

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 October 1995

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

SA WATER

A petition signed by 147 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to legislate to retain public ownership, control, management and operation of the supply of water and the collection and treatment of sewage was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown. Petition received.

SCHOOL SERVICES OFFICERS

Petitions signed by 366 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review and rescind the proposed reduction in the number of hours worked by school services officers were presented by Messrs Brindal and Meier.

Petitions received.

GLEN BOREE CORNER TO NATIONAL HIGHWAY 1 ROAD

A petition signed by 162 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to upgrade the road from Glen Boree Corner to National Highway 1 was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the joint sitting of the two Houses for the choosing of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa, to which vacancy Mr Paolo Nocella was appointed.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 3 and 6.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Australian Financial Institutions Commission—Report, 1994-95.

Youth Court Act—Regulations—Fees.

Rules of Court—

District Court—District Court Act—Guardianship and Administration Act.

Magistrates Court—Magistrates Court Act—Restraining Orders.

Summons—Failure to comply.

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—

Guardianship and Administration Act.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

State Services, Department for—Report, 1994-95.

State Supply Board—Addendum to Report, 1994-95.

Housing Trust, South Australian—Financial Statements, 1994-95.

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Environment, Resources and Development Committee—Response to Sixteenth Report—Inquiry into Compulsory Motor Vehicle Inspections.

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

ETSA Corporation—Report, 1994-95.

Sewerage Act—Regulations—Charges—AWT Systems.

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

Regulations under the following Act—

Reproductive Technology—

Code of Ethical Clinical Practice.

Code of Ethical Research Practice.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Development Assessment Commission—Report on Demolition.

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Rules of Racing—

Racing Act—

Off-Course Totalisator Rules.

On-Course Totalisator Rules.

Harness Racing—Mobile Phones.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Soil Conservation Council—Report, 1994-95.

South Australian Timber Corporation—Report, 1994-95.

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

Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report—Inquiry into the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies.

By the Minister for Family and Community Services (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report—Inquiry into the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies.

By the Minister for the Ageing (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Commissioner for the Ageing—Report, 1994-95

Economic and Finance Committee—Response to Fifteenth Report—Inquiry into the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies.

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

Construction Industry Training Board—Report, 1994-95.

Non-Government Schools Registration Board—Report, 1994-95.

University of Adelaide—Report, 1994.

University of Adelaide—Statutes, 1994.

SA WATER

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: The Adelaide model of a contract for the development of an export-oriented water industry as well as the operation and maintenance of a metropolitan water and sewerage system has earned favourable recognition nationally and internationally, for example from no less an authority than the World Bank. The Leader of the Opposition has asked me 37 questions. He is trying to

create the impression that these are all unanswered issues about the contract. Yet when one looks at his 37 questions most of them are irrelevant—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If the Leader of the Opposition will keep quiet for a while he will get the answers to his questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Most of the Leader's questions are irrelevant; most of them are based on myths and innuendo, on assumptions which the Leader knows to be wrong. However, we know he will continue to perpetuate these myths and misinformation, unless we put the answers on the public record to those questions. I shall now respond specifically to each of the questions that the Leader asked.

Question: Will the contractor pay for the monopoly right to run our water and sewerage system? Answer: The question exhibits a total ignorance of the proposed contract. The contractor will perform work for us, and for that we will pay less than it would cost us to run the system ourselves. It is a fee-for-service contract.

Question: What will be the savings over the life of the contract? Answer: I repeat what I have said *ad nauseam* in this House—there will be substantial cost savings. Our target is savings of 20 per cent compared with our costs today. No substantial savings, no deal—but there will be a deal.

Question: What are the Government's target annual returns by way of dividends from SA Water? Answer: The dividend target for this financial year was published in the budget. It is \$61.7 million. As always, the dividends for the following years will be negotiated in the budget process each year.

Question: In the event that dividend forecasts are not met, does the contract provide for SA Water to review the contractor's performance and profits, and what action can be taken against the contractor? Answer: The dividends have nothing to do with the contractor's performance. SA Water sells the water, collects the revenue, runs the business and pays the dividend. The contractor has nothing to do with this. The contract will include penalties for non-performance, including the right to cancel the contract.

Question: Will the Government hold any securities against failure by the contractor to perform? Answer: Yes.

Question: And when he asks whether SA Water will have authority to direct the company to improve performance and are there penalty provisions? Again the answer is yes.

Question: What will be the minimum capital of the contracting company? Answer: This question would have to be the naive question of the lot. We will ensure that whoever gets the contract is a financially viable company. We are dealing with the biggest companies in the world in the water business—world wide.

Question: Will the contracting company—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Mines and Energy.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As indeed most of the questions are.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I suggest that the Leader get a new research officer; it might help hone the construction of a number of these questions.

Question: Will the contracting company be registered in South Australia? Answer: Yes. We are saying no real economic development, no Asia-Pacific headquarters in Adelaide—no deal.

Question: Is the contracting company required to lodge financial guarantees, and what are the details? Answer: Yes. Each bidder has confirmed that it will provide appropriate guarantees. The details will be finalised during the contract negotiations.

Question: What recourse will SA Water have should the contractor fail financially? Answer: What we know—and we know it through the authority of the World Bank—is that we are dealing with bids backed by the best global water companies in the world. Their financial strength and reputation are our guarantee.

Question: What analysis and economic modelling has been done to arrive at a realistic assessment of potential economic benefits from the contract? Answer: Given some of the Leader's questions, I wonder whether he would understand if I answered this question in full detail. When I tell him that we are taking an output-based approach, does he understand that we are measuring the success of the deal on the value of sales and exports and that we are commissioning the Australian Bureau of Statistics to measure the export performance of the contract and the development of the South Australian water industry in general? The economic modelling for this contract was done by some of the most experienced financial analysts working in Australia. It has real benchmarks and it will deliver real jobs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, I will. Question: Will the contract control the contractor's annual level of profit? Answer: The contract will ensure that SA Water gets the benefit of improved efficiencies, which mean substantial cost savings over the life of the contract. This will be reflected in the contract and the fees we will pay to the contractor.

Question: Will performance indicators be made public? Answer: Yes—and we will be proud of them. When we have signed the contract we will talk publicly about export targets, jobs and other benefits of this project for South Australia.

Question: What will the contractor be required to do towards the conservation of water? Answer: Water conservation is not a responsibility of the contractor. That responsibility remains with the Government—like the responsibility for prices, quality and customer service.

Question: Will payments to the contractor include amounts based on volumetric throughput? Answer: No, it will not.

Question: Who is responsible for 'capital maintenance' and will SA Water supervise maintenance programs? Answer: The contractor will carry out maintenance of capital works to the schedules agreed with SA Water.

Question: Has the Government given any guarantees about the level of capital works? Answer: No. We have a forward capital works plan which will be controlled by the Government.

Question: How will SA Water ensure that all work undertaken by the contractor represents best practice? Answer: We have assessed all bidders on their ability to implement best practice and achieve cost savings at the same time. High performance standards are built into the contract with financial penalties for non-performance.

Question: What reporting systems will be in place by 1 January to ensure that SA Water is fully equipped to monitor the performance of the contract and the systems? Answer: SA Water is well equipped to manage the contract. The detailed

monitoring and reporting systems will be finalised during the transition phase; that is, the time between the signing and the commencement of the contract.

Question: Will the management of SA Water be restructured to manage the contract? Answer: Yes. Action is already under way to reorganise SA Water to meet the demands of contract management from January 1996 and the new directions of the corporation.

Question: Will contract administrators be engaged to protect SA Water's rights? Answer: The contract will be managed by SA Water. This contract is about saving money and about a partnership with the private sector to create an export-oriented water industry in South Australia.

Question: Will the Minister release projections for future charges to consumers necessary to support the contract and dividends to the Government? How often will charges be reviewed and what criteria will apply? Answer: As in past decades, year in and year out, prices and dividends will be set by the Government annually, based on the different needs of the community, which owns SA Water. The revenue required from customers to meet dividend targets will be lower because of the real cost savings gained from this contract, and the people of South Australia will therefore benefit.

Question: Is the Government bound contractually to increase charges to consumers under certain circumstances and what are the details? Answer: Absolutely not. This is another perfect example of the myths put out by the Opposition Leader.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader might well laugh in embarrassment at some of the questions he has put up.

Question: What arrangement will apply for staff to transfer to the contractor? Answer: Before asking this question the Leader should have talked—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition ought to look at *Hansard*. We passed legislation last year, following a statement by the Treasurer in this House as to the course of action we would follow, after which the shadow Minister went overseas and interviewed the companies. What the Opposition said at the time was that this was the right direction but that we were not going far enough. How it has changed in the few months of this year!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is true. The Leader says that that is not true. The Leader ought to know, because he was briefing journalists in this town that this was the right policy direction, but that only one thing was wrong—we were not including customer service in it; that we ought to go the whole step if we were going to do it and do the job properly. From that, and from the briefing of journalists in this town by the Opposition, it now has got to the stage of saying that it will take a totally different tack—

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a minor point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister sought leave to make a ministerial statement and not engage in falsehoods, lies and arguments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House gave the Minister leave to make a statement. He is now making that statement and the honourable member cannot indicate that the Minister is telling lies and therefore he must withdraw that comment.

Mr CLARKE: I withdraw the word 'lies'.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. This ministerial statement has deteriorated because of the interjections. There is a rule in this House that ministerial statements be heard in silence.

The SPEAKER: Order! All interjections are out of order and all members know that. The Chair has endeavoured to allow a reasonable amount of free flow across the Chamber: it has now got out of hand and the Chair will not permit it.

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Clearly this ministerial statement has degenerated—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr QUIRKE: My point of order is that the Minister is now clearly debating the issue. The Minister is entering into debate, and that is an abuse of the ministerial statement process in this House and he ought to know that better than anyone else opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The decision on whether the ministerial statement continues is entirely in the hands of the House.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Question: What arrangements will apply for staff to transfer to the contractor? Answer: Before asking this question the Leader should have talked to his union colleagues. We have negotiated with them and the result is that no SA Water employee will be retrenched, none will be compelled to transfer to the contractor and those who choose to do so will be offered a comparable remuneration package.

Question: What controls will be in place on the use of subcontractors by the prime contractor, and how will SA Water ensure that any subcontract let by the prime contractor is let at arm's length and on the best commercial terms? Answer: We are giving encouragement, while the Labor Party is into control. It just cannot come to terms with the fact that people want to get on with their lives and their jobs without interference from the Government. The whole concept of this contract is to generate work for small businesses in this State and jobs for South Australians. The more work the prime contractor will give to subcontractors, the more work for small business and the more jobs for South Australians. The contractor cannot subcontract to any of its affiliates without the approval of SA Water, and all work must be let through a competitive tendering process.

Question: Do the consultants used to assist in the preparation of contract specifications and evaluation of the tenders have any ongoing liability for their advice? Answer: Yes, of course they do. We have engaged experts to protect the State in this deal. All consultants are signing off on their advice.

Question: Which consultants were given disclaimers against their advice? Answer: None.

Question: Will the salaries of senior water company executives be publicly disclosed as a condition of the contract? Answer: No. What they do has nothing to do with us. This is another red herring from the Leader of the Opposition resulting from his lack of understanding of the contract. This is a fee for service contract.

Question: What sanctions will apply to the private company if it is found to have breached environmental standards? Answer: The contractor will be subject to all sanctions of the Environmental Protection Authority.

Question: Can the Minister explain specifically what technology transfer will occur to South Australia as a result of the contract? Answer: All bidders have put forward substantial and exciting proposals on research and development to be carried out in South Australia. All are keen to work with the Australian Water Quality Centre at Bolivar, the

core of the Australian Cooperative Research Centre for Water Quality.

Question: What specific requirements exist in the contract to make sure the contractor keeps pace with technological improvements and does not saddle South Australia with inferior technology? Answer: The RFP document requires that best intellectual and technological standards are achieved on an ongoing basis. This includes specific contractual obligations to keep pace with technological improvements. Let me add that we are dealing with companies which are world leaders in technological development.

Question: Specifically, what new intellectual property of the company will South Australia have access to as a result of the contract to which it did not have access previously?

Answer: We will have access to all the latest intellectual property which is costing these companies billions to develop. It is a partnership.

Question: What specific goals and targets have been laid down for South Australian industry involvement? Answer: 150 companies have registered with SA Water to participate in the growth of the water industry. Their capability profiles were made available to the bidders. The bidders had to commit to specific monetary values for exports of goods and services out of South Australia and submit one, five and 10 year plans for industry development in this State, and I can assure the House that every one of the bidders has delivered.

Question: What have been the due diligence costs of negotiations to date and what are they projected to be by the signing of the contract? Answer: The costs of negotiations are small compared to the huge savings which this contract will deliver to South Australians. They are at least best practice level.

These are the answers to the 37 questions. If the Leader wants to ask any more questions, by all means let us have them and we will respond to them. But I encourage the Leader to think them through more carefully and get a new research officer, which perhaps would be a start, with at least a basic understanding of the contract. He should make his questions relevant and drop the innuendo and misinformation from them. Perhaps when the Leader asks his next round of questions he can tell us why he is opposed to the more efficient delivery of water and sewerage to consumers in South Australia, why he does not want cost savings for the Government and consumers in South Australia, why he rejects economic development in South Australia, why he prefers to assign young people to a life of unemployment instead of supporting every effort to create jobs and why he would rather play politics with the truth than work for the rejuvenation of this State.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to raise two points. First, the Minister has exceeded the 15 minutes allotted for a ministerial statement. Secondly, the Minister is going into the realm of debate rather than stating straight-out Government policy.

The SPEAKER: The Chair believes that the Minister has concluded his remarks, but the Deputy Leader is correct: in making ministerial statements, Ministers should not engage in debate.

RACING INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can assure the honourable member that the time is being monitored.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: In June 1995, I advised Parliament that a need for strategic reform existed within each of the three codes of racing in the face of continuing challenges that affect the ongoing viability of the racing industry. At that time, I had already initiated discussions with the newly appointed Chairman of the Greyhound Racing Board, Mr Mark Kelly, who responded by implementing a comprehensive overview of the greyhound racing code undertaken by Speakman Stillwell. I undertook a similar process for the harness racing code by appointing Mr John Delaney to advise me on the future strategic direction for that industry. That report will be presented to the Harness Racing Board today.

With respect to the galloping code, the process of reform needs to be more internally driven due to the composition of the controlling authority committee, the South Australian Jockey Club, and its recognised status within the structure of the Australian Conference of Principal Clubs. Notwithstanding this situation, I will be making my intentions clear that a strong and determined focus is required in the areas of financial management, planning and marketing. In addition, any structural reform of the controlling authority must necessarily provide formal opportunities for input by industry participants.

There are many difficult issues facing the racing industry at the present time, including diminishing on-course patronage, reductions in betting turnover, the number and mix of racing dates between metropolitan and country areas, competition from other gambling activities, the emergence of pay TV and the development of interactive betting technologies—to name but a few. Without structural reform to positively position the industry to address these issues, it faces a period of stagnation. Such a future for an industry which is a significant contributor to the economy of the State cannot be tolerated.

These issues will require careful consideration and analysis in order that appropriate strategies can be introduced to maintain and develop the racing industry in this State. In recent weeks, I have received from Speakman Stillwell and Mr John Delaney their reports on recommended future strategic directions for the greyhound and harness racing codes respectively. The key recommendations arising from these reviews can be summarised as follows:

With regard to greyhound racing—

- The existing Greyhound Racing Board be replaced by a Greyhound Racing Corporation, comprising five members who have a range of experience and skills in finance, law, commerce, business, marketing and technical areas.

- Responsibilities of the new corporation be expanded to include the commercial operations of the greyhound clubs and the conduct and administration of the greyhound racing events.

- The consolidation of night racing in the metropolitan area at Angle Park, and to establish Wednesday evening as the venue for country greyhound racing at Port Pirie and Strathalbyn.

- The establishment of a South Australian Greyhound Racing Federation, comprising nominees from all greyhound clubs and associations (such as owners, breeders, trainers and bookmakers, etc.) to advise and liaise with the new corporation.

With regard to harness racing—

- The existing board be replaced with a restructured controlling body called Harness Racing Authority (SA).
- The new controlling body be comprised of five persons—none of whom represent any interest groups within the industry and include marketing, legal and financial expertise.
- The Harness Racing Authority to become a principal club and assume control of racing at Globe Derby Park.
- The authority to relocate its offices to Globe Derby Park.
- The creation of an Industry Advisory Council to advise and assist the authority in its decision making processes, and,
- Investigations to commence on the issue of club rationalisation.

It is particularly relevant to note the common conclusions reached by each report: first, the recommendations to replace the nominees of interest groups on the controlling bodies with independent appointees who have the required expertise and, secondly, the establishment of an advisory body comprising industry representatives who can provide the detailed knowledge and advice required by the ultimate decision making authority.

These are significant changes to the future operations and administration of the greyhound and harness racing codes. Clearly, this push for reform at the highest level of industry administration has been consistent across these two codes of racing from a majority of all participants and administrators concerned.

Given the significance of the recommendations concerned for change, I will gauge industry response to both reports over the next three weeks and prepare a response on the Government's position in early November. During this period I will be discussing each of the recommendations with the Opposition spokesman for Recreation, Sport and Racing, as well as the Australian Democrats, in order to facilitate bipartisan support for any change which is deemed necessary.

WITJIRA NATIONAL PARK

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to inform the House of the release of the Witjira National Park management plan, marking an important milestone in the joint management of this park by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and Irrwanyere Aboriginal Corporation. The plan follows the signing of a long-term lease arrangement between Irrwanyere Aboriginal Corporation members and myself as part of a growing commitment to Aboriginal involvement in the management of our national parks. Mr Speaker, I am delighted that my colleague the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and yourself, as the local member, were able to witness this significant event.

The Witjira National Park is located in the Far North of the State and includes the well known Dalhousie Mound Springs. In the development of joint management for Witjira, four conditions were accepted as crucial. First, it has been important for the department to deal with an organisation rather than with individuals. Irrwanyere Aboriginal Corporation is the relevant body formed for this purpose by the Lower Southern Arrernte and Wangkangurru people. The corporation's membership is open to all Aboriginal people

who have traditional association with the park. Such rights and responsibilities are derived from being born in the area or growing up there or from being a descendant of Aboriginal people who were born or grew up in that vicinity.

Secondly, Aboriginal cultural and customary concerns must be taken into account in the plan of management. It is through the planning process that Aboriginal interests and those of the broader community are reconciled.

Thirdly, Aboriginal joint managers must be able to establish living areas in the park. Reintroduction of Aboriginal land use practices will be made possible through Aboriginal people living on the park. This will assist in accomplishing some of the overall objectives of park management. It is also in the public interest that the Lower Southern Arrernte and Wangkangurru people maintain their culture. For Irrwanyere members this requires that they live on lands with which they are traditionally associated. Establishment of living areas by Irrwanyere, and Aboriginal subsistence use of the park, is thus provided for in this plan, together with management strategies to ensure that modern Aboriginal land does not adversely affect the environments of the park.

Fourthly, it is fundamental that the Aboriginal people concerned have their traditional associations taken into account through some form of tenure over the park. Without this recognition they cannot secure funding for community services or develop enterprises that might help them realise their aspirations for social and economic development through management of lands with which they have traditional associations.

Accordingly, approval in principle has been given by the Minister for a long-term lease to Irrwanyere. Under the joint management arrangements proposed in this plan, Aboriginal expertise will be fully utilised and mechanisms will be established for Aboriginal people to be successful joint managers and to realise their own goals for community development. I think we should all welcome this as a significant step and look forward to the success of this arrangement.

QUESTION TIME

HUS EPIDEMIC DOCUMENTS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Health give a categorical assurance that the Coroner was provided with every Government document relating to the HUS epidemic and that no documents were withheld? On 11 July, the South Australian Health Commission provided the Opposition with 'those documents tendered as evidence before the court which fall within terms of your application under the Freedom of Information Act'. The documents provided to the Opposition do not refer to all matters listed as having occurred on 23 and 24 January in the Minister's chronology of events dated 2 February.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will have to examine the actual details of that matter, but I assure the member for Elizabeth that I have been assured by my department that all the relevant material was provided.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Premier report on any developments today in the South Australian Government's efforts to ensure that the Adelaide Airport is leased as soon

as possible in order to facilitate a major upgrading of the terminal facilities?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have some very good news for the House. This morning, I met with John Howard and the Federal Coalition Shadow Cabinet, and I put to them a case that the Adelaide Airport lease-out should be brought forward from the end of 1997, which is where the Federal Labor Government wants to put it at present. The Federal Labor Government says that we will have to wait for more than a further two years to be able to lease out the airport. This morning, I put our case to John Howard and the Shadow Cabinet, and they decided to allow the leasing out of the airport immediately upon their getting into government, which is 18 months sooner than would occur under the Federal Labor Government.

Here we have egg going straight back onto the face of the Leader of the Opposition, because on the last sitting day in this place he tried to accuse John Howard of delaying considerably the leasing out of the Adelaide Airport. Now we find that John Howard and the Coalition Shadow Cabinet will allow the leasing out much sooner than would have occurred otherwise. On three days last week the Federal Labor Government put out statements accusing John Howard of delaying the leasing out of Adelaide Airport. That will not occur. This morning he announced that the airport can be leased out immediately, and he intends to move an amendment to the Federal legislation to allow that to occur.

This is good news for South Australia, because as a result of the past 12 years of a Federal Labor Government Adelaide has ended up with the worst capital city airport of any capital city in Australia. The Federal Labor Government failed to extend the runway.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was a Liberal State Government that got the money for that. The Federal Labor Government failed to upgrade the airport passenger terminal facilities, and we have no air bridges at all. The State Liberal Government and now the Federal Coalition Opposition are forcing this issue and will achieve for South Australia better airport facilities well ahead of what otherwise would have been achieved under the Federal Labor Government.

I also point out that, as a result, the Liberal Government intends to start negotiations so that we will have a substantial upgrade of the Adelaide terminal once the leasing out occurs. That upgrade will involve a multi-million dollar development together with the possibility of bringing together the domestic and overseas terminals, and it will include air bridges at the same time.

The Coalition Shadow Cabinet raised one other issue this morning, and it is this: once again, it restated its opposition to any increase in the wine tax which would have an adverse effect on South Australia or any attempt to restructure the wine tax at a Federal level. That is a very important commitment from John Howard, one which the Federal Labor Government has been unable and unwilling to give. For more than three months, Mr Keating and the Federal ministry have been sitting on the Industry Commission report refusing to release it. Why? Because I believe that they have a secret intention to increase substantially the wine tax in South Australia, and that would seriously and adversely affect the wine industry in this State. When we come to the next Federal election South Australians will have a clear choice: a Federal Liberal Coalition Government that cares about South Australia or a Federal Labor Government that thinks only about itself in Canberra.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HUS EPIDEMIC DOCUMENTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Did you or your office provide the Coroner with copies of minutes and records of the meeting called by you on Saturday 4 February to review the Government's response to the HUS epidemic?

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand that Standing Orders require members, including even the Leader of the Opposition, to refer to members by their rank or electorate and not by the second person pronoun.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ridley is correct. However, on this occasion the Chair does not believe there to be a great breach of Standing Orders.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will recap without breaking Standing Orders. Did the Premier or his office provide the Coroner with copies of minutes and records of the meeting called by the Premier on Saturday 4 February to review the Government's response to the HUS epidemic; and, if not, why not? On 7 February the Premier told this Parliament that he had convened a meeting on 4 February of all relevant authorities and spent three hours reviewing the HUS epidemic. The Premier said, and I quote his words directly:

Later that day, we called in representatives of the company itself, Garibaldi, and went through their evidence.

The FOI request lodged by the Opposition on 9 February sought all internal assessments, reports and internal memoranda, but no records of the Premier's involvement have been provided. Did you give those minutes to the Coroner?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will have to ascertain what information, if any, was given to the Coroner.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked his question. He knows the Standing Orders, and I suggest that he not set out to breach them on a regular basis.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Premier advise the House on recent trends in the employment of young people in the public sector?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I read with interest an article in yesterday's newspaper which quotes the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as saying:

In targeting 12 400 people to be cut from the public sector, the Brown Government has paid out millions of dollars getting rid of one end of the market and not recruiting at the other end.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had the opportunity during the last sitting week to read the Commissioner for Public Employment's annual report to this Parliament. He knows exactly what the facts are, but once again he decides to ignore the facts and the truth and to say whatever he thinks will secure for him a political point. One could describe it, in different circumstances and not in this House, as perhaps a significant untruth, but I will not accuse him of that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Cummins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood is not being helpful to the Chair. I suggest that members take a step backward. The Chair has been particularly tolerant this

afternoon. If members continue to ignore the rulings of the Chair, Standing Order 137 will be applied forthwith.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had looked at the facts—which are clearly recorded in this House in the various annual reports—he would have found the following: in June 1993, under the former Labor Government, 126 employees or trainees were employed within the State Government. By June 1994 (12 months later and six months after the election of this Government), we had substantially increased that number to 414 from the previous 126. By June 1995 we had further increased that figure to 741. In other words, the number is something like six times higher than the number employed by the former Labor Government.

By June next year this Liberal Government will have employed more than 2 500 young people in specific training and work experience activities under the Government's youth training schemes. Statistics show that of this number 68 per cent of young people are obtaining permanent employment at the end of their training period. It is this Liberal Government that has embarked on a major expansion of youth training within the services of Government and has allowed those people to stay on. I compare that figure of 2 500 in the first two years of this Liberal Government with the fact that, as at June 1993, a mere 126 people were being trained under the former Labor Government.

The facts speak for themselves: this Liberal Government has given the emphasis to youth training. It is a pity the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is either so lazy and cannot help himself to the annual report of the Commissioner for Public Employment, or deliberately does not wish—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —as the Leader has just said—to know the facts so that he can go out and say any untruth he desires.

HUS EPIDEMIC DOCUMENTS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Which documents relating to the fatal HUS epidemic are still being withheld by the Government, and why? The release of documents to the Opposition has not detailed which documents are still being withheld and why as required by the Freedom of Information Act. For 23 and 24 January the documents provided to the Opposition do not contain records of advice to Garibaldi that the epidemic had been traced to its product, copies of advice to the Minister, reports of inspection of the Garibaldi premises and minutes of meetings with Garibaldi.

The SPEAKER: Many aspects of the question are very similar to a previous question and I ask the Minister to ignore those aspects.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I must unfortunately give an answer that is very similar to my previous answer. I have been informed by officers of the commission that all relevant material has been presented. I will look into the specifics of the question, but I am assured by Health Commission officers that the package of material sent to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday afternoon, if not this morning—certainly within the past 24 hours—contained all the documentation, but I will check.

SA WATER

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Infrastructure allay some of the concerns people may now have as a result of misinformation conveyed at a rally in Adelaide on Saturday about the State Government's contracting out of the management of metropolitan water services?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We saw the Leader of the Opposition at it again on Saturday. As the Premier has just referred to the Deputy Leader, so it is the case with the Leader: he does not let the truth get in the way of a good story-line. The Leader of the Opposition stood on the steps of Parliament House holding up a sprinkler licence system. What he forgot to say was that many counties in the United Kingdom do not have water meters, and for decades many consumers have had licences to turn on a hose and water their gardens. He did not mention any of that because it would have destroyed his good story.

