at the same time—he will be able to understand what I am about to say and take it in one word at a time. I will speak slowly for him because I know that he has a problem. As far as the legislation on shop trading hours is concerned, I have not allowed my personal views to impede on what is best for the State. When I listen to the member for Ross Smith it reminds me of early European history when Christopher Columbus wanted to sail over to discover the New World. The member for Ross Smith would have been one of those hoods in the crowd saying, 'The world is flat. There is no way in the world we can get to the other side, we will fall off the edge.'

The member for Ross Smith reminds me of those people; the people who were against change. If we had had the member for Ross Smith there is no way in the world we would ever have flown an aircraft. If we had had the member for Ross Smith there is no way in the world we would have had shipping. There is no way in the world anyone would have landed on the moon, because the member for Ross Smith is a great one to say, 'Hey, well man, let's hold back, let's take it easy, we do not want change, everything is all right the way it is at the moment.'

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: I do not think the member for Ross Smith has quite heard. Maybe the best thing for the member for Ross Smith at this stage is for me to refer to another quotable paragraph from Mr John Hogg, Secretary of the shop union in Queensland, as follows:

... I don't see how we're going to have massive unemployment when one considers that the end of the marketplace that Mr Baldock is seeking to protect, and rightfully so, are the people which are primarily 'mum and dad' type shops. ... yes, but that is not necessarily related to trading hours.

He was talking to Paul Lyneham about those particular shops and about the demise of the 'mum and dad' type shops. He said:

That is related to a whole host of factors which would include the expansion and proliferation of shopping centres, the different ways in which goods are now retailed, as opposed to say 20 or 30 years ago.

Mr Hogg then goes on to say some very important things, that the member for Ross Smith should listen to, which are quite diametrically opposed to the statements made by the union official for the same union here in South Australia. He says:

Unfortunately, society hasn't stood still for them or for us. And we must move as society moves.

I am reading from a press release from the Secretary of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association. He then goes on to say:

They're anxious to get productivity in the nation up. They're anxious to ensure that we are a more productive and more competitive nation, both internally and externally. And I suppose this is one area where Governments must undoubtedly, in the end, take an interest.

It is in that particular area that this Government is not frightened of its responsibilities. This Government is prepared to take an interest.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The member for Ross Smith should just listen for a few seconds. The IAC draft report on petroleum products was then released in March of this year. It relates to trading hours in Western Australia, as follows:

Although they protect some retailers from competition, the restrictions stifle innovation, reduce consumer choice and convenience, and impede the best use of assets in retailing.

A report on market share this year highlighted 5 000 new retail jobs that could be created in South Australia.

Mr Clarke: How many?

Mr CAUDELL: Five thousand new jobs associated with the deregulation of trading hours. A report from the Western Australian Tourism Commission declared that in 1992-93 Western Australia forfeited between \$24 million and \$31 million in tourism dollars mainly because of restrictive trading hours. I look forward to the legislation when it is brought forward and to the debate that will follow. I am sure that we shall have some pearls of wisdom from the member for Ross Smith. Then we come to further economic reform. I am looking forward to economic reform in the petroleum industry. The Industry Assistance Commission has brought down a draft report. I have given a submission to the Premier in relation to that report and I hope that something will come from that report towards the end of this session. We are at the bottom when it comes to interstate and overseas tourism. We must face the reality that there have been 10 years of neglect in relation to tourism.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: He does not face reality; he does not even look in the mirror. We have no tourism industry whatever in this State. When listening to the Minister yesterday replying to a question, I felt that he was far too kind to the former Minister for Tourism. I would not have been so kind. In this connection, I should like to refer to some comments that were forwarded to me, as follows:

I write prior to your final budget deliberations to urge you to consider the enormous potential and opportunity for this State through Government investment in both tourism promotion and development. Tourism is now the world's largest industry and Australia still enjoys the position of being the most favoured long-haul destination for Europe and the Americas—let alone its growing importance as a popular destination for Asia. However, within this South Australia is still completely invisible.

I know that the member for Ross Smith was involved with clerks and had nothing to do with tourism, but he always has a chance to learn no matter how far behind the eight ball he is.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The trouble is that I have nearly run out of time. I have had to speak slower than normal so that the member for Ross Smith can understand. When overseas wholesalers come to Australia for the ATC and show me their packages, not one package on South Australia is included in the packages that they are selling to the Australian market. We have the best viewing spot for the sighting of whales in Australia. I am not talking about Victor Harbor or the Enfield pool where the member for Ross Smith goes for a swim; I am talking about the Nullarbor Plain near the Yalata Aboriginal lands. There are no signs along the road, so a tourist in this country would not know where they are. Further down the road is a sign painted in white shoe cleaner hand dipped in tar. Obviously the member for Ross Smith has been there because somebody has guided his hand as he has gone along. The direction in tourism has changed and the direction is

right. The airport upgrade is on the Government's list of priorities. We must address the runway situation and the facilities. As the member for Ross Smith knows, curfews are for another place.

We must address the facilities and must project our own direction with regard to the airport and South Australia. We must also take on board the Darwin to Adelaide railway link. I conclude by saying that South Australia has taken over from Queensland the tag of the Cinderella State. We must strive to improve our financial situation. We can no longer tolerate the financial mismanagement and objectives of the former Government. They were intolerable and unacceptable. This Government must and will provide legislation that will produce growth, development, jobs and, hopefully, a new member for Ross Smith.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is clearly evident when you get out and about in the community today that much has been done in the first six months of the Brown Government. Restructuring has occurred in a significant and positive manner, and we have seen the most effective reform of any State in Australia. We are aware of the work done in the past session with respect to WorkCover, and we are aware of the problems that faced this State as a result of the previous WorkCover policies or, in many respects, the lack thereof. All we had was more and more people being left out of work because the rates were rising and the money called upon from the State Government coffers to prop up the blowouts was continuing to increase. We have been able to successfully restructure that legislation, and it will bring \$20 million worth of savings to South Australia. Employers will be able to spend that \$20 million in a positive way to create new jobs for South Australians. The future, therefore, in that area is looking a lot brighter and, as has been clearly indicated before, unless we can become competitive in all areas we will continue to decline.

