

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 December 1997

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

### UNFAIR DISMISSAL

**Ms KEY (Hanson):** I move:

That the regulations under the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994 relating to unfair dismissal, made on 4 September 1997 and laid on the table of this House on 2 December 1997, be disallowed.

The main reason for our opposition to these regulations is the method by which these provisions will be brought into being. If it is true that, as has been noted by the media and by the Hon. Dean Brown, unfair dismissal is causing great hardship to small business and to business in general, why has there been no general review or inquiry into unfair dismissal provisions under State awards in this State? Despite the opposition that has been shown by not only the Labor Party but also the Democrats, the method of introducing and reintroducing regulations has continued.

Basically, the provisions under the regulations, which discriminate against workers in workplaces of fewer than 15 employees, casual employees and employees who are serving a probationary period in their job, are not supported in the Commonwealth arena. Under the Workplace Relations Act, the Senate has rejected the proposal that workers in these workplaces should be discriminated against. The proposal being put forward will mean justice for some but no justice for others. Dismissal is the termination of a contract and should be subject to some legal redress. Again, I ask: why should some employees not have a remedy for unfair dismissal? The International Labour Organisation Convention 156, Termination of Employment, 1982, which has been ratified by 20 nations (including Australia in February 1993) discusses this issue. I very briefly quote from that Convention as follows:

The Convention applies to all branches of economic activity and to all employed persons with some possible exceptions. . . The Convention provides that employment may not be terminated by an employer unless there is a valid reason for such termination connected with the capacity or conduct of the worker or based on the operational requirements of the [worker concerned]. . . the filing of complaint against an employer; race, colour, sex, marital status, family responsibilities, pregnancy, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin; absence from work during maternity leave; and temporary absence from work because of illness or injury.

The Convention deals with the procedures to be followed for the termination of employment and for appeal against termination.

The regulations that have been put forward under the Industrial and Employee Relations Act do not provide for that remedy or for any appeal whatsoever if you are employed in a workplace with fewer than 15 employees, if you are a casual employee with less than 12 months service or if you are on a probationary period.

Under these regulations and the Act itself costs are awarded only against the worker. If the worker wants to put in an application for unfair dismissal, he must pay \$50. This is to ensure somehow that the application is not vexatious. I remind the House that there is no evidence so far of small business campaigning on this issue and that there is a connection between unfair dismissal provisions and employ-

ers being encouraged to employ young people or others in their workplace.

I conclude on the point that, as an advocate in the industrial arena for many years, one of my first introductions to the unfair dismissal provisions was through the Cawthorne report. I believe that the then Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Dean Brown) received this document. This report, which was released in April 1982, dealt with the requirements for legislative change to meet the current and likely future developments in industrial relations. My recollection of that document is that reasonable procedures were provided to deal with unfair dismissal, and that they included redress for workers who had been harshly, unfairly or unjustly dismissed. It is my experience in this part of the industrial arena that, through the years, those proceedings have worked quite well with regard to unfair dismissal.

So, with reference to my original point, I ask the House to consider why we are using this method of introducing and reintroducing regulations to deal with what is supposed to be, in the words of the Government, 'a very serious problem'. Why not hold an inquiry or a review; why not actually interview people who deal in this arena so that, if necessary, we can come up with a more appropriate way of dealing with dismissals and terminations?

**Mr MEIER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1936. Read a first time.

**Mr ATKINSON:** At about 1 p.m. on Saturday 22 February this year, Canberra Raiders Rugby League player Mr Noa Nadruku started a bender at the Kingston Hotel on Canberra's south side. During the next 11 hours he drank 28 schooners, six stubbies and half a bottle of wine. At about midnight, he attended the South Pacific Rugby League Club in Civic on the north side, where the barman served him another schooner. Soon after being served, Nadruku left the club via the stairs. As he went down the stairs, 20-year-old Australian National University student Sally Middleby was ascending the stairs. Ms Middleby did not know Mr Nadruku and had said nothing to him, made no gesture to him nor blocked his way. She did not even barrack for the Canberra Raiders.

Mr Nadruku punched Ms Middleby. On the pavement he struck Ms Rebecca Platten (also aged 20) with his fists, and later on he assaulted his wife at the Civic bus interchange. His wife did not press charges, but the other two women cooperated with the Australian Capital Territory police. Mr Nadruku was charged with assault and appeared as an accused in the ACT Magistrates Court before Magistrate Shane Madden.

Mr Nadruku's counsel led evidence that his client had a blood alcohol level of between 0.3 and 0.4 at the time of the alleged offence. Defence counsel also had a consultant psychiatrist give evidence that at those blood alcohol levels a person is likely to black out and be unable to form the intent to assault someone. Magistrate Madden found Nadruku had struck the woman as alleged. The magistrate said the accused's behaviour was 'deplorable, intolerable and unacceptable' and that 'these two young ladies were unsus-

pecting victims of drunken thuggery, effectively being king-hit'.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible conversation on my right. If members wish to carry on a conversation, could they perhaps go to the lobbies.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Mr Nadruku was, however, acquitted on the grounds that he was so intoxicated by alcohol that he was unable to form the criminal intent required to be proved by the prosecution. The outcome of the trial would have been the same in South Australia and Victoria because the Australian common law, as stated by the 4-3 majority of the High Court in the O'Connor case, applies in South Australia. All Australian jurisdictions bar Victoria and South Australia have now removed the drunks' defence by statute. The House had an opportunity to remove the drunks' defence this year. I moved this same Bill in November 1996. However, the Liberal Party voted to keep the drunks' defence, with the exception of the members for Ridley and Lee, who crossed the floor to vote for the second reading of my Bill.

Miss Middleby's father spoke for more than 95 per cent of Australians when, asked about the Nadruku verdict, he told the *Canberra Times*:

I frankly don't get that. If you drive a car drunk you are criminally liable. Yet if you beat someone (while) drunk you have mitigating circumstances.

I should add that the plea of automatism or lack of criminal intent owing to intoxication results in acquittal: it is not merely a mitigating circumstance. It is worse than Miss Middleby's father says.

I say that self-induced intoxication ought not by itself save a person on a criminal charge from conviction. The Bill, which fulfils the recommendation of the 1990 House of Assembly Select Committee on Self-Defence, provides that a person charged with an offence who is in a state of self-induced intoxication at the time of the alleged offence shall be taken to have had the same perception and comprehension of the circumstances as he or she would have had if sober and to have intended the consequences of his or her acts in so far as they would have been reasonably foreseeable by that person if sober.

I am not wedded to this particular method of abolishing the drunks' defence. I would be happy with the method used by the New South Wales Government whereby the defence was abolished only in respect of crimes of general intent rather than specific intent and crimes of specific intent listed in the schedule to the Bill. If members have a better idea, I look forward to their supporting the Bill's second reading and moving amendments in Committee.

Australian common law is that a person charged with an offence can use his intoxication to say that he was in an automatistic state, that he was not capable of committing the act (*actus reus*) and to say that he was not capable of forming the relevant criminal intention that must accompany a criminal act (*mens rea*).

This point can be illustrated by two cases, one Australian, the other English. My Bill substitutes the law of England, Canada and the United States for the law of Victoria and South Australia. The first case is the Australian High Court case of *R v O'Connor* 1980 Commonwealth Law Reports. Mark Norman O'Connor was charged with theft and wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm. He broke into a car parked outside a block of flats. He took from the car a map holder and a knife. When challenged by a police officer, he ran away. When he was caught by the officer he stabbed

him. O'Connor had ingested hallucinatory drugs and alcohol. He told the police, 'I didn't know anything. I wasn't there.'

At his trial he pleaded that he was so affected by drugs and drink that he was in an automatistic state and did not voluntarily commit the act; moreover, for the same reasons he was unable to form the requisite criminal intention. Either is sufficient for an acquittal. The High Court by a majority (Barwick, Stephens, Murphy and Aickin; Gibbs, Mason and Wilson dissenting) held that the O'Connor plea should have been left to the jury as a possibility. A retrial was ordered. Justice Barwick in the leading judgment of the majority said:

If to take alcohol and drugs with at least the risk of becoming intoxicated is in one sense a reckless thing to do, yet that variety of recklessness can scarce be carried forward and attributed as a substitute for actual intent to do the proscribed Act.

Stephens J, who was part of the majority, said:

It would, in my view, require convincing evidence before one might conclude that, as a matter of human behaviour, the person who becomes grossly intoxicated and also commits a crime while in that condition will be in any way discouraged from his initial act of becoming intoxicated by the knowledge that the fact of his intoxication will not be available for use in evidence at his trial to deny the presence of any mental element involved in his crime.

I find the reasoning of Stephens J unconvincing—and I say that reluctantly, because when I was a law student I found him to be one of the finest High Court judges we have had. I do not want to remove the intoxication excuse because I believe that it will induce violent young males to alter their habits. Mine is not an exercise in harm minimisation. I am moving this Bill to right wrongs. Those who have committed violent crime should not be acquitted owing to self-induced intoxication. The Bill is a just law, and the vast majority of electors will see it as such.

The three judges in the minority (Gibbs, Mason and Wilson JJ) were a formidable team of dissenters, and on this occasion I found their version of the law preferable to the majority. Mason J said:

It is wrong that a person should escape responsibility for his actions merely because he is so intoxicated by drink or drugs that his act is not willed when by his own voluntary choice he embarked upon a choice which led to his intoxication. Society legitimately expects for its protection that the law will not allow to go unpunished an act which would be adjudged to be a serious criminal offence but for the fact that the perpetrator is grossly intoxicated.

Just how the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) can reject my Bill a second time—based, as it is, on the reasoning of two former Chief Justices—I do not understand.

I now come to the second of the two cases, *DPP v Majewski*, which was appealed to the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords on a point of law. Robert Stefan Majewski was concerned in a brawl in a public house, to wit, The Bull, Basildon, Essex. He assaulted both the landlord and the customers, the police officer who arrested him, another police officer on the way to the station and, the morning after, assaulted a police officer in the cells at the station. Majewski was charged with three offences of assault occasioning actual bodily harm and three offences of assaulting a police officer in the execution of his duty. Majewski's defence was that the offences had been committed while he was suffering from the effects of alcohol and drugs.