I make the point that there will be no sprinkler licence fee in South Australia because the Government will continue to set the price of water and the price of sewerage facilities and services in South Australia. No private contractor will get its hands on that decision-making process: it will be retained by the Government. The Leader well knew that fact before the rally, but he sought to ignore it. Of course, it is interesting to look at some of the familiar faces at the rally. If one looks at the education and health rallies and the water rally at the weekend, how familiar and similar were the faces.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, and we will get to that point. I expected the Leader to be at them all but, let me say, he has some consistent supporters. One face in particular tended to stand out, and it was Doug McCarty. Doug McCarty has a similar name to Clare McCarty—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —and, of course, she has had a high profile on issues in recent times, but Doug McCarty has a more important background. It was Doug McCarty who led all the opposition and rallies against uranium mining in South Australia about 10 or 12 years ago, coincidentally, when the Leader of the Opposition was press secretary to the then Labor Party Leader. It was the Leader of the Opposition and Doug McCarty who were running the rallies against Roxby Downs. It was a consortium that, 10 to 15 years ago, tried to stop Roxby Downs—a billion dollar export industry, providing thousands of jobs in the State of South Australia. They tried then and they failed. If they try again, they will fail again.

We well know the old saying about the truth not getting in the way of a good story. It was during that time that the Leader—and it has been well referred to in this Parliament on many occasions—in an effort to get the media a bit enthused about a good story, took the front cover off a report, stamped 'Confidential' on it, distributed it to the media and said, 'Here is a leaked confidential report for you.' That is the sort of fabrication we get from the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This Leader has a history in South Australia of fabricating stories for political mileage. This Leader is ignoring the truth about the water issue. He is ignoring the facts and trying to create fear in the community. Try he will, but he will fail.

Members interjecting:

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

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And so is the member on my right who interjected. The member for Taylor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the member for Taylor because of the interjections. If the members who are interjecting keep it up, they will not be here to listen to the member for Taylor.

PORT AUGUSTA TO ALICE SPRINGS RAIL LINE

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Does the Premier support the privatisation of the Port Augusta to Alice Springs railway?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, I take this opportunity to congratulate the honourable member for apparently now reaching the status of being in the shadow Cabinet. She is leader of the right—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—and now shadow Minister for Tourism. Thank goodness she is not the shadow Minister for Transport because she would have realised that the Port Augusta to Alice Springs rail line is a Federal issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If she is so intelligent, why does she ask me whether we support the privatisation of the line?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I well recall Tom Playford relating a story to me about his first Question Time in the Parliament. One of the rather senior Ministers said to him, 'Tom, why don't you ask me a question today about a particular property with a large fence on the eastern side of Adelaide? Why don't you get up and ask why I have not bothered to replace this fence and made sure that it is kept in order?' It turned out that the fence did not belong to the State Government at all. The Minister had simply pulled poor old Tom's leg. It would appear that the member for Taylor has been dealt the same cruel blow.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Mrs HALL (Coles): Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs aware of a report on the Channel 7 *News* last night about State Government office accommodation; will he inform the House of the situation relating to the Government's office holdings; and, in particular, will he explain the circumstances—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is contrary to Standing Orders to ask a Minister whether a statement in the media is true.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence is correct in his point of order. If the member for Coles was asking the Minister to verify a news item, that is contrary to Standing Orders. My understanding was that the member was not asking the Minister that question. Therefore, I ask the member for Coles in completing her question to ensure that it conforms with Standing Orders.

Mrs HALL: Mr Speaker, I asked the Minister whether he was aware of a report on the Channel 7 *News*. Can the Minister explain the circumstances surrounding the refurbishment of the State Administration Centre, a project initiated, as I understand it, under the former Labor Government?

The SPEAKER: The last part of the question is comment.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: This seems to be the day on which we should not let a bit of truth get in the way of a good story. Last evening Channel 7 ran a story to the effect that there had been a significant increase in the management of public space. I notice that the shadow Treasurer—we should not get too uptight about him; he was not in the previous Ministry, so we will let him off to that extent—was helping the story to be blown up a bit. It is interesting to look at the Auditor-General's Report in the years 1992-93 to 1993-94. I think that was the time when the previous Labor Government was in power. As I said, I would not expect the shadow Treasurer to understand or know this, but the reality is that during that period the previous Government decided to transfer the management of the Netley commercial area of 40 000 square metres to the control of DBM. It also transferred the tram barn, 6 000 square metres, and the Flinders central building, which is now to have the police in it, of 14 000 square metres. Therefore, it increased the area managed by DBM by about 56 000 square metres. The Auditor-General has said that we have increased our management by 45 000 square metres. The reason is that we sold Australis, which represented 16 000 square metres.

This is an area where it would help in reporting if people were to approach the Minister. I understand that the reporting was done in front of the building, only four floors below. If anyone had bothered to ask the Minister, they would have discovered that it was all done under the previous Government, because the previous Government believed it would be better if the management of all this space was under the control of one Minister.

The other issue that was brought up about the overrun in the State Administration Centre is interesting. The State Administration refurbishment was put together by the previous Labor Government. Thank goodness the Liberal Government was able to come in and manage it to its end. When this Government came in, the last four floors were in an absolute mess. Because of good management by the Minister, it was brought in under budget. Prior to that I had to take a special submission to Cabinet to get an increase in the potential budget. It is a pity that the media and the Opposition do not bother to approach Ministers, because they will tell them the position as it is. It is a very simple story. The previous Government, in good management, transferred it to the Department of Building Management so that it could manage it better on behalf of the Government.

PORT AUGUSTA TO ALICE SPRINGS RAIL LINE

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In light of the Premier's reluctance to state his position on the privatisation of the Port Augusta to Alice Springs railway, does he support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Unruly members are making it particularly difficult for the House to hear the member for Taylor. I suggest that the member for Taylor ask her question and not comment before asking it.

Ms WHITE: Does the Premier support the Federal Liberal Opposition's policy of privatising the Port Augusta to Alice Springs railway, or will he now urge the Federal

Opposition to change its policy? A letter dated 22 June this year from the Federal shadow Minister of Transport to the Northern Territory Treasurer states:

Consequently, I have since the last election reiterated the Coalition's commitment of providing free to a private sector developer the existing line from Port Augusta to Alice Springs as an incentive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been very tolerant. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition take a deep breath, or he will be the first to have Standing Order 137 applied to him.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Again, if only the member for Taylor had talked to someone with a little more experience, she would have found that in 1992—not June this year, but 1992—a significant proposal was put forward whereby all the Alice Springs to Tarcoola and the Darwin to Alice Springs line—this is part of the proposal for the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link—was to come under one management and be part of one private rail company. That was part of the proposal put forward in 1992, and it was further talked about in considerable detail before the Federal election in 1993.

Part of the reasoning behind this was that it would be a way of helping to secure the \$500 million or \$600 million that will be required for the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link, and that would allow for the privatisation of the entire line from Tarcoola to Darwin so that one company operated all trains on that line. That makes a great deal of sense. Part of trying to secure the \$600 million and reduce the required \$300 million to \$400 million from the Federal Government was instead to allow them to have equity in the Tarcoola or, as the member said, Port Augusta to Alice Springs line. There is nothing unusual about that at all. If we could secure the building of the Alice Springs to Darwin line by allowing the privatisation of the line from Alice Springs to Port Augusta, I would support that, because it would be an enormous boost to South Australia.

I throw back a question not only to the member for Taylor but also to the Leader of the Opposition: do they support the building of the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link? If they do, it is about time they went to Canberra and put pressure on the Prime Minister to say that it would be good for South Australia and that it would open up a whole new opportunity for exporting from South Australia into South-East Asia. The benefits to this State would be huge, first, during the construction phase when we would be building the railway lines in South Australia. The opportunity would be there for contractors to get work. Once the line is finished the opportunity would be available for substantial exports from manufacturers in South Australia going to Indonesia.

I had the opportunity and privilege this morning to meet a senior delegation from Indonesia here in Adelaide. One of the projects they talked about at length was the huge opportunity for new trade between Indonesia and South Australia. Indonesia is already in the top 10 countries trading with South Australia, but that rail link, as was highlighted by the Indonesian Minister this morning, would open up enormous new opportunity where, instead of involving four or five weeks of sailing, it would take a matter of days. I throw out a challenge to the Opposition: put aside your petty politics and come out and support the Liberal Government in fighting for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line—and do so as quickly as possible.

GRAFFITI

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): With recent publicity centred around three graffiti offenders from South Australia being given gaol sentences in Victoria, will the Minister for Youth Affairs say how these sentences compare with South Australian penalties for similar offences?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Mawson for the question as it is an important one. Many South Australians were surprised last Wednesday to see on the front page of the *Advertiser* that three young people from South Australia were gaoled in Victoria, one for 30 days and the other two for 40 days. Some people have the idea that in South Australia the penalties are less, but in fact they are more severe. The maximum penalty for graffiti offences or for carrying a graffiti implement is a maximum of six months gaol, irrespective of whether the person is a juvenile or an adult. In Victoria the detention penalty does not apply to juveniles.

Also in South Australia an offender can be charged under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and, if the property damage exceeds \$25 000, the maximum penalty is imprisonment for life. Where damage exceeds \$2 000 but not \$25 000 a maximum of five years imprisonment is provided, and where the damage does not exceed \$2 000 it is two years. They are the penalties under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

In addition, people can take civil action (as is the case with Happy Valley council) and pursue individual offenders in the courts. So, there are three avenues through which offenders can be targeted. As a Government we want young people to do positive things and in fact most young people do. As a Government and a community we will not sit back and tolerate this sort of behaviour. The courts in South Australia have the power and the penalties are severe indeed. Shortly I will announce in detail a program for our school system, both private and public, that will focus on encouraging young people through the curriculum to understand that they own community facilities—the schools, TransAdelaide and the playgrounds—and that by destroying or damaging them they are damaging property they own.

That program will be launched next year, not only through Education Department (DECS) schools but also through the private school sector. Parents and young people must understand that the community has had enough of graffiti vandalism. It is not art but destructive, and it costs individuals, the Government and the community a lot of money. The penalties are there. The courts can and will enforce them, and the penalties are much tougher than those existing in any other State in Australia.

SA WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Minister for Infrastructure. Given that the Minister has told the House that the successful tenderer for the water outsourcing contract will be registered in South Australia, will he reveal to the House what minimum capital the Government will require the successful SA company to have and what cash guarantees the successful contractor will be required to lodge with SA Water against failing to perform under the contract? The Australian Securities Commission records show that North West Water Australia Pty Ltd is a \$2 company with two shares issued at a face value of \$1 each. South Australian Water Services Pty

Ltd was registered on 13 December 1994 and its principal activity is listed as 'a shelf company'—something of which the Premier is well aware.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Commission records show no paid-up capital but that its parent company, Australian Water Services, owned by Lend Lease, Lyonnaise des Eaux and P & O, is a \$3 company with three \$1 shares issued. United Water Services Pty Ltd was registered on 31 March 1995, and its principal activity is also recorded as a shelf company. Again, no paid-up capital was recorded. Of course, we are talking about some of the biggest companies in the world.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition continues to flout Standing Order No. 97. You have warned him before that he will not be allowed the question, and this House has been subjected to his continual disregard of Standing Orders on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The Chair was listening particularly carefully to the Leader and to other questions today. Members on both sides today have not distinguished themselves in following the Standing Orders. Because the House has not been in session for particularly long, the Chair has endeavoured to be more tolerant than usual. I suggest to honourable members that if they continue in this vein Standing Orders will be applied without warning. The Minister for Infrastructure.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Opposition continues to display its total ignorance of commercial matters and of running a business.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Be patient! In the former Government I do not think that any Minister, bar one, had any involvement in the private sector in running a business and, my goodness, did that not show at the end of the day! As the Premier says, look at the Opposition currently with its experience in commercial private sector matters. It is effectively zilch. The companies referred to have formed companies in Australia, and I told the Leader in my ministerial statement that they will be registered in South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has been warned for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Every time you interject you show how naive you are. If you do not want to embarrass yourself further I would keep quiet until you get the answer, until the contract is let and until the full explanation is made. The simple fact is that those companies formed consortiums to present bids to the Government. Those bids are now being evaluated, clarified and assessed and the best and final offers have just been received in the past few days from those companies and are now, and over the course of the next week or two, in the process of being assessed. To meet the Government's wish for maximum Australian industry involvement, many of the companies have put together consortiums that meet that requirement, and the Leader will be surprised when all is revealed. But until such time as the evaluation, clarification and assessment phase is completed (that is, commercial negotiations, if you did not know what it meant in other terms), we will not be able to disclose the full details. I give the Leader an absolute commitment that the full details will be put on the table for him, the public—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The whole contract?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has had two warnings. He knows the consequences.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This is the 100 question Leader. He is up to No. 39 and is working towards 100 to try to give some credibility to the other 38 that got shot down earlier today. We will lay out the full structure of this contract for the scrutiny of the Leader of the Opposition, the Parliament, the select committee and the public of South Australia.

MOUNT BURR SAWMILL

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Has the Government decided to sell the Mount Burr sawmill in the South-East of the State? Earlier, in May this year, the Mount Burr mill was advertised for sale by the Asset Management Task Force. What is happening?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Last year we made a decision to pursue the sale of Forwood Products. There was some interest in the issue of whether Mount Burr could be sold as a stand alone item with a timber supply as an economic proposition. The Asset Management Task Force did a scoping study on the Forwood Products operations, including Mount Burr, expressions of interest were sought and the Government has decided not to sell the Mount Burr operations simply because we believe that the economic result achieved by a stand alone sale would not be sufficient. So, Mount Burr will be included in the total Forwood Products sale rather than being sold as a separate entity.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Treasurer explain the abnormally large increase in executive remuneration referred to on page 400 of the Auditor-General's Report concerning the Lotteries Commission? Do these figures include a large payout to former Chairman Fioravanti? On that page in section 19 the total executive remuneration for 1994 for persons earning over \$100 000 was \$125 000. For the most recent reporting period of 1994-95 it was \$496 000, an additional \$371 000.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The honourable member is correct: a payment was made to Mr Fioravanti on his retirement. He took a separation.

MOUNT BURR SAWMILL

Mr VENNING (Custance): Can the Minister for Primary Industries explain how the Government's arrangements for the future operations of the Mount Burr sawmill differ from those proposed by the former Government?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Obviously, the interest in Mount Burr is spreading statewide, because it is normally the member for Gordon, when he is here, who takes a lot of interest in this matter. I think the House should have reiterated to it the very responsible approach that this Government has taken in the matter of not only the management of forests in South Australia but also the sale of Forwood Products and the responsible way in which that has been handled.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: That is a good question. The honourable member asks when I was last down there, and I happened to be down there on Sunday, when I looked around the mill because I knew that the Treasurer was about to make a decision. Certainly, it was not a fleeting visit.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: It is all right for the Deputy Leader to interject. A moment ago he interjected when the

Minister for Infrastructure was telling us about the calibre of the overseas companies competing for the tender to manage our water. He interjected that they are only big because they charge too much. I am going to send that interjection to the directors of Mitsubishi, Holden's, Western Mining Corporation and all of those major companies to see how they feel about that. They have just become world competitive and are trading all over the world, but the Deputy believes they are so big only because they charge too much. They will be interested in his view.

It was this Government that stopped Mount Burr from closing down and flicked off, with all those good working people at the mill losing their jobs and ultimately going on the dole. It was this Government that stood against that. However, it was the former Government that did a secret deal with the union two days before the last election to close Mount Burr and have those people chucked onto the scrap heap. I have reiterated this fact to the House before and I want all members opposite to understand who it was—and which unions were involved—that was prepared to do that deal. It was outrageous that the former Government went to the last election saying what it would do for employment in South Australia and how well they had managed it, yet behind the scenes was this sneaky deal to close down Mount Burr and the unions agreed to it.

The unions which signed the deal were the Construction Forestry Mining Employees Union (Mr Quentin Cook signed), the Public Service Association of South Australia, which is the body that stands up for employees (Jan McMahon), the Automotive Metal and Engineering Workers Union (Mr M. Tumbers) and the Electrical, Electronics, Plumbing and Allied Workers—Electrical Division—(Mr R. Geraghty). That is what those unions think about employment in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: This Government has said that Mount Burr will stay open with an allocation of timber. It has been offered to the private sector once, and it goes in with the sale of Forwood Products. I can assure the people in the South-East that we do care for employment and those people will have employment.

WATER FILTRATION

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that members allow the member for Hart to ask his question.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you very much for your protection, Mr Speaker. In light of the fact that the Minister is planning several private sector funded build, own and operate water filtration plants and that concerns have been expressed by the Auditor-General about the potential risks of such projects for the public sector, will the Minister undertake to provide the Parliament with the opportunity for scrutiny of these deals before the contracts are signed? The Auditor-General refers to the risks of such schemes, stating that careful and extensive scrutiny is required to guard against deals in which 'there is the appearance that the private sector has taken risks which it has not, and the . . . appearance that the public sector has avoided risks which it has not'.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I refer the honourable member to the Premier's ministerial statement to the Parliament

responding to the Auditor-General's Report. If he reads that, he will get the answer.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr KERIN (Frome): Does the Minister for Health agree with the Commonwealth Minister for Human Services and Health that the drop-out rate from private health insurance is not causing the pressure on public hospitals that the State Government claims?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Frome for his question about something that actually strikes at the heart of the apparent misunderstanding of the Federal Minister for Health's concepts of the health sector. Of course, as has been proven in Perth of late, she has trouble remembering and understanding a number of things.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has spoken to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and will not do so again.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Government is more than happy and indeed seeks to work with the Commonwealth to strengthen and develop the public hospital system, but it is difficult because the Commonwealth simply will not face realities. The Federal Minister for Health gave an interview last week in which she asserted that the drop-out rate from private health insurance is not causing pressure on public hospitals and certainly is not causing the pressure on public hospitals that the State Government suggests. Yet her own officials in a joint Commonwealth/State study last year found that 7 685 people had used the public hospital system—they were admitted to the public hospital system last year—who had dropped private health insurance in the previous 12 months. So, 7 685 people who had left private health insurance in the previous 12 months utilised the public sector.

When a patient moves from the private health insurance sector, if they need hospitalisation they move from being a private patient in a private hospital or a private patient in a public hospital (in that case the public hospital gets reimbursed for the cost) to being a public patient in a public hospital. The person who pays the bill is the taxpayer. So the same person receives exactly the same services but, because the person is no longer privately insured, the public hospital does not benefit in any way from an income stream.

The latest figures confirm an absolute avalanche of people leaving private health insurance cover. In three months, in the June quarter, about 12 000 South Australians withdrew from private health cover. On an annual basis, clearly that means 50 000 South Australians have abandoned private health insurance. This is part of a trend because, in the decade of the State Labor Government's mismanagement, private health insurance fell from 65 per cent plus to what is now below 35 per cent. That is a 30 per cent extra burden on the public sector.

The study, to which I referred previously, stated that, regarding the 7 685 people who dropped private health insurance in the previous 12 months and who utilised the public hospital sector, every taxpayer in South Australia was up for a bill of about \$27 million. For the two years that we have been in office, the sum is about \$54 million—\$54 million which we could have been putting back into the system to provide better health services. So the changes directly affect the resources available to the hospitals. The overwhelming proportion of revenue that the public hospitals generate comes from privately-insured patients in public

hospitals. The facts are that public hospitals have had a significant fall in revenue in the past 12 months. With regard to private revenue, in the past 12 months the Flinders Medical Centre experienced a \$1.6 million fall in revenue; the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a \$1.8 million fall in revenue; and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, a \$3.1 million fall in revenue.

I emphasise that the key component of a public hospital's revenue is the privately-insured patients. They are being driven in droves from private health insurance, and the Federal Minister for Health refuses to acknowledge this matter. She refuses to acknowledge that, despite the fact that her own officials have said that it is costing every taxpayer in South Australia \$27 million. It is actually time that the Commonwealth addressed these matters, that it stopped passing the buck, that it actually cooperated with the States in doing something or other to ensure that the number of privately insured patients increases so that the burden on the public taxpayer decreases. I have to say that the present Federal Labor Government has given no indication that that will happen. Perhaps if we are to see the public hospital system supported in this fashion we will have to see a change in Federal Government.

OFF BALANCE SHEET OBLIGATIONS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Following the Auditor-General's revelation that by 1998 we will have run up off balance sheet obligations and liabilities to the private sector worth \$240 million, will the Treasurer disclose precise details of these transactions, and will he ensure that this information and the full cost of this is in future budget papers?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Auditor-General has reflected upon a decision such that, if we wish to finance public works off balance, there will have to be proper accounting. I assure the House that there will be total and proper accounting for those items. There is not a difficulty there. In the same context, I would like to mention that we reduced the liabilities of Government by \$6.5 billion in this last financial year, and I know the Opposition has not been talking about that either. We can be assured that, if indeed there is a problem with any of the issues raised by the Auditor-General as far as accounting is concerned, there will not be any problem: it will be properly accounted for.

The issue for Government is to not finance all the works itself, because it is not necessarily the most efficient provider of those services or the financing thereof. The Government has made no secret of the fact that there are ways in which the community itself or the recipients of the service should be active participants and that financing should come from other areas. Those matters are being explored, as are the changes of accounting standard and the issues that are being raised by the Auditor-General. I can assure the honourable member that it is a matter that is being scrutinised very carefully at the moment. We intend to make sure that the capital works program and that some areas which we believe are necessary infrastructure for the State but which are not necessarily needed to be provided by Government are properly accounted for, and the House will be provided with the detail.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources say what steps are being taken to document locations of pollution in South Australia, and will this information be available to the public? Constitu-

ents across the State have indicated their keen public interest in the environmental performance of companies and Government agencies in this State. I ask the Minister to advise the House how the public will be able to measure the performance of South Australian companies and Government agencies.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would like to thank the member for Newland for the question. She is certainly right in suggesting that there is a considerable amount of public interest in the environmental performance of private companies and of Government agencies. That is being recognised more and more. It is because of that that we are moving to establish an environmental monitoring database. It is being prepared by the Environment Protection Authority, using the latest in information technology. In fact, we will put South Australia right up front in this area.

The database will provide valuable information that is available to the public, and it is particularly important that that should be the case through the GIS system. It will not only document soil, air, water and marine pollution sources on a geographic base but also provide background information, trends and photographic information. For example, it will provide monitoring details of industrial, stormwater and effluent discharge into the sea, and that is particularly important with the onset of the 25 March 2001 deadline, by which time all environmentally harmful effects must be eliminated from discharges into marine and river environments. It is something that this Government is very keen to see happen.

This system will be useful in monitoring the benefits of environment improvement programs being undertaken throughout the State, particularly by private companies, and it will also be able to identify trouble spots in locations where particular emphasis should be placed. It is important that the Government be provided with this information. The information that will be provided will come from a database that will put South Australia right up front in this area. I am delighted with the progress that is being made by the EPA in this area.

ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Premier demand, once and for all, that his Ministers, in particular the Minister for Correctional Services and his officers, comply fully with recommendations 122 to 187 of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody? In March this year, and tragically again yesterday, Aboriginal persons have died in custody at the Port Augusta prison. On the first occasion, the person, despite having a history of acute mental illness, was left in his cell alone, without having taken his medication, with permission having been refused for him to see his *de facto* wife and with his belt left on. With regard to yesterday's tragedy, all the facts are yet to emerge, but it has been reported that the victim was left with a mirror in his possession.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Both these cases are subject to a coronial inquiry and it is inappropriate to comment further as a result of that. I made statements to the media this morning believing, incorrectly, that there was a mirror on the wall, but that appears not to be the case at all. If there are mirrors on the wall, they are stainless steel metal mirrors: there was not a glass based mirror on the wall. At this stage it appears that the prisoner managed to smuggle in a piece of glass from a broken jar, which he hid upon entering the cell.

The claim by the honourable member appears to be incorrect, given my advice so far, but the Coroner is investigating both matters and I think we should wait until the coronial inquiry—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It could well be that all the recommendations of the Royal Commission were complied with in the recent case. We should wait until the finding of the coronial inquiry has been handed down.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): In yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading 'Trust tenants under threat', it was reported that 1 400 Housing Trust tenants could be evicted to make way for a private housing development. That is a very mischievous piece of reporting. The development in several western suburbs aims to create a better mix of public and private housing in five suburbs known as The Parks but will involve the demolition and reconstruction of run-down houses in the area. I am very concerned about the article as it can only unnecessarily frighten those tenants who live in the western area. There are numerous tenants in the electorate of Hanson whom I constantly have to reassure.

I have read the proposed relocation policy of the South Australian Housing Trust, which aims to balance the needs of tenants with the trust's responsibility to provide appropriate housing for those in housing need, to use the available resources efficiently and to protect the value of its assets. It ensures that tenants are consulted about their housing preferences and needs and aims to minimise financial costs incurred by the tenant and the trust. The policy is in line with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement which states that tenants have a right of security of tenure and if required to move are given a choice of dwellings and locations which meet their specific needs.

The policy explains that tenants will not be required to move if the proposed relocation is not essential. Forcible relocation is a last resort and will be used only in extreme circumstances. Tragically, that has happened on rare occasions. In the proposed policy, the South Australian Housing Trust will meet relocation costs for electricity, gas and telephone connection; mail redirection; removal; and compensation for improvements made to the original dwelling.

All tenants affected by relocation, including significant loss of yard space, will have the following choices: location of alternative housing; housing types; and short-term, long-term or move back relocation. The trust will continue to negotiate compensation with tenants for improvements to the original housing in regard to carports and pergolas. The trust pays compensation at the current value of the tenancy improvements as determined by an independent valuer. Alternatively, the trust may provide the improvement in the permanent relocation or redeveloped housing, and I refer to things such as security doors and carpets. The proposed policy indicates that there will be considerable consultation

with the tenants and every attempt will be made to assist them to move to appropriate housing of their choice.

That is made perfectly clear in this policy. I believe that the policy will better define the rights, entitlements and responsibilities of tenants. The Housing Trust Board is seeking comment from a number of community organisations and tenant groups. These people have a tremendous amount of expertise and input—and this is a very important time to have input. Following receipt and consideration of these responses, the policy will then be finalised.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): The issue that I wish to raise this afternoon relates to restricted services to mystery bus tours which emanate from the St Agnes bus depot. I wish to make clear to the Minister for Transport that these tours have vast community support and do not cost the Government any money. In fact, they provide the public with a wonderful service, one which many in the community could not otherwise afford. Many of our aged citizens, in particular, enjoy these tours, and I understand that the age of people who use the service ranges up to 90 or more years. Many interstate visitors also use these services as do senior citizens organisations around the State. Tours are run on a weekly basis with an average of 80 to 120 passengers.

These buses would not otherwise be utilised—often they just sit in the depot—so not only do they provide an excellent service to the community at an affordable price (\$8.50 for a bus tour is quite reasonable and within the means of people with a restricted income) but patrons are also provided with a meal at a reasonable rate, and some income, albeit small, is generated for TransAdelaide. That is the important thing: the service is not run at a loss, it provides some income and, more importantly, it provides a service for our aged citizens, in particular. Many elderly people do not have the means or the transport to enjoy a day's outing. Mystery tours provide them with that opportunity, and for many that is perhaps the only way of making friends or enjoying the company of other people.

These tours are very educational and well presented. The drivers have committed themselves to seeking out the history of local Hills towns and surrounding areas. How many people would know, for instance, that the Sawyers Arms Hotel at Crafers, which opened in 1939, was reputedly used by bushrangers who bailed up travellers, or that the Pikes Brewery built in 1886 went into soft drink manufacturing when its brewing activities were banned after a virus was discovered in the brewers' yeast? There are many more such tales about our Hills country towns. As a result of the new restriction that has been placed upon these mystery tours, they are now unable to go into country areas; in fact, from the St Agnes depot they cannot go a few hundred yards up the road to Newman's Nursery as that is also restricted.