I am pleased to see that we have started to implement policies that will put South Australia back on the map. The other significant legislation that is already well and truly in place and being applauded by employers and employees is our brilliant industrial relations reform legislation. We know the problems of the previous Government's industrial relations policy.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith is testing the patience of the Chair with the present speaker. I appreciate that with the last speaker he was thoroughly baited and I allowed him considerable licence. I assure the honourable member that, having been warned once today, that is still on his card and I urge him to err on the side of caution.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: We know the problems that faced employers and employees under the previous dim and dark age of industrial relations policy. We still have the difficulty of the Federal policy, particularly the unfair dismissal provision, which employers in my area say still scares them away from taking on employees. Once things settle down, and employers and employees see the benefits in our State's industrial relations policy, I am confident that many of those small businesses will begin to take on new employees.

Our ports have always been a laughing stock in this State. If you talk to some of the transport drivers, they will tell you about their frustration in trying to get into a queue to unload their containers, let alone the people with perishable products desperately waiting to get them onto ships. Through the State

Government's initiatives we have been able to solve those problems by selling the ports to Sealand and, as a result, we are seeing a 48-hour turnaround with a massive increase in Asian trade and development. The future can only auger well for better growth in that area as we see South Australia clearly becoming a transport hub. Talking about transport, we all know the history of public transport in this State. Under the previous Government, millions of passenger journeys were lost every year.

South Australia had a deficit of about \$140 million, something that clearly was not sustainable if we were to address the State's problems. After much deliberation and frustration in the Upper House, eventually that policy went through. We now have TransAdelaide and already public transport is on the up. At the moment, of course, the TransAdelaide staff are still adjusting, wondering what their future will be, and wondering whether they will remain in the public sector or will be moved to the private sector. It is important that that situation settles down as quickly as possible. Some of the staff on my working party have indicated that that is starting to happen. They are generally quite pleased with the initiatives that the Government has shown.

People in my area now feel much safer travelling on public transport—be it bus, train or tram—because they can see the benefits of the initiatives that this Government has introduced. Fully-fledged police officers have been appointed to the Transit Squad in place of the former officers who did not have the same powers as police officers. In February last year the Transit Squad managed to apprehend only 19 offenders. In March this year the Transit Squad apprehended 204 offenders. I understand that as a result of those apprehensions a minimum of 1 300 hours of community service work has been undertaken to clean graffiti, damage and filth from our public transport infrastructure, and that augers well for the future.

Many people in the community are delighted to see a Government that has taken the initiative to ensure that the people concerned are caught and that the message is firmly implanted in their mind that in the future it will not be worthwhile damaging our public transport or causing problems for passengers. Another area which has not been highlighted a great deal in the public arena, but I know that it is about to be, is the enormous amount of work which has been put into tourism and restructuring the Tourism Commission. It is true that in the past tourism in this State has not done very well. In fact, we have lost 50 per cent of our international market over the past five or six years, even though we spent something like \$80 million during that period trying to entice tourists to South Australia.

We did not do too badly in the intrastate and interstate arena, but they were steady figures—not growth figures. As we all know, continuing growth in industry is important. I commend the Minister for Tourism for his initiatives. I know that the Tourism Commission has a strategy plan, a draft marketing plan, and a business plan. It has a clear direction and focus. The hierarchy of the commission has been restructured, and new and innovative board members have recently been appointed to the commission. Tourism is extremely important to my electorate. The south does not have the luxury of an MFP, a Gillman site, or an Iron Triangle, but it does have some of the greatest icons that anyone could ever wish to visit.

I know that with the support of the Minister my electorate will strongly focus on tourism development in the south. I am delighted to say that tomorrow I will be presenting to the

Minister for Tourism a fully detailed submission, which is the culmination of three months of intense work by the community in my electorate. They have spent about 2 000 hours of voluntary time developing what I believe will be the best tourist visitor centre anyone has seen in this State. I hope that we will see in the order of 100 000 to 150 000 tourists accessing that area per annum because, if that occurs, it will achieve two things: first, it will guarantee the protection of our area, because we will not be able to damage our landscape if the economic multiplier effect is so strong that people demand we protect and look after it; and, secondly, it will strengthen the traders' situation and also our wine industry.

We all know how important wine is to this State, and it is important that we tie that in with tourism. Once again, we have shown the initiative. We have realised that the wine industry is an important area on which we must capitalise. I look forward to seeing a great deal of marketing promotion done through wine and fine food, through culture and the authenticity that we South Australians can offer to tourists.

We started to look at where we had to assess the problems and set up some bench marks for our State, and it was a pity when we came into office to see just how much lack of detail there had been in trying to audit and keep under control the financial books of this State. In fact, it disappointed me when I heard that our Treasurer had to spend so much time on the periphery coming up with fundamental audits on things such as car fleets and computer bases, and I could go on for the remainder of my speech talking about the things that were out of order through the lack of competence and management ability and the general ineptitude of the previous Government.

So, we took on immediate responsibility by getting an Audit Commission group together to have a look at where that debt was up to. Of course, it was no surprise whatsoever to find out that we had an additional \$350 million per annum of underlying recurring budget deficit in this State. Sure, the former Government had done a really good job, as only it could do, of covering it up by selling off another room of the State house and putting that into the general weekly cash flow so that it could buy the food and the clothing for that week. But it forgot that it had a lot of debts to repay and for which it had to make provision, and that, if it continued to sell off room after room, eventually there would be no rooms or no house left. It was very unfortunate to see the truth of that irresponsibility coming out. However, the Audit Commission has said that we would have to make some tough decisions, and we knew that would be the case. In fact, members of the community at large have been demanding those tough decisions.

Mr Clarke: That's why we won Torrens.

Mr BROKENSIRE: Torrens is a red herring, and I hope you continue to consider it to be such, because even the honourable member will be vulnerable if he considers it to be a red herring. Indeed, he will be the most vulnerable.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BROKENSIRE: The honourable member should not worry about that, because we are now doing things in the south—not as the former Government did in the past 10 years when it gave the south nothing. All that Government did was fill up the pockets of a particular element of this State and neglect the rest. People in our area in the south have said, 'Enough is enough,' and they will not forget it for a long time.

The bottom line is that the incompetence meant that we were going into debt at the rate of \$1 million a day, and they

still smile about it. How the hell they sleep at night is beyond me. Where is the conscience? I do not think it is there at all. At least we have got on with the job. As a result of the Audit Commission, we brought out the financial statement which clearly shows what we have to do if we are to give our children a future.

The financial statement is not a slash and burn statement: it is a responsible statement that will start to rebuild the rooms that we did not have, thanks to the ineptitude from the other side, and we are all aware of that. As a result of the budget that is about to be brought down, we will be able to start to tie it all in together with the blueprint that we have for this State and start to see this State get back into business.