Majewski was tried at Chelmsford Crown Court in Essex and convicted. He appealed to the Court of Appeal on the grounds that the trial judge was wrong in law in failing to leave to the jury the question of whether he did intend or foresee the result of his actions. Majewski argued that the judge was wrong in law in failing to direct the jury that, in

order to convict him, it had to be convinced beyond reasonable doubt that his actions were a product of voluntary movement performed in a state of conscious awareness with proper perception of his physical surroundings involving the intentional or reckless use of force against the person.

Majewski was asking the Court of Appeal to rule in the same way as the High Court of Australia subsequently ruled in *O'Connor*. If our Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) had his way, Majewski's defence would have been left to the jury as a possibility. I am pleased to be able to tell the House that Lawton LJ rejected this notion. He said in his judgment:

The facts are commonplace, indeed so commonplace that their very nature reveals how serious from a social and public standpoint the consequences would be if men could behave as the defendant did and then claim they were not guilty of an offence.

When the case was appealed to the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor in Jim Callaghan's Labour Government, Lord Elwyn-Jones, said in his leading judgment:

If a man of his own volition takes a substance which causes him to cast off the restraints of reason and conscience, no wrong is done to him by holding him answerable criminally for any injury he may do while in that condition. His course of conduct in reducing himself by drugs and drink to that condition in my view supplies the evidence of *mens rea*, of guilty mind.

The Lord Chancellor continues:

It is a reckless course of conduct, and recklessness is enough to constitute the necessary *mens rea* in assault cases. Acceptance generally of intoxication as a defence would, in my view, undermine the criminal law and I do not think that it is enough to say that we can rely on the good sense of the jury or of magistrates to ensure that the guilty are convicted.

I agree with Lord Elwyn-Jones—and I notice the member for Mawson nodding his head and agreeing. It is a pity he voted against this very principle earlier this year—and he is down on the record as voting against it. Lord Elwyn-Jones' statement of the common law of England is commonsense, even if it is not logical to the abstracted mind of our Attorney-General. As Lord Salmon said:

My Lords, I am satisfied that this rule accords with justice, ethics and commonsense, and I would leave it alone even if it does not comply with strict logic.

A number of points that buttress my case on the Bill have come to my attention since the original Bill was defeated by the Liberal Party. First, that part of the Model Criminal Code drafted in 1994 supports removing the excuse of self-induced intoxication with drink or drugs. However, if we were to wait until the Model Criminal Code applied in South Australia—as Mr Matthew Goode counsels the Attorney-General—we would be waiting until the next century.

Second, I have discovered via a parliamentary question that the Attorney-General is wrong when he tells the media that there are no examples of the drunks' defence being pleaded in South Australia. Earlier this year I asked him:

How many criminal defendants in South Australia pleaded intoxication last year and how many were acquitted on this basis?

The answer was:

Alcohol is often raised in pleas and trials to negate a specific criminal intent. The number of cases where intoxication is pleaded is not recorded. Therefore, the answer to the question is unknown.

It is a pity that the Attorney-General does not read the answers to my questions on notice prepared for him by public servants, in this case—

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** I know that, member for Mawson, as a matter of fact, because the Attorney-General told me during

the Estimates Committee that he had not read his answer to this particular question—that it had been drafted by the Director of Public Prosecutions, had gone over his desk and had been published in *Hansard* without the Attorney-General's reading it.

**Mr Brokenshire:** An outrageous claim.

**Mr ATKINSON:** It is not an outrageous claim: it is on record in *Hansard*. It is an admission against interest by the Attorney-General himself, perhaps in a mellow mood, late afternoon in the Estimates Committee.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** And an exception to the hearsay rule: quite so. The only reason we have not read about a Nadruku case in South Australia is that journalists assigned to the courts cannot be in every courtroom. In the same edition of the *Advertiser* as the Nadruku case was reported, an example of the drunks' defence being pleaded in Adelaide was reported on page 1.

At 4 a.m. on 13 May 1995, Evanston Gardens father of two Michael Heinrich went outside the family home to investigate noises on the front lawn. I seek leave to extend my remarks briefly.

Leave granted.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to move that the Bill be read a second time; he has not yet done that.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I am very sorry. I move:

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

At 4 a.m. on 13 May 1995, Evanston Gardens father of two Michael Heinrich went outside the family home to investigate noises on the front lawn. It was accepted by both the prosecution and defence that there he was stabbed to death by Craig Allan Williamson. Williamson has twice been convicted of murdering Mr Heinrich but is now appealing on the basis that he was strongly affected by prescription drugs and had not realised that he was holding a knife. This case and others shows how our Attorney-General has misled Parliament and South Australians on this matter.

Thirdly, I have discovered that section 19 of our Criminal Law Consolidation Act already sweeps away the self-induced intoxication defence in respect of causing death or injury by reckless driving. Subsection (8) of that section reads:

Where at the trial of a person for an offence against this section it appears that the defendant was, or may have been, in a state of self-induced intoxication at the time of the alleged offence but the evidence adduced at the trial would, assuming that the defendant had been sober, be sufficient to establish the mental elements of the alleged offence, the mental elements of the offence shall be deemed to have been established against the defendant.

Oddly enough, one of the arguments raised against my proposal by the former member for Norwood was that the drafting was too difficult, yet here it is, already on our statute book. But that is not all on this point. This subsection was introduced in 1986 and, in debate on the Bill, the then shadow Attorney-General, the Hon. K.T. Griffin, supported self-induced intoxication's being removed as an excuse for reckless driving and, not only that, for crime generally. Let me quote the man who now defends self-induced intoxication as an excuse for crime, as follows:

I express some concern about the extent to which self-induced intoxication is considered by the courts in not only determining whether a person is guilty or not guilty but also in mitigation of penalty. While this provision relates only to causing death or bodily injury by dangerous driving, I would like to think that the Attorney-General [Hon. C.J. Sumner] will consider the use of the defence in a whole range of other offences.

This is the man who, as our Attorney-General for the past four years, has dismissed my request each time I have raised the need to close the drunks' loophole in the House, in the Estimates Committee, on radio and in the *Advertiser*. The Hon. K.T. Griffin continued in this 1986 debate:

It has always seemed to me to be somewhat inconsistent to say that although the consumption or the taking of a drug has been voluntary, there comes a point where the person so consuming alcohol or taking a drug is no longer responsible for his or her actions as a result of voluntarily becoming intoxicated or under the influence of a drug. It is time that the community recognised that there should be a penalty for that sort of behaviour which causes death or injury to individuals or damage to property.

That was the man who is now Attorney-General. The same man who told the Legislative Council this year that there was no urgency to close this loophole and that no-one much sought to use the loophole told the Council in 1986:

I call on the Attorney-General to conduct a review of those areas of the law which allow self-induced intoxication or the effect of drugs taken voluntarily to have a bearing on innocence or guilt.

The fourth point I should make is that my proposal is supported by the Federal Attorney-General (Hon. D.R. Williams) and the Federal Minister for the Status of Women (Hon. J.E. Moylan). Minister Moylan said recently, referring to the Nadruku case:

No civic-minded person in our country would tolerate such behaviour. Unfortunately it appears that the legal system operating in some parts of the country still does. It is totally unacceptable to have such a defence at a time when alcohol and drug abuse are causing so much human pain and suffering in our communities.

My old friend Gary Humphries, the Attorney-General in the Australian Capital Territory, moved swiftly to abolish the drunks' defence after the Nadruku case. I urge the House to do what the Liberal Government has failed to do over the last 12 months. The Bill is common sense. It is morally right. It accords with the values of the people we represent. It ought to be supported.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have an explanation of the clauses that he wishes to insert?

**Mr ATKINSON:** No, Sir.

**Mrs HALL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### EDUCATION (GOVERNMENT SCHOOL CLOSURES) AMENDMENT BILL

**Ms WHITE (Taylor)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the Education Act 1972. Read a first time.

**Ms WHITE:** I move:

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

This Bill amends the Education Act to enshrine in law a safeguard that addresses an inadequacy in the educational decision-making processes of the present Government. It has been born out of a strong concern that the process used by this Government in making decisions about school closures in South Australia is flawed. One might be forgiven for thinking that it should be possible to correct this inadequacy without recourse to legislation, and that the Government would be convinced by the continued efforts of the Opposition Parties, by the force of community expectations as reflected in the media and by the tenacious community protests that we have witnessed in past months that it needs to reassess its thinking about school closures.

Yet in the past 12 months this Government has rejected every opportunity to correct its school closure policy. With an extremely bad election result for the Liberals, following

an election campaign which focused South Australian minds on the human consequences of just one of the Government's decisions—a flawed school closure decision—I believe that campaign will be best remembered for the image of a Premier running away from ordinary parents and young children who simply asked, 'Why are you doing this? Please reconsider'. This Bill is necessary and urgent. During the past four years the Government has closed 39 schools in South Australia. While the Opposition recognises that changing demographics and the need to upgrade and modify schools may from time to time create circumstances that do warrant the amalgamation or closure of schools, there are often powerful reasons and strong community support that would override a closure.

It is vital and necessary that reasons to maintain schools also receive due consideration and are not overwhelmed or swept under the carpet by arguments for closure. Each year the budget allocates several million dollars to school closures and the sale of school land. From the very start of the financial year the decision is made that schools must be closed and that drives the agenda. Why do we do that? Why are we not fighting to maintain schools rather than to close them? It is often claimed that small enrolments at schools restrict curriculum offerings. It is also true that smaller schools can offer closer attention to the special needs of individual children and often generate strong community participation and support for the school and school community. Of particular concern to the Opposition is the need to ensure that any review process is being driven by a desire to improve educational outcomes for our children and not just by budgetary imperatives to create a pool of capital from the sale of school property and school land in order to reduce expenditure.

This year in the 1997-98 budget the estimate for capital receipts from the sale of land and buildings is \$13.5 million, and last year it was \$14.5 million. This budgetary approach is in line with the Government's Audit Commission report which, in April 1994, argued that South Australia had a greater number of smaller schools than the Australian average and that this represented a cost penalty. That same report suggested that 300 was the optimum number of students for primary schools and that 600-800 was an optimum number for secondary schools. As I have clearly pointed out, there are other considerations, but those considerations do not seem to be reflected in those budgetary figures.