These tours do not take business away from private operators because the people who participate could not afford the cost of some of the private companies. So, I am at a loss at this stage to understand why this restriction has been placed upon them. There is another side to this as well. Many of our country businesses are now losing income that was generated through these tours. Country pubs provided meals at an affordable rate and employed additional staff for the day. They and other small businesses have lost income from door sales, and I think that perhaps the Toy Factory would be in that position as well. The real question is: what is wrong with providing a service to the community, even one that is a little out of the norm? I congratulate the initiative of the

staff of the St Agnes bus depot for having had the foresight to provide a service that keeps costs within the range of our elderly citizens and those on a low income, and I condemn the Government for taking away or restricting that service.

The restrictions will now mean that most tours will be in built-up areas and the participants will not be able to enjoy some of our wonderful and picturesque Hills country areas. One could be called cynical for wondering why this has come about. I ask the following question: will we at some stage in the not too distant future hear that this service is to be tendered out?

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): The final Australian Formula One Grand Prix in Adelaide is a matter of only a few weeks away. It is the last of these events to be staged here since we began 11 years ago. A fantastic multi-macro entertainment agenda has been developed by the Grand Prix Office and the Sensational Adelaide Office of the South Australian Tourism Commission, and I think we should pay tribute to the enormous effort that has been put in not only this year but last year and at earlier times during the course of this Government by Michael Gleeson of the Tourism Commission, who headed it up, and Ann Ruston from the Minister's office, who has worked with him very closely.

I wish to let members know of the fantastic program that has been arranged for this week. On 28 October, the Sensational Adelaide Dinner in the Pits will be held. That means literally the pits where we service the cars and not to the bottom or the dregs. A number of garages will be converted into a huge food fair area with cafes offering tastings from Australia and other Grand Prix host nations. The highlight of the night will be the Scalextric Challenge. The Channel 9/City of Adelaide/Japanese Grand Prix family fun day will be held on the following day. So, there will be something for everyone on that weekend. Not much further down the track closer to our own event comes the 3 November Sensational Adelaide taxi promotion supported by 5AA. Information kits will be provided to taxi companies, and over the ensuing few days the details contained in those kits can be given to visitors to enable them to enjoy themselves even more while they are here for the Grand Prix. They will know what is on, how to get there and where to go.

On 5 November, there will be the Sensational Adelaide Grand Prix Open Day in the East End of the city with the East End Wine and Food Fair. The South Australian wine regions will offer a taste of South Australia to complement the catering offered by restaurants in that precinct. TransAdelaide buses will transfer patrons between the East End and all the on-track facilities. On Thursday 9 November, the Sensational Adelaide SA Great Grand Prix breakfast will be held at the Grand Prix Club on the track. Jackie Stewart will be the guest speaker and Ken Cunningham will be the MC.

On Thursday there will also be the Sensational Adelaide/Telstra Mobile Net celebrity challenge cocktail party at the Adelaide Casino. On Friday 10 November there will be the Channel 9 Sensational Adelaide Friday night variety show. That will be a fantastic concert staged on the CBC oval. The set up for this concert will be of an international standard with full concert lighting and production, all the bells, lights and levers that you can imagine. The concert will feature popular Australian acts with special guest comperes.

Sunday 12 November will be the big day, with the Sensational Adelaide Celebrity Challenge featuring 21 celebrity drivers. The Pit Straight Spectacular will begin

immediately after the celebrity challenge and will include the V-Room-Ba Parade, flag drops and a flag display, with 75 000 hand-held flags. The concert after the race will feature the international rock band Bon Jovi. The grande finale, the Sensational Adelaide last blast fireworks display, will be staged immediately after the concert and will be synchronised to music.

These are just some of the macro-activities planned to be staged on and off the track during the Grand Prix. In addition, through the South Australian Tourism Commission, Sensational Adelaide banners and a plethora of other souvenirs will be displayed around Adelaide. I believe this will add to the festive atmosphere in a fantastic way. All hotels and other accommodation facilities are being issued with the tourist information kits. All concierge staff at major city hotels will be given detailed briefings on those kits between now and the Grand Prix to help deal with tourists and their queries. This is all part of the comprehensive program to ensure that this event is special for South Australia. It will be the biggest, the best and the most memorable Grand Prix, I am sure. I congratulate anyone and everyone who has been in any way involved.

Mr BASS (Florey): First, I would like to mention a letter that has been circulated in my electorate. It states: 'An important message from Mike Rann MP State Labor Leader', and it is titled 'Privatisation of your water?' The *Oxford Dictionary* defines the word 'privatise' as follows:

... to sell (public property) to commercial interests.

If the Leader of the Opposition can show me where we have sold or privatised water, I will be very surprised. If the Leader peddles any more of this garbage, he will be dealing with an untruth. I will send him a copy of what I have said, and perhaps I will also send him a copy of the *Oxford Dictionary*. If he persists with this absolute balderdash, he will be dealing in untruths. I would now like to speak about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BASS: —another lot of rubbish the Labor Party is circulating in the western suburbs about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It keeps referring to Modbury Hospital. The Labor Party says, 'It is a disaster. Don't let them do it down here.' Let me tell the House about Modbury Hospital. The campaign of misinformation about Modbury Hospital being waged by the Opposition is now being circulated in the western suburbs. However, I point out that Modbury Hospital is working very well.

The State Director of Healthscope, Mr Greg Johnson, and the Chairman of the Modbury Public Hospital Board, Mr Jim Selth, have both publicly condemned the misinformation campaign and will continue to do so because, as the Director of Medical Services at Modbury, Dr Geoffrey Williamson, pointed out, this sort of misinformation campaign by the Opposition and its supporters could cost people their lives. This is particularly true of allegations that Modbury's emergency service has reduced operations to the same extent as under public management. That is totally false: there has been no change.

The allegation that ambulances are bypassing Modbury and taking patients to the QEH is also totally false. In fact, fewer ambulances have taken patients from the Modbury area to the QEH under Healthscope than they did under public management. The number of emergency patients taken by ambulances and treated at Modbury Hospital under

Healthscope has increased. Allegations that the x-ray department of Modbury Public Hospital no longer operates 24 hours a day are false because the x-ray department never operated 24 hours a day. The department continues to operate under its system of having staff on call from midnight to 8 a.m.

Allegations that the police can no longer admit mentally-ill patients after 8 p.m. are incorrect. Police could never admit mentally-ill patients to that type of hospital. It is totally untrue that the hospital no longer provides artificial ventilation. Services have not diminished at Modbury: in many ways they have been enhanced. Services such as ENT, surgery, radiology, hospice care and anaesthesia have all been expanded. More patients are being seen—400 more than in the same period under public management. An independent audit has shown that there have been no significant changes in the types of operations and procedures performed at Modbury since Healthscope took over.

There have been no significant changes in the admission or re-admission rates or in out-patient attendances. Modbury is performing fabulously. We have not heard the management of Modbury complaining about budget cuts because its budget is already way below that which the rest of the public sector is paid; it always will be because that is part of the contract. Modbury Public Hospital is a credit to everyone involved, and the Labor Party's campaign is being shown up for what it is every day as more and more residents treated at the hospital find out for themselves what an excellent job Healthscope is doing, and what a heap of lies they are being asked to swallow by the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker, before I begin, I would ask that the honourable member withdraw his reference to the Opposition telling lies.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey was not referring directly to an individual member and therefore he is not out of order. It is not a course of action the Chair would encourage; and it is not a course of action that the Chair thinks is wise. The Chair is of the view that those sorts of comments are better not said. Other terms should be used.

Mr CLARKE: A political Party always knows it is striking home on its opponent when it starts squealing like a stuck pig. With respect to the issues of privatisation of our water supply and hospitals it is interesting to note that the Government is trying desperately to patch up a very poor PR job. The Government's problem is that the ordinary citizens of this State understand the issues at heart. They may be prepared to tolerate the sale of the Pipelines Authority and they may be prepared and happy enough to see the sale of a bank, an insurance company, or some other type of commercial activity with which the Government has been involved; however, the general citizenry not only of this State but other Australian States want to know the essential terms of office of its State Government, and they want to know the reasons for having a Parliament.

A Federal Parliament's first and foremost duty is to provide for the security and protection of the nation and its citizens. The State Government's prime responsibility, surely, is the provision of public health; the provision of a good public education system; and providing publicly-owned water and sewerage facilities. It is about publicly-owned institutions, such as public transport, because they relate to access, equity and social justice. If this Government does not want to govern and hands over all the levers of power that a State Government exercises on behalf of its citizens because it

finds the job too hard, it should resign and let those of us who are only too willing take over the reins of Government. It is not unreasonable for the public of South Australia to demand of their own State Government that water be provided by the State to its citizens on a cost basis equally shared, no matter where they live, and not to be run for private profit.

The Minister for Infrastructure is quite happy not to check the remuneration levels of the executives of these private water companies which will be running our water supplies. They will not be subject to parliamentary scrutiny and they can pay whatever they like. We know from North-West Water that they do pay whatever they like to their chief executives and Chairman. The Chairman's remuneration is about \$750 000 per annum, but that does not seem to be of any concern to the Minister for Infrastructure. His attitude seems to be, 'Let them pay whatever they like, because it won't bother us.' That defies certain basic laws of economics. The pricing structure also has to take into account the wages and salaries of employees, senior executives and directors of those institutions. It is not a question of saying that the water companies can pay whatever they like to these people, because it has a direct bearing on the pricing structure of the service they provide to South Australians.

The backbenchers, particularly the oncers, are only too well aware of the unpopularity of the Government's bid with respect to water. It does not matter how much the Minister for Infrastructure tries to rationalise it: the punters do not believe it, and they are very wise in coming to that conclusion. The oncers—

Mr Condous interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): The member for Colton is out of order.

Mr CLARKE:—who include the member for Colton—will pay a very high personal and political cost at the next election. If we were just interested in Party politics, we would encourage the Government to go ahead with the privatisation of water and public hospitals, because we will reap the political dividends at the next election. Unfortunately, we also care about the State.

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

Mr KERIN (Frome): Today I wish to talk about an exciting initiative in Port Pirie. First, I should like to thank the Premier and several of his Ministers for again visiting Port Pirie on Friday. This Cabinet has shown much greater commitment to Port Pirie and the surrounding region than the last Government and probably any Government for a long time. The constant flow of Ministers to the electorate has been indicative of their interest in the area. Last Friday Port Pirie was well and truly 'Liberalised' as in excess of 200 delegates from the Liberal Party's Rural Women's and State Councils converged on the Pasmenco-BHAS community club—a good Liberal institution—for meetings. Yet again, that is a substantial example of the commitment of this Liberal Government and Party to the region. The motels, hotels and other businesses in the city benefited from the trip. I thank those people who came and the people of Port Pirie for making them so welcome.

Those attending heard details of the commitment which Pasmenco-BHAS has recently made to its Port Pirie smelter, and hence the city. Pasmenco-BHAS has gone through difficult times in recent years. In efforts to become world competitive, it has needed to rationalise its work force and look at how it has conducted operations at the smelter. Since

1967 a substantial percentage of the material input for the zinc plant has come from the retreatment of the granulated slag which was previously dumped on the site. It was expected that by the year 2001 this dump would be exhausted, raising doubt about the future viability of the zinc operation at Port Pirie, which is one of the important operations on the site.

Concurrently, Pasmenco-EZ, at Glenorchy in Tasmania, faced a difficult decision. Since 1973 Pasmenco Metals-EZ has disposed of jarosite waste by ocean dumping off the continental shelf in an area approximately 100 kilometres south-east of Hobart. Due to a commitment to the Federal Government, it has to cease dumping in the ocean by December 1997. Pasmenco has now decided to change the process at Glenorchy so that parageothite will replace jarosite as the biproduct. Hence, it will ship between 120 000 and 160 000 tonnes of parageothite to Port Pirie. This will have enormous benefits for South Australia and Port Pirie.

Having made this decision, Pasmenco-BHAS has announced a major capital investment program which has been a great boost to the confidence of Port Pirie. The announced major capital works for the Port Pirie smelter amount to \$51.4 million over the next three years. Some \$21.3 million will be spent on building a giant storage shed on the wharf. This shed, which is currently under construction, will have a storage capacity of 50 000 tonnes. It will also have enormous environmental benefits for Port Pirie and its present and future inhabitants. Also, \$10.6 million will be spent on a wharf crane with a 900 tonnes per hour unloading rate and a conveyor to the shed. In addition, there will be considerable upgrading of the cinder plant, the cadmium plant, the arsenic plant, the slag fume bag house and the oxygen plant, with benefits to workers from better conditions.

This initiative by Pasmenco-BHAS will have enormous benefits for Port Pirie. Obviously, the extra 120 000 to 160 000 tonnes of material will increase the viability of the port. The City of Port Pirie will also benefit from development fees and the increase in construction in the city. These developments will also see a major injection in the local economy through construction moneys and other spin-offs, such as accommodation and other money spent in the town.

These announcements have certainly been welcomed in Port Pirie. It has given much confidence that the city's major employer has made such a commitment to Port Pirie well into the next century. The Pasmenco-BHAS commitment is largely due to the Port Pirie site manager, Bob Jones, and the staff of the smelter. The work force has taken up the challenge and lifted productivity. This has now been rewarded with these latest decisions. It is hoped that the increased confidence in the future of Pasmenco-BHAS will result in other business investment in the city. Certainly, the city council and the Development Board are working hard to achieve development locally, and they are very encouraged by Pasmenco's latest announcements.

GAS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gas Act 1988. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill will amend the *Gas Act 1988*.

The Gas Act was enacted to regulate the supply of gas to the State and to provide for the formation of SAGASCO Holdings Limited. The Act subsumed the South Australian Gas Company into SAGASCO Holdings Limited and vested the shares in the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation (SAOG) into SAGASCO Holdings. SAOG was wholly owned by the Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA).

A significant portion of the Act relates specifically to the corporate restructuring and corporate regulation of the holding company. In particular, the Act provides for the transfer of assets from SAOG to the holding company, the transfer of employees, restrictions on share dealings, profit control and restrictions on dealings by the utility company.

In October 1993, the Government sold its interests in SAGASCO Holdings Limited to Boral Ltd. and in June 1995 sold the Pipelines Authority to Tenneco Gas.

Boral Ltd have taken over those activities previously undertaken by SAGASCO Holdings Limited which is now dormant. Regulatory controls over SAGASCO Holdings Limited are no longer relevant.

The Bill removes from the Gas Act references to SAGASCO Holdings Limited and corporate regulation of the South Australian Gas Company.

In summary, the amendments proposed reflect the changes in the South Australian gas industry over the past two years.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

It is proposed to amend section 4 by deleting the definitions of words and phrases that are obsolete as a result either of the amendments proposed in this Bill or of amendments previously made to the principal Act.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 8—Duty to supply information

It is proposed to insert a new subsection (4) to provide for a definition of 'related body corporate' used only in this section. (This definition is substantially the same as the definition of 'related corporation' deleted by the proposed amendments to section 4.)

Clause 4: Repeal of Part 4

It is proposed to repeal Part 4 of the principal Act which provides for corporate restructuring and regulation. This Part is no longer required.

Clause 5: Repeal of schedule

The schedule contains provisions of a transitional nature. The work of these provisions has been completed and the schedule is no longer required.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 111.)

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I should like to pay my respects to the Governor in addressing the Government's role in the forthcoming session of Parliament. During the break I watched a news program on Channel 7. It is amazing that Channel 7 always seems to be pushing the point of view of the Opposition so strongly. On this particular night a young lass of about 12 or 13 years of age appeared on television, saying that she missed 12 months of schooling because she had tonsillitis and could not get the operation that she needed for about 12 months to two years at the Women's and Children's Hospital. I felt sorry for this young girl parading her cause before 200 000 viewers throughout South Australia, probably pushed by her mother and prompted by the Opposition to appear on television.

I was amazed to see in the paper at the weekend the percentage of the population in South Australia compared with Australia regarding private hospital cover. In 1982 the percentage of South Australians with private hospital cover was 70.6 per cent compared with the national average of 67.9 per cent. That continued to deteriorate fairly rapidly and we find that some 13 years later only 34.3 per cent of South Australians are on private health cover compared with the national average of 35 per cent. I have not heard the shadow Minister for Health say anything about having made representation in Canberra to the Federal Health Minister to find out why there is not some incentive to the general community by way of tax deductions to encourage people to go back into private health cover.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That is right, you know all about it. That is why the Prime Minister has not got it. However, I bet that the Prime Minister's daughter would not have to wait two years to have her tonsils removed if she had problems. She would make sure that she got the VIP treatment and got put into hospital straight away. The Minister of Health tells us today that this year alone 7 685 people who use the public health and hospital systems dropped out of private health cover in the past 12 months. The *Sunday Mail* states that of four patients in the same public hospital using the same doctor, nurses, food and equipment, three walked out paying nothing but the fourth, who was on private cover and paying between \$2 000 and \$2 500 a year for it, was hit with a doctor's bill of \$1 000 plus an additional hospital bill for some \$1 500. The minority are paying without any encouragement at all.

One of the things concerning me at the moment is something that will always be attributed to the Labor Party, namely, the instigation and implementation of the gaming machines. It may be a hot topic, but if you have any feeling for the people out there, are any sort of human being and worry about the people you represent, you have to be concerned with the devastation going on in our community with the effect of gaming machines on the family. We heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition get up and slag us during debate and say that we are divided, that we cross the floor and vote against our own Party and do all those sorts of things, and that people support the Labor Party because there is unity there all the time and that what they see is what they get.

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir, the member for Colton accuses the Deputy Leader, using the term 'slag'. The member for Colton claims that the Deputy Leader 'slagged' the Government over certain matters. I ask your ruling, Sir, on whether the verb 'to slag' is parliamentary.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not think it is unparliamentary, but it is not what we would like to hear in the House and I ask the honourable member to be conscious of that.

Mr CONDOUS: We are criticised because we have the gumption to cross the floor. You have to remember that, if you are a member of the Labor Party and it is a vote that has been taken in the Party room, there is no way you could ever cross the floor, because united we stand and divided we fall! We saw little Normie Foster, who had the gumption to go across, sent into oblivion for having made that decision. This vote was to be a conscience vote and it passed this place and went to the other place. One fellow for whom I have the utmost respect—one of the finest little gentlemen I have struck in my time—the Hon. Mario Feleppa, who has now retired from the Parliament, made the decision that he would

not support the gaming Bill. It would never have gone through without his support. So, at 3 a.m. the then Premier of South Australia (Hon. John Bannon) and the Attorney-General (Chris Sumner) got to him in the corridors of the Parliament and exerted enormous pressure until they broke down the man and he supported the Bill to enable it to go through. Whether or not the Labor Party likes it, the implementation of gaming machines will always be—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: I am not saying that all of you did. I am not talking about this House but about the other place. Pressure was put on one Labor member to get it through by one vote and the Labor Party has to accept the fact that the devastation going on in the community presently has been caused by the Labor Party. It was that Party's vote in the Upper House that allowed the Bill to go through, thereby bringing gaming machines into the State. We have seen something like \$2 billion gambled in the past 14 months.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONDOUS: If the Hon. Mario Feleppa had stuck to what he believed, the Bill would not have gone through and gaming machines would not have been introduced.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order. The member for Colton is canvassing debate and the outcome of votes in another place, contrary to the traditions of this place.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not accept the point of order but caution the member for Colton. What the member for Spence says is correct: one can comment but not canvass what happened in another place. The member for Colton.

Mr CONDOUS: It is a fact of life; it has been printed in the dailies and has appeared on television: the change of vote by the Hon. Mario Feleppa meant that we went from the possibility of defeating the Bill into the reality of passing it. That is all I will say and you fellows can live with it. Look at the suffering. Children today are going to school under-fed and without proper clothing, small businesses are suffering across the State, pensioners are suffering—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: Pensioners in your area are suffering. Welfare agencies such as the Central Mission, the Salvation Army, St Vincent de Paul and the Anglican Community Services are having trouble raising funds. People have lost enormous amounts of money. I have had cases of people losing entire WorkCover payouts. A woman who approached me at Torrensville Foodland wanted her social security money paid into her bank with part of it given to her as food coupons so that she would not have the ability to spend it on gaming machines before she got it. That legislation made millionaires out of a handful of publicans.

I do not begrudge the publicans making money. I am angry because in New South Wales when its Bill was introduced it confined gaming machines to the clubs, which meant that players were receiving larger amounts of money, entertainment was being put on and therefore musicians and entertainers were getting work and the money was circulated within the community. However, with this legislation most of the money remains with the publicans, who are making millions of dollars and are reinvesting in real estate, keeping it in their own pockets and not putting it into the community to be spent. It is one of the most destructive things.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir, I refer to Standing Order 119, which states:

A member may not reflect upon a vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that the vote be rescinded.

I ask you therefore, Sir, to call upon the member for Colton either to move that the gaming machines legislation be repealed or to hold his peace.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Colton can continue.

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Acting Speaker, what is the basis of your ruling?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not believe that the member for Colton is reflecting on another House.

Mr CONDOUS: I now wish to refer to a couple of topics that impact on my electorate. First, I refer to the possible implementation of option 3 in the clean-up of the Patawalonga. This would divert water through a man-made channel to West Beach. This has been an interesting matter because the member for Ross Smith has come to a couple of meetings and shown great concern for the environment. It is a little out of character and I expect his Party might send him to the annual awards for the Australian Ballet Company as his next job. That would be equally out of character as well.

The Opposition wants to get onto the band wagon. It advertised that there would be a meeting on a Saturday morning where they would talk about sludge. The Party said, 'Here is a good opportunity for us to get down there and hop into the Government.' Down they came and the Deputy Leader listened to the debate and wanted to have a say. When no-one was doing anything, one of his candidates who might run against me at the next election was in the front row.

Mr Clarke: Who?

Mr CONDOUS: I am not stating names. He was in the front row yelling, 'What about Ralph Clarke; what about Ralph Clarke?' The funny thing is that this person gets upset when I suggest that they are using their position as a platform for what they are working towards. As I could understand the people of West Beach being concerned about the building of this great trough and the washing of silt from the Patawalonga, I quickly arranged for Ministers Wotton and Oswald to meet with a deputation of about eight people from West Beach. The deputation came in here and met together with about 10 people employed on the project itself. In a short time the deputation was convinced that the Government had acted responsibly and that there was no danger that people would be affected. In fact, four significant issues relating to dangers to health and safety were raised, yet today all the people at West Beach who were concerned about this issue two or three months ago are now sitting back totally comfortable in the knowledge that they have been able not only to get an independent report but also to have an ongoing independent person reporting to them about all the work that is being undertaken.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: They are totally satisfied. This is an example of the local member working with the community in a sensible manner without all the hoo-ha of politics being involved. It is simply a matter of hand-to-hand work overcoming a problem. I know that the Opposition—

Mr Ashenden: They don't want to overcome it.

Mr CONDOUS: They are hoping for option 3 to go ahead. They believe it is a certainty and the Opposition has based its whole campaign for the next election on Condo being knocked off because option 3 will go ahead. I believe I am not a bad lobbyist and I believe I have a good chance of convincing the entire Cabinet that option 3 is not the way to

go. One only has to visit Skase's development to see examples of tidal flushing. It involves bringing fresh water in from two kilometres out and pumping water back for another two kilometres in order to have a continual flush of clean sea water. However, we can do something a bit smarter than that. As well as implementing what has been done so far involving trash racks and silt traps, we can create wetlands in all 12 council areas from Stirling right through to West Beach. It makes commonsense to do that because we live in the driest State in the driest continent, so why should we be pouring thousands of megalitres of water out to sea every year when we should be collecting it and using it during our dry summer months to water our recreation areas?

Adelaide City Council, with which I was involved, is a prime example, because it will be creating wetlands in the south parklands bounded by Goodwood Road, Greenhill Road and Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue. Water will be stored during the summer months. Instead of using fluoridised water from our reservoirs, it will use stored storm water to irrigate the entire south parklands. That process will prevent heavy metals and pollutants from being washed out to sea: they will settle and can be taken away later rather than being flushed through to destroy our marine life. I do not believe that this Government will go through with option 3.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: If the Government goes through with option 3, I will start barracking for Kilburn. There are alternatives and Ministers are now starting to ask me what those alternatives are.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: I am confident. Once that is knocked on the head, the Opposition will lose its impetus, because it has been a one policy brigade and members opposite have had nothing else to support them at all.

Another matter I wish to refer to also concerns my electorate. I have made representations to the Minister for Transport to safeguard the interests of local people regarding additional traffic use on Seaview Road in the event of the extension of Adelaide Airport runway. I have given assurances that no diversions will take place until an environmental impact study is carried out. There should be consultation involving the local members and the two councils concerned, West Torrens and Henley and Grange. In the picture that members received about the extension, a roadway is marked '3', which takes traffic off Tapleys Hill Road and onto Military Road, enabling drivers to get to West Beach Road and then to Seaview Road.

The last thing we want is to have an additional 10 000 cars going through the electorate, using Seaview Road as a means of getting to Grange. I believe that, with the cooperation of the community and the Henley and Grange council—which I know only too well supports me wholeheartedly in stopping any additional traffic going through the electorate—and based on assurances I have had from the Minister, we will make that diversion difficult and we might have to put down humps or something else to stop traffic flowing through.

Another matter I wish to address results from the member for Giles constantly throwing up at me that I supported the Myer-Remm development. I was a good Lord Mayor to Premier Bannon and supported him when he wanted development in my city. The Premier told me that he wanted to get approval for the Myer-Remm development. I played my role as Lord Mayor in getting my members on side to approve it and it was the same role that Henry Ninio as Lord Mayor played in giving an assurance to Premier Dean Brown which

resulted in approval for the medical centre and car park at the East End Market location.

The point is this: I met Mr Michael Brown from Remm when the development was going on in Brisbane in about 1989. I visited Brisbane and came back and said to the Premier that I had concerns because I felt that the man lacked substance. Recent comments by the member for Giles and the member for Playford about the sale of the Myer-Remm Centre for \$151 million to Intro International Limited are a pathetic attempt to rewrite history, but worse than that the comments expose the Opposition's refusal to acknowledge the monumental mistakes that were made when Labor was in government. That means it could happen all over again, if Labor ever had the chance to control this State's finances. No-one will ever ask them to write a book on budgeting and running funds.

To save the member for Playford from further embarrassment, let me remind him and his colleagues of the facts. There were concerns and doubts about the project's commercial viability from the very beginning, and the Labor Government of the day knew from the very beginning that there were serious questions about its viability. The State Bank Royal Commission found that the State Bank Board's decision in 1988 to undertake the Remm project was 'not made on valid commercial grounds'. The royal commission report states:

The participation of the Government in the Remm project reflects explicitly that by now the relationship between the bank and the Government was really very different from the claimed independence of the bank.

The board was anxious to please the Government to the extent that it almost suspended commercial responsibility in supporting a project that was demonstrably too finely balanced to be safe and sound. The magnitude of risk in this case should have been seen at the time to be too risky and an unjustifiable use of what were, in essence, public funds.

The bottom line, as evidenced in the royal commission findings, is that the project was beset with difficulties from the start. The most telling factor in this whole disastrous chapter is that the viability of the project was highly questionable and, indeed, was questioned from the start.