Obviously there has been a lot of restructuring of the Public Service, and we are all aware of that. I look to the future to continue working closely with the Public Service. I know that morale has been low over the past two or three years. The Public Service has been like a boat without a motor floating down the gulf. Sure, there had to be a bit of restructuring. However, those public servants are not silly. They pay tax, and they believe in this State. By and large they, along with us, are prepared to get on with the job. I look forward to supporting those public servants as they continue their efforts to improve the service within the public sector to a world-class standard—something which even the Opposition knew had to happen but on which it was not prepared to bring out the report prior to the last election.

It was hidden in the bag with a padlock on it, like so many other documents which the Opposition had but which it did not have the guts to use in getting on with the job. We have had the guts and that is why we will be in government for a long time. The Opposition continues to be taken off the track with its red herrings in relation to Torrens. That indicates how much management ability it has.

We have already seen 7 200 full-time jobs and many more part-time jobs created in the seven months that we have been in Government. The participation rate has increased. Of course it will increase, because people now think it is worthwhile putting up their hand and saying, 'Hey, I would like a bite at this recovery. I would like a chance to get into the work force. I am now putting up my hand.'

Of course, restructuring does result in some unemployment for a while. We have clearly seen that happening in the Eastern States over the past two or three years and we have seen it happen in Western Australia. However, those States now have their house back in order. They have taken the tough decisions and away they go. Unfortunately for South Australia, because of procrastination and because the Labor Party knew it would be rolled and hammered—and did they get rolled and hammered in December last year—once again it showed total irresponsibility. Instead of going to the polls in December 1992, the Opposition hung in there, continuing to drive the State down. However, that will all change. Of course, we all know that we have the State Bank debacle—the largest single corporate loss in the history—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BROKESHIRE: So, you think it can be fixed that quickly—and you were an adviser. No wonder the bank went down. If the member for Hart realised anything about the economic damage that he has caused he would know that the State Bank will be around the neck of this State, my children and our grandchildren for a long time—it will be there for 15 or 20 years. It will certainly be there at the next election, the election after that and so on. It is the biggest corporate loss in Australia's history.

An honourable member: Absolutely disgraceful.

Mr BROKESHIRE: It is absolutely disgraceful, and I will deal with that towards the end of my address. The fact is that we are getting on with the job of fixing it up. Twenty per cent of the work force has now taken on more overtime. As an employer myself, I know that one of the greatest positive indicators—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BROKESHIRE: Absolutely. We had great industrial relations policies. We looked after our employees and we gave them incentives. However, the fact of the matter is that 20 per cent of the work force has now started to take on more overtime. That is one of the greatest indicators, because overtime has to increase only a little more, combined with all the initiatives we have now brought forward, for us to see more people being brought into the work force.

In terms of bringing people into the work force, members have only to look at the new investment that we have already been able to bring into this State, such as Motorola, Australis Media Limited, Mitsubishi, Wirrina, ACI, Orlando, BRL Hardy and many information technology investments. Some of those investments involve \$200 million, \$100 million, \$90 million and so on. I could go on for the next 13 minutes about that. There are many more proposals on the drawing board and they are getting up. That is what is hurting members opposite. We are kicking the goals.

What happened to the \$2.5 billion worth of investment that could have come into this State? It went; it was lost. The former Government procrastinated and did not kick any goals. What a coup it was getting Ian Webber to lead the EDA team. He is doing it because he believes in this State and in the EDB and the EDA working together.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BROKESHIRE: You are not bad at ABC, but you can't add up. Ian Webber is doing what he is doing because he believes in South Australia. He knows that he needs to work with the Brown Government because it is doing the job and getting on with it. The Government has introduced a lot of deregulation already and we will do a lot more of that. We will get rid of the red tape, and that process is starting right now in this session with the introduction of many Bills. Unnecessary licences and impositions are being removed from small business. That sector has been crying out for such a move for a decade, but those cries continued to fall on deaf ears.

It is clearly evident now that this Government has removed the handcuffs from business. It is now out there waving the green flag, and thank goodness businesses are taking it up. This Government has offered new incentives such as payroll tax reductions, export enhancement and import replacement initiatives, WorkCover incentives, a guarantee that taxes and charges will be retained within CPI increase figures, and young farmer incentive schemes because this Government recognises the importance of agriculture. It understands that agriculture is significant to this State. The Liberal Party is the only one that ever has and ever will support agricultural industries.

I refer now to my electorate of Mawson. Already the visitor centre is about to start. Panalatinga Road has been pushed ahead by this Government, and I am pleased to say that it is six months ahead of schedule and also below budget, and that is another sign of good management filtering through from the restructuring of the department. We have had main street program initiatives announced with coordinators and funding being made available to help the economic develop-

ment of some of the ailing areas of my electorate. School maintenance has increased. An amount of \$100 000 was spent just in one school where the air conditioning units had not worked for two years. For two years they had not worked, and this Government repaired them, because it believes in looking after South Australia's students. And this Government will make it even better by creating jobs for those students so that they will have a future.

As a result of the transport policy, we are now allowed to look at initiatives and new ideas in relation to crossover transport, which is so desperately needed for the youth and the aged in my electorate. I have been able to achieve \$20 000 to fence off the delicate Morphett Vale Pimpala Reserve, which is the only area left in my electorate with its original scrub and spider orchids.

The previous Government slashed the budget of the McLaren Vale Hospital by up to 60 per cent in a three year period, and I hope soon that, when negotiations are completed, it will at last have some autonomy, direction and a budget that will allow it to grow.

We have taken many initiatives in relation to neighbourhood centres, and I understand that very soon the Minister will be making some positive announcements in that regard. We in Mawson have capitalised on our agriculture and viticulture policies and we are continuing to support the growers in planting more vines and flowers and in furthering the areas of horticulture and viticulture. Most importantly, this Government in the short time that it has been in office has agreed to refocus the 2020 Vision document and give the same tax breaks to the south that the previous Government gave to the northern areas in its selfish north-only approach. It gave incentives only to Gillman, which was its pet project. At least this Government realises that those incentives should be given across the whole State.

I have attended many meetings with my constituents and I look forward to attending many more. I enjoy my door knocking on the weekends when I speak to them on a one-to-one basis and find out their problems and concerns, getting from them a report on what they perceive this Government is doing and what they want it to do in the future. So, this Government is a listening, talking and working-with Government that believes in grass roots politics and working with and for its constituents, and that is something that has been badly neglected in the past. I encourage the constituents in Mawson of all political persuasions to come to my office, to get on the phone and to talk and work with me, because I am interested in them whether they are Labor, Liberal or Democrat supporters. The fact is that, if we work together and get on together, we achieve things together.