During the past four years the Government conducted reviews into the future of many individual and/or clusters of schools. Even though the process involves school communities, many schools were closed by the Minister either against the recommendation of the review and/or sometimes against the wishes of the school community. Closures of the Sturt Street Primary School, The Parks High School, the Port Adelaide Girls High School, McRitchie Primary School in Whyalla, Croydon Park Primary School, Croydon Primary School and Findon Primary School are examples. Perhaps the most public objection to the Minister's decision to ignore the advice of a review and the advice of his own department has come from the Croydon Primary School community. As a community faced with the closure of their primary school, the parents of Croydon mounted an overwhelming case, I believe, and overwhelmingly demonstrated community support for the retention of their school.

They were not rent-a-crowd protesters. Those prolonged and determined efforts by that community came from ordinary parents and young school students. Instead of closing that school the Minister and his department should

have acknowledged the level of parental support and embraced and harnessed the community's enthusiasm for the future of the school. If ever there was a case of a community's intention to keep a school viable, I would expect that this was it. Why will the Government not harness that enthusiasm, intention and goodwill and work with rather than against the community, their wishes and their expectations of this Government?

In the case of Croydon Primary, the Ombudsman has found that the review process was flawed, that the co-chairpersons of the school council were misled into signing off the review document and that the dissenting report by Croydon was not given due consideration. Even the advice of the department's Executive Director for School Operations that the Croydon Park Primary and Croydon Primary Schools should be amalgamated and relocated at the Croydon High School site rather than be closed was ignored by the Minister.

On 24 October this year the Minister justified the closure of Croydon on the grounds that, 'You cannot keep six schools open for 1 100 students.' On Tuesday in the House he reaffirmed and justified that decision by saying that he had seen no new evidence. One would think that there was evidence aplenty to cause the Minister to reconsider that decision. The statement by the Minister sent a clear message to the communities that host the 200 primary schools in South Australia which have fewer than 200 students.

In fact, five schools in the Minister's own electorate have fewer than 100 students—Hewitt, with 97 students; Rosedale, with just 35 students; Roseworthy, with 74; Tarlee, with just 44; and Wasleys with 57. Will those schools be reviewed in this coming term? What is the Minister's logic in keeping Rosedale open with 35 students while he closes Croydon with almost 200 students? Perhaps there is a valid educational reason for keeping Croydon open. Instead of spending thousands of hours and thousands of dollars on reviews directed at closing schools, why does the Minister not work out ways to make schools viable, to keep them open, to give the community what they want and to meet the expectations of the community?

This legislation has come about because of community disquiet about the wholesale loss of schools and the Government's announcement during the election campaign that more closures are on the way. This Bill is necessary. It will establish a process of review for schools that are to be closed against the wishes of the community. It does not stop the Minister from closing schools by agreement with the school community, and in many situations, where parents can see the advantages of better curriculum choice in new or amalgamated facilities, that will be the case under this legislation as well.

But in those other cases such as Croydon, where the Minister's decision goes against the review recommendations, against the advice of his own department and against the wishes of the school community, the Bill allows for the establishment of a review committee and an independent process to consider whether the closure should proceed. I will briefly summarise the clauses of this Bill and then seek leave to have a more detailed explanation inserted in *Hansard*.

This Bill does not apply to schools closed temporarily or in an emergency or if it is the wish of the majority of parents or caregivers of the students attending that school. If they are not opposed to the decision, this amendment Bill will not apply. The Bill acts to ensure that schools cannot be closed except at the end of a calendar year. This is to ensure that the

students attending the school have maximum opportunity to make an effective transition to another school.

The Minister must also, no later than 15 June of the year preceding the year the school is intended to close, give notice so that there is 18 months notice of a school's being closed; and, within 21 days of that notice, if it is against the recommendations of the review committee that the school be closed, a committee of review will be set up and the Minister must provide to that committee the reasons for the proposed closure and any relevant documentation and reports that he or she has in his or her possession relating to the closure.

The review committee will consist of seven persons and include representatives of the Minister, the Education Department, local government and parent and teacher organisations. Once the committee has reported to the Minister and the Minister has made a final decision on the committee's recommendations, the Minister must lay before the Parliament within six sitting days a copy of the report and recommendations and an explanation of the Minister's reasons for closing the school and for rejecting the recommendations of the committee. The Bill also contains transitional provisions that cover the cases of three schools whose closure has been announced by the current Minister so that they will now undergo a review process under the clauses of the Bill. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Amendment of s.9—General powers of Minister*

This clause provides that the Minister may close a Government school subject to new Part 2A (see clause 3).

*Clause 3: Insertion of new Part*

**PART 2A—CLOSURE OF GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS**

*14A. Application of Part*

This clause provides that a Government school cannot be closed except in accordance with new Part 2A.

New Part 2A does not apply to—

- the temporary closure of a Government school in an emergency or for the purposes of carrying out building work; or
- the closure of a Government school if a majority of the parents of the students attending the school indicate that they are not opposed to the closure.

*14B. Initiation of procedure for closure of Government schools*

The provisions set out in new section 14B apply in relation to the closure of a Government school to which new Part 2A applies.

These provisions are—

- (1) the school cannot be closed except at the end of a calendar year;
- (2) the Minister must, not later than 15 June in the year preceding the year of the proposed closure of a school—
  - notify the head teacher and the presiding member of the school council of the proposal to close the school; and
  - publish a notice of the proposal in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the State;
- (3) the Minister must, within 21 days of giving such notice—
  - appoint a committee to review the proposed closure; and
  - provide the committee with details of the Minister's reasons for the proposed closure and copies of any reports or other documents prepared by or for the Minister or the Education Department relating to the proposed closure.

*14C. Review committee*

A review committee will consist of 7 persons (including representatives of the Minister, the Education Department, Local Government and parent and teacher organisations) appointed by the Minister.

*14D. Conduct of review*

In conducting a review of a proposal to close a school, a committee must—

- call for submissions and seek expert demographical and educational advice relating to the school's present and future use; and

- invite submissions from, and meet with, teachers and parents of students of the school and representatives of local communities likely to be affected by the closure of the school. The committee must have regard to the educational, social and economic needs of the local communities likely to be affected by the closure and of the needs of the State as a whole when making its recommendation.

*14E. Report on review*

A committee must submit to the Minister its report on the review and its recommendation by 30 September of the year in which the committee was appointed.

*14F. Decision not to accept committee's recommendation to be laid before Parliament*

If a committee recommends that a Government school should not be closed and the Minister does not accept that recommendation, the Minister must, within 6 sitting days after receiving the committee's report and recommendation, cause—

- a copy of the report and recommendation; and
- the Minister's reasons for closing the school and for rejecting the recommendation of the committee,

to be laid before each House of Parliament.

*Clause 4: Transitional provision*

This clause provides that new Part 2A will apply in relation to the closure (which will be taken to be void and of no effect) of—

1. Croydon Primary School; and
2. Croydon Park Primary School; and
3. McRitchie Crescent Primary School,

as if the Minister had given notice of the proposed closure of those schools under proposed section 14B(b) (see clause 3) before 15 June 1997.

The Minister must, within 21 days of the commencement of this measure—

- appoint a committee to review the closures of the schools listed above; and
- provide the committee with details of the Minister's reasons for the closures and copies of any reports or other documents prepared by or for the Minister or the Department relating to the closures.

The effect of the transitional clause will be to bring the closure of the 3 listed schools into the regime established by new Part 2A (see clause 3).

**Mr MEIER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (VICTIM PROTECTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I move:

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

I first moved this Bill on 7 November 1996 and, throughout the fourth session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament, the Liberal Government ignored the Bill. At the end of the session I was unable to obtain a vote on the Bill because of the Liberal Government's tactic of refusing to debate it.

**The Hon. W.A. Matthew:** It is already law.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I thank the member for Bright for his interjection. It is an attempted administrative practice by the Department of Correctional Services, but it is not in the law. It is not on the statute book and I have had occasion over the past four years to check that—most recently in discussions with an officer of the Parole Board this morning. So, the former Minister for that portfolio is not correct. This is not in law. If it were in law I would not need to introduce the Bill. But I will be kind about the honourable member later, so he should be quiet.

A private members' Bill or motion may be voted upon only if both sides have spoken to the Bill or motion. If the former Minister wanted to make the point that this was already in law, he could have spoken on the Bill in the last Parliament and made that point, in which case we could have

had a vote on it. But all members of the Government studiously avoided speaking on this Bill, because they were frightened of a vote on it. They did not want to let the Opposition introduce a sensible reform.

The purpose of this Bill is to give the victims of crimes of violence and, where the crime of violence has been a homicide, the next of kin of the victim, the statutory right to be notified when the prisoner who was convicted of that offence applies for parole, and be given the opportunity to make a submission to the Parole Board on whether parole should be granted and, if it is granted, whether any conditions should be placed on that parole. There is no provision in the Correctional Services Act for that to occur, and I challenge the member for Bright to comb through the Correctional Services Act 1982 and find the section that provides it.

The need for this Bill came to my attention from a constituent who had had certain of her relatives murdered by an in-law. The lady wanted to know when the prisoner, who was sentenced to life imprisonment for the multiple murders, was to appear before the Parole Board, because she would like to make submissions on behalf of her family about whether that prisoner should get parole and, if so, what conditions ought to be placed on that prisoner's parole. The family of my constituent were particularly concerned that the prisoner, being an in-law, might seek to approach them after his release or that he might linger in the suburb in which they lived with a view to approaching them. That seemed to me a reasonable request, but there is no statutory obligation on the Government so to inform the victims, or the next of kin of the victims in the case of homicide.

I give credit to the previous Attorney-General, the Hon. C.J. Sumner, and to the former Minister for Correctional Services, now the member for Bright, because both of them tried to ensure that the correctional services system notified the victims and next of kin of victims, but that notification was not always practicable and, when it was practicable, it did not always happen. The importance of this Bill is to create a statutory obligation to ensure that, in those cases where notification is practicable, it is given.

I now mention a recent example of the departmental system of notification failing, and I hope the member for Bright will be all ears. The Opposition has recently been contacted by Mrs Anne Docking, whose mother-in-law, Shirley, was murdered in 1982 by prisoner Stephen McBride. McBride was sentenced to life imprisonment, but now that 15 years are up he has applied for parole and has already been released. Mrs Docking did not know prisoner McBride had applied for parole until April, when someone she knew told her in the street. This person added that a Channel 7 news reporter was seeking her—Mrs Docking's—comments on this.