The Myer Centre finally opened in June 1991—almost a year late—with a total development cost of \$557 million, and involving some of the greatest torts by individuals. I believe that literally hundreds of people who worked on the project are still on WorkCover. By March 1992, the value of the centre had been written down to \$305 million; by June 1992, \$290 million; by June 1993, \$205 million; and by June 1994, \$155 million. By 30 June 1995, the total legal debt on the project, including holding and interest costs, amounted to \$1.066 billion—more than \$1 000 million dollars. The taxpayers' loss on this project after the sale is about \$900 million.

The member for Giles said that I encouraged the development. I did not even know that the development was to be approved. Along with members of the public, I heard it reported on the radio and the TV, and saw it in the press the following morning. The Premier did not even ring me to tell me that a decision had been made that the Government, through the State Bank, would finance that project. And I warned the Premier that the people involved did not have substance. Michael Brown was a fly-by-nighter. In fact, my exact words to the Premier were, 'Be careful; the only thing this bloke's not wearing is his white shoes', because he was from Queensland. They were the sorts of people with whom we were dealing and to whom we were lending money that

was deposited into our State Bank by hundreds of thousands of South Australians.

The loss in the centre has already been accounted for in the former State Bank losses and is covered by the Government's \$3.1 billion indemnity. However, South Australians continue to pay for that disastrous venture, and we are still paying more than \$700 million a year in interest costs on the State debt. The blame for the Remm project debacle can be sheeted home directly to the former Premier and the former Government. The Labor Government of the day was desperate to push through the huge development when no-one else in the world was interested or prepared to finance it. They were driven by ego—a desire to erect a monument to themselves.

The project became a symbol of the massive financial burden imposed on the South Australian taxpayers through the mismanagement of the former Government. Had I been a member of the Government that made that decision, I would have done the right and decent thing and resigned from this Parliament. Not only that, I would have moved from the State of South Australia, because I would have been too ashamed to walk around the State knowing that I was part of a Government that made a decision that turned this whole State into a debacle.

Let us look at the performance of the last Government over that 11 years. When Premier Bannon came into power in 1982, the interest payments of this State totalled \$300 million a year: when he went out of government in December 1993, the interest payments of this State were \$900 million. I can assure members that I will never let my electorate forget the disasters of that era. I would simply like to say one thing: I believe that in future we must be accountable for every cent. I do not believe that we should be any different from a board of directors who have responsibilities. If we make mistakes, we should pay for them. If it is not going to be in monetary terms, we should at least be sacked from the Government. That is what I honestly believe. Anybody who is in this Parliament and who is part of a Government that makes those sorts of disastrous decisions should leave and do the honourable thing of at least admitting they have made a mistake. But, no: people still sit on the Opposition benches having been part of that.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: There are very few. But even then I think they should have left as well.

Mrs HALL (Coles): In speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I take the opportunity to congratulate the Government for facing the enormous debt created by the previous Bannon and Arnold Labor Governments and for taking action to reduce the negative effects on future budgets.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs HALL: Quite right! I personally congratulated him. However, today I refer to three issues that impact either on the whole of the South Australian community or on my electorate of Coles in particular. They are poker machines, local government reform and intelligent pigs. As the debate on gambling and the evils or otherwise of poker machines continues to gather apace, it is worth noting the obvious: gaming machines in South Australia are legal and they are here to stay.

Enabling legislation was passed by the South Australian Parliament in 1992, under the previous Labor Government, and it was supported by a majority of members from both

sides of politics. A year's operation has revealed amazing public acceptance of poker machines, and we can now all enjoy the perfect vision provided by hindsight. I am not sure whether I would have supported the legislation and, two years down the track, that view is not relevant, anyway. However, I am concerned that the current public discussion about poker machines should be conducted on the best available information.

I have no doubt that the major increase in gambling in South Australia is a direct result of the introduction of poker machines and that easier access to gambling causes difficulties for a minority of people. There is also a heavy responsibility on Government to administer wisely laws designed to clamp down on any criminal activities, to protect those who do not want to gamble when gambling is an overt intrusion into their life, and to maintain a proper balance between patrons, the industry and Government in disbursing turnover receipts.

It is also incumbent on Government to ensure that funds are available to rehabilitate those individuals who are addicted to gambling. An article in the *Advertiser* of today regarding the overload on the resources of the Salvation Army underlines that need. So many of their clients are an unhappy residue of our gambling instincts that we all know so much about. The help that they need should come from gambling revenues. I am delighted that the Government is looking at all forms of gambling habits and not just gaming machines. The two inquiries being conducted by the Government are important, because the result will be invaluable in formulating the rehabilitation and preventive programs of the future.

Announced by the Minister for Family and Community Services, a study will be funded by the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund to look at gambling habits across all codes—the greyhounds, trots, gallops, footypunt, lotteries, the pools, X-Lotto, bingo, the Casino and gambling machines. This study will complement the inquiry specifically focused on the impact of gaming machines in South Australia announced by the Premier in late August. That inquiry is assessing the impact of pokies on the demands for help from welfare agencies, fundraising by charities and community welfare groups, and small business. It has received submissions from business, charities, community service groups and the public, and it must report by the end of this month.

An interesting article in this week's *Bulletin* scans the problems of gambling in Australia and across the world. Aptly titled 'Fools Gold', it makes the point that no country can withstand the pressure for gambling facilities. Britain, the last western industrialised country to do so, introduced a new national lottery last November. There is a warning in the article that states:

Governments get into the gambling business because they're hungry for revenue but too chicken to raise taxes. They may find, however, that they let loose an appetite that's hard to control.

In the United States, Government gambling taxes now exceed \$16 billion. The ultimate uncontrollable schemes are now playing on the Internet, complete with cyber-croupiers, no less. Where will it all end? I do not want poker machines in shopping malls, so let us at least hold the line there—

Mr Kerin: Or kindies.

Mrs HALL: —or kindies—and keep them in clubs and pubs. It is in those facilities that so many South Australians enjoy the machines and, in doing so, provide the financial backstop for those clubs and pubs and, I might add, significant Government revenue. In measuring the extent of this

activity, we do need to know what is spent, and in this regard the reference to turnover can be very misleading. Last year's turnover was \$1.49 billion, and it is probably taken by many observers and critics as what South Australians spent on poker machines. This is not so.

Figures provided by the Hotels Association show that actual gaming expenditure was \$187 million. Because a great deal of money is returned to a player during the time spent at the machines, this becomes \$1.49 billion—on average, \$10 of expenditure by \$79 worth of games. That \$10 represents actual expenditure and the \$79 represents turnover. Whilst \$187 million is a most significant figure, it paints a very different picture from the popularly accepted measure of poker machine financial implications.

Last year South Australians, per adult, spent \$3.24 per week on gaming machines, \$1.58 on lottery products, \$1.43 on TAB and racing products and \$2.01 at the Casino. Eighty-six per cent of the public were involved in some form of gambling that produced these rather amazing statistics. Thirty-five per cent of the public played poker machines. Of this sector—that is, the 35 per cent—63 per cent play once every few months, 40 per cent play for fun, 24 per cent play for socialising, 12 per cent for participation with friends and 12 per cent for entertainment. The machines are here to stay and the public overwhelmingly approve them. Any regulating measures undertaken by this Parliament must recognise this established fact.

Figures provided to me indicate that after 12 months of operation in South Australia there are currently 609 licensed hotels in South Australia, 5 783 machines operating in 234 hotels, 1 101 machines operating in 54 clubs, and 637 machines operating under 23 general facility licences: a total of 7 521 machines. Of the \$187 million of actual public expenditure in 1994-95 on machines, this Government collected \$63 million, leaving a gross figure of \$124 million for the industry. This figure obviously provides some handsome profits for a number of hotels and clubs as well as some useful sustenance for the minor businesses that are smaller players in that scene.

You may ask how the industry has faced its responsibilities. Apart from an estimated 3 000 new jobs and the financial and building opportunities, South Australia's clubs and hotels have allocated \$2.5 million to the Gamblers' Rehabilitation Fund. This compares most favourably at \$1.80 in South Australia per adult with 42¢ in Queensland and 30.6¢ in Victoria; and New South Wales has no allocation at all. In addition, last year our pubs and clubs donated \$5.56 million to charities and \$2.8 million in goods.

I do not quote these figures with any particular advocacy for the industry. However, I believe that the current debate should be conducted on facts and not on emotion alone. Interestingly, a seminar is being held in Adelaide today. Representatives from hotels, clubs and welfare agencies are meeting to identify and review current codes for responsible gaming. This seminar is being sponsored—commendably, I might add—by the South Australian branch of the Australian Hotels' Association. I repeat what I said a few moments ago: poker machines are here to stay, and it is better that they are run by a prosperous and cooperative industry that can provide what patrons want rather than one that might otherwise operate in sub-standard conditions. On this basis, I look forward to the reports from the two inquiries now under way as a guide to the intended future directions of this new and rather volatile industry.

From gambling I would like to turn to local government reform. I am pleased that the Government is proceeding with reform and restructuring in this most important area. This subject can be approached from several points of view. There are those enthusiasts among us who would bang together the heads of recalcitrant councils, forcing amalgamations strictly on an efficiency and financial basis. There are others, who from a different perspective would want amalgamations to proceed only on a totally voluntary basis with a hands-off position from the State Government. This view, I might add, has been around for several decades. I am pro amalgamations and reform when the major indicators clearly show that this is beneficial to ratepayers and the State in general.

For this reason, I am pleased that the Governor's speech outlined proposed legislation to facilitate voluntary council mergers and structural reform. I am pleased that this reform will take place in Parliament this year and that the stated aims are to achieve reform in the local government sector by significantly reducing the number of councils across the State and by reducing the cost of local government services to the community from efficiencies of scale, and to ensure a more efficient service delivery to ratepayers.

The establishment and function of a local government reform board to drive the reform program, public consultation and assistance to facilitate voluntary amalgamations will create a wide basis for discussion and, it is to be hoped, swift action across the State. The appointment of Mr Ian Dixon to the challenging and I hope rewarding position of Executive Director is a good start. I wish him well in his new endeavours. One aspect of this reform agenda that has been widely debated is the possibility that Party politics will intrude further into local government. This may have a certain inevitability about it anyway, depending on the suburbs and regions. I note that a motion to be debated at the State ALP convention this weekend is aimed to promote Labor Party involvement in local government elections. However, I believe that the retention of the current 'ward' system is recognised as significant in keeping the 'local' in local government.

The three councils in my electorate, as I understand their current attitude, want to be part of the reform process as outlined by the Government and are working in a most cooperative manner to be part of that process. I know that these councils (Burnside, East Torrens and Campbelltown) will be concerned about some of the important details in the forthcoming legislation, and I have no doubt that they will want to ensure that the interests of ratepayers are bettered by any action that they might recommend and support.

There are still issues of fine tuning at the edges that need to be resolved about the amalgamation questions. They are, for example, the size and composition of the board; the criteria used to determine the efficiency of a council's operating performance; the proposed timetable; ministerial power and responsibility with respect to rate levels; the percentage of turnout by electors in a proposed new council area; whether we should re-establish an efficient modern day department of local government; and postal voting. These are just a few examples of policy discussions that are still taking place around local government and State parliamentary circles. I have no doubt that a cooperative approach mixed with a measure of goodwill and optimism will see this long overdue reform in place before Christmas. However, I would like to put on record my appreciation of the general forward thinking that emanates from local government in the electorate of Coles.

I now refer briefly to the continuing saga of water supply in the district of Coles known in 'waterspeak' as the north-east quadrant. In no way do I wish to tempt fate but I must go on record as saying that there has been peace, if not at last then at least, for an enjoyable period of time in this area on the water main situation that has received so much media attention over the previous few years. The fact that no major bursts have occurred in the past few months does not mean peace in our time, but it certainly is a delightful respite from the turmoil of high pressure water jets gushing from a damaged main.

However, further from this current happy quiescent state, a certain amount of humour and interest has crept into the scene and the debate concerning 'intelligent pigs'. I assure the House that these are not the 'pigs might fly' variety but are really a new development in technology for the internal inspection of pipelines. I received this encouraging information following my persistent questioning about this matter when officers of the Marden Service Centre of SA Water discussed with me several weeks ago the general issue of pipes and mains in my electorate.

They informed me that earlier this year Tubemakers of Australia conducted a seminar demonstrating what was called 'new asset management technology for the water industry'. This was staged in conjunction with Russell Technologies of Canada together with Sydney Water and Engineering and the then EWS Department of South Australia, now SA Water. I would like to quote from the information provided, as follows:

Russell Technologies Inc. have developed an intelligent pig for non-destructive, *in-situ* condition assessment of operational cast and ductile iron pipelines. The device and system represents leading edge technology and this is the first demonstration conducted outside of North America.

The system has direct application in the high cost areas of mains renewal, program maintenance and pipeline failures, enabling selective and pro-active asset management strategies. It offers the high probability of substantial savings and capital expenditure, and in many instances will eliminate the disruption caused by unforeseen pipeline failure.

Previously I had, by way of question, put forward the proposal that perhaps a system of safety valves might be installed to provide an automatic shut off at mains in the event of a pipe burst. I understand the officers of SA Water now believe that the 'intelligent pig' might be a better system of finding the points of weakness in the system. I know that none of this will happen overnight, or maybe even next year, but I do urge SA Water to persist in remedies for what has been, and will sadly no doubt be again, a very difficult situation for residents in my electorate.

I thank those officers who have pursued these matters and wish them well in their search for continued research and development funds, which will inevitably give them the capacity to produce a solution to the problem. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply.

An honourable member: Welcome back.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The member for Baldrick welcomes me back, and I am pleased the member for Baldrick wants me back. This honourable member is a little wilier than one of his good friends on this side of the Chamber: he knows better than to identify himself for the purposes of *Hansard*. I take pleasure in personally supporting the motion before the House. Some comments need to be made about the Governor and the meritorious role she has

played in South Australian public life over a great many years. As I understand it, the Governor's days in Government House are drawing to a close. From memory, her appointment was made some five years ago and, as a consequence, a new Governor will probably be announced in the not too distant future. The Government—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I should warn the Government that if it wants to keep interjecting I will come back at it and say nasty things. It is a shame the Government has not extended the term of this Governor, but maybe it will do that.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): The member for Mawson is out of order.

Mr QUIRKE: I should not respond to the member for Mawson, but I say that it is a pity the Governor's term may not and probably will not be extended—that seems to be the message that is coming across. That is the right of the Government and we accept that. We accept that the Government will make an appointment and that probably it will be an appointment we will support. Certainly, the role performed by Dame Roma Mitchell has been excellent. Dame Roma was a member of the judiciary; she was a lawyer and a QC in this city, and I remember those days. I remember when she was appointed a QC.

I have never told the Governor but my mother named my younger sister after her. My mother thought that Roma was a good name and that Dame Roma was a role model for women. My sister was born in 1960, which was a couple of years before Dame Roma became a QC. Dame Roma has served us all very well. Every member of this House would have to say that in her professional dealings with members of Parliament, spanning a term including two Speakers of this House and two Presidents of the Legislative Council, she has acquitted herself very well. It is very interesting that earlier this year she attended a birthday party celebration for the present Speaker and another colleague who has been a member of this House for a considerable number of years, and it is to her credit that she attended that function.

She was also in attendance at the funeral of the late Gordon Bruce. I take this opportunity to wish Dame Roma well in whatever activity she undertakes in the future. I am sure that a person such as Dame Roma does not retire. I predict that the minute she leaves Government House she will undertake and fully discharge a series of obligations to the community. Dame Roma, in so many ways, has been a person who has epitomised the spirit of South Australia. Obviously her professional career, in a sense, is drawing to a close. All members of this House would realise that, in all probability, the speech she read out in the other place a few weeks ago might be the last such speech she makes in her capacity as Governor.

I have been listening with some interest to the debate on poker machines in South Australia and the whole question of gambling revenues from the TAB, the Lotteries Commission and a range of other organisations. There seems to be a push for the Government to increase the take from poker machines. I see a lot of this as a backdoor way for the Government to obtain more money through poker machines. The big winner from the introduction of poker machines in South Australia is the South Australian Treasury. The early estimates of Government revenue from a full complement of machines—at that stage a full complement was deemed to be about 12 000, and we have not yet reached that point—indicated figures of the order of \$25 million to \$55 million.

That money is paid by the IGC straight into the Treasury. Presumably, a receipt is issued for the money—perhaps it is even done electronically, I do not know. What must the Treasury pay to collect this amount of revenue? It probably pays 45¢ for a stamp to issue the receipt. It does that once a month, so annually that is 12 times 45¢. It probably has two or three people to lick the stamp, but I do not know how Treasury works. It may have someone to press a button on a photocopy machine.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Baldrick says that 200 or 300 people are working on it, but the reality is that the \$74 million going to Treasury during the first financial year of the operation of the machines will not be reduced very much by administration costs. In fact, all the administration costs are down the other end: in the pubs, the clubs and the IGC. With a full complement of machines and over a full financial year we will see more like \$95 million to \$100 million of revenue going straight into Treasury. Treasury may well have to employ a couple of other people to count the money; I do not know, but I doubt it.

I am sure it has plenty of people who can do that job. At the end of the day, up to \$100 million with virtually no administration costs at all will be going into Treasury. I hope all these inquiries into poker machines—and this is the first occasion I have had to say this publicly—do not convey the idea that we on this side of politics will let the Government increase the levy under all sorts of various guises, because we will not cop that at all. We will not cop the amount of money coming from these machines going straight into Dean Brown's pocket.

Opposition members also recognise that there is a case for those who gamble on the machines to excess. There is no doubt that there are many such people. In recent times a couple have come into my office. Of one I am certain, and the other I suspect. I have many people in my office who could not afford the car they bought at 5 o'clock the day before, but by 9 o'clock the next morning, surprisingly, the finance company has processed all the papers and the deal is irreversible. Used car people tell me that they do not want a cooling off period. I would bet they do not want a cooling off period, so I suggest that that matter ought to be looked at by the Government.

A car is a major purchase for most families. In fact, for most it is the second largest purchase they make. Of course, there is a three-day cooling off period with the purchase of a house, and it can be waived only if it is taken before a solicitor who has a very large indemnity insurance cover. Any solicitor who does not have that indemnity insurance will simply refuse to cooperate. A person's rights, before they are waived, are clearly explained, but there is no such process with the purchase of used cars.

Many people come to my office because they cannot pay their electricity bill. ETSA is always reasonable about this, or it is by the time I get around to ascertaining the supervisor's name. Usually, at the first telephone call the person concerned is reluctant about the whole thing, but when I want to know that person's middle name so that when I call the general manager I can identify exactly who it is, they are more reasonable. I have a number of single mothers in my electorate—and the member for Lee knows all about this—to whose heads ETSA puts a gun and says, 'Not only do we thank you for paying the last bill, but we will let you pay the next one up front.' A single mum who had paid her electricity bill came to my office. In my electorate the source of funds

to help her comes down to two groups—the Salvos and the Salisbury Emergency Relief Fund.

I do not know where we find all these other charities about which I hear in this place and read about in the *Sunday Mail* and *Advertiser*. However, I know where they are not. They are not in Playford paying bills for people, paying electricity accounts, helping the single mums who cannot pay their rent or helping in any other way. I am sorry if they take offence at that, but I have to say that, if it were not for the Salvos and the Salisbury Emergency Relief Fund in my electorate, there would be many people freezing in the dark without a roof over their heads and experiencing a number of other problems. That is not to decry the work of the churches, but in my patch the Salvos have got it organised.

At the end of the day people cannot pay their electricity bills, and some cannot afford to pay other bills they have, such as hire purchase which is made so easy for them. They come to me and say that they have all sorts of problems in meeting their day-to-day expenses. Poker machines have been seen as the goose that lays the golden egg, and we now have some charities which think that this is a good source for getting a few quid. The Government thinks, 'If we let this argument run long enough, having got the last \$100 million really easily, we might get \$150 million next time, so we could possibly put \$10 million down to some of the charities', or whatever. Clearly, the former Labor Government made it clear that these issues need to be addressed out of Treasury revenues.

How serious are these issues? They are serious because people are being hurt through the poker machines. People are being hurt because they cannot get a Housing Trust house, and in my electorate they have to pay rent of \$150 to \$160 a week for an average three-bedroom home. For someone on a pension, receiving about \$250 to \$300 a week, even with a couple of kids, it is very difficult. To those who say that single mums have another kid because they want the money, I point out that they get only \$45.16 for that extra child.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Lee says that they cannot add up. The member for Lee is an absolute disgrace on this issue, and his own people say that. If he wants to interject, that is fine by me, because his own people say that about him. They distance themselves from him. If he wants to join in on this issue, that is fine. For \$45 a week a mother has to feed and clothe her child and meet medical expenses, because Medicare does not cover the lot. She has to put shoes on that child's feet and pay for a whole range of different things. If anyone can do that on \$45 a week, they deserve it.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Lee again interjects.

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

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Lee is not only out of order, but I hope that after the next State election he is out of this place and back where he belongs, which is a long way from public life. At the end of the day, not only single mums but a large number of pensioners and others have problems with their day-to-day accounts. It may be that I am unusual, but more people come to see me about electricity and water bills, hire purchase, used cars and mortgage repayments than about poker machines.

The other day there was talk about super profits in the industry. I came into conflict with a number of people on my side of politics because I adopted and voted for the model which gave the maximum choice for the pubs and clubs

which were to go into this exercise. I did so because I had seen the Queensland arrangements and the Lotteries Commission's suggestions about how things should be done. I recall listening to Jack Wright and Laurie Fioravanti about allowing the Lotteries Commission to make all the decisions. It was to decide not only how many machines a pub or club should have but also the colour and type. It was to be the Berlin wall all over again.

I had a little self-interest in this matter. I did not want the pubs and clubs in my community which had had machines foisted on them, and which they did not want because they knew they would not suit the local area, to come back and say, 'You, the Government, made this decision and now we are in a mess over it.' In the free enterprise system, it is a win or lose situation. Frankly, those pubs and clubs need to make good commercial decisions. The advice I gave to the clubs in my electorate was to ensure that they had proper accounting expertise. Of course, they said, 'We have Fred here. He used to work as an accountant.' Fred, of course, who had been an accountant's clerk, had been good enough up to that time in auditing their books, but when it becomes a \$1 million business it is a good idea to get good commercial advice.

Some of these organisations are doing much better than others and increasing the rates across the board will devastate a number of those that are struggling. Some of the clubs are not making an enormous success out of gaming machines because they made the wrong commercial decision to get into it in the first place. It will be devastating for them. Some of the pubs have entered areas where there are already too many gaming machines or too many licences; decisions were made to over-capitalise and spend literally \$1 million or more on housing the machines. Some of them will be hurt.

The other day one newspaper stated that there was a gross profit to the industry of \$170 million. That is erroneous: that represents the share of the revenue that has gone to the pubs and clubs. It is also employing 3 500 people. I understand that the Hotels Association has said that about 3 400 persons are now directly employed in that industry and their wages, superannuation, long service entitlements, WorkCover levies and everything associated with it comes out of this gross profit. The servicing costs for loans and the machines (I understand that it costs about \$10 000 to install each machine) also come out of that. A couple of hotels in my electorate—in particular the Settlers, but also the Bridgeway—have spent \$1.5 million to \$2 million on housing the machines and rearranging the rest of the hotel so that it can perform the other functions that the community wants. At the end of the day, the cost is what comes out of the gross operating profit. It is not as simple as some people would have you believe.

We are hearing an argument that the community is being ripped off by these machines so that money can be channelled into all sorts of other areas. I offer advice to the Government—although I do not think the Treasurer needs very much on it: it ought to be careful about setting up funds for the various groups that supposedly deal with some of the problems created in this regard. Frankly, when I have someone in my office who has a problem, such as an inability to pay their bills, you can ring many of these organisations but you cannot get an answer. At the end of the day I hope that the Salvation Army would be one of the main recipients of Government funding, because I am sure that members representing the other 46 electoral districts in this State have also found that the Salvation Army performs a major role in

terms of picking up the pieces in a number of areas where families need support.

I will move from gaming machines but I want to make clear where I stand on the issue. In a year or two, after at least two financial years, we may need to look at the legislation much more closely. We may need to look at the percentages that certain people get from the gaming machine arrangements. It is far too early to be talking about upping the levies now. Given the windfall that has gone to Treasury, it has some obligations and responsibilities to ensure that some corrective measures are taken with at least some of that money. I make no apology for the fact that the Government is one of the main recipients of gaming machine revenues because, as I say to my constituents who complain constantly about the level of taxation and such things, they drove to my office on a road or they caught a subsidised bus, they send their kids to the local school and every day they take part in a series of different activities which, if we did not have an organised, civilised society that collected taxation to pay for these things, we would not enjoy.

The other matter to which I refer tonight concerns my electorate, in particular the question of education. Some hard decisions were made four or five years ago about reducing the number of schools. Arguably, one more school could have been closed, but I am pleased that that did not occur, because the closure would have filled up the other primary schools to a far greater extent. Over the past five years I have seen major refurbishment in all the schools in my electorate under both Governments. The arrangements were largely but not entirely in place during the life of the last Government and the lead-on time is some years.

The last of these refurbishment has now taken place at the Para Hills East Primary School. I am grateful that the Government has honoured the obligations of the previous Government regarding that refurbishment. That was one of the schools caught in the middle, and by that I mean that it had no chance of getting priority funding from the Federal Government or of getting a lot of grant moneys available from the State Department of Education and Children's Services. Para Hills East Primary School felt like the orphan that no one wanted. Its buildings are 20 years old and, when they get to 30 years, they will be fixed. However, they have not been painted in the past 20 years.

Para Hills East Primary School is undergoing extensive refurbishment, with a school hall being provided. The local community is happy with the arrangements and making its own contribution. Considering all the schools in my electorate, whenever a function is on at Para Hills East Primary School, the community supports it: it has the best community support of any school in my electorate. I wish all schools would have 80 per cent of parents turn out on quiz nights, at auctions for children's artworks or simply a barbecue or sporting carnival. When it gets the new buildings, when the old ones are refurbished and when the painting is done, that will be the lot of Para Hills East Primary School for some time. I am pleased to say that it will be a stem to stern refurbishment.

Most of the other schools in my electorate have seen a number of major changes over the past five years, some of which related to the fact that funds were generated from the closure of other schools in the Ingle Farm area. The amalgamation process has led to better facilities in some schools. The back-to-schools grants and various other moneys have also helped in that process so that some of the schools which are a number of years old and which have a parent base

unlike that of Para Hills East Primary School and cannot raise much money are now fully refurbished. They have been painted and there is an educational environment whereby the computers, donated by industry or bought by parents with scarce amounts of money, now have a proper home.

Some schools, particularly Para Hills, are air-conditioned and over the past five years the Government has achieved a number of changes there. In the period of the last Government, we saw partial refurbishment of the school, with a major electrical upgrade, the air-conditioning being paid for by parents in the community. And recently the Minister for Education and Children's Services opened a new school hall on that site, and the community is very satisfied with what it has got.

I had some thoughts back in 1993 that some of these arrangements might not be finalised when the new Government came in. I have found no instance where that has taken place. In fact, in my area every arrangement put in place has been dutifully carried out and the community and the kids who are being educated in these schools feel good about those issues.