There is still much work to be done, and 10 years of mess that has driven this State into almost bankruptcy will not be fixed in 10 minutes. Most people realise that. In all honesty, we will be lucky to fix it in 10 years, but the fact is that this Government is getting on with the job and the signs are there. We must remember that we have to apply a fairly tight tourniquet to stop the bleeding before we have any chance of the wound healing. My constituents realise that. I talk to them about that and I work with them on that matter, and they are there supporting me. For that I thank them.

The member for Ross Smith asked what the Federal Government is doing. A little bit in the white paper was beneficial, but \$6.5 billion aimed primarily at training and retraining CES officers to train people who are unemployed will not generate jobs. What they should have done was spend about \$4 billion of that on an arrangement with

employers through dropping direct taxes and charges in return for taking on employees. Then we would have started to see some real improvement in our unemployment figures.

We are screaming out for infrastructure support for the airport. We know we are losing \$1 billion a year in this State because the airport has not been extended. When my constituents grow world class flowers for the Asian and Japanese markets, pack those flowers carefully and take them to the airport and they are loaded, then up comes the wind and those containers are dropped off because the plane cannot take off, that is not good enough for me. I will be in there battling as hard as I can with the Brown Government to put some sense into the Federal Government in the hope that it will give our airport a fair go so that we can build up our economy. Imagine what \$1 billion more income a year for this State would do to address those problems. Once again, it is not only the previous Labor Government that has forgotten the south for so long.

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: If members opposite assessed the situation, they would see that the previous Liberal Government always looked after the south, and this Government will continue to fight to look after it. The Better Cities money that Brian Howe brought over was dangled again like a carrot with no planning and no consideration given to the south. We did not get a cracker—not a biscuit. Where did it go? North again. It is about time that the Federal Government worked with this State and realised the plans and developments that this State has now got together. Instead of trying to destroy it and make it into a big sheep station, the Federal Government should put the money where it used to be put—with the Ministers such as the Minister for Tourism—and let those Ministers decide where that basket of money would be best spent.

I warn all members in this House to be eternally vigilant regarding what Paul Keating is trying to do to this State. He knows that his votes are in the Eastern States. He could not care less about South Australia. Why would he want to spend money here when his plan is to build up his support base in the Eastern States and control things from there. I call on members opposite to remember that and support me with it. As I said yesterday, it is about time that all members of this House became bipartisan and worked together. Sure, in opposition you have to oppose when necessary, but only when necessary. Why oppose just for the sake of opposing? Why not get behind us and support us?

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I will never get sick of talking to those who can listen and comprehend, but you would not be able to listen for half an hour, because you could not pay attention for that long and, if you did, you would not be able to absorb it, because your brain would not be functional enough for that length of time. Fact, fact, fact. Get behind us, be bipartisan, stop knocking all the good work we are doing and, for once, help us to get South Australia going.

I am keen to continue working for my electorate. I thank the constituents of Mawson for the support they have given me already in my first term. I will continue to try to overcome the lack of support that the south has had in the past 10 years. Enough is enough. It is time we got on with the job. We have already implemented an enormous amount of fundamental restructuring, which most other States are jealous of. In fact, some of them are already picking up some of the Brown policies and taking them on board to help enhance their State. That is an absolute fact.

I look forward over the next 3½ years to working with my colleagues and those members of the Opposition who are prepared to wipe the smile off their face, put down their head and start once and for all to be serious about where this State is going. Instead of laughing every time there is an announcement that a 1 per cent increase in rates will add a further \$85 million to our interest debt—a further \$85 million that we cannot spend on getting this State going again—they should say, ‘Yes it is a problem; it’s a huge problem, one that, in the main, they caused. The ability, the skills, the initiative and the drive are there in this Government, and we had better become bipartisan and think about our children and this State, sit back for a minute and realise what can be done if we work together and get on with the job.’ To those on the other side who are prepared to do that, I look forward to working with them. To the couple who just want to oppose everything, I look forward to fighting hard with them in the future.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): We have certainly heard a couple of very spirited contributions from the member for Mawson and my colleague the member for Mitchell tonight. However, they are strong on rhetoric and very short on fact; they are very strong on support for the Government, but you would expect that. In my Address in Reply speech tonight, which is my second major contribution to this Parliament in the eight short months that I have been here, I thought I would have a bit of a critique of the Government’s performance over the past eight months. I thought we would look back and see how well the Government has performed over the past eight months.

I am but a new and very junior member of this Parliament, but I have sat back and watched with extreme interest how this Government has performed over the past eight months. One of the real truths about politics is that some politicians never learn from the past. For all the mistakes that have been made in the past and all the errors of former Governments—and I have been prepared to criticise the former Government—what do we see opposite? We see history repeating itself, and we have this collection of members—Brown’s dream team—stumbling along for the past eight months.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am sorry. I must say that the Minister for Tourism, a very able Minister, perhaps has stumbled a little less than the others. Let us look at what this Government has been able to put together over the past eight months.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Believe me, 28 minutes will be enough for what I have to say, and I will take every minute but, unlike the past two speakers, I will have fact and not rhetoric. A report called the Arthur D. Little report was commissioned by the Government some two or three years ago now and gave us a very good look at the economy. I suspect that very few members opposite have read it or would understand it, but there are some fundamental facts in that report about how we deliver a prosperous economy in this State. One of the points made in that report was that, to develop our economy in this State, you cannot shoot any bird that flies past in terms of investment.

What have we had from this Government in terms of economic development? We have heard a lot of words and a lot of rhetoric, but I am concerned that after eight months this Government lacks a strategic approach to economic development. It is falling into the trap that, when any investor walks into this State or makes an approach to this Government, it is throwing millions upon millions of dollars at that investment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. The point I am making is that, whilst I acknowledge the enthusiasm of the new Government, which has spent well in excess of a decade in Opposition (it is finding its feet), I ask it to read the Arthur D. Little report and learn a little about developing a strategic economy. I want it on the public record—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr FOLEY:—that I caution the Government: we are a State of very meagre means. I offer a simple caution. You can ignore it, you can ridicule it, you can criticise it; I simply put on the public record a cautionary note. I think the member for Unley knows what I am talking about. Members opposite should not automatically think that if they throw millions and millions of dollars at new investment you tend to prop up artificial economic strength in this State, because I have seen it before.