Mrs Docking then applied to have her name placed on the departmental register of people wanting to be notified of prisoner McBride's parole applications, parole proceedings and release. She was not contacted when prisoner McBride was granted parole and a release date set. The proposal went from the Parole Board to Cabinet, Cabinet made a decision to release prisoner McBride and, before it went to the Governor for the Governor's signature, it was in the media the very next day, which I think was 15 November—the day after the Cabinet meeting.

Yes, it was another—albeit minor—Cabinet leak. Perhaps it was a purposeful leak, but the fact is that Mr Gary Docking (the son of the deceased) and his wife first heard about prisoner McBride's release in the media, and that is not good

enough. Mrs Docking rang the Parole Board and was told by the chairman's secretary that there was no legal obligation on the department or the board to inform her.

The Opposition attempted to introduce these amendments at my instigation and that of the now member for Mitchell in another place during the Committee stage of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Mental Impairment) Amendment Bill. The Attorney-General was good enough to accept the Opposition's amendments as they related to prisoners who were confined in James Nash House because they had pleaded not guilty on the basis of insanity, but the Attorney was not willing to accept the amendments as they related to prisoners who were sane at the time the crime was committed. The Attorney gave some arguments why he thought our amendments in respect of sane offenders ought not to be accepted on principle, but he invited us to introduce a private member's Bill to give effect to this principle, and that is what I have done and am now doing. It seems to me that the Bill increases the rights of victims in a way that does not cast obligations on the Correctional Services Department much beyond what it assumes now—and I think that is the point that the member for Bright has been trying to make.

The Opposition accepts the point which the Attorney made in another place that sometimes the victim will not want to know anything more about the prisoner, that the victim will not want to know when the prisoner applies for parole or is released and that the victim may want to put the crime behind him or her—and I accept that—but those victims and next-of-kin of victims who want to know the progress of the offender through the criminal justice system and then through the prisons system and the parole system ought to have that information as of right not just if the department cares to provide it.

**Mrs HALL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ADELAIDE CROWS FOOTBALL CLUB**

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I move:

That this House notes the fantastic victory of the Adelaide Crows Football Club in winning the 1997 Australian Football League, and congratulates the Coach, Malcolm Blight, Captain Mark Bickley, the players and officials.

I have much pleasure in moving this motion. I make clear from the outset that I am a lifelong supporter of Port Adelaide and, therefore, a supporter of Port Power, but many other South Australians and I put our State first. We were so proud when the Adelaide Crows won the grand final. I have proudly worn an Adelaide Crows tie for six weeks in recognition of a team that plays for our State. They did us proud.

I wish to congratulate the Adelaide Football Club for achieving the highest accolade when it defeated St Kilda in the AFL grand final on 27 September 1997 at the MCG. This magnificent victory will no doubt go down as the greatest moment in South Australia's sporting history. The Adelaide Crows started the season badly with a great number of injuries, which was a major factor in their loss to Port Power—showdown No. 1. I was there and I enjoyed the day, but I must say that I think that match was the turning point for the Adelaide Football Club. I was a guest of Living Health on that day; I sat in its box, and it was a fantastic day.

It was not long before the Crows finally got the monkey off their backs and were able to achieve success consistently when playing away from home. The Crows finished fourth at the end of the minor round. Two home finals saw the

building of things to come. The spirit of South Australians was swelling. The qualifying final saw Adelaide defeat the much favoured West Coast Eagles by 33 points. In the following week, the first semifinal saw Adelaide again go into the game as very much the underdog only to emerge victorious over the much favoured Geelong side by eight points—and we all watched that.

South Australia was well and truly under the influence of Crow mania as the AFL grand final was in the sights of all—and by this time my sights, well and truly, as I had put my team away until next year. The Adelaide Football Club then travelled to the MCG for the second semifinal to take on the Western Bulldogs. Once again, they went into this game as the underdogs. However, their loyal fans and supporters—and, by this time, I was one—had no doubt that they would produce the goods necessary to see that the Adelaide Football Club gained its rightful place in the AFL grand final. At five goals down at half time, the Crows fought back most courageously to stun the Western Bulldogs, who were sure of their place in the grand final. The two point victory to the Crows was all that we as South Australians needed to throw this State into complete Crow mania—an unbelievable situation.

In only its seventh year the Adelaide Football Club was about to embark on the game of its life. South Australians felt united in their striving for a common cause. Whether or not they were long-term supporters, it did not matter; we were united in the mission to bring the Holy Grail (the premiership cup and the flag) to South Australia. As with most grand finals, Adelaide and St Kilda relentlessly attacked the player and the ball in a bid to gain ascendancy before a crowd of 98 000 people. With the Crows trailing by 13 points at half time, a magnificent 14 goal second half (which included five goals in the last quarter by Mr Magic, Darren Jarman) wrote Adelaide into the history books as the winner of the 1997 AFL grand final. Andrew McLeod was the worthy recipient of the Norm Smith Medal.

This was a great triumph for Malcolm Blight in his first year as coach of the Adelaide Football Club, particularly when one considers that he was the coach of Geelong, which lost three times in the one that counts and just missed out. That was a great triumph for the club considering that it finished well out of the finals during the past three years, a disappointing effort when one considers that it finished third in 1993, narrowly missing the grand final that year. I knew that the coming of Port Power would change things—and it certainly did.

The win was greatly celebrated by a huge crowd at the Wayville Showgrounds on the next day and similarly by many fans as the Crows players subsequently toured country centres. As we drove around South Australia, we saw gardens, cars and public amenities decorated in Crows' colours. I have not seen the like since the 1953 Royal visit. It must have been a great result for Shaun Rehn who had two knee reconstructions in 1995 and 1996. However, the disappointment of Tony Modra's untimely injury was felt throughout South Australia. Tony must have been devastated not to play in the grand final after playing every game that led up to it. We hope that his recovery is speedy and that he will return to the field as the leading goal kicker for the Adelaide Crows, an achievement for which he has been recognised since 1993.

To win the grand final was a tremendous result for those who have supported the club since day one, including the club chairman, Mr Bob Hammond, the chief executive, Bill

Sanders, and the thousands of fans and loyal supporters who have stuck with their club through thick and thin amidst the ridicule from across the border—including my personal assistant, who is an ardent fan. We can all laugh now as the Victorians lament that the third consecutive AFL premiership cup has gone west, leaving Victorian borders. Malcolm Blight and his team achieved in one year what they may have been planning to achieve over a longer period of time.

The challenge now for the Adelaide Football Club is to avoid a premiership hangover and repeat their success in 1998. This task will commence in Melbourne against Carlton in March 1998, and the following week the Crows will hoist the premiership flag for the first time at Football Park.

Debate adjourned.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 3 December. Page 69.)

**The SPEAKER:** In calling on the member for Chaffey, I remind members that this is the honourable member's maiden speech.

**Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey):** Mr Speaker, I join with other members in congratulating you on your appointment as Speaker. As one of the many new members in this Forty-Ninth Parliament, I trust that this infusion of new blood will not make your task too difficult and that due respect will be paid to your office and to you.

At the election on 11 October this year, the people of South Australia delivered a very clear message to the members of this House. They expect this Government to get on with the job of getting this State back on track; they expect higher standards of conduct from within this Chamber; they demand clear direction and vision from Government; and they will not tolerate endless political point-scoring and factional fighting from within political Parties. Rural South Australians, in particular, have made this abundantly clear with the election of two Independents and a National Party member in what were previously safe Liberal seats. I acknowledge the great honour bestowed upon me by the people of Chaffey, many of whom broke with a life-long voting tradition. I sincerely thank all those who supported me and gave the National Party the opportunity to demonstrate that there is a place in politics for an alternative rural voice.

It is almost three years since I moved back to the Riverland after 15 years of living and working in cities around Australia and overseas. After readapting to small town country life, I consider myself extremely fortunate to live in one of the most unique and beautiful areas in the country. The opportunities for economic growth in this region are substantial. With more days of sunshine each year than the Gold Coast, the opportunities for tourism are endless. However, I believe that the Riverland should be promoted by this State as a region in its own right. To promote the entire length of the Murray River in South Australia as 'Big River' does nothing to identify the unique features of this diverse and beautiful district that is known here and interstate as the Riverland.

The rapid growth in the wine industry over the past 10 years could be used as an example to this House on how an integrated, competitive but cooperative approach can achieve remarkable results. When you consider that 15 years or so ago growers were being paid to bulldoze their vineyards, you

see that the recent rate of expansion in this industry is extraordinary. Ten years ago, grapes grown in the Riverland were considered substandard. Today, the focus for many growers has changed from quantity to quality. We need to look only at the extraordinary success of Bill Moularadalis of Kingston Estate Wines on both the domestic and export markets to realise this. I extend my congratulations to Bill Moularadalis, who this year received the award of SA Entrepreneur of the Year.

Southcorp Wines recently announced a \$145 million expansion over the next five years, including a \$12 million expansion for the Waikerie Winery. Primarily, the expenditure at Waikerie will be to develop a more premium mix of production while enabling it to process larger volumes of red grapes. BRL Hardy wine company is also expanding rapidly. At Berri Estates, about \$5.5 million is being spent annually in upgrading the capacity of the winery to meet the expansion intake with new vineyards in the region. Renmano Winery at Renmark, which crushes 20 000 tonnes annually, is being upgraded to process the premium Riverland fruit that is used in its bottled wine labels, at a cost of about \$1 million per annum.

In 1995, BRL Hardy purchased a property called Banrock Station, just downstream from Kingston on Murray. The property has 12.5 kilometres of river frontage that is mainly wetland. BRL Hardy has worked closely with Australian Wetland Care in restoring and rejuvenating those wetlands. As a consequence, it decided to use the environmental link with its new Banrock Station wine label. Part proceeds from the sale of the wines go to land care and, so far, it has donated about \$50 000 annually. This is a fine example of where Riverland industries are combining with conservation groups to work towards a sustainable future for the environment and development.

The cloud on the horizon for continued growth in this industry is the shortage of water. The Murray River is this State's most precious resource and must be protected for environmental reasons as well as sustainable horticultural pursuits. Over the past 20 years, the attitude of growers and the community has changed considerably toward the lifeblood of our region, the Murray River. The Riverland is now leading the nation in irrigation best practice. We are seeing the rehabilitation of most of the region's irrigation systems. This, combined with irrigation best practice, has led to the freeing up of excess water allocations for future developments. However, we still have a long way to go. It is imperative that this Government support the Loxton irrigation rehabilitation project currently under consideration by the Federal Government, and an equitable funding arrangement between this State, the Commonwealth and growers must be negotiated. This irrigation district still operates with open channel distribution of water, which results in substantial wastage of our valuable water resources, drainage problems and a dramatic increase in river salinity levels.