I want to finish by commending the Minister for Transport for seeing the necessity of a major upgrade of Montague Road, on which a couple of people died not long ago at a dreadful intersection. I have raised this matter in the House on many occasions and I understand that work will start early next year, when the road will be made into a safe dual carriageway over its whole length from Modbury to Port Wakefield Road. I understand that the intersections will be more safely constructed and that there will be a proper provision of lights at the Bridge Road and Montague Road intersection and at the other end on Main North Road. Much of that was done through Federal money spent on Port Wakefield Road about two or three years ago. I am happy to tell my electorate that the Government in that regard has made the right decision. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I, too, support the adoption of the Address in Reply. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to follow the member for Playford who is, I sincerely believe, rare amongst his peers. He is certainly a wily adversary and is very capable of squeezing the last drop out of any political orange that comes his way. Nevertheless, he is essentially honest and often speaks a great deal of sense in this Chamber and, I might say, much as he has done for all the time he has been here. Having said that, I also wish him well. If papers are to be believed—and I will not dwell on it because it concerns matters that are best his—he might have pulled away his field marshal's baton and accepted instead a knapsack in terms of his own Party. All I can say to this House is that anyone who believes that the member for Playford will continue to be pleased with a .303 instead of a field marshal's baton had perhaps better watch out, because he is inherently a field marshal and not a private.

Having said that, I would take up some points raised by the member for Playford. He is to be commended for what he said about education in his electorate and for his acknowledgment that promises given by one Government were honoured by another Government and that everything is not falling to bits in terms of education in his electorate or in terms of the Minister for Transport. Goodness knows, I will tell the Minister in another place that she was the subject of a kind comment from the member for Playford, because I think she sorely needs it of late. She seems to have taken a bit of a

belting not only from members opposite but from some of us who get fussed about stations closing and various other things.

Before going on with other aspects under the Address in Reply, I would like to take up a point about which I disagree with the member for Playford in respect of poker machines and the place of Government in the collection of revenue. The member for Playford is right in saying that this has been a windfall to the Treasury—and an unexpected windfall. I listened with care to the contributions of both the members for Playford and Coles. The member for Coles quoted interesting statistics with which I will not argue, saying principally that turnover and gross profit do not necessarily equate to net profit. I think the member for Coles said that \$10 worth of coins in a machine resulted in \$79 worth of games, and so it is dangerous to talk about turnover. As the member for Playford pointed out, it is dangerous to talk of gross profits as the entire profits but, nevertheless, everyone in the Chamber has been surprised by the windfall collection of the Government, whichever way one analyses the figures from the amount of money that is flowing through poker machines in this State.

I note that as an important part of the member for Playford's contribution he did not dismiss that it was the right of Government to look at this matter: he merely suggested that we should look at it two years down the track. I believe that we should do it much earlier and I believe so for the following reasons. Where, as the member for Playford says, a small club or pub is making reasonable profits, I do not believe that we should impose further tax, but there are some hotels which are easily identified and there are some establishments which are not making, by anyone's definition, reasonable profits. They are collecting windfall amounts and my evidence—I do not intend to present it to the House today because I would hate to be inaccurate—suggests that, when an analysis of those establishments that are doing the best is put into the public domain, it will clearly show that areas which are recipients of major Government benefits, be it welfare benefits or extra money for schools or other Government services, are the very areas in which some of the hotels are making the most profits.

Some people have said to me, 'As a Liberal, don't you think this is market competition? Should not anyone be able to get in there and the profits made be the rightful province of the business concerned?' I would generally say 'Yes.' Generally, that is a principle that I would accept, but I would put that it is a different case. It is all right to say to a Liberal, 'In a free market, isn't profit a fair thing?' My answer would be 'Yes.' However, what we have in this case is not a free market. By will of this Chamber we have said that certain establishments may be the operators of gaming machines and we have limited the operation of those gaming machines to hotels and clubs.

Members who were here at the time will remember that there was a strong argument put by the clubs that pubs should be excluded. I do not think it was the opposite, but certainly the clubs wanted it and they wanted to keep the pubs out of it. We made a decision here that both should have it. We did not say that the churches could have it in their front porches or that the schools could have it in their front offices and staff rooms or that delis or other places could have it. We did not create a free market. By act of this Parliament we limited the market and, therefore, we created a privileged position for two groups of people: the owners and operators of pubs and the owners and operators of clubs. If we are to create for

anyone, whether it be people who have taxi licences or people who run clubs, privileged and special conditions, we equally have a right to examine the profits that they make by the special provisions which we provide and the share, if any, which the Government has the right to expect.

We have heard the member for Playford refer to the Salvation Army and other welfare organisations which have said that the advent of poker machines is straining their resources in that there has been a lower collection from traditional sources of revenue and a greater demand for services from people who seem to be spending a lot of money on poker machines. Good naturedly, I would enjoin the member for Playford that, while I acknowledge the very valuable work of the Salvos, I suspect that St Vincent de Paul and the Anglican Community Services are doing a great deal more in his electorate than he obviously realises. They have a different sort of operation and a different way of going about things, and he may find that there are more welfare organisations contributing actively to his area than he realises at this time.

Having said that, that being the reason why I believe we should look at the revenue the Government is taking from poker machines, I point out that, if someone is spending excessive amounts of money on poker machines, they will come to school on Monday morning saying that they cannot afford the books or they will go to the hospital saying that they cannot afford the medicine. They will go to a myriad of Government services, having spent their disposable income, expecting Government largess and support. I for one—and I am sure every member in this Chamber would agree with me—would not deny them that support. We have an obligation and a duty to all our citizens.

When people start starving on Adelaide streets or becoming homeless, and so on, every member in this Chamber would agree that as a society we had best look at and redress the issue. That is not to say that we do not have a perfect right to expect, perhaps, one of the causes of people's suffering as some redress. In other words, if people spend money on poker machines, the Government has a right to claw back some of it to give people the services that they will thereby demand. I commend the Government for its inquiry into this matter, and I will be most interested in its findings. However, I am not for one moment suggesting that the Government should apply an equal tax to everyone who has poker machines.

I agree with the comments made by the members for Coles and Playford, that that could hurt some small business people who are plodding along and doing quite well, although not excessively but, from the way the industry is set up, we could easily find out where excessive profits are being made. In those instances, we would have every right to apply an additional taxation measure, to be reviewed—at least until this situation settles down. You, Mr Acting Speaker, know, as other members would, that it is affecting people in South Australia. It is affecting not only those who are gambling but also many small businesses, for example, nurseries (and there are probably some out your way, Mr Acting Speaker). We should ask nurserymen whether their cash flow is the same, as well as those people who are in clothing. It involves basically those lines of business.

You can forget about the punnet of petunias this year because you went and played the pokies last night. You might make do with your current pair of shoes because you played the pokies. It is those sorts of businesses that have been affected, and it is affecting this State. If anything affects this

State, whether it be pokies or the way we run our taxicabs, trains and buses, it is the legitimate province of this Parliament. It is not so much interfering as ensuring that social justice is done to people who have a legitimate right to make a profit but equally to those from whom that profit is made. Therefore, we should look at the introduction of some form of super tax, where excessive profits were made in the industry.

I note that the member for Coles, quoting a newspaper article, said that Governments generally raise gambling revenue when they are hungry for revenue but are too chicken to raise taxes. I accept that, but I remind the member for Coles that, in terms of poker machines, this Government, and certainly the last Government, did not realise the windfall profit that would accrue. It is true to say that the measure was introduced largely because the hotel and hospitality industry was seen as being in crisis. Its revenue had been falling. Some hotels around Adelaide were finding it difficult to survive. They had Sky Channel and betting facilities, which had not proved a financial windfall, and some large segments of the hotel and hospitality industry were really suffering. Therefore, poker machines were seen by this Parliament as some sort of help to an industry that is important to this State and to any State. In the case of South Australia, perhaps, poker machines were introduced not so much to raise revenue for the Government as genuinely to help an industry that was in crisis.

The Deputy Leader joins us, so I will not be so hypocritical as to deny that the Government is and should be pleased by its windfall profits or that, if he or his colleague were sitting on the Treasury benches, they would be equally pleased by the windfall profits. I do not believe that the previous Government introduced poker machines as a taxation measure so much as some form of help to an industry that needed help. As the member for Playford said, it has not always been successful.

Most members on this side of the Chamber would be aware that the Murray Bridge Rowing Club was reported as being in receivership. It did exactly what the member for Playford said it should not do: it took what was obviously wrong and bad financial advice from an accountant, and found itself with all these poker machines. It had invested huge amounts of money, with nobody playing the machines. It was a recipe for bankruptcy and the liquidation of a very old and highly regarded sporting facility in Murray Bridge, and that is to be deplored. However, others have done very well, and I am sure that there are some in the middle who are just plodding along.

In conclusion, I note that it was said today that there was a code for responsible conduct in the gaming industry, which has been sponsored by the Hotel Association. I have been around this place long enough to realise that philanthropy often starts when people realise that they might be in a bit of trouble. I am just a little bemused that right now they should be having such a worthwhile seminar. I am not saying that the seminar is not worthwhile, but the advent of the seminar seems to correlate fairly closely to the fact that the Government is examining this matter, that the papers have been quite vocal in saying that the profits made by the industry seem to be excessive, and that the churches and the welfare organisations have been literally screaming for months that they are hurting.

It is all very nice to be kind, warm and fuzzy when you find you have no choice. I hope good comes of the seminar,

but I am a little sceptical about the motives that give rise to it. At any point, the Government must—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I was not going to answer the interjection, but the member for Ross Smith commented that my glasses are broken. I can assure him that I find it very convenient to use glasses that have only one arm, because they are easier to get on and off, but that, if he would like to have a whip round and get me a new pair of glasses, I would be equally grateful and would accept them with much joy, because that would mean less money for him to get re-elected and more money for me, and that will suit me down to the ground.

Mr Leggett interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hanson cruelly interjects that I am like the member for Playford: I have lost the Left wing. In the case of the member for Playford, I would say that the Left wing has rather fled to the Right, and the Left wing is without one of its major sources of power. Indeed, it will be interesting to watch what eventuates on the other side, because members opposite laugh about us and about our blood-letting, but I guarantee that it will be a regular Christians versus the lions circus on the other side of the Chamber before we break for Christmas, and it will be interesting to watch the blood.

Mr Clarke: The member for Coles is standing behind you.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith interjected that the member for Coles is standing behind me. I can tell him that I would rather have five of the member for Coles standing behind me than one of the member for Playford standing behind the member for Ross Smith.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: It is very cruel for the member for Ross Smith to suggest that the member for Playford wears stilettos. That is outrageous! Finally, I would again like to support the member for Playford in his comments about the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. All members in this Chamber will agree that she has acquitted herself exceptionally well as Governor. She came to office amid some mild controversy. She was older than the average appointment of Governor, and there was some to-ing and fro-ing about whether someone at her stage in life was capable of performing the duties. She has proved unequivocally to her worst critics that they were entirely wrong. She has performed her duties with more energy and vigour than many previous Governors who may have been half her age. She has not faltered once, and everyone in South Australia should take their hat off to her; she is part of the spirit and history of this State.

It is well known that in the tapestry behind me the jurist just above the words 'Equal before the law' is said to represent Dame Roma Mitchell, the first woman Governor of this State. She is a woman of integrity, tenacious energy and the capacity for service. She has brought compassion, humanity and a sense of humour to the job. More than her predecessors, she has demystified the office of Governor, and last Sunday was a great example of that. The public response to an initiative of Dame Roma was so great that there was standing room only; people had to be turned away. She has made the office of Governor more relevant to the community. Dame Roma's life, and especially her public service, have been not only an exemplar to her gender but an exemplar to us all. If many of us in this Chamber accomplish a fraction

of what Dame Roma has, we will consider ourselves well satisfied. Finally—

Mr Clarke: That is the fifth time you have said ‘finally’. You look at the clock, see you have 10 minutes and want to fill it in.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith may be about to speak after me, and I therefore consider it kinder to the members of this House to detain them a further 10 minutes than to have them suffer the indigestible drivel that the honourable member will serve up so close to the dinner break.

At this time, the mid term of the Government, it is important that the Government examine its performance. I can assure the Opposition and the people of South Australia that this Government is constantly examining its performance. The member for Ross Smith says that it is lamentable, and I agree that it is absolutely lamentable. I sat down the other day and tried to think where we would be if we had not inherited the absolute catastrophe that has been foisted upon this State. Every backbencher and every member of the Opposition knows that we have problems dealing with the cuts to SSOs in education, with what is happening in our hospitals and with the police pay dispute. It is hurting each and every member of this House, because the cloth we have to cut has been left to us by the previous Government.

Members opposite sit there sanctimoniously carping, whingeing and whining ‘We need more of this, we need more of that and we need more of everything under the sun, but we are not prepared to pay for it.’

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith says that it is what I do in the Party room all the time. I acknowledge that.

Mr Clarke: Carping and whingeing?

Mr BRINDAL: I acknowledge that I am not afraid—and nor is any member on this side—to stand up in my Party room and say what I think to keep the Government honest and accountable. I say to the member for Ross Smith that it is a great pity that many of his backbench colleagues did not do the same in the last Government. Had his backbench colleagues had the guts to stand up to a Premier who rode roughshod all over this State and who dipped his lid to Tim Marcus Clark every time he walked past in the street; had half of the backbench even had half a spine, this State might not be in its present situation.

They sat there—and you know, Sir, because you sat in that back row—and if the Premier stood up they all but genuflected. It was heresy for us to say that something might be wrong with the State Bank or anything else, because Mr whatever per cent he was could not be wrong. But he was wrong, and it was a total disaster. If the member for Ross Smith wants to challenge me—or you, Sir, who are not afraid to stand up in the Party room and tell the truth—he should take a lesson from both of us, because he will never be a decent member of Parliament until he is prepared to take on his own Party.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: He says he could not, because he would not have the spine to take on his own Party. He is the one person left in the faction, with everybody else swimming in opposite directions. He is in real trouble and he knows it. I do not think that he can count on even his own vote today, and

tomorrow he will be a dead cert to lose: he is a disaster waiting to happen.

Mr Brokenshire: A shattered Party.

Mr BRINDAL: A shattered Party, as my colleague the member for Mawson says. I do not think that many of us have taken much joy in some of the more serious cuts that we have had to make, but we as a Government have kept to one promise, and that has been not to raise taxes and charges excessively, to let small business get on with reinvigorating itself, and to get this State’s economy back on its feet. If you have a limited financial resource you must cut the cloth accordingly. If we have a fixed revenue in this State and if police, teachers and nurses deserve and are awarded more money, it is obvious that this State must cut its cloth accordingly. There is a choice: we can go to the people and say, ‘If you want better education, better roads and better hospitals, you will have to pay for them, but that will mean raising taxation.’

If the member for Ross Smith, the member for Torrens and other members opposite wish us to raise taxation, let them say so. Let them tell the people that they will have to pay more taxation, and we will then be able to gather more revenue.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith obviously learnt to read during the break, and he has discovered that there is a water catchment levy on the rates notice. He says that that is a new tax. Well, wacky do! It happens to be an appropriate revenue raising measure to redress a serious environmental problem. If the member for Ross Smith in his simplistic way wishes—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry, but I must challenge the member for Mawson. Members opposite did not cause storm water damage. They caused a lot of things, but I do not think that even the member for Ross Smith can take credit for the rain. We are having a good and, according to Mr Speaker, perhaps even an exceptional season. The Government may give the Premier and his ministry credit for that exceptional season, but it will never give credit to the member for Ross Smith, so he had better keep well away from the rain that falls on South Australia.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If I held the Government of South Australia in the hollow of my hand, it would be a pretty terrible Government. With that statement alone, the member for Ross Smith encapsulates his attitude, his greedy grasp of naked power. That is all it is about on that side of the House: how much can I grab for myself—how much influence can I have—not whether there is anyone on the front bench or anyone in their entire Party who has any brains, but how much can I grab for myself. I think that is a very tawdry comment by the honourable member, and I hope that the people of South Australia when they go to the polls note that sort of comment and realise what sort of a disaster they are again buying into if they look to Labor to govern this State.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: He asks for the Andrew Peacock look. It is better than the Caligula look, which he seems to bring—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: He is a scholar. He realises that Caligula appointed his horse the Consul of Rome. He probably also realises that Caligula waded into the sea and then declared a victory against Neptune. The ability of the member for Ross

Smith is very closely aligned to that of Caligula. I commend the Address in Reply to the House.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

PRINTING COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. P. Nocella to fill the vacancy on the Printing Committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. P. Nocella to fill the vacancy on the Legislative Review Committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from this page.)

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as moved by the member for Frome, and I congratulate Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia, Dame Roma Mitchell, on her speech at the opening of the Third Session of this Forty-Eighth Parliament. Her Excellency referred to some very significant issues affecting this State which the Brown Liberal Government has so efficiently addressed by responsible reform. During the past 20 months this Government has introduced two tough but frugal budgets, which even the most amateur of economists could see were needed to pull South Australia into line after a dismal decade of reckless spending by the former Government over the past 10 or 11 years.

Further legislation to support the reduction of our overall debt will be introduced in the near future. As Her Excellency said, this will allow for the sale of the timber processing operations of Forwood Products and the Ports Corporation's bulk loading facilities. The sale of the State Government Insurance Commission and Austrust should be finalised by December 1995. Also, the Brown Government is proceeding with the proposed sale of the South Australian Meat Corporation. The Asset Management Task Force is supervising the proposed sale and lease-back of the Government's light vehicle fleet to reduce further debt from occurring.

It is important to note that the Brown Liberal Government aims to reduce the debt of approximately \$8 billion it inherited in December 1993 (and creeping towards \$9 billion) by \$1.3 billion at the end of 1995. The people of South Australia sometimes forget that the huge debt this Government inherited will not blow away. It can be reduced only by careful and responsible bookkeeping, and credit must go to the Treasurer, who has kept a tight rein on the debt level in this State.

Former Labor Premier, Don Dunstan, who must be remembered as a contributor to our debacle during the 1970s,

recently said that our current debt is nothing about which to be particularly concerned. That is an interesting statement when one considers that the State debt and the State Bank debacle have reduced the former Government to almost total extinction, with now only 11 sitting members. Indeed, at this very moment only the member for Spence is sitting in Opposition.

Over the years, mostly under Labor Governments, when we compare our interest debt from 1950, when it was \$30 million, we see a startling increase. In 1960, during the time of Playford, it was \$40 million. In 1970, which was the second last year of Steele Hall's Government, the debt was \$58 million. Before that, we had a Labor Government in power. In 1980, during the Tonkin Government but after many years of the Dunstan Government, the interest debt was \$158 million. In 1994 the interest debt was in the vicinity of \$900 million per year.

Mr Atkinson: What was the figure for 1983?

Mr LEGGETT: The member for Spence is asking all sorts of questions. Perhaps if some of his colleagues were present in the Chamber they could help him out. He is fighting a losing battle. Thanks solely to Labor, two years on, the people of South Australia are still fuming and hostile about our debt, and the member for Spence would do well to listen to that. It is easy and hypocritical for the Opposition to sit and scoff at necessary cuts to essential services such as education and health, and to many other portfolios. If Labor members had not squandered taxpayers' money to the degree that they did, there would not have been the necessity to make the tough budgetary decisions that are now needed. Opposition members have no right even to open their mouths in protest, given that this Government had to pick up the pieces from the biggest financial disaster in the history of the Southern Hemisphere. Labor's way of taking easy options of increasing Government spending has eroded South Australia's ability to maintain essential levels of service, yet the Labor Opposition sitting in this Chamber—the number has now climbed to two—is calling for more expenditure.

In his rather theatrical Address in Reply, it was sad to hear the member for Giles, a former Deputy Premier and Treasurer, a former Minister who held all sorts of portfolios that did not work out terribly well, and a member who was up to his ears in the State Bank debacle, bucket a Government that has taken on the task of rebuilding South Australia from the ashes—almost \$9 billion worth of ashes.

I do not want to highlight the honourable member's speech, although I know he would like me to do that, because that is his style. Most of it was hypocritical garbage, but a few points need explanation. The member for Giles said that, in government, we promised to improve 'the representation of the people and to make Government more accountable to the people through Parliament', but, according to the member for Giles, we have not delivered that. However, that is exactly what has taken place.

In my electorate, the people are delighted that we have open government. They know exactly what is taking place. The Brown Government is one of the most democratic Governments in the history of South Australia. In fact, it was Don Dunstan who promised open government and never delivered it. How can the member for Giles challenge us when his Government kept everything from the people, gave them no hope and promised things that they could never hope to deliver?

The former Treasurer and member for Giles capped off his rhetorical drivel with the member for Kaurna's question to

the Premier in the House in Question Time the week before last. The honourable member's question was: 'What was the outcome of the South Australian road show that the Premier led to Sydney and Melbourne last week?' The Premier answered the question well and at length. It was a stunning success and South Australia was well promoted. It was a very productive exercise, yet the member for Giles attacked this positive promotion and dismissed it with a bout of severe sarcasm.

Perhaps if the Labor heavyweights at the time had attended more road shows than side shows this magnificent State would not have gone through the agony it did over the past five years. The member for Giles also stated that this Government behaves more like a secret service and that by throwing money at the media through advertising and sponsorship it will, indeed, buy support. The Brown Government's advertising has been frugal; it has been positive; and it has been strategic. The positives are that it has brought jobs, investment and economic recovery to South Australia. Do not tell me that the former Treasurer did not waste money hand over fist on numerous unwise investments and mismanagement when Labor was in Government during those past 11 years.

I now refer to the contribution by the Leader of the Opposition. Anyone hearing the Leader of the Opposition's speech would not think that he was also a member of the worst performing Government in this nation's history, yet he calls this Government's economic performance 'lamentable'. The Leader of the Opposition has the audacity to challenge this Government's accountability to Parliament and its cuts to essential services. As I previously indicated, there would have been no need for the two responsible budgets handed down by the Brown Government if Labor had not bankrupted South Australia. What does the Leader of the Opposition mean by 'lamentable economic performance'? I hardly think that 27 400 jobs created from January 1994 to August 1995 along with other investments in this State could or would be categorised as 'lamentable'.

The Opposition has two experienced leaders talking about the failures of the Liberal Government. The Opposition is always prepared to attack our Ministers and even to fabricate leadership splits. How nice it was to read an article by Mike Duffy in the *Sunday Mail* of 24 September—it was good for the heart muscles. The article was entitled 'Leader labors to marshal troops'. The article went on to report very accurately the feel of the public wherever you go. The article stated:

The ALP Opposition is struggling to rise from the ashes of electoral defeat and present itself as a relevant opponent to the Brown Government.

About Mr Rann the article stated:

He has failed to formulate issues to launch attacks on the Government. . . he will have to improve during the second half of the term to keep the Leader's job.

The editorial of the *Sunday Mail* of the same date, headed 'Don't bucket Murray plan Mr Rann—Stop pouring cold water on good ideas,' states:

The electorate bucketed Labor at the last election and the way you are performing it will do so again.

When there are former Ministers like the Leader of the Opposition one can echo Premier Brown's comments when he said recently:

It highlights how this State wound up in such financial trouble. There are many highlights of the Brown Government's 20 months or so in office. South Australia is changing. It has

new purpose; it has incentive; and it has direction. As I doorknock and meet people in my electorate on a daily basis—the young, the young married, the older residents and the owners of business houses—I find that they see the light at the end of the tunnel. There is a feeling of optimism and there is a feeling of hope—no longer hopelessness. The Brown Government has done more for the workers and small business than Labor did in all its time in office. The Liberal Government has established fairer industrial laws and, most importantly, has created more jobs. That is basically what it is all about: creating jobs. In the past two years of the Labor Government in South Australia 35 000 jobs were lost. As I said earlier, from January 1994 to August 1995, 27 400 jobs had been created, with youth unemployment being reduced by a further 4 per cent in August 1995. That is basically what the Brown Government has done and that is why it is a Government of reform.

I refer to education because, having been involved for 25 years in this field, I guess I am fairly well qualified to do so. Under this Government we have done what is fundamentally correct: we have gone back to basics. The Labor Party and the South Australian Institute of Teachers, in opposing the recently completed basic skills testing, were completely out of touch with what parents want for their children, and that is simply a fair go when students ultimately look for jobs.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: As the member for Spence has just said, it's a darned good thing. Kids are being given the opportunity at school to perform to the very best of their ability. Independent research, taken a few weeks ago, showed that 80 per cent of the South Australian community supported this Government's initiative.

In view of the hype and false accusations about the Liberal Government's philosophy and direction, which the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Opposition endeavour to highlight, I will present a few relevant facts. Schools in South Australia continue to have the best pupil to teacher ratio of all States in the Commonwealth. In other words, South Australia leads the way. That has been achieved during the past 20 months of the Brown Liberal Government. Nearly \$10 million has been committed to the early years strategy during the next four years, and a major part is a \$4 million allocation from the beginning of 1995. Also, \$2 million will be allocated for new behavioural management initiatives over the next two years.

It has been a privilege for me to serve on the Minister's education committee and to witness first-hand the Minister's professionalism and insight into education in this State, which had been on a significant slide during Labor's time in government. Other initiatives in education introduced by this Government include the State's first special interest high school for sport and physical education and, most significantly, interstate sporting competition for our 12 and 13-year-olds has again been reintroduced. I applaud this concept.

We also have the first Government school to be built and owned by the private sector. This school has been opened at Woodlands. For the first time in decades all students will be working to a common curriculum framework. Schools have been directed to fly the Australian flag or to have it displayed prominently in their main office. Again, this is an outstanding initiative. I have presented all schools in Hanson with the South Australian flag, which is a magnificent flag, and it is prominently featured in both State and private schools.

One of the great initiatives introduced by the Minister occurred on 25 August when he released a new policy for

gifted students. Gifted children and students can be found in all age ranges and levels in education. If South Australia is to be internationally competitive, we must ensure that the potential of all students, especially gifted children, is nurtured. The Brown Government's policy has many features: early enrolment at school for gifted children under the age of five: children from the age of four years and six months will be considered for early entry under special guidelines. Greater encouragement of accelerating gifted children through subject or year levels may mean that a gifted child skips a year level completely or undertakes a higher level of mathematics while remaining in the expected age level class.

There will be encouragement of extension courses so that students will be able to undertake studies at greater depth with flexible time tabling, mentor programs, clubs and competitions. Early in 1996 there will also be the naming of the State's first special interest high school for academically gifted students. The first such school will commence operation in 1997, with the eventual goal of establishing three or four such schools. These schools will continue to be neighbourhood schools and will have special entry programs for gifted students.

The question of school services officers has been an emotive issue in both schools and the wider community. As a former teacher with 25 years' experience, I can fully appreciate the position facing such schools. However, it is important to note that, when the Brown Government was elected to office in 1993, the State was spending about \$300 million a year more than it was earning, and we just cannot do that. The Government's first two budgets have reduced this overspending by two-thirds. All Government departments made cuts; in fact, the education and health areas were reduced less than the other departments. The teachers union is pushing for a Federal award claim for a \$53 increase and 2.5 hours less teaching time per week, which will cost the taxpayers an extra \$137 million per year, and this money has not been budgeted for. With 80 per cent of the education budget already spent on salaries, and a determination not to increase class sizes, the only sensible and responsible option for the Government was to reduce the number of SSO hours.

It is also important to remember that, in all areas, South Australia spends more per student on education than any other State, and the South Australian ratio of school services officers to students will still be about 10 per cent better than the Australian average after adjusting to allow the reduction of 250 SSO full-time equivalent positions out of 2 992 positions. These figures are from the Australian Bureau of Statistics taken in 1994. I now refer specifically to correspondence from the Hon. Rob Lucas, Minister for Education and Children's Services, as follows:

It should also be noted that taxpayers in South Australia have now invested approximately \$16 million in EDSAS, a new administrative computer software package for schools. This package is intended to reduce the amount of time school support staff have to spend undertaking administrative tasks. Consultants to the previous Labor Government predicted EDSAS would reduce administrative time in a secondary school by 32 to 50 hours and in a primary school by eight to 15 hours.