The former Government did make the occasional mistake in economic development. We spent millions of dollars getting new investment into this State. Down south, for example, five years ago the former Government spent millions to attract Yazaki to this State: it lasted four years, upped anchor and shifted to Fiji, chasing the cheap labour rates of Fiji. I simply caution members opposite not to think that they can buy investment and jobs in this State *ad infinitum*. You have to be strategic.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson. He is continually interjecting.

Mr FOLEY: The other issue is the fact that we have good home-grown investment in this State. I am a big supporter of foreign investment, but we should not just think that the only investment in this State worth giving tax holidays and financial incentives to is foreign investment. Look at the local investment. I do not believe this Government is paying enough attention to home grown investment. Another very disturbing sign with this Government is what I consider the very small-town, parochial, narrow approach by the Premier. I have heard the Premier speak at a number of functions where I believe he has put forward too much a small-town attitude and focus on this State. We are part of a nation: we are part of a global economy. I urge the Premier to get a global focus.

It really is not good enough for this Premier to retreat into small-town parochial politics. It is time the Premier strode the national stage and talked about national issues. But I suspect there are enough members on the opposite benches criticising the performance of the Premier: they do not need me to add to it. I was quite amused to be at dinner the other night when the Premier talked about his achievements over the past eight months and said that he had reformed the State far beyond what Jeff Kennett had done, and he had done it with style. I think that Jeff Kennett must have tripped over himself when he heard that! I suspect that the dries opposite know exactly what I am talking about: Dean Brown ain’t no Jeff Kennett.

I now want to touch on another important issue, that is, my already publicly stated position in terms of Adelaide Airport. I consider very few issues as important for the development of this State as the upgrading and improvement of Adelaide Airport. I will be arguing, as I am sure many of my Party will be doing—although perhaps not the member sitting behind

me—within the forums of the Labor Party for the Government to privatise Adelaide Airport. The Federal Airports Corporation has been given long enough to upgrade our airport and to extend our runway. If it cannot deliver on that, I am prepared to look at a private investor who will. There are many people, perhaps many in the gallery, who would share my view on that issue, but it is a strange thing. I heard the Minister talk about it: he supports it. The member for Hanson supports the extension of the runway, but what about the member for Peake?

The other night at a public meeting the member for Peake was nobbled. They were all there: the Minister for Tourism, the member for Hanson and the member for Colton; but where was the member for Peake? He arrived late and he left early—because he was nobbled by the Premier.

What does the member for Peake say? I will deal with him later, because I have kept part of my speech aside dealing with the performance of individual members. I would urge all members to consider this issue carefully because it is an important issue relating to the development of South Australia. I am prepared to stick my neck out in terms of the Labor Party and I will be arguing for it. I hope the member for Peake can support the Government, not to mention the Federal member for Hindmarsh who, on the evening concerned, simply vacillated on the issue.

I would now touch briefly on what I consider is already developing as this Government's major mistake—the member for Peake has joined us, and I will come back to him. I have kept another piece aside for the member for Peake. But what about the farce we are seeing with information technology? Hasn't the Premier got himself into a nice old stew about information technology! What did we have from this Government two days before the election? The then Leader of the Opposition sat with the then General Manager of IBM Australia, Mark Bradley, in a disgraceful piece of partisanship by a member of the corporate sector who, I might add, was no longer with the company four weeks after the election, and announced that IBM would be investing \$150 million in South Australia.

In mid-January the Premier, in response to a letter from a constituent, wrote confirming that an agreement was in place with IBM. What happened? Nothing—absolutely zilch. Since that time the Premier has been back pedalling on the IBM/EDS issue at a million miles an hour. Again, I call on the Premier and demand that he table the IBM agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I do remember Marineland, just as the member for Reynell does. I am sure members opposite remember the member for Reynell—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

Mr FOLEY: —the President of Friends of the Dolphin.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been most tolerant as there has been a considerable amount of goodwill across the Chamber and the Chair does not wish to interfere with that, but I will not allow shouting matches. The member for Peake has been here long enough to know when the line should be drawn.

Mr FOLEY: I am not sure that I would have referred to it as goodwill across the Chamber, Mr Speaker. I just touched on that and I have a contribution that I will make to the House some time down the track about the member for Reynell's quite amusing performances as President of Friends of the

Dolphin. I have a few stories to relate to the House in the future. It was a very anti-development stance. Let me look briefly at what the Government is doing about EWS and ETSA. The Government is embarking on what can be described as nothing short of the wilful wholesale gutting of ETSA and EWS. Little empathy is being shown to the workers and their families.

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: That shows how much the member for Florey understands about State finances. ETSA and EWS, for the information of the member for Florey, are off budget; they contribute. I must admit that it never ceases to amaze and amuse me as to the lack of understanding by members opposite about how this State operates. Certainly, I am happy to sit down with any members opposite and chat with them about it. I am concerned about EWS and ETSA reductions in services, because South Australia faces some real difficulties flowing from a massive reduction in services by those two organisations. What about shop trading hours?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much conversation. The member for Mitchell has been talking all the time, the member for Unley has joined in as has the member for Hanson. I do not wish to unduly disrupt the proceedings but the Chair believes that the member should be given the opportunity to be heard.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker, yet again. I do not really deserve this behaviour given my exemplary behaviour during Question Time. I now refer to shop trading hours. I apologise to the Minister for Tourism but I have a little piece of criticism for him. He walked into this when he came into Government saying, 'What will I do about shop trading hours? I am going to have a committee. I am going to have a review.' There has been more written and spoken about shop trading hours than any other issue in this nation's history. But the new Minister, in the typical Brown Government vacillation mode, had to have an inquiry. So he gets his inquiry but then says, 'Oh dear, oh dear, this is not what I wanted, this is not the answer I wanted.' You never set up an inquiry unless you know what the outcome is. But the Minister has learnt from his mistakes, I am sure. We still have a Government vacillating. It had a three-month inquiry, it gets its report back but decides to have another eight weeks of public comment. It has now set up an office of deregulation to give it a bit of advice on shopping hours. If any single issue has typified the vacillation and stumbling attitude of this Government it is the issue of shop trading hours.