Whilst the wine industry booms, the citrus industry is experiencing the exact opposite. While export opportunities for select varieties of fresh fruit are expanding, the juice industry has been decimated. Grower returns are not profitable, and many are choosing to bulldoze their trees, often with the fruit still on them, to plant vineyards, rather than replant their land with new citrus varieties that will take many years before a return can be realised. This creates a dilemma for the industry that goes well beyond the shortage of supply in the future. The value added industries, such as packers and processors, are large employers in the region, and I believe



that it is necessary for this Government to closely examine the structure of the industry with a view to reform before we see the otherwise inevitable loss of jobs.

Although the Riverland has traditionally been renowned for horticultural and agricultural industries, we also boast a number of new and innovative industries. Enviromist is a developer, manufacturer and exporter of a range of shrouded sprayers and this year was awarded SA Exporter of the Year in its category. Gateway Meats is developing a state-of-the-art emu, ostrich and venison processing plant with a view to export and the creation of 80 new jobs in the Riverland once the plant is fully operational.

It will come as no surprise to the Deputy Premier and Minister responsible for racing that I now turn to a development opportunity that, in my view, was a major factor in the National Party winning the seat of Chaffey. In November last year, I attended a public meeting in Waikerie held by the then Waikerie council to outline a development proposal which was reported to have the potential to create in excess of 1 000 jobs in the Riverland. Understandably, the proposal received widespread community support. I refer to the TeleTrak Multimedia Straightline Racing proposal that has been the subject of much criticism in the ensuing months. Riverland communities have been dependent upon horticultural industry since the region was first settled, and the opportunity to attract an industry to the area with the job-creating potential of TeleTrak was one that the council, supported by the community, could not just let pass by.

The State Government, however, was not prepared to embrace TeleTrak with the same enthusiasm. In fact, this Government was particularly aggressive in its endeavour to discredit the proposal, prior to any investigation into the merits of the project, despite the Government's commitment to attracting investment and jobs for South Australia. It is no wonder that this position justifiably met with a public outcry of disbelief. Reinforcement of the community support for TeleTrak was highlighted when a second public meeting was convened in January this year at Waikerie and, in a township of approximately 4 500 people, an estimated 1 000 residents turned out for this meeting. The overwhelming support for the proposal should have sent a clear message to the Government that this proposal warranted a full investigation into the potential of the project for South Australia. The TeleTrak proposal, I again emphasise, offers jobs, economic development and an opportunity for expansion within the existing racing industry, and all without a cent of the taxpayers' money.

As stated in His Excellency the Governor's speech opening this Forty-Ninth Parliament, 'This Government is committed to economic recovery, to rejuvenation for South Australia.' I commend and support this commitment wholeheartedly. As far as I am aware, there is no other development proposal before this Government which offers the potential of creating over 4 000 jobs in regional South Australia; that is, in excess of 1 000 jobs in each of the districts of Waikerie, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and Millicent, with no Government funding required.

With the understanding that the existing racing industry fervently opposed the introduction of private racing, the appointment of the Racing Industry Development Authority to investigate the TeleTrak proposal for Waikerie was again met with an outcry of public disbelief. But once again, this fell on deaf ears. A report tabled in this House in March this year by the Minister for Racing identified four areas where RIDA considered the information from TeleTrak was

insufficient. In August this year, the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research completed a 200-page independent report to address each of the four questions raised by RIDA in its initial assessment of the proposal and, in addition, included its own extrapolations of the TeleTrak proposal. The report assessed information provided by Turnbull and Partners, AC Neilsen McNair Research and a KPMG business plan. I now quote from the executive summary of this report:

The National Institute of Economic and Industry Research concludes that TeleTrak is financially viable, technically feasible and capital market attractive.

The NEIR report concludes:

For any Government anywhere to act to restrict competition, stifle private investment and fail to adopt technology, the result would be incredulity and rejection, deservedly so in our view.

How accurate those words, written prior to the election, have turned out to be. On the question of accuracy, authority and informed opinion, I draw this House's attention to the fact that, of all the economic forecasters, the only one in Australia to accurately predict the recent Asian monetary crisis amidst much derision was Dr Peter Brain of the National Institute of Economic Research. TeleTrak is a twenty-first century communications project which really should not even come into the domain of the Minister for Racing. Racing is only the software in the project. However, for this Government to claim itself capable of assessing a communications project, I must refer to its support of the Australis/Galaxy venture.

TeleTrak does not seek any financial contribution by Government. In fact, it has always proposed to pay a share of its revenues to the South Australian Government. It is the firm belief of the constituents of Chaffey that this project has not received a fair hearing from this Government. Personalities have entered into what should have been a rational assessment of a development proposal to create jobs for South Australians. I hope soon to see this Government take this proposal seriously, that is, take it out of the hands of the racing industry and assess this proposal on an economic, not emotional, basis. A development with the job creating opportunities of this magnitude does not present itself often, particularly in regional areas. I commend the Riverland community for their persistence in the pursuit of a fair hearing for this project. Alternatives to horticultural development are a must for balanced development in regional areas.

In closing, I thank those members who have eased the transition into political life for both myself and my comrades in arms on the crossbench, by the courtesy shown and assistance offered to us irrespective of the Party to which they belong. I have no doubt that the debate in this Chamber will be vigorous and fearless, but I believe we should never relinquish our respect for each other, as men and women who have been elected by the people of this State to perform the function of government.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Elder. In calling the honourable member, I remind members that this is also the honourable member's maiden speech.

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** First, Mr Speaker, let me congratulate you on your election to the important post you hold. Let me congratulate the other new members elected and, in particular, I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, who endured quite possibly the worst campaign of personal vilification in the lead-up to an election that I have seen in this country. I have never seen such a campaign fail so completely—perhaps not quite as completely as we would

have liked, but it did fail nevertheless. With my friend opposite apparently finding this difficult, I will waive any right I have to be protected from interjection if it is the wish of my friends on the other side—or this side, for that matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Interjections at all times are strictly out of order.

**Mr CONLON:** I can only try!

**The SPEAKER:** It is not wise to provoke members opposite into interjecting.

**Mr CONLON:** In my first speech in the Chamber, I wish to recognise the debt of gratitude I owe to my family, my parents in particular, for their decision to migrate to this country many years ago, when they had seven already born children and little to their name except an assisted passage. I wish also to express my appreciation for having been welcomed to this country which has offered refuge, new hope and a haven of tolerance for so many migrants in the past. My parents left friends and family, all that was familiar and secure, to give their children opportunities they would not have known otherwise. They and South Australia gave me the opportunity to become a lawyer and a parliamentarian, and for that I am profoundly grateful.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr CONLON:** And, as the member for Hart mentions, before that a wharfie, which was not particularly bad either! In recognising the opportunities I have had through being lucky enough to be a citizen of South Australia and Australia, I must pass to acknowledge that the opportunities that have been offered to migrants to South Australia since 1836 have come here, as in the rest of Australia, at enormous cost to indigenous Australians. In the past we could claim the defence of ignorance in regard to our devastating impact on one of the oldest cultures on earth. We could argue that they were different times with different standards and different values. We could argue that we did not know better. Well, we know better now, and that is why I turn to the current debate before the Federal Parliament.

I refer to the debate over the attempts by the Federal Government—to use its terminology—to extinguish in bucket loads what little native title remains with indigenous Australians. The Federal Government does not have the excuse of ignorance. It cannot claim the defence of consistency with community values or standards. The principled and articulate interventions of church leaders and other opinion leaders have made this absolutely clear. The Federal Government has no excuse for its immoral and racist Wik legislation, and it is incumbent upon us, and any who have a voice, to say so.

I have enormous respect for a large number of members of Federal Parliament, on both sides of the House. I cannot go so far as to claim any friends among the Liberal or National Party members, but there are many there for whom I have enormous respect. However, I believe it is the worst, most divisive, most mean-minded Federal Government since Federation.

I would like to state my pride at joining this Legislature. While South Australia has always been certainly a less populous State, this Legislature has often led the way for Australia and, in fact, the world, particularly in the matter of social reforms. This Legislature in 1896 was among the very first polities in the world to enfranchise women, and that followed on from a very early grant of universal adult male suffrage and a less onerous property qualification in the Upper House than in many other States. With women having been enfranchised in 1896, I note the extraordinary success at this election, particularly of the Labor Party, in having

women elected to this Chamber, and I congratulate those who were elected.

Of course, in the twentieth century, the South Australian Legislature led the way frequently in reform. We made the first legislative attempts to recognise and deal with what were then termed Aboriginal land rights. The South Australian Parliament led the common law world when it acted to give women some measure of propriety of their own bodies and outlawed rape in marriage, a matter that was followed many years later by the rest of the common law world (it was eventually followed, I hope). We had protection for tenants and consumers.

We had good industrial legislation long before many. We were the first to lift the scourge of the criminal law from those people who chose to engage in homosexual behaviour. There was a time when this Chamber and some others believed that it was the duty of Legislatures not only to run economies but also to be as fair as possible in the laws they made. Unfortunately, I believe that most Parliaments in Australia in recent years have been shy of too much reform. There is a prevailing belief that in the past we have wasted too much time trying to be fair and that it is uneconomical. These days people who have expressed concerns about social justice are often pejoratively described as politically correct. There is a new ideology abroad among many that to be compassionate is to be weak; to attempt to be fair is misguided; and to reach back for those who fall behind is foolish.

I believe that this is because economic rationalists have dominated Parliaments and economic debates for too long in Australia. These are people who have adopted a sort of mystical worship of the marketplace: they have taken what began as a fairly bad idea and turned it into a religion. They believe in the invisible hand of competition like some people believe in the Shroud of Turin. They believe in the operation of the marketplace like normal people believe in gravity. I think there is as much science in those who believe in the visits of UFOs and strangers from another planet as there is in so-called economic rationalism. In their religious fervour they have put to the sword industry assistance, industry protection and especially that heresy that most horrifies them, public ownership.