I refer to an article from the Department for Education and Children's Services publication *New Times* of 10 August 1995, regarding the EDSAS school administrative computer program, and headed 'EDSAS eases the load'. The article states:

EDSAS is being put to work in our schools. EDSAS, the Education Department's Schools Administrative System, is a sophisticated school records keeping system comprising a suite of

computer software which is designed to streamline the DECS system. It is up and running in most schools with the implementation of the student and staff modules soon to be completed.

In further education, 100 new places in information technology have also been provided. The electronics course at the Torrens Valley Institute is recognised as an international leader. New technology is being applied to overcome disadvantages faced by students in more remote locations, with 19 interactive video sites now linked across the State and more planned in what is becoming one of the world's largest electronic classrooms.

Many facts and figures from the first 20 months of the Brown Government need highlighting with respect to further education. Efficiency has been increased by 6 per cent, and up to 22 per cent for individual institutes. TAFE now has a capital budget of \$21 million. There is now the innovative program LEAP (Landcare and Environment Action Program) for the unemployed under 20 years of age. The Brown Government has a brokerage of 511 placed to the end of 1995, and it must be applauded for that.

I now address the facts about this Government's handling of health in this State. Despite the propaganda from the Opposition, the facts are not always clearly reported. In 1994, South Australian hospitals treated 4 per cent more people than in 1993. The hospital waiting lists have not lengthened; they have been reduced by 7.5 per cent. The number of people waiting for surgery has not increased; it has been halved this year. Last year, 1994, the allocation for community health services in the metropolitan area was doubled from \$7 million to \$14 million.

In 1995-96 the Brown Liberal Government will spend \$70 million building better hospitals and providing better equipment. Only just recently the Minister publicly stated that, because of the previous Government's wasted projects, the Brown Government now faces a minimum of \$500 000 000 to bring the State's hospital buildings and equipment up to the acceptable standard.

The Brown Government has just approved nearly \$6.7 million to be spent on replacing old medical equipment. About \$3.2 million of that has already been budgeted for, but an extra \$3.45 million will be spent to replace equipment that is in some cases more than 20 years old. In some cases the equipment, despite being hospital equipment, was actually dangerous to operate. In other cases the lack of upgrading of equipment has meant long delays and is terribly inefficient. Some equipment is so old the manufacturers have long since run out of spare parts. It is the aim of the Brown Government to look creatively at involving the private sector in capital works development projects so that the public hospital patients have access to the latest facilities and equipment.

At a local level in my electorate the constituents of Hanson are to receive a huge boost. The development of the Mile End railyards is a brilliant, innovative initiative by the Brown Government which will see a complete splicing up of Adelaide's ugly western gateway. This will take place at the 15 hectare site, which is only three kilometres from the city and located between Burbridge and Henley Beach Roads at Mile End. This broken down area has long been recognised as occupying prime land, given its proximity to the city and the western parklands.

This new Brown Government initiative is a \$30 million plan to redevelop the Mile End railyards in partnership with the private sector, containing medium density housing and a world-class athletics centre. The new \$7.5 million athletics centre will enable Athletic SA to move its headquarters from

the Olympic Sports Field at Kensington, where it leases land from the Burnside Council. The provision of around 100 medium density homes in the redevelopment has been made possible through Better Cities funding from the Federal Government and will further strengthen the State and Federal Governments' resolve to achieve inner suburban renewal. Being located beside a gateway arterial road from the Adelaide Airport to the city, this redevelopment will provide visitors to Adelaide with a much better first impression of South Australia—something that they certainly did not have before. When they came down Burbridge Road and looked at the site it was quite appalling and not a good way to start a visit to a new city.

Work will also start in October on the third and final stage of widening South Road between Anzac Highway and the River Torrens. Much of this area is in the electorate of Hanson. Starting the third stage of this project signifies the beginning of the end to frustration suffered by motorists and pedestrians for so many years and this work will also overcome traffic congestion problems, pavement deterioration and drainage issues. The work is expected to be completed within 12 months. There will be tremendous benefits to my electorate as a result of this, including the undergrounding of ETSA overhead powerlines, a tree replacement strategy, landscaping and streetscaping to be carried out by the Thebarton council and increased clearway restrictions to further improve traffic flow. I also compliment the other council affected here, namely, the West Torrens council, and pay special tribute to its Mayor, Mr George Robinson.

Great changes have been made in South Australia during the past 20 months of the Brown Liberal Government. The people of South Australia can see that they have a Government that cares for them, a Government that is clearly responsible, a Government that is informative with the people kept in touch with projects and matters which affect them on a day-to-day basis. Pessimism has been replaced with optimism as we move into the second half of the Brown Liberal Government's first term in office. I support the Address in Reply.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I, too, rise to support the Governor's address and, even though I was not present to hear Her Excellency's address, I read her speech with interest and I commend her positiveness and her strong belief in the future of our State. There has been much talk throughout the debate on the positive outlook for our State, and I know that nearly all in this House are working hard towards the betterment of South Australia and a secure future for our children. However, there are still some who know that change is not easy and who know that we have to progress forward even with the tight fiscal restraint bestowed upon us, but they still go out of their way to use scare tactics and gutter methods in an attempt to sabotage the work that has to be done. While a lot of positive things are happening and South Australia is building up strong economic confidence, there are still a number of social problems that seriously need addressing. They will not and do not go away on their own. We have to tackle them and we have to do it soon.

I want to use this opportunity to address one such social problem, and that is the issue of child sexual abuse. In opening my debate on this issue I want to share with members Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989, which provides that children have the right to express their views freely in matters affecting them and shall have the opportunity to be heard, either

directly through a representative or through an appropriate body. I thought I knew what this meant, but do we really mean it, and are we listening to them? It is with dismay and anger that I feel I need to raise this subject in the House tonight. The subject of child sexual abuse is an issue that many still choose to believe does not exist. During the past month I have worked with three different families, all faced with the same dilemma of dealing with and learning to cope with children who have been victims—or should I say the prey—of their fathers.

It is easy to say, 'Do not get involved; it is a court matter or (as in two of my cases) a family court matter,' but it is not easy not to get involved. How do you not help a seven-year-old boy who tells you, 'I don't want to see my Dad; he hurts me. He does things I don't like,' or a five-year-old girl who screams at the thought of an access visit because her Dad hurts her and she cannot talk about where, but she knows it is not right and she cannot go to sleep at night because that is when he climbs into bed and rapes her? That is bad enough for both mother and daughter to cope with, but try to imagine how the mother feels when she suspects that her two year old baby girl has also been interfered with. Life is a living hell for some children and some families, and sometimes it makes us feel ashamed that as adults and legislators we allow this to happen. We have laws in place, but who are they really protecting?

I must admit I have very little faith in the Family Court. Section 64(2) of the Family Law Act provides that the court shall consider any wishes expressed by a child in relation to the custody or guardianship of or access to the child or in relation to any other matter relevant to the proceedings and shall give those wishes such weight as the court considers appropriate in the circumstances of the case. I have looked at this section of the Act over and over again. I have tried to relate it to court cases that I was aware of, but I keep questioning how section 64(2) is applied. Does what the child has to say overrule what the court feels is in the better interests of the child? Does what the child has to say carry any real weight? If so, why is a child not removed from the care of a suspected perpetrator if the child states that a particular person is interfering with them? Does the child's statement not mean anything?

I am aware of the case of a little boy who after many months now feels safe because access to his father has been suspended. He feels his battle is over and he will not be hurt any more, because his Dad cannot see him. This little boy has no understanding of the temporary suspension, and who is going to shatter this momentous feeling and tell him that the battle is not really over yet? We tell our children that it is okay to tell and that they have every right to feel safe, but do we really mean it? In fact, does it mean anything to those kids out there who are still scared of the dark, still suffering nightmares and still wetting their beds? These children cannot really be children; they have been violated by someone whom they are supposed to trust and who says they love them. What rights do these children really have? When I was at college I clearly remember learning about the 1959 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child, which provided the right to shelter, to food, to an education and to be cared for. What was not expressed—probably because in 1959 no-one would have acknowledged that a parent or care giver could ever violate a child—was the right to feel safe and free from sexual abuse.

Human rights are also children's rights, and I am pleased to see that there is to be an inquiry into child sexual abuse by

our Human Rights Commissioner. However, it does not end here. Children's rights are the responsibility of all of us. Children do know right from wrong and they will tell you when something is wrong and, no matter how young, they still have the right to be heard. We have a real dilemma here in our own State, a dilemma that because of the different jurisdictions—State courts and Federal courts—our power to interfere in what I consider to be the better interest of the child is somewhat restricted.

To give an example of this I will refer to my own files and a case where the parents of a child could no longer care for the child and the grandparents had virtually raised the child. They are now fighting for custody in the Family Court. The child's doctor suspects possible abuse. The child says it is the father, but of course this has to be proved. The father contested the custody battle and had a good chance of winning. Then I was told that we needed new evidence before we could make a case. In other words, the child had to be raped again and we would know within hours so that at least we could get the proof and have the issue go into a courtroom to be heard. That is fine for giving the perpetrator a fair go, but where is the equity? What does a child have to endure to be believed? I wonder whether it would be different if the child had a right to vote!

The National Association of Parents Against Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN) has called for an urgent review of the criminal justice system in child abuse cases. This follows a year of research by a team of doctors, police, social workers and other allied health and welfare workers in the field of child abuse. It has been made very clear that child abuse offenders are escaping punishment because of the inadequate justice system in South Australia. Paedophiles know that in South Australia if they abuse a child under seven they will more than likely go free. This is because existing rules of evidence do not cater for children of tender years who are still developing cognitive skills and are hazy about sexuality, dates, times and places of alleged offences.

The report goes on to highlight some very concerning facts and figures collated from the Department for Family and Community Services and police statistics. For example, three out of 54 cases of abuse against children under seven, or less than 5 per cent, resulted in conviction. Of these, two accused had pleaded guilty and a third defendant is appealing. During 1993-94, 1 579 child sexual abuse notifications were reported to the Department for Family and Community Services. Of those, 506 were confirmed to be abusive in nature. There were 1 104 notifications to police and, of those, 499 resulted in either arrest or report. After the screening process by both the DPP and the police prosecution units, 173 briefs were referred to the Magistrates Court, the Central District Court and the Supreme Court. The report went on to focus on the outcomes of court findings. In the majority of convictions the accused has pleaded guilty and thereby avoided the trial period. In the cases not prosecuted the reasons given included lack of corroboration or problems with judicial acceptance of a child's evidence, a child's fear of facing the accused, fear of the general cross examination process and also the general court environment.

There was also the problem of parents not wanting their children to give evidence and, unfortunately, the inability of a child to recall times, dates and details. The tender age of the child is an issue that the court process currently cannot address. The court process is designed for adults and currently does not seem to maximise the potential of the child to give their evidence at their own level of development and

ability. Part 2 of the report addresses alternative systems for dealing with child sexual abuse. It refers to the 1986 Child Sexual Assault Task Force, where Justice Wells, when interviewed, suggested that child sexual assault could be more appropriately dealt with by way of a coronial inquiry. There was also a reference to the 1991 parliamentary select committee report which included two recommendations that the committee supported but, to date, these recommendations have not been acted upon. It is also important that I highlight the first of these recommendations and I hope in the near future that these recommendations are acted upon. The first is:

that in conjunction with bringing together legislation dealing with children under one Act, the Government also sets up an inquiry into alternative approaches to the adversarial system with the aim of making law more effective in achieving justice for children.

Part 2 of the recommendation is:

that in-service training seminars presented by experts, are provided for all solicitors, barristers and judges working in the field of child abuse.

After reading some of the anecdotal comments brought forward by judges making a mock of children's evidence I believe this recommendation is long overdue. Over recent years many social justice issues have been identified as requiring ongoing judicial education. In particular an understanding of a child's language skills and cognitive development would assist judges to maximise the evidence—giving potential of child witnesses.

The phenomenon of child sexual abuse has a body of knowledge now available which is not commonly known to judges. The committee debated many complex considerations and came to the view that any revised system for dealing with child sexual abuse should be based on clearly identified values and aims and, to quote from the report, would include the following: the system would encourage offenders to accept responsibilities for their actions and seek treatment; the revised system would have a commitment to the safety and protection of children; it would acknowledge the need to foster a sense of justice in any children involved in the process, family members and the wider community; the primary focus should be on determining where the truth lies; and the system for ascertaining the truth should be strict enough to safeguard the rights of the accused, whilst being flexible enough to allow the true situation to become evident. The process would be conducted so as to minimise delays in finalising matters.

Part 3 of the report addresses counselling services and whether sufficient resources were available for victims. I guess I had predicted what the outcome would be in this area and, as expected, the results reflected long waiting periods and general limitations due to a lack of resources, delays in subsequent appointments, a need for more training for counsellors and improved inter-agency communication.

Whilst I commend the work of the NAPCAN committee, I still have a concern as to the powers of the Commonwealth versus the powers of State: in bringing together under one Act legislation dealing with children, will the suggested recommendation in the report, the section dealing with alternative systems (part 2b(1)), address cases that are presently considered under Federal legislation? This is an area I consider a serious problem. Is it a State issue or is it a Federal issue? Why can it not be a child's issue? Why do the rights of the child—the right to be safe, the right to be protected—not have a higher priority that is above that of either State or Federal court, thus making the child the No. 1 priority?

What I am talking about is not new. Norway was the first country in the world to appoint a separate official to watch over the rights and interests of children. A *barneombudet*, or children's ombudsman, was appointed by the Norwegian Parliament in 1981. The first appointee, Malfrid Grude Flekkoy, was an effective advocate for the concept of a Government-funded agency to promote the interests of children. Sweden, too, has an enviable record in protecting the rights of children, and a non-government agency, Radda Barnen (the Swedish Save the Children Fund), appointed a children's ombudsman in the late 1970s. The *defensor de la infancia* was an initiative of the Costa Rican Government set up in 1987 and given full legal status in 1990. New Zealand's Commissioner for Children was appointed in 1989, funded by and having administrative links with the Department of Social Welfare.

I recently received some information from Ms Pam Linke of the Australian Early Childhood Association. I had met Pam at a function that was addressing the issues of child abuse, and we shared a common interest. I relayed to Pam my perceived frustrations in child protection and how I believed the current system was out of touch. Pam spoke to me of a report and a draft policy called 'Action for Children—the Establishment of a National Office of a Commissioner for Children'. The report was dated November 1994. It provides a worthwhile alternative in addressing children's issues.

In writing in support of the establishment by the Federal Government of an independent office of Commissioner for Children, the Australian Early Childhood Association foresees the office of the Commissioner as having the responsibility to ensure and promote the needs and rights of children. At present, there is no coherent, systematic or structural means by which to ensure that the needs, interests and rights of our children are brought to the attention of Government and are taken into account. Indeed, children are probably the only major group in the population for which this is not the case.

The wellbeing of children must be a commitment of the highest order because, as the most vulnerable and dependent group in society, they cannot pursue it for themselves. This should be sufficient reason to take whatever action is necessary to guarantee their wellbeing. However, there are also other reasons for a nation to give the wellbeing of its children the highest priority. The future is constructed in the present, and so it is, to a large extent, dependent on the quality of our children's childhood. Children are the citizens of the future. Governments which ignore their obligations to children, which see them only as adjuncts to other economic and social policies, which address their needs only as members of families or in an uncoordinated way, jeopardise not only the lives of children now but also the future. There are more than 4.5 million children and young people below the age of 18 years in Australia. They constitute almost 27 per cent of all Australians. The physical, sexual and emotional abuse of children by adults is one of the most pressing social issues in Australia today, yet policies for protecting children vary considerably in their ambit and effectiveness and are too often piecemeal and patchy, under-funded and lacking in suitably trained and supported staff.

The legal protections for children depend on where they live. Laws and practices as to care, protection and treatment of children vary significantly between different States and Territories and, again, between the States and the Commonwealth, with consequent uncertainty, inconsistency and variation in the quality of services. Australia's family law

system treats children as objects of concern, and largely denies them the opportunity to advocate for themselves and to present their views in court or as part of a mediation process.

I have only skimmed the surface of a problem that has existed for many years. For hundreds of young children abuse is a way of life. There is also a small team of caring people—concerned parents, welfare workers, health workers, doctors, police—trying to help the children but, as I mentioned earlier, resources are limited and funding is not there to cope with problems or to properly address preventive measures. I do not know the answer to the problem—I wish I did—but we have many good people working on preventive measures and possible solutions. In finishing I quote Thomas Hummarberg, the Swedish representative on the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child 1990, as follows:

Politicians, eager to be seen as child friendly have often paid lip service to the well-being of children. But, at the end of the day, children usually have been let down. In the power game, other interests have been stronger. Children have always been, and still are, the victims of hypocrisy.

I support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brokenshire): The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): As have other members, I wish to present my compliments to the Governor—a superb Governor, indeed. She has taken the office to the community and travels into the country at a very hectic pace, thus ensuring that all areas of the State have equal recognition. She is a woman of great integrity. My mother-in-law knew her in her very early days, as other members have recounted about our Governor, and has always spoken very highly of her. If my mother-in-law speaks highly of anyone, then they are very deserving of those comments.

Sadly, this Government that she is saddled with does not give one iota about the traditional working people of this State. I have heard nothing in favour of support and commitment to the needs of the average community dweller. In the contribution of the member for Lee, he says 'Teach the people to fish and they will eat fish for the rest of their lives. Make them responsible for themselves. Go out and do more voluntary work.' I can only say to the member for Lee that we are responsible people: we do voluntary work, but we also need Government to provide proper services such as health care, education and the right to work. Sadly, this Liberal Government is reducing those rights and our work force.

Government members speak of the number of jobs they create, but never of the number they shed. During this Address in Reply we heard the contribution of the member for Wright: denigration of an issue of the community dwellers again. However, it was not in defence of his Government's appalling denigration of those in the community but, in his comment, in self-defence. I can only say to the member for Wright that he would have been wise to let it go. I would not have brought this matter to this House in this debate. I would have discussed the issue at another time, for the reason of ensuring support for and awareness of the plight of the peoples of French Polynesia. The member for Wright has raised the issue in this debate when it should have been dealt with at another time and, as I said, as another issue in its own right.

Mr Caudell: When?

Mrs GERAGHTY: There is ample opportunity, I remind the member for Mitchell, to raise these issues, and they could have been raised publicly; but not in this debate. If the honourable member would like to listen, I may be able to enlighten him on one or two things. In his contribution the member for Wright said that he did not raise the issue with me or an honourable member from another place. Why? Because he cannot do so with integrity. I have long followed the walk through life of the member for Wright, particularly from the day he defeated the very good member Molly Byrne in the seat of Todd. I watched his demise a couple of elections later and I have watched his activities since with interest.

It is fair to say that I am a fairly reasonable person. I never denigrate for the sake of it, nor with a deliberate intention to cause harm. I do not involve myself in personal attack for the sake of it, but I will not let go of an issue that I believe is one of injustice—and with this Government there is great injustice. There is no wage justice. There is no—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The honourable member may think this fairly flippant, but I suggest that he listen. There is no wage justice, no equity for the working and unemployed persons and no justice for the grassroots of our society. I sat here that night and listened to the comments of the member for Wright and, in all honesty, I was absolutely appalled and even infuriated by his contribution. That is indicative of the attitude of this Government to the grassroots of our society, those who live the struggle and the battle every day. Where is the soul of this Government? Sadly, that soul is spelt 'sole' as is the member for Wright's. Where is the honourable member's insight, foresight and commitment to people? It is nowhere. I do not believe that the honourable member has any. The member for Wright has the mentality of the aristocracy of occupied countries.

Let me tell members the story of Tahiti as seen from the streets, from my heart, and the truth not as I see it but as it actually was. The day-to-day incidents as stated by the member for Wright are not all that important. Who did what is merely a kaleidoscope of days of activities, of words, thoughts, feelings, anger and frustration: frustration from years of suppression, from being ignored and from just being fodder; from being a means to another's end. This is our country. What would our reaction be if another country were to come in and create activities of violence against our existence? If we were to make the member for Wright our spokesperson, he would sell us out. If we raised our fists in gesture, the honourable member would say that we were uncouth and violent and would disassociate himself from us.

He would have his own distorted understanding of the situation. His attitude is that of a bygone era where countries determined the fate of people for colonialistic ends. Thankfully, that time has gone and it is just some arrogant quarters that have not yet realised that. I wonder what the member for Wright would have said when the French were forced to leave South-East Asia; or, for that matter, the Americans. Imagine standing in the streets of Tahiti with hundreds of people: families, including mums, dads, grandmothers, grandfathers, kids, community groups from other countries and politicians from around the world—all united together with a message: no bomb. At the end of the runway at the burnt-out airport, a group of elderly women sat in a canoe in a peaceful defiance against the military. They were there as the last bastion of Tahitian protest.

Mr Caudell: Was there any water?

Mrs GERAGHTY: The honourable member may jest about this.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I think you are. The member for Mitchell jests about this very serious situation in Tahiti. I suggest that this is not a matter about which to be light hearted. It is a very serious matter and one which affects us now and may affect us in the future.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, indeed. This was the message, and it was a strong message. An element of the independence movement was involved, and the member for Wright spoke about this on numerous occasions. In fact, the member for Wright said that independence was all the protest was about. I suggest that the issue of independence is one involving those who group together, and they all opposed the bomb. The real issue, as always, was the bomb. Hundreds of people were involved in the march to say to the French Government, 'No bomb.' Regardless of what the member for Wright says, the issue was always the bomb.

French Polynesians do not want any more nuclear testing, and 63 per cent of the French population said 'No', as did other countries. Nuclear testing pollutes the waters around French Polynesia and elsewhere. It also takes away their ability to sell the few remaining products of their agricultural pursuits. They cannot sell produce such as copra and vanilla because they cannot produce certificates proving that those products are unpolluted by radioactivity. No sale, no jobs, no self-reliance and no freedom. Did the member for Wright investigate that?

Mr Caudell: Any profit?

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Mitchell asks—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell will have his turn in due course. He is distracting the member for Torrens. I ask the member for Torrens to address her remarks through the Chair and not across the Chamber.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Thank you, Sir. The member for Mitchell raises an interesting point. He suggests no profit: does the honourable member place the welfare of people behind profit? His remark indicates to me that profit is paramount to the welfare of people. I suggest that he not continue with that sentiment. As I said: no sale, no jobs; with no self-reliance, there is no freedom. I ask whether the member for Wright investigated that. As to the member for Lee's suggestion that the people should be taught to fish and they can eat fish for the rest of their lives, what fish can the peoples of French Polynesia eat? Nothing—not safely, anyway.

I agree with the member for Wright that there was disorganisation regarding the trip, and I too have concerns about that, but I and my colleague from another place went to Tahiti to support the local people and to say 'No' to the bomb, and we did that. We did that but we did it with the local people in the streets, unlike the member for Wright. I recall seeing the member for Wright on only two occasions: once when we arrived and the day when we flushed him out of his hotel, which for the benefit of members was the Hyatt. I visited the Hyatt, which has a wonderful view of Papeete from the balcony, but you would need binoculars to see what was happening, and even then it would still be a distant blur.

The member for Wright apologised for the behaviour of some of the Australians. Again, his criticism is not directed at me or a member from another place, yet he denigrates and criticises everyone else. However, he did not criticise his own Liberal colleagues. The member for Hindmarsh, Chris Gallus,

stood on the podium and spoke of her support at what the member for Wright claims was merely a march about independence. Very confused messages come from the member for Wright. In fact, many of his colleagues packed their bags and took off before the riots started because they were terrified of staying and seeing what was happening. In my opinion, they went there for publicity, not for the real issue—the bomb—and not because they were concerned about the Tahitians, their livelihood and the future of their families. The member for Wright made specific reference to the riot at the airport. He told this House that the riots were well planned and claimed they were organised by the pro-independence movement, which used women and children as shields. He spoke of the violence, insinuating that it was the deliberate intention of the pro-independence movement. He said that rocks had been strategically placed in position. It is interesting that he displayed such knowledge of the situation when his only trip to the airport on the morning of the riot was a futile attempt to leave. He did not go anywhere near anything to know the real story.

We were at the airport every day. We did not go island hopping to escape. As acknowledged by the member for Wright, he went off to Bora Bora, the island of paradise, as it is called. We were there every day with the Tahitians, supporting them and their message. They wanted the Australian politicians there, but sadly some of them had hopped on a plane and flown back to Australia, while the rest of them went island hopping. I believe that the people who demonstrated intended it to be a peaceful demonstration. The situation did become tense and physical, but had the French military not over-reacted I do not believe that the situation would have escalated to the point it did.

The French response was deliberate and provocative. Even so, there was an element of humour in the situation. The Tahitians were dressed in shorts, T-shirts and thongs and threw rocks at the military. The military, who were in full battle gear, responded with stun grenades, tear gas and rubber bullets, taking the hand of a nine-year-old child. They deliberately fired at a nine-year-old child. Tell me that that was not a provocative action on the part of the French military! It was hardly a fair battle. The tear gas was very painful, and it was certainly an experience that I do not wish to repeat.

I have no doubt in my mind about the intention of the French Government in this matter, and to hear the member for Wright apologise to them was galling. What did he apologise for—for saying 'No' to the bomb and for protesting? The French Government's propaganda encouraged anti-Australian feelings among the French people in the area, and it was deliberate. I do not want to repeat my experience, but it was enlightening to have been there and then to compare that experience with what we saw on television and read in the papers, which was completely different. What we saw via the satellite and what we read in the papers was not true. It was propaganda at its worst.

We hear of the suppression of information, we are told about controlled media and, indeed, we experience it in this country. However, to witness it to the degree that it occurred in Tahiti and via the French satellite was absolutely stunning. By way of example, I cite an article in the French newspaper *Despatch* claiming that Australians keep the Aboriginal community locked in compounds and surrounded by razor wire. It is somewhat like the situation in this House on odd occasions. The member for Wright gives his view, and he probably believes the propaganda because he took his

information from the television commentary and not from personal experience. However, his views are almost completely opposite to those of other politicians from around the world who were there. The physical facts are true to a degree: there was rioting, looting and burning, but the member for Wright forgot to ask why and to what extent. I suppose the answer is that the Tahitians have been repressed for years. They have no say in what happens around their territory. Nuclear testing goes on without concern for their welfare and without consultation.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Mitchell again says it is a minority group. The honourable member was supposed to go on the trip but he piked out. Why did the member for Mitchell not go and see whether there was a minority group or whether it was Tahitian people saying 'No'?

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I agreed with the member for Wright and I agree with the member for Mitchell that the organisation was not very good. However, some of us still went because we had a commitment to say 'No' to nuclear testing. Our commitment was not about whether the organisation was very good: it was a commitment to say 'No' to nuclear testing. But the member for Mitchell piked out. I suggest that the member continue with his reading.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

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

Mrs GERAGHTY: As I said, the Tahitians and the people of French Polynesia have no say in what happens around their territory. Nuclear testing goes on out without any concern for their welfare and without any consultation. They are forced to wear a decision made by Jacques Chirac. The education system does not give them the skills to manage their affairs. They are taught things like geography and literature but never any of the sciences or anything of any academic standard that would enable them to have a career in anything other than service industries. To do this they must go to France or to another country. In fact, the issue of nuclear testing cannot even be discussed in their Parliament; they have no say in the matter. In the future, when France has finally finished with the islands and no longer has a need of them, what legacy will it have left behind? What will the Tahitian future be? With the resilience of the people and their strength, they will have another battle to contend with, and I have no doubt that they will survive, but at what price? Yet, the member for Wright apologises to the French Government—a Government which flew in the military to quell the violence to which it contributed and which it inflamed.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: That is a good point and I will come to that. The military was indiscriminate in its attack and was deliberate and intent on a forceful resolution—this was the role of the military. My colleague and I were sitting in a taxi observing the activities at the airport the following day, and we were fired at numerous times. The accuracy from such a distance was impressive, to say the least, and there were several direct hits on the taxi. Thankfully, there is a high failure rate with stun grenades but not so with tear gas. The poor taxi driver had trouble starting the car, and his terror was added to by my pounding on his back telling him to go. As is the nature of the Tahitians, he apologised for swearing in this most tense situation. It was frightening, but it brought home to me the reality that the military meant business.