Another great issue of vacillation is the Hindmarsh Island bridge. We had the now Premier as Leader of the Opposition, the Minister for Transport in another place, and the Minister for Aboriginal affairs all bleat screaming hearts about Hindmarsh Island bridge: we should not have it, we should not build it. They even set up an inquiry. They gave Sam Jacobs another \$30 000 or \$40 000 on top of his royal commission money to go out and give us a report on the bridge, because they said, 'Mr Jacobs, we want to get out of this, find us a way out of it.' However, the response was, 'Sorry, Mr Premier, we could not find you a way out of it.' It was a disgraceful performance by the Minister for Transport, and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs was almost in tears in this Chamber because he could not find a way through the Aboriginal Affairs Act to stop it. Then, all of a sudden Robert Tickner makes a decision, a decision that I do not support incidentally, but what does the Premier do? The Premier starts crying crocodile tears over this intrusion of Federal

powers. The Premier created the environment that allowed Robert Tickner to interfere and intervene in the way that he did. This was a deplorable performance from a Premier who up until four weeks before Tickner's decision wanted any way out of the Hindmarsh Island bridge that he could get. Honestly, Dean Brown is making Alexander Downer look decisive.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, I did not think that was possible.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe it is customary to refer to people who occupy seats in this House by either their title or the seat that they occupy and not by their Christian name.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is correct.

Mr FOLEY: I apologise, Mr Speaker, for referring to the honourable member by name; I meant the member for Finnis. Now let us have a look at the member for Finnis's backbench. I have already given a fairly succinct critique of his Ministry, so now let us have a look at his backbench. I talked before about the Adelaide Airport extension. This Government, with my support, is trying to develop Adelaide Airport. We have heard the member for Mawson talk about a bipartisan approach to economic development. One of the Government's most senior, respected members of this House, Chair of the Economic and Finance Committee and Chair of the Industries Development Committee is a member for whom my respect is growing as I serve under him on these committees.

What does he say about the Premier? What does Mr Becker say about the Premier, and I shall quote from the *Advertiser*. Mr Becker, whose electorate covers western suburbs along the flight paths, such as Torrensville and Cowandilla, said that the Government's thinking on the runway issue was flawed. The article stated:

The member for Hanson rejected claims by the Premier that the extension in conjunction with tourism projects being negotiated for the Government would attract four additional jumbo flights a week to Adelaide.

I do not believe it will bring in one additional flight.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Hanson was not prepared to support the Government—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I apologise: the member for Hanson was prepared to support the Government. I suspect that the member for Peake knows a bit more about campaigning than the member for Hanson, and that is probably why he has been in this Parliament for so long. I now look at the member for Mitchell who came out in the *Advertiser* a few weeks ago proposing a change to loitering laws. He somehow got the support of the Minister for Emergency Services, but that does not surprise me. But they had to be carpeted by the Attorney-General for daring to challenge Government policy. Then we have the member for Elder, and I must respect him for this—it is something I quite like doing—he attacked one of his Federal colleagues quite openly, and I refer to Bronwyn Bishop, without one shadow of thought for how that might impact on the local Liberal Party. Of course, I must mention my neighbouring member of Parliament, the member for Lee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: He got on Ray Martin's show in the evening, but the *coup de grace* was appearing on the Andrew Denton show, which I thought was a great performance. I

have spoken in this House already about a member of his community that I am having to support. I am finding my workload massively increased because people in those neighbouring suburbs to my electorate are coming to see me, because they happen to be Housing Trust constituents who are simply not prepared to go to the member for Lee. I have to tell the member for Lee that they are lining up in the Labor Party for preselection for Lee. They are shifting into the electorate. Real estate sales are going through the roof in the electorate of Lee as potential Labor members pour into that electorate. I must say that I do feel a bit sorry for our profession to be embarrassed in the way it is by the member for Lee, but I have even sporting clubs in the member's electorate who have made me number one ticket holder at their club because they really do not want to adopt their local member. I know one particular club—

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Lee said the club was bankrupt. Was that the West Lakes Football Club?

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, that is another 200 votes gone. Isn't he a champion! I thank the member for Lee for putting that on the record. I just make that comment as an overworked member of Parliament, having to deal with the constituents of the member for Lee. In the few minutes left to me I must talk briefly about a couple of more important issues.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Maybe I will just spend the next six minutes *ad libbing* about how good this back bench is. It is full of oncers. Their contributions have been lacklustre, ill-informed, ill-researched. Let us look at who will not be coming back in three and a half years. We have two of them up the back at least, one in the middle, three over there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: The point I make is that the member for Mawson can make sycophantic contributions about the performance of this Government, but I cannot wait until the last 12 months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

Mr FOLEY:—and see how your backbenchers react. If after eight months of government we have six or seven members, such as the member for Unley, the member for Lee, the member for Elder and the member for Mitchell, spraying all over the place, what will they be like in three years?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell has a point of order.

Mr CAUDELL: Mr Speaker, I have had assertions cast against my name previously in the honourable member's speech and I have allowed it to occur, but talking about the fact that I will be spraying everywhere is really just a bit too much.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not consider that comment to be unparliamentary. I point out to the member for Mitchell that he has continually interjected. Therefore, I suggest that he does not provoke the honourable member by continuing to interject. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, yet again, Mr Speaker, for your protection. The point I am making is that this Government has been a bit embarrassing. I suppose I should feel sorry. Having worked as a minder to a Minister—a very fine

Minister—I have some sympathy. I see the Premier's eyes roll when some of his backbenchers get up.

Mr Clarke: The member for Adelaide has already moved up there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: The speculation is that the member for Adelaide—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith and members who continue to defy the ruling of the Chair. The Chair has been most tolerant. The member for Hart has the call and I think he should be given the opportunity to continue with his speech.

Mr FOLEY: I have struggled through this contribution, Mr Speaker. I admit that we are quite significantly outnumbered, but do not think we are going to lie down and let you guys continue to steamroller this State, because we will not. We are Labor politicians and proud of it, and we will support the working people of this State. We will protect this State from the excesses of a Government whose power has gone to its head; we will protect the people of this State from an arrogant Government which has misled this State.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Goyder is making a display in the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a frivolous point of order. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: The Premier spent six weeks leading up to the State election promising Utopia: 'We will do this; there will be no jobs lost; we will not cut this; we will not cut that; we will have more of this.' He has broken every promise because he misled the electorate. If you think the electorate at the next State election will forget the contemptible way that you treated them—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe it is customary for speakers in this place to address their remarks through the Chair and not to throw inflammatory remarks across the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is correct. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Through you, Mr Speaker, the electors of this State will not forget the contemptible manner in which you conducted yourselves during the last State election. I will say through you, Mr Speaker—

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe it is correct for an honourable member to refer to people on this side as 'members', not as 'you', and also to address remarks through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is correct. However, the honourable member has been labouring under considerable difficulties with all the interjections. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: My great friend and political mentor, Mick Young, once told me, 'The quality of your speech is measured by the number of interjections.' This has been a great speech. I have got you all worried, haven't I! The point I want to make is very simple: you cannot mislead an electorate; you cannot promise what you promised and expect to survive politically.