They take pride in the proliferation of their victims, and they have convinced us that Australia has been misguided in wanting to own its own rail system. They have shed jobs in that industry with devastating effect on our northern towns. They have scourged jobs from the Public Service at a prodigious rate, with enormous economic and social dislocation. The control—and here we have a special example of the water supply in South Australia—has gone from public hands, with the only noticeable dividend being the great pong of 1997. It is very ironic to have the privilege, as we have, of going into the Members' Bar and seeing that all wines, as they should be, are from South Australia. In fact, the only thing French you can get in the Members' Bar is the tap water.

Economic rationalists have searched out what they consider to be weak industries and put them to the sword. Their battle cry is, 'Don't worry, it's for your own good. Trust me, I'm an economic rationalist.' However, with friends who are economic rationalists, we certainly do not need enemies. What is the result of this sacred crusade? Is South Australia a better place to live? Can we offer our children a better future than our parents offered us? Can we even offer them as good a future as our parents offered us? Economic rationalism has failed utterly, here and everywhere

it has been endured by suffering populaces. We have chronic unemployment rates and people who no longer feel secure about the future in this lucky country. It is time to stop blaming the unions, the industrial system, the greedy welfare recipients, the lazy unemployed, the sinful public servants, the conniving injured workers, the avaricious single mothers or the slow pace of reform.

I am grateful for the slow pace of reform. Were it any quicker, we would all be tenant farmers and sending our children to work in coal mines. It is time to face the truth, and the truth is that some enterprises should be operated by the State for the good of all South Australians; that public sector employees can and do play an important productive role in a mixed economy; that Government intervention through industry policy, regional development policy, has been an integral part of so many successful economies here and around the world. In recent days in this Chamber we have heard talk about the South-East Asian tiger economies and the fact that we have fallen behind. I used to feel very sorry for Malaysia, because it has no economic rationalists and no freedom from Government intervention or planning. I thought, 'My God, those poor people must be doing appallingly.' Malaysia is one of the great tiger economies.

Sweden was mentioned in this place, yet Sweden is an enormously regulated place with an enormously regulated industrial relations system, and it sells value added goods into the Asian region. Most of all, economic rationalists might just admit that they may not be right. They remind me of that other ideology, the one that prevailed in command economies for so long, where year after year, decade after decade, those command economies failed in their role of providing for their populaces. Those people used to sit around and say, 'It's not working this year, comrade, but it will next year because the science is right.' That is economic rationalists for you: they reckon they have the science right and it is everyone else's fault.

I believe that the public reaction against what is known as economic rationalism, which I believe is the most repulsive economic doctrine that I have seen in this country, is growing. Indeed, it played an enormous role in the election of 11 October. In doorknocking, I heard ordinary electors of South Australia, who in the past would not have known a Keynesian from a cane toad, talk about how economic rationalism has gone too far.

My electorate of Elder has suffered at the hands of the economic rationalists. Elder, by and large, is made up of ordinary working people, many of them now ageing. They have lost the South Road Primary School, a school which I remain unconvinced should have been closed or was closed for anything other than base economic reasons. Marion High School, which has made enormous contributions in this State, producing many important South Australians, and which had a long welcome history, not quite unique but certainly unique in its area of multiculturalism, has gone and is lost for ever.

Prior to the election, I had the misfortune of visiting that site with the Leader of the Opposition to see it bulldozed flat and not even the oval retained for local kids. In the year that the South Australian Crows (unfortunately not the Power) won the AFL flag, the kids at Marion will not have anywhere to kick a football. A promise was made to the Clovelly Park Primary School some years ago, when Mitchell Park and South Road Primary were lost, of \$600 000 for upgrading because of all the changes being made. I inform the House that we remain waiting for that money. As I have said, I have an ageing population of ordinary, honest working people,

many of whom now rely on the pension. In recent years those people have seen the abolition of the Commonwealth dental health scheme. That scheme, which was abolished by the economic rationalists to save a little money, used to involve a three month waiting list, I am informed, for pensioners wanting dental work. That waiting list has blown out to two years. I find it completely hypocritical for our Prime Minister to use his national leadership to oppose euthanasia laws and yet introduce a measure that will accelerate the demise of pensioners. It will do that because they will not eat properly because they will wait for two years to have their teeth fixed.

People in my electorate have lived there all their lives; they have been workers who for the first time in their life are not sure if they can manage. That is not a South Australia in which I want to live. I have people in my electorate who see their children and grandchildren moving interstate to seek jobs. This is not the place in which I want to live. Again, I say that the policies of economic rationalism have failed South Australia and Australia, and there must be an intelligent approach to economic development in the future—a mixed economy. We live in one of the greatest places on earth, as many speakers have recognised.

We are bounded by wealth and the sea. We have enormous agricultural and mineral resources. We have all heard of the Barossa and the role that it is playing. We have an intelligent and resourceful populous. We have the raw materials for an enormous future. We can be economically successful and socially just. We need leadership and hard work to make the most of our potential. I believe that we have the leadership in Mike Rann on this side of House, and I look forward to his being Premier some time soon. I pledge humbly to do all I can for the people of Elder and the electors of South Australia.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to support the Address in Reply. I congratulate his Excellency on the fantastic work he is doing for the South Australian community and for the South Australian Parliament. I want to thank my family for their support over the past five years, particularly the past four years. Families of members of Parliament in busy electorates suffer immensely, as my colleagues would agree. The support from my wife and children has been fantastic.

I thank the branch members of the Liberal Party of Mawson for their strong support over a long period, particularly during the election campaign. It is a thankless task to get people to go out on election day in all sorts of weather and conditions, sometimes to suffer abuse from people, but they do it because they believe that the Liberal Party must govern for some time to redress the issues that currently face this State.

I also thank the constituents of Mawson for whom I have tremendous respect. I work closely with them; they are a great community. They are an intelligent community which is very much committed to South Australia and its rebuilding. Like me, they are passionate about the south, the opportunities currently existing and the even greater opportunities that can be developed in the future with good Government and with the support of Parliament—if that is possible.

I remind my constituents of what I said about this time last term: all I can do to thank them for their support is to continue to give my absolute commitment that I will work hard on their behalf and to offer my full support to them irrespective of whether they are Liberal, Labor, Democrat or

Independent. As a member of Parliament, I am here to serve the community, and I look forward to working with them.

Clearly, on 11 October the Government copped some lessons. I am the first to admit that I was far from happy with what I saw on the TV screen by about 7 o'clock that night. It was a salutary lesson for members of the Government of South Australia, but I believe it is a lesson that will give the South Australian Government, and indeed the people of South Australia, a much better opportunity to continue growing and rebuilding over the forthcoming years. This Government does listen, this Government does learn and this Government does admit its mistakes.

I would like to talk briefly about some of the achievements that have occurred in the electorate of Mawson over the past four years, and later I will talk about projects proposed for my community. When I was elected, I made a pledge to the people of the south that it would no longer be the 'forgotten south', and the fact is—and it is undeniable—that the south is now no longer the forgotten south. A lot still needs to be done, a lot of money and capital works are still required, and we are only part-way through our program. I remind members that, prior to the election of the Liberal Government, promises were made during election campaigns yet little was delivered.

Some of the major achievements during the past four years have been the McLaren Vale and Fleurieu Visitor Centre, the improvements generally to Department of Transport roads, and the Expressway, which will open in the next few weeks and which is an exciting opportunity for the south and clearly identified in the McKenzie report as being a very important piece of infrastructure to provide real long-term, genuine jobs in the southern region.

I was absolutely disgusted with the state of the schools in Mawson when I first became the local member. For example, Willunga High School, where my wife went to school, still had the same desks and the same chairs, and very little painting and maintenance had occurred in nearly 20 years. It was an appalling indictment on the commitment to education by the previous Labor Government. But millions of dollars have been spent on schools in Mawson and for the first time in a long time the schools in Mawson are in good shape. Later, I will talk a little more about why they are in good shape because there are some educators, parents and students I want to thank.

I turn now to agriculture. This State's economic base was born and bred through agriculture, but we needed to diversify, and it is great that Sir Thomas Playford saw that as important. We now have an opportunity, as the world gets hungrier, to capitalise on the great knowledge, energies and experience of South Australian primary producers.

In my electorate that is clear. People like Steve Maglieri came to Australia as a 21-year-old with a few dollars in his pocket. This year he won a world wine medal for shiraz—a first for South Australia, I understand. It is magnificent to see people who come from other countries becoming committed to our region. He also won a gold medal for his red wine at the Italian Wine Show this year—another superb effort. That is one example of the sort of commitment that we have in industry.

As their local member, it is important that I see where job opportunities, economic wealth generators and growth can occur. I look forward to seeing further plantings of viticulture and other diversified horticulture in the region over the next four years. It is possible that by this time next year we will see the start of an additional 4 900 hectares of irrigated

horticulture occurring in the region. That means real jobs, not bandaid jobs.

When I helped Dean Brown write the policy back in 1992-93, the pipeline from Christies Beach to the Willunga Basin was something that we dreamed about being a real economic opportunity for the region. That is now virtually a reality and, hopefully, it will be signed off in the near future.

Other things made life difficult down our way: things like providing transport opportunities to enable young people to get to Noarlunga Centre to access recreation; to enable students to get to TAFE; and to enable pensioners, young mothers and people who cannot afford cars to get to the hospitals and shopping centres. For 20 years they had been calling out for improved transport services through both the residential and rural parts of my electorate. At last we have these services, although I appreciate and accept that more is to be done in transport.

I have learned a lot about the commitment of teachers since becoming a member of Parliament. Teachers are not far behind politicians when it comes to being regularly bagged by the media. For some reason, it appears to me that a member of the media can knock a politician or a teacher because they are easy meat, because they cannot retaliate. At least in Parliament members have a chance to speak up. A teacher finds that very difficult. Teachers are trying to deal with the complexities of the broad-based curriculum and other activities which are offered in schools today, and some of the problems which occur at home and which relate back to the 1970s, where we started to see the destruction of the social fabric of this country, are coming out in the classroom today.

It is not easy being a teacher, and I would like to thank them. I would also like to thank the school counsellors who night after night look at ways in which they can help to support and improve our schools. They know that education is one of the fundamental planks to the future of a person's well being. But it is not the only plank. When one is installing a floor when building a new home, to ensure that it is safe one must make sure all the planks integrate.