The Tahitians are peaceful and warm people. Violence is not their way. But can you wonder in the current climate why there is violence? Oscar Temaru, who has been denigrated in this House by the member for Wright, is a strong and gentle man. He is deeply religious and has a great love of his people and of his home. Even in moments of anger his raised voice could hardly be called a roar. We had many meetings (at none of which I saw the member for Wright) with Oscar Temaru, union members, members of the church and with the local people. They spoke of independence, but can you wonder why? They sought help from politicians from Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and around the world to put pressure on the French Government to stop the testing: it was as simple as that. On Sunday 24 September the second bomb was detonated. Surely, we can all see the provocation of that. It occurred on a Sunday, the day of worship of a deeply religious people. Why not the day before? Why not the day after? Why not? It is because it was Sunday, their day of worship. It was deliberate provocation. There is no answer to the French Government's contempt for the people of French Polynesia.

We know that the media's video tapes were confiscated for the purpose of identifying activists and incarcerating and intimidating them and their families. While we were there, unionists and others participating in the riot were rounded up, gaoled and tortured. It is not an allegation; it is true.

Mr Caudell: Fact.

Mrs GERAGHTY: It is a fact. Jacques Chirac, aided by Gaston Flosse, has ensured that anyone who wants to protest cannot do so. By intimidating supporters and leaders such as Oscar Temaru and others like him, they have effectively hamstrung and, by intimidation, quelled the riots and opportunity for the freedom of speech. Oppression is the name of the game and the means of dealing with the situation.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: It is interesting that the member for Mitchell finds this amusing. This is an issue of human rights and the member for Mitchell finds it amusing. That is most interesting.

Even while we were there, people were taken and locked away. I have had faxes in the past few days with information showing that people are now being identified from those tapes and being interrogated at gunpoint in their homes. Their front doors are being broken in, their homes are being ransacked and they, too, are being taken away. We do not see that on our television and we do not hear that in our media broadcasts because of the suppression of information.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Mitchell says that is not happening. That is probably the most unintelligent remark I have ever heard from a member in this House, and it lacks deep compassion. What else will he joke about? What about Bosnia? Is it not happening there either, or is that a fantasy of a great writer? It probably is.

An honourable member: This is the Address in Reply debate.

Mrs GERAGHTY: He says that this has nothing to do with it.

Mr Caudell: That's right.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Did you say that to the honourable member? He says that I should not be addressing this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Torrens should address her remarks through the Chair and ignore the member for Mitchell, who is out of order.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Sir, I should be delighted to ignore the member for Mitchell. However, he is at my side and is like a little canary, just twittering away.

Mr Foley: A big canary.

Mrs GERAGHTY: A big yellow canary, twittering away.

Mr Foley: A big ugly yellow canary.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I would not go so far as to say that he was ugly. The member for Hart wishes me to confirm that, but I shall go on. As I was saying, these people are being interrogated and psychologically and physically mistreated. Many of the people to whom this is happening are innocent bystanders. It is an outrageous violation of the fundamental rights of citizens.

Their method of electing the people's representative in the Territorial Assembly is not one that we would encourage. In fact, we rid ourselves of it some time ago. The last State to cast this asunder was Queensland. I refer to the gerrymander system of government. Sadly, the French Polynesians at this stage are not so lucky. Electorates there range from 300 to well over 1 100 people and are obviously weighted in favour of the pro-French dominators. We would be grateful to have electorates of between 300 and 1 100; even 2 000 would be fine. We could all be god parents to each of their children. As it is weighted so much in favour of pro-French dominators in those islands, we could hardly say that the majority of people can have their say. It is basically a political system of dominance. The people of French Polynesia are still seeking our support, as well as world support, and I think we owe it to them. It is our duty, and we should give them that. Whatever happens there will ultimately befall us at some time in the future.

The fragility of Mururoa is obvious. The French Government could not use the atoll for the second bigger test because that atoll is unstable. How stable is Fangataufa? There may still be six more tests to go, and I ask: why in a peaceful world do we need nuclear testing at all? Are we not able to resolve these issues by discussion? These performances of power, of cockerels fluffing their feathers, crowing about their ability to dominate, is a dangerous game and one that sadly causes great damage, not only to the people of French Polynesia but to our world's environment. The contamination is there and will spread further. It is not only to France that we should be saying we will not tolerate the testing but to other countries as well.

What of the issues for the people of this State? What benefit from everyday services will we derive when this State Liberal Government relinquishes control over them? At whose mercy will we be and what will we have? I am a citizen and taxpayer of this State, and I rely on good health care. In fact, just a week or so ago I needed the emergency services of a public hospital. My grandson wants a good education, so why are we destroying these essential services, the grassroots of our society, that which all our society relies on every day? We have been listening to Minister Olsen telling us that he is selling off our water.

Members interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: He says he is not selling it off, but I bet he sells it off to North West, because even he is not game enough to move into the French company. Then we have Minister Ingerson, with his despicable activities concerning WorkCover. He is just putting people on the scrap heap.

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

Mr FOLEY (Hart): It is with pleasure that I contribute to the Address in Reply debate. Tonight I intend to speak mainly about outsourcing within Government, a feature of the first 18 months of the Brown Government, and the specific issue that I would address tonight is the EDS contract, the proposed outsourcing of information technology. It is important that we have a very close review of what the Government has done in this respect. If we cast our mind back to the day before the last State election, and trace back the key critical points since that date to evaluate and assess how the Premier has handled this major outsourcing contract, we trace a very interesting story.

I have to say it is a very good case study in how not to undertake a major outsourcing project. It is important, as we enter this new area of Government activity, that both the Opposition and the Government have a candid look at how it has handled this contract. Let us consider the day before the last State election. I still have the vision etched in my mind of the then General Manager of IBM, Mr Mark Bradley, and the then Opposition Leader, Dean Brown. What were they saying? Together they made an announcement that IBM would invest in South Australia about \$150 million and create at least 2 000 direct jobs, with the distinct possibility of its being somewhere closer to 4 000 when we take the multiplier into account. It would stimulate a further \$500 million of economic activity for this State and involve the contracting out of the whole of Government IT functions somewhere in the order of \$1 billion. That was Dean Brown's statement the day before the last State election.

What I intend to do now is to walk us through the critical dates since Dean Brown, on the eve of the State election, made that bold prediction. I mentioned 10 December, which was the critical date on which Mark Bradley and Dean Brown made that now fateful statement. The Leader of the Opposition then became Premier of the State and on 29 December, following the memorandum of understanding signed between Mark Bradley of IBM and Dean Brown prior to the election—and it was quite extraordinary for an Opposition to sign a memorandum of understanding with a private sector entity—the Information Technology Industry Development Task Force was set up, commissioned by the Cabinet at the suggestion of the Premier. The Chairman was Dr Craig Mudge and task force members represented the industry associations, the Office of Information Technology, the Economic Development Authority and the MFP. So, soon after coming to power the Premier wanted to implement his vision.

The next critical date of interest is 7 January 1994. Mr Mark Bradley, who had been the IBM General Manager for South Australia and who so boldly sat with the then Leader of the Opposition and announced this deal, left IBM under a cloud. I do not know why but one can only speculate that, within six or seven weeks of the new Government, senior management within IBM nationally did not look favourably upon a partisan political stunt by a regional manager of IBM. It was nothing more than a partisan political stunt by a regional manager of IBM and perhaps Mark Bradley paid the price for that. It is a credit to IBM that it realised that it was not the appropriate way for its executive to be conducting himself.

During the month of February—the first sitting month of the Parliament under the Liberal Government—the then Leader of the Opposition (Lynn Arnold), the now Leader of the Opposition (the member for Ramsey) and I launched into a number of searching, probing questions of the Government

as to exactly what the IBM deal involved. It did not seem right that it could sign a memorandum of understanding committing the Government to \$1 billion worth of expenditure over a decade without due process and without considering all other options. The Premier's immediate reaction was that we were being a typical knocking Opposition—the terrible Opposition. How quickly we had slipped into the role of a negative Opposition! I suspect that members opposite were well skilled in negative opposition as they had been doing it for so long. That is not what we were doing: we were simply saying that it just did not look right.

Through the month of February we asked what the memorandum of understanding involved, whether the Premier would table it, to what had the Premier committed himself, what homework had the Premier done, what discussions and negotiations had occurred, why was not EDS permitted to tender, why was not local industry prepared to look more closely at it and why were other major multinationals not prepared to look at it? There was simply stonewalling from the Premier. We did not stop at that, because the role of an Opposition is to be constructive and to point out where a Government is going wrong.

On 10 March the Premier addressed State Government departmental executives and all the heads of each agency. The Premier and Dr Craig Mudge talked about the Premier's IT objectives and the non-negotiable issues of IT outsourcing. The Premier felt that it was important that he tell his bureaucracy exactly what he and Dr Craig Mudge saw as their vision. I am painting a picture of a top-down policy. This was the vision and the policy of the Premier of South Australia that he was driving onto his Cabinet, his Party room and his chief executive officers.

The next critical date is 5 April. The Office of Information Technology advised the employees of the Government in the area of information technology of the Cabinet IT subcommittee's decision of some days earlier, on 29 March, first, that there would be a complete outsourcing of agency applications. Secondly, I would like to say that, as the result of Opposition pressure (to which he would not admit), the Premier then announced that he would allow parallel negotiations with both EDS and IBM. One month earlier he had said that it was not appropriate for us to be quizzing him on this cosy deal we thought he had done with IBM and, all of a sudden, one month later he was telling the employees of the Government that they were to have a parallel tendering process; EDS had been brought into the fold. He mentioned that the Government also intended to outsource telecommunications and that there would be a common, whole of Government software and user interface. The local computer industry immediately asked, 'What does this mean to us? What is IBM and EDS's contract with the Government? What does that mean for local industry?' At that time there was significant local industry angst and concern about just what that meant. Were they being shut out and excluded; were they going to lose from this deal? There was wide reporting in the print and electronic media expressing local industry concerns.

On 12 April the Premier said that the Government was then going through due diligence with two major companies, EDS and IBM, and that the Government would achieve substantial savings and industry development. It guaranteed that there would be a market share for smaller companies in South Australia. That was in response to questioning by me; the Premier basically committed the Government to ensuring that local industry was not being left behind. I welcomed that;

I thought it was the least the Premier could commit to supporting local industry.

On the same day on Keith Conlon's radio show on 5AN the Deputy Premier denied that local industry would be frozen out of the proposal. He said that companies involved in information technology in South Australia would remain and that most of the Public Service IT staff would remain within Government. This will be a very interesting comment to read back to the Premier in the months ahead. On Keith Conlon's program of 12 April the Deputy Premier said the Government would not be subsidising or investing huge dollars into the proposed economic development plant at Technology Park. The leverage to get EDS or IBM to South Australia would be via the whole of Government contract and would not involve any inducements such as payroll tax concessions or other industry attraction offerings. I will wait with interest to see exactly whether that is the case.

On 14 April EDS made a confidential request to the Government as a commercial in-confidence request from EDS to the Office of Information Technology requiring descriptive and cost information re staffing, hardware, software, computer suppliers, outside services, facilities, administration details, service level agreements and data communications inventory. Clearly, in mid April EDS was concerned that there did not appear to be sufficient information from which it could prepare its bid. Two days later on 16 April in Philip White's column in the *Advertiser* there was reference to Crown Law concerns about the legitimacy of the then Leader of the Opposition's memorandum of understanding with the then manager of IBM in South Australia, Mr Mark Bradley, and that followed Opposition questioning about the legal status of that memorandum of understanding. Again in response to Opposition questioning, on 20 April the Premier said that EDS and IBM were in parallel negotiations for Government outsourcing and economic development. The final contract signing would be within the end of three months. This was at the end of April 1994, and the Premier was saying that the final contract would be signed within three months. He says:

It is widely accepted in the IT industry that 20 per cent savings can be achieved through outsourcing.

Members should listen to that. Towards the end of April 1994 the contracts are to be signed within three months and savings achieved to the Government of at least 20 per cent.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Please wait, there is more. The following day on 21 April, this time in response to a question from the member for Hartley (my colleague across the Chamber), a Dorothy Dixier which gives the matter even more importance, the Premier cites the possible savings of about \$60 million a year and significant economic benefits to the State. The Premier denies that there was a pre-election agreement with IBM and that what agreement there was had no legal standing. Through deliberate questioning from his own side the Premier was saying that there would be savings of at least \$60 million a year. Members should track those figures in their heads as we go through the chronology of dates and critical comments and we will see how these numbers shrink over time.

On 21 April the Opposition through me called for the Auditor-General to investigate the dual tendering process and ensure that due process had been undertaken, that there had been no shortcuts and that the Government was undertaking the due process. On 23 April we saw an article in the

Weekend Australian entitled 'Computer firms snub tender offer', which stated:

Local South Australian firms are angry over the South Australian Government's announcement of EDS and IBM's parallel tender negotiations. . .

The companies rejected an offer by the Government to put in an alternative bid because of the impossibility to do so in the limited time. At the eleventh hour the Government said it would accept a tender from local businesses, but it had left no time for them to do it. On 3 May, again in the *Australian*, which has taken a particular interest in this issue, we saw an article 'Investor lure in controversial outsourcing deal' and it details the IT 2000 Task Force strategy and committee's identification of \$1.2 billion of outsourcing work in Government IT.

Professor Craig Mudge, the Premier's own person designed to come up with the quantum of business available for outsourcing, put a figure of \$1.2 billion on the value of computer IT work. He said that \$140 million worth of business should be let in the first year. A few days later on 3 May things started to get a bit tight. Speculation was rife as to who would be given the contract, whether it was EDS or IBM. An *Advertiser* article said 'IBM not ditched says the Government' and it went on:

The Brown Government denies it has ditched IBM from the estimated \$1 billion contract for IT outsourcing.

Two days later as the shadow Minister I received a letter from the Auditor-General in response to my request that he investigate the due process and the Auditor-General advised that he would be examining the outsourcing in his audit for 1993-94 and in subsequent audits. On 10 May the local industry association members are briefed by Mr Ray Dundon on proposed outsourcing. Industry sources were on the record saying that the Government had decided on outsourcing before looking for in-house cost savings and considering local industry in the whole of Government approach. I now go to 15 June—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I have got all night, if you like. On 15 June IBM announced that it would be headquartering its ASEAN regional computing operations in Australia. This was just prior to the State Government's awarding the contract and IBM was floating publicly that there was a big economic development initiative on the horizon. It was clearly a deliberate ploy to put them in a better position with the contract. One day later, on 16 June, the *Telegraph Mirror* in Sydney actually tipped that this establishment would be located in Sydney. Then on 18 June, the IT 2000 Report, by Professor Craig Mudge, was published. The next critical date is 8 July, and the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, Stephen Baker, mentioned that the EDS/IBM best and final offers were received on 27 June. There would be an eight-week assessment period before the final decision. Expected cost savings were about 20 per cent, and there would be a guaranteed share of business for local industry. So again there was a commitment from the Government that savings to the Government through IT outsourcing would be at least 20 per cent.

Then in August the Opposition released a confidential report on outsourcing by the Centre for Economic Studies. It was the report commissioned by the Department of Treasury and Finance. It was extremely critical of the proposed deal. Of course, we raised that in the Parliament. The Premier dismissed it, and he was quite pleased with himself when he

said that he deliberately excluded Treasury officials from the whole IT outsourcing negotiations because they—and he said words to this effect—would simply hamper the process.

On 25 August the Premier said that the negotiation process for the preferred supplier would result in a very significant economic development and potentially huge savings of some \$20 million to \$30 million per year to the State Government. He said, in response to a question from me, that South Australia would have the very best contract possible and that he had employed the two best outsourcing contract lawyers in the entire world. So he was still sticking to his huge amount of predicted savings. On 5 September, the Premier announced that South Australia would establish a world class IT industry, with five key objectives. The following day, on 6 September, he announced that South Australia would move to boost its IT appeal. He detailed the contents of the IT 2000 report, and the Brown Government's strategies for the development of IT in South Australia.

On 13 September, in a pre-planned sequence leading up to the announcement, the Premier announced that EDS was the successful bidder. He expected savings of \$100 million over nine years and that a new computer technology centre would be built in South Australia. He expected that up to 1 300 new IT jobs would be directly created, and that there would be up to half a billion dollars improvement to the economy in South Australia over nine years. So it would mean an extra half a billion dollars to our State gross product. He claimed delivery of major benefits to the State after only nine months in office, and he emphasised the Government's commitment to maintaining the level of contracts with local firms.

We can all remember that day in the Estimate Committee. We could not wipe the grin from the Premier's face. On that day, the Opposition cautiously welcomed what the Government had announced, but we made clear that we had some major concerns. This was the first time any contract such as this had ever been attempted in the world. The complexities were just mind boggling, and this was being attempted with great haste and with great speed. We said that the Premier should really just take it a little more slowly. He should look at involving small groups of agencies instead of this whole-of-Government approach. I do not want to bore members by recycling the comments of the time, but I will say that we were concerned about a number of issues.

The following day, EDS announced that it would consolidate its IT operations for General Motors-Holden's in South Australia, would build two major building projects at Technology Park to accommodate EDS, that final contracts were expected to be signed in early 1995, and that EDS had earmarked \$170 million for its IT Centre of Excellence in South Australia. That was a joint release by EDS and the Premier. On 18 September, the Chairman of EDS announced that he would visit Adelaide the following week. The Premier announced that the Government was about to launch into the final stages of negotiations; he was looking to having the whole matter finalised by early 1995. On 19 September, in response to further questioning from me, the Premier detailed the economic spin-off benefits of the EDS deal. He mentioned its uniqueness; that Adelaide was to become a training ground for EDS staff in Asia; and that 4 000 people would be employed at Technology Park by the year 2000.

Incidentally, at the announcement in September, the contract had gone down from \$1.2 billion to \$1 billion and then to \$700 million. On 14 November in the *Advertiser* under the headline '\$700 million computer error', inter-

national computer consultants warned of risks of technological lock-in in outsourcing contracts, and stated there was an international move to co-sourcing and specialist outsourcing rather than the whole of Government approach. That was an interesting article putting an interesting point of view across.

On 17 November the Premier addressed an IT conference at the Hilton. He cited three major initiatives of the Government's IT strategy: the development and production of the spatial information systems; the establishment of the IDC; and that South Australia was a major Asian-Pacific regional IT training centre. Certainly full steam ahead for the Premier. On 23 November the Premier claimed the SA Centre for Economic Study report was irrelevant and out of date even before it was published.

In 1995, an article in the *Advertiser* by Mr Robert Kella of Arthur Andersen entitled 'Public sector outsourcing fears' expressed concerns regarding the outsourcing and felt there had not been a proper impact assessment. On 8 March 1995, EDS announced due diligence negotiations were entering the final stages. The focus was to reach a conclusion by the end of March 1995 and it was expected to have eight different function groups working parallel with the SA Government by April. We were looking for the contract to be signed by May at the very latest.

On 19 April the Premier had a video conference link up with Hong Kong explaining to EDS managers the benefits of the Government's strategic partnership with EDS. On 20 April, an article in the *Advertiser* was headlined 'Computer deal still not signed'. Government sources were speculating on further delays in the computer contract signing. The Premier denied there were problems with the contract but expected it would be June before the signing. On 19 May the Premier admitted in the *Advertiser* a \$700 million deal hitch and said there had been difficulties finalising the deal but it was still on track for June. On 6 June, in response to a question from me, the Premier refused to commit the potential value of the EDS contract. On 13 June, again in the *Advertiser*, the headline was, 'Talks to save huge contract'. The article detailed the problems in finalising the EDS contract; the Government had been unable to generate the necessary amount of work to meet the savings targets and the complexity of the contract was causing difficulty.

On 20 June, the Premier was questioned in the Estimates Committee by the Opposition and me. He admitted to the difficulties in achieving the \$700 million figure and admitted agencies such as the TAB and the Lotteries Commission had been brought into the equation. On 21 June, the Deputy Premier, in response to questions in the Estimates Committee, acknowledged that the cost of the contract process to date was approximately \$6 million. On 21 June, as Opposition shadow Minister, established again on record that the Opposition was cautiously supportive of the contract but the size, speed and process had been inadequate and were of major concern. On 26 July, the Premier in Parliament was non-committal about the projected savings level of the EDS contract and he would not commit to a signing date. On 31 July, the headline in the *Sunday Mail* was '\$700 million computer deal near'. The Premier scotched speculation negotiations had stalled.

In the *Advertiser* on 1 August, under the headline 'Computer contract signed by end of year', the Premier revealed a complexity of negotiations due to the diversity of Government and the absence of records. The Premier claimed that he was optimistic for finalisation of the contract by the end of 1995. On 7 August in the *Financial Review*, the headline was, 'SA threatens to reopen \$600 million computer tender'.

Clearly, the value was going down all the time. It reported of stalled negotiations and talked about the Government and EDS being on the brink. On 8 August the *Advertiser*, under the heading 'Final bid to save computer contract', reported a Government ultimatum to EDS to resume negotiations, major stumbling blocks being the level of actual savings and the quantity of work. On 10 August a headline in the *Advertiser* stated 'Brown calls for calm on EDS deal'; the Premier accused the ALP of ill-informed criticism and admitted that the Government had been overly optimistic concerning the March signing date. The quantity of work and savings targets were the key stumbling blocks.

On 12 August the headline, 'New offer from EDS: big data deal revived' appeared in the *Advertiser*. On 16 August the Opposition called on the Premier to clarify when this deal will be finally signed. On 31 August the headline in the *Advertiser* read 'Big data deal vital: scientist'. Professor Craig Mudge said that the EDS deal is vital to South Australia's economic future. On the same day the Premier said that the EDS deal is not the centrepiece of his vision for the State:

and anyone who says it is just based on this project is wrong.

So, the Premier was contradicting himself quite openly. On 1 September the *Advertiser* reported on the Premier's announcement on his visit to America under the headline, 'US talks wipe out hurdles to EDS deal'. The Premier was quoted as saying that we are likely to have a contract by Christmas. On 4 September the *Advertiser* again stated that they are finally getting somewhere. However, on 5 September the Premier was still saying that no contract will be signed unless it is in the best interests of South Australian taxpayers. He was not saying that two years earlier. Of course, the Auditor-General's Report came out on 26 August. The Auditor-General is critical of the vague basis from which the negotiations began. He stated that no early position of firm knowledge was established. He identified overall coordination arrangements and procedures as critical to effective and efficient outcomes for the whole of Government IT initiatives. He has also identified significant implications for a whole series of things that I will discuss tomorrow night. So, the Premier clearly had the whole process wrong and stands condemned for the poor way of handling this project.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply and wish to compliment Her Excellency the Hon. Dame Roma Mitchell, Governor of South Australia, for the way she presented her address to this the Third Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament. The majority of members and many people of South Australia know what a remarkable lady Dame Roma is. It came home to me again yesterday when I was walking back to Parliament House along North Terrace. As I looked to my fore I recognised this person walking alone. As I got closer I thought 'My word, it is Dame Roma.' Here she was, walking along North Terrace without any *aide-de-camp* or other person. That is the type of lady she is. She is happy to walk out of Government House and go shopping, or do whatever she wants to do—and in her own time, too. She is a lady of the people, and we can be very thankful that we have a Governor of the calibre of Dame Roma.

Certainly, it was once again a pleasure for me to be one of the members to listen to her present the address on this occasion—and what an address it was. It is very heartening

to see some of the positive views coming through after this Government has been in power for over 18 months. We noted in Her Excellency's address that employment in South Australia is at its highest level for almost five years. It now exceeds the pre-recession peak with the creation of some 27 400 jobs since January 1994—a truly credible performance. We also note many of the economic and financial reforms that the Government is undertaking. It is also seeking to achieve some of the short and long-term social benefits for the people of South Australia. Certainly, as Her Excellency said:

The momentum of reform will be maintained, built on firm financial foundations and linked by economic, environmental and social development strategies which apply technological change and new technology to improve employment opportunities and community services.

How great it is to be part of a Government that is seeking to reform South Australia to get South Australia back on track. Her Excellency noted:

The objectives of public sector cost saving and industry development through exports are also driving my Government's policy to develop a new water industry in South Australia. A prime contractor to manage, operate and maintain Adelaide's water and waste water systems and to lead the development of an export oriented water industry will be selected before the end of 1995.

We have heard a lot of discussion about the outsourcing of our water. Unfortunately, we have heard a lot of untruths as well. A letter written by the State Labor Leader, Mike Rann, MP—we know him as the Leader of the Opposition—has been brought to my attention, entitled 'An important message from Mike Rann MP: Privatisation of your water?' I could not believe the letter when I read it, because apparently this letter has been distributed only recently. I remember being in this House on many occasions when both the Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure continually corrected the Leader of the Opposition that privatisation of our water was not occurring in this State. We now have a letter from the Leader to residents of South Australia deliberately fabricating the situation; deliberately telling untruths. He has the hide to commence his letter by saying:

Dear Resident

In South Australia we have worked hard to be a positive and constructive Opposition. That's important for our State.

I find this incredible. How can it be a positive and constructive Opposition after what the Leader of the Opposition and other shadow Ministers have been saying and doing? They are not positive; they are not constructive: they seek to be destructive the whole time, and they are being exceptionally negative. In this letter the Leader of the Opposition has the hide to purport to be positive and constructive. The letter is exactly the opposite. In fact, I do not believe it is part of a 'Labor Listens' campaign: I believe it is part of the Labor fabrication campaign. In fact, it illustrates that Labor lacks credibility, and that is the real situation.

Today the Minister for Infrastructure replied to some 37 questions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition about the outsourcing of our water supply. We have heard time and again that the Government will continue to control the reservoirs; will continue to control the infrastructure; will continue to control the pricing of the water; and that the key objective of the outsourcing is for lower cost water, more efficiency in the outsourcing of the water, and for South Australia to be able to tap into and to sell some of our expertise to overseas markets, particularly the potentially \$800 billion market in the Asian region alone.

We have heard it time and again, but today we heard, in answer to questions from the Leader of the Opposition, that our target is to save 20 per cent per annum compared with our costs today. It is not surprising that the Labor Party should be seeking to denigrate what we are doing. We know what the Labor Party did to our costs: it oversaw the demise of the State Bank. It saw this State reach a situation where we had record debt levels, and now it is attacking a policy that will seek to save South Australia 20 per cent per annum compared with our costs today.

I hope that the people of South Australia take on board the fact that they can save up to 20 per cent on the overall cost of their water. The Government's dividend target from SA Water for this financial year is indicated clearly in the budget at \$61.7 million; yet the Opposition does not want that, it believes that it is outrageous, and it wants to waste money. We have seen them do it year after year and I hope that they will never again have the chance to take the reins of Government in this State because we are starting to get things back into shape in South Australia. We have had to make some very tough decisions, which have not been popular with a lot of people, but I know that the majority of people in this State are prepared to make sacrifices and are prepared to weather the hard conditions simply for the sake of making a better State for future generations.