What about the contribution tonight of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, who, I might add, did a great job in knifing the member for Bragg some months out from the election. The Deputy Premier on statewide television tonight, when asked, 'Will there be tax increases in this year's budget?', said, 'I can't rule anything out.' The reporter then reminded the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of the Premier's pre-election

commitment, 'I will resign if taxes go up.' The Deputy Premier's answer to that comment from the media was, 'I don't think he will have to resign.' So, they are all excited. Members opposite have not kept one election promise, and that is disgraceful!

Mr WADE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I will take up a point made by the member for Hart when he said a minute ago that you cannot mislead the electorate. I am delighted because it leads in beautifully to the subject on which I want to grieve tonight, namely, the attempts of Peter Duncan and the Labor Party in the north-eastern suburbs to pull the wool over the eyes of the electorate. Let us look at some of the games that the Labor Party is playing.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: As far as the member for Ross Smith is concerned, I encourage him to keep it up because from 1979 to 1982 I put up with similar taunts and had great delight in coming back in 1982 and pointing out to members opposite that they did not know what they were talking about. I will repeat the dose in 1997. I refer to the attempts of the Labor Party in the electorate of Wright and the north-eastern suburbs to mislead electors. I want to encourage Mr Duncan and the Labor Party in what they are doing because they have no idea of the number of phone calls and approaches I am getting from my electorate because of what is going on out there. Let us look at the games that Mr Duncan and the Labor Party are playing in the north-eastern suburbs.

First, not too long ago a public meeting was organised at the Modbury Hospital, allegedly to discuss the privatisation of that hospital. I was there representing the Minister for Health and saw nothing but a sea of Labor Party faces and Labor Party apparatchiks. I have seen them with their how-to-vote cards. If someone had said, 'Will everyone here who is a member of the Labor Party hold up their ticket?' you would not have seen a face as the room would have been full of Labor Party tickets. Those people who were not members of the Labor Party were union members. It was a really great evening. At the end of it I had great pleasure as I walked out, because I thought one thing about the Labor Party: it has done it again, because it certainly knows how to organise a political meeting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: If they thought that I walked away from that meeting thinking other than that it was a perfect example of Peter Duncan and the Labor Party organising a set-up, they were wrong. I will give Duncan and the Labor Party one thing: they certainly know how to stack a political meeting. To say that the meeting represented the wishes of the north-eastern suburbs is absolute nonsense. Boy, did we ever see some beauties there! Two rows from the front was a person I will loosely call a gentleman. I will not repeat the language that he used in relation to what I was saying or when describing me, but he typifies the attitude of the Labor Party, namely, that, whatever you do, do not let the other side

get out any facts, drown them out and try to ensure that nobody hears the facts so that everyone goes away happy.

The point is that I left that meeting thinking that, if that is the best the Labor Party can do, it has sunk to the nadir. I apologised for the Minister for Health who had a genuine reason for not being there: he had accepted another engagement long before that meeting. Peter Duncan came in, all pure, with halo shining, saying, 'I had another engagement, but I am here'. I remind Peter Duncan that I have been to many functions in the electorate and will go to many more when Peter Duncan will not be there and he will have to submit an apology. As in the case of the Minister, I have no doubt that his reasons will be genuine, but Peter Duncan has sown the seeds.

Peter Duncan has broken the convention of a member of Parliament submitting a genuine apology. If he wants to play it that way, that is the way the game will be played. I attend many more functions where he is not present than the other way around. If he wants to play dirty, so can we. Peter Duncan knows that there are conventions and that there will be times when he will be unable to attend functions in the north-eastern suburbs. In the future when he apologises and I am there I guess I will be left with no alternative but to say, 'I had another function but I felt this was more important and here I am.' He has sown the seeds, and he will reap the crop that he has sown.

I move on to the tactics of the Labor Party in my electorate. Some months ago a series of letters were written to the editor of the *Leader Messenger* which were actionable and which were extremely untrue and critical of me. The letters made all sorts of allegations about me and what I had or had not done. The letters were signed with the names of people allegedly living in Greenwith. Two letters related to the provision of a school crossing at Greenwith Primary School. What have we found? There are no such persons on the roll. When the *Leader Messenger* wrote to these persons it found that no such persons lived at the addresses they had given. The Labor Party has not even got the guts, when it writes critical letters, to use the names of members of the Party. It makes up names, and if you do not believe me—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member has been in the game. I suggest he rings the editor of the *Leader Messenger* who will confirm that these people do not exist. I do not mind responding to genuine people who write letters, but these people are not only not on the roll but there is no building at the addresses that they gave. So there! That is a perfect example of the Labor Party wanting to stab me in the back. It wants to peddle untruths, and it does not even use the names of genuine people. Although that was some months ago, the Labor Party has still not learned because in last week's *Leader Messenger* another letter was printed which was critical of me. What do we find? No such person or address exists.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The letters are in the *Messenger* for anyone to look at. Therefore, it is obvious that this is Duncan at work again. Do not worry about the truth, just get out there and write these abusive letters. As I said, the Labor Party has not even got the guts to use the names of genuine people.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: If the honourable member believes that, he would believe anything. *Aesop's Fables* has nothing on what we have heard tonight. I make the point that I hope the Labor Party keeps it up. As a result of those letters I

received a letter from the chairperson of a school council who said that the information given by these people was just untrue and how much the school appreciated the work that I had done to provide a school crossing. I hope that the Labor Party keeps it up because the people who telephone me and write to me about these letters make it quite clear that they do not accept them.

A letter in last week's *Leader* mentions my name a good dozen times. Keep it up, that is all I say, because I am delighted to have the publicity and, as residents in my electorate tell me, they know that it is just not true. These letters are doing a lot of damage, not to me but to members opposite. The next issue involves trading hours. I have received a letter from the SDA. The SDA asked me to reply indicating my stance on the issue, which I did. My stance is very clear. My reply covered about a page and a half. I used even, bold letters to discuss where I stood on the issue. I said that I am totally opposed to the deregulation of trading hours and to any general extension of Sunday trading. What did the SDA do? It wrote a letter to small businesses in my electorate, as follows:

This letter is to advise you that your local MP, Scott Ashenden, the member for Wright, has written to the SDA indicating his support for the introduction of Sunday trading.