That is what this Government is about. It is about having a holistic approach to the future of South Australia; it is not about knee-jerk reaction stuff, and it is not about being locked into a union movement that says that you will do this and, if you do not, you will not be endorsed again. That sort of nonsense has cost this State dearly for a long time. People are starting to wake up to that. In fact, when I visit people in my electorate, they tell me that they are sick and tired of seeing their hard-earned money going from the union movement into the Labor Party and into supporting the propaganda and tripe that was trashed around my electorate during the election and paid for by the union movement.

It is nice to see that we have finally learnt a lot of lessons when it comes to the environment, when it comes to sustainability and the obligation to be good caretakers in our era in this Government and this Parliament. The lessons and opportunities are there to correct it. Much has been started. Water is the key to the success and survival of this State. I had a lot to do with the Water Resources Bill that went through, and I congratulate the previous Minister (Hon. David Wotton) for the work he did with the Water Resources Bill. I know that the new Minister will really run with it and ensure that there are economic opportunities and sustainability with respect to water resources. I will be keeping a close eye on that. There are sensitive issues in my electorate as we work through water management plans. Opportunities

exist to look after our producers and our future, but we have to work quickly on it. I accept the fact that the Water Resources Committee and producers are becoming a little frustrated at the time that it is taking.

I touch now on social fabric issues. It was interesting to listen to members today on both sides talking about economic rationalism and in many respects knocking it. It is not a matter of knocking economic rationalism but of looking at the balance between economic rationalism and the social fabric and social issues that surround our State and country. The church is doing a good job in my electorate. There is a lot of growth there, which I am pleased to see. It realises that the foundation for success in the community is a strong social fabric.

I said in the 1970s—and I will say it again in this place—that the Labor Party went too far. I admit that, back in the 1950s and 1960s, the Liberal Party was probably too focused on economic factors, but the Labor Party missed the middle of the road and went right across to the other side and, my goodness, we are paying dearly for it now because we have two and three generations coming through who have not been able to understand the importance or experience the opportunities of the social fabric that those of us like myself born in the 1950s know about. That undermines intensely their opportunities. The church, the Government and the Parliament have a strong role to play in rebuilding that social fabric. The family unit and community spirit are number one. Let us not forget that and make sure we build on it.

Some of the people who are building on those opportunities are the volunteers. In the south, to give an example of what we know about, something like \$8 million to \$10 million a year of goodwill in free time is given by volunteers. I see it wherever I go. It is not something new. If you think about it, volunteerism has been around since man was created, but there seemed to be a vacuum some time ago and it became the mentality that the Government would do it all: 'We do not need to do anything; the Government is responsible for it.' The Government is not responsible for everything and cannot do everything. I am pleased to see enormous growth, support and strength for volunteerism in the south. I thank those special people.

Let us look at charting the way forward. Let us look at the successes of this Government. In my opinion, the biggest mistake we made in the election was that we did not remind people of how successful this Government has been. We became bogged down with U-turns caused by the media and an Opposition that was hell-bent on putting out smokescreens and pulling away people's direction from the real issues.

One of the essential ingredients in the recovery program is to positively believe in each other and ourselves, and it is time that we developed a confident attitude in respect of South Australia's successes and opportunities. That is the role and responsibility of everybody in the Parliament. This business of always opposing things for the sake of it is not on. I have said before—and I will say it again at the beginning of this term of Government—that, when we do things wrong, as we have done and will do in the future, the Opposition should come out and hit us, but when we are doing all these other things right it should get with us, support us and not get in our way.

The Leader of the Opposition put out the olive branch in the past few weeks when he did the big U-turn and went away from being a negative knocker—which he really is—to being someone who has a new position: he is now the positive and optimistic 'I'll work and help you' Leader. I look forward to

seeing the Leader change his spots, and I will be the first one to stand in this Parliament and remind him of his new position if he goes back to his old ways. He has an obligation bigger than anybody else in this Parliament to work with this Government, and I will explain why that is. He was one of the people who led the Government during the destruction of this State, so he has the biggest obligation.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** The member for Hart says that I have not learnt a thing. Frankly, the Labor Party still has not learnt a lot. During the election it promised to spend \$600 million, but it was money that it did not have. The member for Hart is one of the more astute members of the Opposition. I thought he would have been Leader by now. I am surprised that he is not Deputy Leader, although I acknowledge that he may have been rolled by the factions. I suspect that it will not be too long before the member for Hart moves up a bit. I have much admiration for him. However, the member for Hart knew that the books he was trying to sell did not add up. You could see it on television when he put out his economic statement. He got caught like I have never seen him caught before. He was embarrassed because he knew that he could not support the fact that the \$600 million did not add up.

I have heard members opposite talking about opportunities and the future. Clearly they have learnt nothing because you have to live within your means, be responsible and look further ahead than trying to become a Government within one or two terms. You have to look at what sort of business plan you will create and develop and how responsible you will be to lead and take the community with you. The Labor Party has not learnt that. In fact, at the recent election the Australian Labor Party returned its second lowest vote in its history in South Australia. If Cheryl Kernot had been honest for one moment, I suggest that we would have won four or five more seats.

I refer now to a very important issue—balance. It is time South Australians, particularly parliamentarians, realised that we must have a balanced vision for this State. We owe it to South Australians, particularly our young people, to be fair and responsible, but in being fair sometimes we need to be firm and we certainly need to show leadership. The trend indicators are looking fantastic for South Australia at the moment. It does not matter whether you listen to Professor Cliff Walsh, pick up the Trends SA booklet, or read the paper today and look at what SA Great's Chairman has reported because, over the next 12 years (and this is not according to us as a Government but according to independent organisations), 100 000 new real jobs will result in this State, with something like 12 per cent growth. That flies in the face of what I saw when the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister responsible for employment, education and training where, just in the manufacturing area alone, we saw 33 600 jobs lost in a three year period.

During this term I will put more energy into ensuring that we as a Government and I as a local member look more at micro issues together with macro issues. One of the things people often cannot get a handle on as far as specifics go is what impact the debt has. That is really for us to work on. But they can easily get a handle around micro issues—smaller issues—law and order, health, education and the issues that affect them on a daily basis. They understand that we have major problems with State debt and with getting in new manufacturing bases and so on, but they cannot comprehend how great they are. As a Government we must realise that

those other important micro issues must be worked through while we work on macro processes as well.

There is still a long way to go in this State. I heard one of my colleagues suggest that 15 or 20 years down the track we might be out of the debt problems we currently face. If we are in power for another three terms, I would suggest that that is possible. If we are not, I would suggest that, when they come along, the grandchildren of every member in this Parliament will still be suffering the wrath of the debt problems. The 1996 budget results have admittedly changed again over the past 12 months, and we as a Government should take pride in how we have redressed both core debt and obviously recurrent debt. It is interesting that when we talk about public sector superannuation I hear the Opposition say, 'Oh no; that's not debt; you don't want to worry about that.'

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** The member for Hart again shows his experience and intelligence, as against most of the other Opposition members, because the member for Hart is now admitting that core debt must include public sector superannuation liabilities. But guess what happened for 11 years while members opposite were in government? Zero money was put into that area, yet good, hard working public servants in good faith paid superannuation on a fortnightly or monthly basis. A lot of those public servants are now about 45 to 50 years of age, and within 10 to 15 years those public servants will be retiring. They deserve to get their superannuation but, also, young people do not deserve to have an additional \$3 000 million burden—in other words, an amount equivalent to the State Bank's initial loss (and I say 'initial', because the State Bank has now cost us about \$4 billion). They do not need another State Bank debt in the form of public sector superannuation, so we must start to fund that. The Auditor-General has confirmed that, and I am pleased to see that we are being responsible in that way.

I will mention a few of our opportunities as we chart the way forward in the future. They include working hard on further value adding in agriculture; the wine industry is doing it very well. I believe there are some exciting opportunities in this State for the dairying industry now. I declared my interest in that regard at the beginning of this term; as all members know, I am a dairy farmer. I look forward to looking at those issues, but I will always declare my interest. As members know, at the moment some moves are afoot (and they can read it in the press today) that may greatly benefit the future of dairying in this State.

With respect to minerals, we have finished all the aeromagnetic survey work and there is now a fantastic opportunity to get on with the job of extracting of some of that mineral wealth and making sure that we create many more jobs for South Australians in the future. The Adelaide to Darwin rail line is now close to becoming a reality, thanks to the hard work of the leaders of the parliamentary Liberal Party and the bipartisan agreements with the Northern Territory Government. Some people, quietly, still do not want to see the Adelaide to Darwin rail line, would you believe, Mr Speaker? Because they were not able to get it running, they do not want us to get it running, but I can tell you that the absolute majority of South Australians do want to see that rail line running.

This Government is a strong Government. This Government does have a business plan for South Australia and it has a very strong social conscience, but the only way we can project that strong social conscience is to make sure that we continue to get this State back into the sort of shape that those

of us who were born as baby boomers after the Second World War knew. We have that opportunity because we are in Parliament. We are privileged to be here; none of us should ever forget that. Our tenure is only four years at a time and, irrespective of margins, I suggest that the community is now watching local members. If they do not think we are doing the job, irrespective of the colour of the member, they will give us a big kick. I am the first one to know that, and that will be the first thing I remind myself of every morning when I wake up and every night it will be the last thing I remind myself of when I go to bed. We are very privileged; we are stewards representing our community. They are our customers. We have a business to run for them, and we can expect them to continue to support us and purchase from us only if we put the commitment into them.

In conclusion, I am proud of my electorate of Mawson. It is an exciting electorate; it is a blend of very good new housing belts and established areas through Morphett Vale and Hackham East. We have a lot of young people in the area; next year the Woodcroft Primary School will be the largest primary school in this State. I will support it very strongly as it goes through its next stage of growth.

The district is a very resource rich and energetic rural area, which will be the real job creator and engine room for all those people living in Morphett Vale, Woodcroft, Onkaparinga Hills, Huntingdale, Hackham East or any other area. That is because it is the only wine making area in Australia and probably the world where geographically the climate guarantees that we will be able to produce a product that in 1997 will be exactly the same as if not better than it was in 1996, and 1998 will be at least as good as 1997, if not better, and so on. We are very well located and, while some of the wine grapes in the area are well over 100 years old, we also have some of the most exciting young wine makers who have come out of Roseworthy and the Waite campus. They are going to places such as France in the off season, learning more about what is happening in Europe and bringing that knowledge back here to capitalise on the leading edge that we already have.