The Minister for Infrastructure was asked a question today about Saturday's rally against the outsourcing of water. It was interesting to note that, when the Leader of the Opposition stood on the steps of Parliament House and held up a sprinkler licence, he forgot to say that many counties in the United Kingdom do not have water meters and that, for decades, many consumers have had licences to turn on a hose to water their garden. He tried to scare the people of South Australia and, of course, he got a headline in the *Sunday Mail* as a result. It was another complete fabrication by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister reinforced some of the points that I have just made.

Mr Lewis: He's not just a fabricator; he is a rabid fabricator.

Mr MEIER: The member for Ridley makes an interesting point. I thought to myself as I watched the television news that night that some of the faces looked familiar, and the Minister for Infrastructure pointed out that one face tended to stand out, that of Doug McCarty. As the Minister said, that is a similar name to Clare McCarty. It was Doug McCarty who led all the opposition and rallies against uranium mining in South Australia some 13 or 14 years ago, coincidentally when the Leader of the Opposition was press secretary to the then Labor Party Leader. It was the Leader of the Opposition and Doug McCarty who ran the rallies against Roxby Downs. Back in the 1980s, a consortium tried to stop Roxby Downs, which is now a billion dollar export industry, providing thousands of jobs for the people of this State. Mr Doug McCarty tried to stop that project just as he is trying to stop the outsourcing of our water so we can make a significant saving to consumers and provide a significant dividend for this Government. I hope that the people of South Australia will see through that person, and I am very sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has become involved in this sort of fabrication.

Today Mr Paolo Nocella became a member of the Upper House, and I offer my congratulations to him. I should also like to extend sincere thanks to the Hon. Mario Feleppa, who recently resigned from the other place. Mario was the Presiding Member of the Legislative Review Committee

when I was one of its members and I enjoyed serving under him for four years on that committee. I know that I also speak on behalf of the late John Burdett, who served with me during that time, as did the present Speaker (Hon. Graham Gunn).

Mario was a very honourable and well respected member of the other place. I am interested that the Hon. Chris Sumner, the Hon. Barbara Wiese and the Hon. Mario Feleppa have all resigned and have been respectively replaced by the Hon. Terry Cameron, the Hon. Paul Holloway and the Hon. Paolo Nocella. I cannot believe what has happened because I was a member of this House about three years ago when, at that time, the former member for Gilles, Mr Colin McKee, sat on the Government side of the House but missed out on preselection for a House of Assembly seat. I well remember hearing stories month after month about the future of Mr Colin McKee. After a lot of toing-and-froing the then Premier, the Hon. John Bannon, categorically assured us that the first vacancy to occur in the Legislative Council after the 1993 election would be given to the member for Gilles, Mr Colin McKee.

I was surprised that Mr Terry Cameron took the place of the Hon. Chris Sumner when he resigned. The argument was that Mr Cameron was Secretary of Trades Hall and the Labor Party felt that it wanted a prominent person. When the Hon. Barbara Wiese resigned I thought, 'All right, I know the excuse here; the Labor Party will want a woman to take the place of a woman.' But, no, that did not occur. Mr Paul Holloway, who had also sat on these benches and who was defeated in the seat of Mitchell by the excellent member, Mr Colin Caudell, actually came in and took that vacancy instead of Mr Colin McKee. Mr Mario Feleppa has now been replaced in this case by a person of Italian origin. I can understand that, too, but what happened to the promise made by the then Premier, Mr Bannon, to Mr Colin McKee?

I assume that the next person who resigns from the Upper House will definitely be replaced by Mr Colin McKee. I cannot understand why the Labor Party has waited so many months with so many replacements before allowing Mr McKee to come in. It is obvious that, for some unknown reason, the Labor Party has decided to leave that promise on hold for a while. The Labor Party does not have too long to go because nearly two years of this Parliament has elapsed and it promised Mr McKee that he would be the first one to fill a Legislative Council vacancy. Mr McKee has not been the first, so we can only assume he will be fourth. I wonder who will be next to resign.

As I indicated in a grievance debate, I was privileged and honoured to be one of two representatives from this Parliament at the twenty-third Australian and Pacific Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association which was held between 9 and 16 September 1995. It was a pleasure to be accompanied to the Cook Islands by the member for Price. I believe I speak on behalf of the member for Price when I say that we both found it very rewarding and interesting. I can only recommend it heartily to any member seeking to be a delegate to a CPA conference. The conference dealt with a number of topics, and I will highlight some of the things that we considered.

It is always interesting for a member from a large country to be associated with Parliamentarians from smaller countries. It was not surprising that one of the papers presented was from the Kiribati CPA branch. Its topic was on the greenhouse effect and over-population. We have heard a lot about the greenhouse effect, and basically we have forgotten about a lot of it, particularly the effect of rising sea levels. How-

ever, the representative from the Kiribati branch in his paper said:

The sea-level rise implications of the greenhouse effect are naturally of concern to the people who inhabit the coral atoll islands of the Pacific. As far as we in Kiribati are concerned, the 'greenhouse' is no longer open to question; it is a scientific fact. Global warming is not open to question either, nor is the fact that sea levels are rising. What is open to question is by how much and how soon the current rate of global warming and sea-level rise will change.

For many of those island communities a rise in sea level of one metre could have devastating effects on their population on the ground that they currently occupy. Take, for example, Raratonga, the main island of the Cook Islands. Most of the settlement is on the coastal area and all of the interior is comprised of high lands. Whilst the inhabitants originally lived in the high lands because of their warring traditions, these days they all live on the coastal lands and use them to produce as much as they can.

The greenhouse effect is of great concern to the island populations, and hand in hand with that, particularly if it occurs, is over-population. It is all very well to ask, 'How should over-population affect them?', but their economies are invariably tied to the Western economies. Unless they are able to improve their gross domestic product—their output—they are very much afraid of being left behind in the modern world. The populations in those island economies, whilst small by our standards, are such that they are causing problems for some of the communities. For example, we cannot buy land in the Cook Islands. In fact, land is not for sale. People can get a lease of land, but the only way they can own land is by having it handed down from father to son and such like.

We also had a paper on the environment and development in small island states. This was from one of the Ministers from the Cook Islands. It was a thought-provoking paper, which indicated to me how much these small islands are concerned about their environment and development in this day and age.

Another paper by the delegate from Norfolk Island was entitled 'The fragility of a one-industry economy: putting all of one's national eggs into one basket'. Norfolk Island relies almost entirely on tourism. It was interesting to hear the Hon. Robert Adams, its delegate, identify how on two occasions the economy of Norfolk Island was virtually wiped out in one fell swoop. The first occasion was the result of the airline pilots strike in Australia. Although it affected Australia significantly, for Norfolk Island it was devastating because no planes came to the island and therefore no tourists came. They had a real crisis, which was averted only when the airline pilots strike was over.

The second crisis occurred when they had a health scare. A virulent and harmful disease, known as Dengue fever, hit that island. Whilst apparently it did not affect too many people, the media got hold of it. However, the media did not let the facts interfere with a good story, and people stayed away from Norfolk Island in droves. Again, tourism was affected dramatically.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: One of my contributions was to make suggestions to Norfolk Island and other small island states on how they could seek to diversify and broaden their economies. In fact, I used much of the thinking and the type of programs that we are considering here in South Australia to develop our regional economies. So, there is some similarity

with our outer areas and the island economies. I believe that many of the ideas that we are seeking to apply here could well apply to some of those small economies as well.

There were several papers on the importance of tourism for regional economies, to promote cooperation amongst regional airlines and to foster the wider international understanding that this could bring. We had papers from the Commonwealth of Australia, the New South Wales branch, as well as from the island branches. Another paper, put forward by Federal member Mr Ray Braithwaite, was on the role of committees, such as the Public Accounts Committee, in the oversight of Government administration and expenditure. Again, it was interesting to hear the variation from various Parliaments on how they use or do not use their committees, and to ascertain just where we in South Australia stand on that score. I believe that we can be reasonably pleased with the way in which our committees are operating, but certainly there were some factors that we needed to take on board as well.

I was quite heartened to receive a mention on the front page of the local newspaper, the *Cook Island News*. I do not know that it is read as widely as the *Advertiser*, but it is their daily edition. Under the title, 'Should MPs sweat for the nation?', it came out of a discussion that we had on health issues. In fact, it related partly to the role that government has in health, of which we are well aware through our Minister for Health, who is doing an excellent job in this State. It was interesting to hear not only how some other Ministers are doing but also about the health of MPs. I received a mention when it stated:

'It is a matter that has been discussed by our own parliamentary Parties,' Mr Meier told MPs in yesterday's mid-morning session. He mentioned the case of South Australia, where one MP died after collapsing and another had bypass surgery after a heart attack.

We are very concerned about the health of our MPs because we know that the former member for Torrens had a very tragic end to his parliamentary career, and we are very heartened that one of our other members has had a much more positive response in recovering from, likewise, a heart attack. In fact, I was able to give a brief paper on the final day of the conference on the health of MPs. I have since been sent a paper by one of the other CPA delegates, the Hon. Kevin Rozzoli, entitled 'On the health of members: doing the job better.' I hope that we as a Parliament will take up this matter because none of us is as young as we used to be, and we need to look after our health. I guess it is too easy in this job to concentrate on the day-to-day activities and to be subject to the pressures in such a way that we forget about our health. If we are not very careful, we can certainly be affected in the long term.

Many other papers were presented, one being on waste management and recycling. That was presented by Mr Arthur Marshall, the member for Murray from Western Australia. Mr Murray is a fairly new member of Parliament but he has done a lot of study on waste management and recycling and had been on a committee that went overseas. Some of the committees we heard about went overseas regularly and I am pleased that we in the South Australian Parliament do not allow that to happen under normal circumstances. In fact, I do not know of one committee that has gone overseas to investigate anything, although occasionally some have gone interstate. Some Parliaments need to learn from us to ensure that their budgets are kept under control. Waste recycling is an important issue.

There were also some papers on aquaculture. The former Premier of New South Wales, the Hon. John Fahey, gave a very enlightening paper on the potential of aquaculture to sustain fisheries and I was very pleased to make a contribution myself on the South Australian aquaculture industry, including the various areas at which we are looking, have developed in so many cases and will be developing in future.

It was very much an honour for me to represent the South Australian Parliament at the Twenty-Third Australian and Pacific Regional Conference. I thank the members of this House for having put their confidence in me as their delegate. If members wish to know more about some of the topics discussed or papers presented, I am only too happy to make them available to members.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I have great pleasure in supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply and I am pleased to participate in this debate for the opening of the Third Session of the Forth-Eighth Parliament.

I acknowledge the role of Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia, Dame Roma Mitchell, A.C., D.B.E., not only for again opening the session of Parliament but for her ongoing commitment and dedication to this State of South Australia and its people. She does a wonderful job and always acts and looks the part, and she will be a hard act to follow for whoever succeeds her in that important position.

Since the last opening of Parliament we have unfortunately seen the deaths of three former members of this place: the Hon. Gordon Bruce who, as everyone knows, was the President of the Legislative Council prior to the 1993 election; Jack Jennings, a former member for Ross Smith (the seat of our Deputy Leader); and Howard Venning, the father of the member for Custance and former member for Rocky River. All three were excellent people, gentlemen in their own right, and I am saddened by their passing and acknowledge the great contribution they made to the South Australian Parliament.

However, life must go on and since the opening last year we have seen three new members come into this place. First, Lea Stevens, the member for Elizabeth, won a by-election in the seat of Elizabeth when Martyn Evans resigned from this place and won the by-election for the Federal seat of Bonython. Secondly, Robyn Geraghty, the member for Torrens, won the by-election after the very untimely and tragic death of Joe Tiernan, the former member for Torrens, who was in this place for only a few months. I got to like him in that short time and it was tragic that he died so suddenly and so young. The third by-election was won by Trish White, the member for Taylor, when the seat became vacant on the resignation of the former Premier, Lynn Arnold.

I pay tribute to Lynn Arnold and his contribution over many years in this place. He was a gentleman and was respected by members from both sides and all Parties in this place. He certainly had unquestionable ability, a tremendous all-round knowledge, being one of the few people who can speak at any time on any subject and without notes. He was certainly a wonderful person. He was involved in the Christian fellowship in this Parliament over many years, being one of the early presidents of that executive group. He will certainly be missed.

In some respects his talents were wasted for many years, although he was a high ranking Minister. He was certainly always Premier material, but John Bannon held that position for so long so that, when Lynn eventually got his chance to become Premier, he was handed a poisoned chalice. It was

no fault of his that Labor lost government on 11 December 1993.

Since that time we have also seen new members go into the Legislative Council. The Hon. Terry Cameron came into this place to replace the Hon. Chris Sumner late last year. I pay tribute to the Hon. Chris Sumner, who did a terrific job over many years. He was a dedicated member and an exceptionally good Attorney-General. He was a very compassionate person and his knowledge of the law was exemplary. I always felt that perhaps one of his biggest problems was that he was such an honest person. He was an honest lawyer and always dealt with matters of State at Attorney-General level in a very honest way, which was a bit of a handicap sometimes, because perhaps we could have got a few things through if he had been a bit less honest and had bulldozed things through, as is sometimes necessary. However, he did a magnificent job, and I pay tribute to him.

The second replacement was after the recent resignation of the Hon. Barbara Wiese. She also did a magnificent job over 16 years in the other place. She was a remarkable Minister for Tourism; it was a role that suited her extremely well. She always looked the part and had enormous credibility in the community because of her flair, her appearance and her characteristics, and she carried off that job very well. She was replaced by the Hon. Paul Holloway, who from the 1989 election to 1993 was a member of this House. I am sure he will acquit himself extremely well in the Legislative Council. He is a quiet person. He has three degrees; he is a very intelligent person, and I am sure he will acquit himself very well in the Upper House.

The other person was sworn in only today. The Hon. Paolo Nocella has replaced the Hon. Mario Feleppa. Once again, he is someone who has come with exceptional qualifications and credibility in the community, especially in the multicultural community, as you, Mr Acting Speaker, would know.

I also wish to comment on the contribution that Hon. Mario Feleppa made over many years and on his friendship. Over the past 10 years I enjoyed working with Mario in the Caucus and on various committees. I feel very grateful to him: he was a very compassionate and supportive person. I remember that, when I got into a bit of trouble in this place some years ago, I found out who my friends were. Mario was very supportive of me, and I will always remember him and be very grateful to him for that. I hope that he and all the other members I have mentioned and their families have long and happy retirements from this place.

With retirements and other losses during and since the 11 December 1993 State election, our two Houses have now lost well over 300 years of parliamentary experience. It is an enormous loss to both Houses of this Parliament, to the State and to the people of South Australia. It is a lot of experience to lose and something that is not replaceable straight away. We are in a rebuilding stage and, while a lot of the new members will be oncers, others will be around for a long time. Some on either side of the House will go on to have long and distinguished parliamentary careers. It is part of rebuilding and democracy that new and young members come in with fresh ideas. A new broom sweeps clean, as they say.

I guess that with experience these people will become valuable performers. It is democracy at work that these people come into this place, and ultimately the people of the State will benefit from these newcomers with new ideas. It is coincidental that I should follow in the debate the Government Whip, my colleague the member for Goyder, who spoke at some length about the recent Commonwealth

Parliamentary Association trip to Raratonga in the Cook Islands. I had also intended to speak about the trip but the honourable member has stolen my thunder. I will therefore not go into the same detail that he did, but I will refer to a few matters that I was very pleased with.

The member for Goyder and I represented our Parties at the Twenty-third Australian Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at Raratonga, Cook Islands, in September just gone. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank the member for Goyder for his friendship, support and help during that conference. I also acknowledge the help and support given by Mr Geof Mitchell, Clerk of this House, who accompanied us on that conference as the CPA Regional Secretary for South Australia. After negotiation with the Government Whip, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I wish to refer to remarks made earlier this evening by the member for Torrens. First, there were a number of statements that she made that I would invite her to make outside the House because I would have great delight in immediately taking her to court, because she made a number of statements about me that are absolutely untrue and I now wish to go through them. First—and this is not in the order in which she made them in her speech—the member for Torrens stated:

We did not go island hopping to escape. As acknowledged by the member for Wright, he went off to Bora Bora, the island paradise, as it is called.

I wish to make it quite clear to the House that at no stage did I go to Bora Bora. I did that quite deliberately because it is regarded as a tourist island and I was in Tahiti purely and simply to put my protest to the French Government in relation to the nuclear testing. The member for Torrens also made the statement that I went island hopping. Yes, I went to a number of islands to meet with different communities, unlike the member for Torrens who met only with her union mates and got a very biased point of view of what occurred in the islands of French Polynesia. I made sure that I developed a network with a large number of Polynesian persons within the Polynesian group. I had an excellent network. In fact, it may interest the member for Torrens to know that that network was able to tell me that the riots were going to occur at the airport before they occurred. That network also told me of the riots that were going to go on in town that afternoon and night, before they occurred. So much for spontaneity. The only thing the member for Torrens and I agree on is that we were both horrified at the actions of the French Government at the resumption of nuclear testing. That is exactly why I went to the islands, to make my protest. Unlike the member for Torrens, who stuck with her union mates throughout, I made sure that I spoke with a representative group of Tahitians not only on the island of Tahiti but elsewhere.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, I did go to the island of Moorea. Why did I go to the island of Moorea? I had made arrangements to meet with a farming family who still practised the original agriculture. I was introduced not only to his family

but to a wide group of Tahitians who, for the interest of the member for Torrens, were native Tahitians—the Tahitians who have been there for thousands of years. I spoke to them. I can tell the member for Torrens here and now that there were two issues: one was the nuclear testing, which had universal support for what we were trying to do over there—to protest; the other concerned a minority splinter group, a very small group, of about two or three members of the local parliament, who want independence. If the honourable member had spoken to Tahitians other than unionists, she would have been told—

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member is absolutely ignorant. I spoke to some French people; but I am talking about the Tahitians who were absolutely appalled at the riots and at their own people who had rioted in the way they did. They were appalled that they were trying to get independence from France because, as so many groups pointed out to me, without France they could not survive. French Polynesia has but one industry, the tourism industry. The rest of the support comes from French money, and they realise it although they were horrified at the actions of the French Government. I refer the member for Torrens to the vote that was taken just a few years ago, where over 80 per cent voted in terms of remaining with France. They do not want independence.

Let me refer to some of the other nonsense of the honourable member. She stated, for example, that I apologised to the French for the bomb. No, I apologised for the actions of some Australians who were so heavily involved with the rioting and the pro-independence group. That is all I apologised for.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: It is obvious that the member for Torrens fully supports the rioting that occurred. The member for Torrens and her union mates believe in the attitude: 'Let's go out and riot. Let's be violent.' If the member for Torrens is honest, she will make some comments. The rioting which occurred in Papeete was not directed at French businesses. In fact, far more properties of Tahitians were destroyed than of French businesses. No wonder the Tahitians themselves were so opposed to what had occurred. The member for Torrens ignored the advice given to her by our own Australian consulate, who advised us very strongly not to become involved, not to go to the riots. I will never resile from the position that I went to Tahiti to undertake a peaceful, lawful protest—which is what I did. On the other hand, the member for Torrens—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member. She has been warned before. Does the honourable member wish to apologise and explain her conduct?

Mrs GERAGHTY: I am very sorry, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is prepared to accept the explanation. It was not a particularly full account of the honourable member's actions, but in view of the fact that the hour is late the Chair will accept it. I will not accept any further such conduct.

Mr ASHENDEN: I made the point that many statements made by the member for Torrens are absolutely untrue. Again, I invite her to make those statements outside the House. For example, she has stated that I have no commitment to the people over there. All I can say is that, in the march, I have never been so moved in my life, where we had the Tahitian people 100 per cent behind us because we had joined with them to protest at the French actions in undertaking nuclear testing. However, I can tell the member for

Torrens that, after the riots on the Tuesday, with the groups that I spoke with, we, the Australians, were absolutely *persona non grata*. We were seen as having identified with a minority group. Again, I repeat to the member for Torrens, I was dealing—

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Well, here we go again. The Labor Party is all for violence, and I went over there to make a peaceful protest.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Members opposite are supporting the violence which occurred. That is what you are doing. I have been accused of selling out.

Mr FOLEY: You're an apologist for France.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am not that. I would like the honourable member to make that statement outside the House because I am not an apologist for France. I absolutely condemn what the French Government did in relation to nuclear testing. However, in relation to the violence, I oppose it, but the Labor Party supports it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr ASHENDEN: Thank you, Sir. As far as the member for Hart is concerned, I point out that, unlike him and his mates over there who support violence, I am opposed to violence. I went to make a peaceful protest.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I call on the member for Wright to withdraw the remark that I and other members of the Labor Party support violence.

Mr ASHENDEN: Ask the member for Torrens.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright will resume his seat.

Mr ASHENDEN: I was accused—

The SPEAKER: Order! It may not be strictly unparliamentary, but the Chair is of the view that the comments were unwise and I suggest the honourable member rephrase those remarks in a more acceptable manner.

Mr ASHENDEN: I will go on and point out that—

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Wright to rephrase those comments.

Mr ASHENDEN: All I can gather from the comments made by the member for Torrens is that she was fully in support of what occurred in Tahiti whilst she was there. That has reframed it, Mr Speaker. She has stated she supported—

The SPEAKER: Order! Members' emotions have run particularly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: Not you personally—

The SPEAKER: Order! Members' emotions are running high on this particular issue. I suggest to all members that they take a breath of fresh air. This debate is available so that all members can make all the reasonable comments they wish to make. It is not necessary to go into personalities or unduly raise the tempo. The member for Wright has been asked to rephrase those comments. He has. I will allow him to continue.

Mr ASHENDEN: I note the Opposition has so effectively stopped the time I had to put forward the points—

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Mr ASHENDEN: Here we go again. You don't like the truth, do you?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take the point of order at the conclusion of the comments of the member for Wright.

Mr ASHENDEN: In the brief time I have available I want to make quite clear on the record that I totally condemn the French Government for its nuclear testing. That is why I took the trouble to go over there. I want to make that quite clear. I am not an apologist for the French Government. However, I do condemn the rioting that occurred. There were two agendas while I was over there: one was for independence and one was against the bomb. I was there to support the anti-bomb only.

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

Mr FOLEY: My point of order was that the member for Wright accused me of improper motives in calling an earlier point of order, which you upheld.

The SPEAKER: The Chair dealt with that matter when I addressed the general conduct of members.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I will answer the comments of the member for Wright without a transcript of what he has said. He had a transcript of what I said in this House in the Address in Reply debate, and, as I said in my statement, I said what I believed from the heart and what I believed to be the truth. He has come into the Chamber to defend himself. I read very carefully what the member for Wright had to say in his Address in Reply speech and I felt he brought that into this Chamber at an inappropriate time and in an inappropriate manner.

I read very carefully what the member for Wright had to say. I read it many times over, and I did so because I was concerned about what he had to say and I was angered and hurt on the part of the peoples of French Polynesia. As the member for Wright says, we went to Tahiti for a specific purpose. Our purpose was to say, 'No bomb. No nuclear testing.' We went there for the reason that we do not believe in nuclear testing, because it affects not only the people in the immediate vicinity but people all around the world. *Workplace* is not something that the member for Wright would read, but it has an article in it about nuclear testing.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright has made his speech. The member for Torrens has the call.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Thank you, Sir. I guess the member for Wright is very angry about the comments I made. He claims that they are false accusations against him. I claim that I do not believe that I misrepresented the activity—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All comments will be directed through the Chair. The member for Wright has had a fair go, and I suggest that he listen to the member for Torrens. He has the opportunity tomorrow if he wants to comment further, but I do not know whether that is wise either. The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, I agreed with the member for Wright on another occasion, rarely though that it may happen. I did say specifically the island of Bora Bora. I also said Moorea, and I note from having perused the transcript of my contribution that Moorea was not mentioned there. So, yes, the member for Wright did go to Moorea but, no, he did not go to Bora Bora, and I do apologise to him for saying that he went to the island of paradise—Bora Bora. It was—

Mr Ashenden: Another false accusation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I counsel the member for Wright in the strongest terms not to interject again.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If it keeps up that may happen to him. The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Now the member for Wright is asking me to apologise for other inaccurate, misleading and defamatory (I think were his private words to me) comments that I made. I can only say to the member for Wright that I apologise for saying that he went to Bora Bora, and I apologise for nothing else. The reason I apologise for nothing else is that what I say is what I believe.

Mr Ashenden: But it's not the truth.

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Wright tells me it is not true, and if he tells me it is not true I ask the member for Wright: during all the time we were in Tahiti at the behest of the French Polynesians to support them in saying that there should be no more nuclear testing and that they did not want nuclear testing in their back garden because it will ultimately affect the rest of us—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright will cease.

Mrs GERAGHTY:—where was the member for Wright? I accept his explanation: the member for Wright was on Moorea, which is a very wonderful island. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to visit Moorea because I, along with my colleague from the Upper House, Terry Roberts, was with the Tahitian people also at their behest. But I did observe Moorea at the sunset, and a very beautiful island it appeared to be. I am sure that the member for Wright will be very happy to enlighten as to the activities on Moorea and its obviously peaceful Tahitian existence. But where was the member for Wright during the activities in Papeete?

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The honourable member says that he saw them.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: I can tell you, Sir, that he saw them—and I am very accurate about this—from the balcony of the Hyatt Hotel, and I suggest that he saw the activities through binoculars, because I could not see the activities on Bora Bora. If he saw them from anywhere else, it was on the French satellite TV. I reiterate my argument to the member for Wright that he indulged in the French propaganda. He tells us tonight—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address her comments through the Chair.

Mrs GERAGHTY: —that he now stands behind the Tahitian people saying, 'No nuclear testing. No bombs.'

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

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

Mrs GERAGHTY: He tells us that now, but in his contribution, to which I responded—and had he not given it I would never have raised this issue—

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, I refer the honourable member to my comments. I made it quite clear that I was over there as part of the bomb protest.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Thank you, Sir. I am sorry the honourable member has disrupted my thought processes, but what he did say was that I, along with my colleagues, supported what happened in French Polynesia.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Wright.

Mrs GERAGHTY: He now says that we were involved in it. This is important, because he is now saying that we, according to the French propaganda, incited the riots. The honourable member is getting close to saying that we incited the riots, but that is absolute fantasy on the part of the honourable member. This man was never there. He might have been physically there, but he was never there in his mind. This man was somewhere else. He was obviously in the satellite, the technology of the satellite, spreading his mind and body across the whole of the universe.

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Orders make it quite clear that when members refer to another member they must refer to them by their seat and not by their sex or anything to do with a third person.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is correct. The member for Torrens should refer to the member for Wright as the member for Wright and address her comments through the Chair.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Certainly, Sir, I am very happy to refer to the honourable member as the member for Wright because I want everyone to know that the member for Wright has the most appalling attitude to the fundamental rights of human beings. I am happy for everyone to know. I am happy for everyone to know that this man does not support the very basic rights of human living standards. This fellow over here just believes—

Mr Ashenden: What a load of rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: —that people who protest are not worth anything. The honourable member believes that one just goes along with the aristocracy of dominant nations. He apologises to the French. God knows who he will apologise to shortly for the behaviour of people in this Chamber—and I suggest the member for Mitchell might be in trouble. The issue is that there was only one reason why genuine people went there, and that was to protest against nuclear testing. The rest of the people, and I am sure that the member for Wright will agree, went there specifically for publicity, and that is the worst kind—I am not accusing the member for Wright of that because he was hiding under his bed—of politicking I have ever seen.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 October at 2 p.m.