Never let the truth get in the way of a good story—that is the motto of the Labor Party.

Well, once again, I hope the STA and the Labor Party keep this up, because I have kept a close contact with all small businesses in my electorate. They know that is not true. They know what my stance is. All that letter achieved was to have them ring me up to say, 'And this is the mob that supported big business before the election!' So, again I encourage the Labor Party and the unions to keep up this campaign, because it is doing me a world of good. I say 'Thank you' to the Labor Party.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith is having a bad influence on the member for Torrens.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I would like to talk about the current concerns being widely expressed in the community in relation to the future of the four women's health centres. I am glad the Minister for Health is present while I am saying these things because, after his reply to my colleague the member for Napier during Question Time yesterday, it is clear that he has a complete misunderstanding of the issues related to women's health and women's health centres. I want to put on the public record some of the information that those of us who support the work of women's health centres believe should be considered. Before I do this, I want just to mention a part of the Liberal policy on health, as follows:

... we will ensure that women's community health centres are able to provide and supervise preventive health measures and health prevention strategies.

So what is the role of women's health centres? There are two main roles: first, to provide a model of service to women that will be complementary to existing services; and, secondly, to act as a catalyst for changes within the broader health system. The core services provided by the centres are grouped under four headings: clinical and preventive health services to individual women; educative and preventive health services to groups of women; development of health information and health promotion programs for women and for use by other health workers and operations; and system change functions.

One of the principal functions of the women's health centres is to develop and demonstrate a model of care which is appropriate, sensitive and responsive to the needs of women. Such demonstrations enable the establishment of a body of knowledge and practice which creates a community recognition of the desirability of such services being offered within the mainstream mixed gender health services. The centres operate alongside and complement mainstream services.

Over the past 16 years, South Australian women's health centres have collectively developed a body of knowledge, practice and experience which enables them to claim status as centres of excellence in the area of women's health in South Australia. They do this in the following areas. First, they promote better recognition and response within the general health system to women's needs. Women's health centres have been instrumental in raising awareness about many significant women's physical and social health issues, and they are about appropriate strategies for addressing these issues. Some of these areas include domestic violence, eating related disorders, use of minor tranquillisers, child sexual abuse, postnatal depression, and pelvic inflammatory disease. Secondly, in relation to the training role of women's health centres, they function as examples of successful community based health services, and provide technical advice and training to individual health workers, as well as to secondary and tertiary institutions. Thus a pool of workers who have had the opportunity to focus specifically on women's health become available to the wider health system.

Thirdly, they are models for consumer oriented health care. Community based women's health services, in consultation with women in the community, have developed and implemented participative health care models. Complementary models which enable women's organisational participation in centres similarly have been developed. In this sense, centres act as safe training grounds for women's participation in the wider health system and society.

Finally, I refer to health promotion. Women's health centres have had a significant focus on illness prevention and the promotion of health through development of innovative and appropriate health promotion campaigns. The centres have also provided expert advice to various organisations whose health promotion campaigns are targeted specifically towards women. Women's health is more than just health for women alone. Women, as the prime carers of families, play a huge role in preventive health care across our community. So, 'women's health' really means 'community health'.

One of the aims of the current health system reform is to create a system that is responsive to community needs. Independent autonomous women's health centres were established in response to the demands of South Australian women. In numerous consultations with women, both in South Australia and interstate, women continue to express concerns about the lack of adequate, accessible, approachable health services controlled by women. Women argue that they see a separate women's space as important in providing a safe environment that acknowledges their specific health needs.

The establishment of women's health centres in South Australia was supported by all Parties. Former Health Minister Jennifer Cashmore was particularly strong in support of their inception. What will happen if women's health centres are mainstreamed, as those involved fear? First, there

will be a dilution of the strong women's health focus which enables best practice models to be developed. There will be the loss of the coherent and consistent approach that the four women's health centres currently enjoy. There will be a reduced profile for women's health issues and a subsequent decrease in influence on the wider health system. It will mean the loss of an important resource for the wider health system and a focus on changing the organisational culture of the host organisation at the expense of other current roles for women's health centre workers. There will be a loss of specialised training opportunities, a loss of focus on women's health needs, a subsequent loss of expertise in the area of development of innovative health promotion programs for women and a contravention of the express needs of women for accessible, safe and locally managed health care centres.

When those involved in women's health centres talk about being 'stand alone', they are not talking about cutting administrative costs, which they have already been addressing. What they are talking about is being able to deliver their service in a way that has worked successfully for the past 16 years. What are we really talking about? Is it a massive slice of the State budget that goes to these four women's health centres? It is in fact .15 per cent of the health budget. To achieve a saving of .15 per cent of the health budget we throw away the significant work of four very successful centres. Is this the way to go?

I will now discuss the process by which these decisions are being made. Overwhelmingly it is being said to me—and I know it is being said to other parliamentarians—that the Minister is not listening to those involved in women's health centres. He is not listening to the women who run them, nor is he acknowledging the issues. I would like to read briefly from a letter sent to the Minister, Dr Michael Armitage, by Rose Chaffey on behalf of the four women's health centre groups. She states:

On Friday 15 July on radio 5AN, you said that you would be willing to have the Coalition for Better Health act as a conduit for community comments. Thus we are sending this letter to you via the coalition. You also mentioned, in addressing the concerns of one caller re the amalgamation and mainstreaming of women's health centres, that there was unnecessary alarm being created about the issue. Are you aware that the South Australian Health Commission asked directors of women's health centres for their input into a paper on the pros and cons of mainstreaming these centres?

Are you also aware that they were asked for comments and given three hours to respond? What this of course meant was that there was no time for directors to consult with other staff or their boards of management, let alone the women in their communities.

The letter goes on essentially to say that they have not been consulted and that they have not been listened to. It concludes with the following paragraph:

We would appreciate a response to our concerns, and a reassurance that women's health centres will not be mainstreamed.

I ask that the Minister for Health take heed of those concerns. I know that he has not paid particular attention to what I have said and that he has continued his conversation, but I believe that the women of this State have the right to be listened to by the Minister for Health and have the right to be heard in relation to their health needs. I urge the Minister to take the opportunity to listen to the people and to make decisions that will not cut off services that have been successful.

Motion carried.

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 4 August at 11 a.m.