South Australia has a lot of leading edges, but the best resource we have in South Australia is the people themselves. Let us be proud of ourselves and each other, let us adopt a positive attitude, and let us look at where we have been. Let us look at the successes we have achieved over most of the past 175 years, and let us capitalise on them as we head into the next millennium. I am privileged to be able to be a member, with the rest of my colleagues, as we do that over the next four years.

**An honourable member:** Is this your maiden speech?

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** No; my maiden speech was this time four years ago, but I would appreciate your listening to me in silence. Interjections are out of order; need I remind you of that? Today I wish to canvass a number of issues, certainly related to the Governor's speech, but I could not do so before passing comment on the events of the past four years and the election campaign. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, Mike Rann, on the campaign he ran. Having been one of those very few members who was in the engine room of the campaign, I can say that the quality of Mike's campaign contributed greatly to our success. No political leader in my memory has suffered as much significant personal vilification as he did. No political leader has had the millions of dollars thrown at his person as has the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure the strategists in the Liberal Party thought they were

onto something. They clearly had an endless supply of money to fund what in the end was one of the most disgraceful personal attacks sustained on a political leader in this country's political history but, as we saw with the result, to no effect, because the people of South Australia saw that for what it was—a very personal and vindictive campaign, which was very much wide of the mark. I would also like to—

*The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I will get to the member for Newland, one of the stunning success stories of the Olsen Government, a little later. I also congratulate the many members on the Opposition side. There are too many to list off, because we have almost doubled our numbers in this Chamber in one election result. I pay tribute to all those members, many of whom had to sustain swings in excess of 7 or 8 per cent, and who in a couple of cases achieved swings in excess of 10 per cent. That, in itself, was a stunning success. The new member for Mitchell achieved a swing in excess of 10 per cent, and the member for Norwood achieved a significant swing.

The Labor Party's results were significant, and I pay tribute to all those candidates. As one member of a very small Opposition that had to put up with the arrogance of members opposite and their personal attacks as well as the absolute abuse of power in the way in which business was conducted in this House, I can say that members on this side copped it sweet. We never resiled from our role in this Parliament to provide an effective Opposition.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Here we go; the tactic of obstruction is at work again.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The remarks that were just made by the member for Hart were I believe derogatory to this House and a previous Parliament, and I think they reflect badly. I ask for your ruling. I believe this matter is covered by Standing Orders.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair was distracted by conversation with the staff. If the honourable member was inferring anything that is contrary to Standing Orders, I ask him to come back to the motion, and I will listen closely to his remarks.

**Mr FOLEY:** I will repeat my remarks, if that would be of value. This Opposition was subjected to the most significant abuse of power and attack by the most arrogant Government that this Parliament has seen for many years. The Opposition sustained four years of abuse by an arrogant Government that threw its weight about, four years of being persecuted by the Government of the day. We took all that, we copped it sweet, but throughout that process we offered effective Opposition. We exposed to the people of South Australia this Government's mistakes and the failure, the arrogance and the incompetence of this Government, for all to see. Whether it was the bumbling and fumbling in connection with the incompetent water contract, the questionable conduct regarding the awarding of that contract, or any of those issues, we exposed it. We exposed the EDS contract and its liability to this State—the disgraceful, scandalous decision to erect the EDS building across the road. We exposed issues relating to the conduct of former Ministers. For four years we exposed the incompetence, negligence and arrogance of this Government, but nothing has been learnt.

The Deputy Premier walks into this place—someone who schemed to have his good mate, the member for Finnis (the current Minister for Human Services) rolled at this time a year ago. What a brilliant strategy that was, to knock off poor old Deano, because they were struggling. That was their

strategy, but what did Premier Olsen deliver? He delivered a minority Government. That was a great piece of tactical work. I look forward to the continued brilliant strategy of the Deputy Premier as he maps out this Government's four-year agenda, because with that sort of strategy we may well be in Government a lot sooner than the next election.

One should not tell tales out of school, but when I was in the tally room I saw that the faces of members such as the Deputy Premier and the former Treasurer were white when they realised that their earlier statements that they would be a 12, 16 or 20-year Government were simply evaporating, because not only did the Opposition suffer their arrogance, incompetence and negligence but the people of South Australia saw through them. They realised that this was one of the worst Governments that has ever presided in this House. They were given a mandate to govern, but all they did for four years was to fight and squabble amongst themselves. They were distracted from the main game. As the ship of State, they simply careered onto the rocks and provided appalling leadership.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** They cannot face it: the member for Unley and the Deputy Premier cannot face it. He talks about 35 per cent. The Opposition has 21 members in this House, and that is twice as many as it had four months ago. You knew very well that when you schemed to roll your mate Deano you did so because you thought Premier Olsen could deliver more seats. If the Deputy Premier keeps devising the Government's political strategy for the next four years, as I have said, we may well be in Government a lot sooner than the next election. The election campaign was appalling, as I have said, but I must say that the—

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

**Mr FOLEY:** Yes, a good one, wasn't it?

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Deputy Premier is now a bit sensitive. We nearly rolled the Liberal Party during the last week of the campaign, when we came from so far behind to almost pip it at the post. It was a great strategy to run the debate on the Tuesday night, although they could have done one better on the Wednesday night. It was a great debate, and I thank members opposite for that good turn. The State Bank stunt on the Friday was a real ripper. I would like to thank whomever thought up the strategy of holding it until the Friday before the election campaign. That probably got a few of my colleagues over the line.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I will talk about the spreadsheet. What do you want to know about it?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** In the light of the lies that were perpetrated during the Deputy Premier's campaign, I suggest that he go a little easy on the Opposition's numbers.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I didn't see anything on television that night, did you?

**Mr Brindal:** No.

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, end of story. The Government has simply not learnt the lesson; it has not heard the message that its arrogance, incompetence and negligence have been rejected by the electorate. We have seen nothing new in the way in which this Government has operated during the past few days. Its only defence has been to throw back to the State Bank and the mistakes of past Governments. It has offered no vision, policies or consistency.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Deputy Premier has just issued a challenge: 'Watch where we go; see if we can catch up.' That is a bit like Premier Olsen saying the other week at the business luncheon: 'Stand aside, we're coming through.' This Government had the most significant margin of any political Party in this nation's history, and it did nothing for four years. Now that it is a marginal Government it is saying, 'Look out, stand aside, we're coming through.' This is the same Government that threatened to move a vote of no confidence in itself before it even got started. Don't tell me, Ingo, that that was one of your tactical strategies as well.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will refer to members by their electorates.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise, Sir. I just wonder whether the Deputy Premier might have dreamt up that strategy as he had dreamt up the strategy to knock off the Minister for Human Services.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** It is very good in the electorate of Hart, actually. It is way up, as yours used to be. We have seen very little from this Government. Since the election there has been more division, whether it has been in connection with the Anderson report and the clumsy, silly, foolish way in which that was handled. That has chipped away at the Government's credibility. The way in which the Government has not been prepared to learn from the mistakes of the past is quite breathtaking.

*Mr Scalzi interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** And the member for Hartley! If I were the member for Hartley, I would sit back and shut up when there was talk about the election. This member was sitting on a margin of 12.5 or 12.7 per cent and he was taken down to 140 votes. This member has lost arguably one of the Liberals' safest seats and now made it the most marginal. If I were the member for Hartley, I reckon I would just sit there and be quiet when it comes to issues of—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, he is here for a few more years. Sit back, member for Hartley, and enjoy your last few years in this Parliament. Always ensure that you have a bit of chalk in the top drawer: you can go back to your old profession—that is where you will be heading in a few years time. We have been able to pull back—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:**—such a significant margin and—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member to my right will remain silent.

**Mr FOLEY:** The Deputy Premier is taking exception to my Address in Reply speech. I look forward to his. We have seen nothing from this Government, in terms of what its economic program will be for the future. All we have seen from this Government is divided Government. It wrote out a cheque during the election campaign for a company—\$20 or \$30 million: we will wait and see what that is all about.

**Mr Brindal:** Who?

**Mr FOLEY:** The Tele—what is it, Tele—

**Mr Brindal:** You don't even know.

**Mr FOLEY:** I was about to say Teletech—back office. Another great big cheque was written, and we will have to look at that. I wonder whether it will be as successful as the Government's effort with Australis.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Deputy Premier talks about saying things outside. This is the Deputy Premier who says plenty inside this Chamber and very little out there. I did not hear him say too much about Michael Gleeson outside this place. Anyway, there is more of the Deputy Premier's hands-on role in dismissing public servants that needs to be looked at over the months ahead—and various other statutory authorities.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** No, it is just a statement. Anyway, let us talk less about the Deputy Premier and more about what this Government's agenda is. There is nothing in the Governor's speech that offers hope or direction or economic strength for this State. Indeed, there is nothing of much value in the Government's agenda: it is more of the same. It will mean more division, it will mean less economic activity and, frankly, it was a very disturbing and disappointing document, in terms of what this Government's agenda will be for the future.

I now turn to issues involving my electorate. I would like to put on the record my appreciation to my campaign team that saw the two-Party preferred vote in my electorate go from some 58.5 per cent to some 72.5 per cent, or thereabouts, which in anyone's language was quite a substantial increase. Whilst I will take some personal credit for it, there is no doubt that my campaign team contributed greatly. I thank all members of my team, especially my Campaign Manager, Jeff Mills, and my Electorate Assistant, Fiona Sage, who has done a tremendous job. Particularly given my need to be in this place, bearing in mind the small number of members in Opposition, it was always important to have an Electorate Assistant who was able to hold the fort—as was the case with all my colleagues over the past four years. This applies to all members, but I say to the Deputy Premier that when there are only 10 or 11 of you it is very difficult indeed.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I am getting to my family. The member for Unley can just sit back; we will get there. The reality is that the Labor Party vote, in many of its traditional seats that had rejected Labor, that had voted against Labor in previous State elections—and, indeed, the last Federal election—in effect, came back to the Labor Party. That has put a degree of onus upon the Labor Party to ensure that we do not let that happen again, in terms of those voters deserting the Labor Party. It is important, though, that the core constituency of the Labor Party feels confident in us and that we provide the representation to them that they deserve. That is a responsibility that I find challenging and one that I will ensure is honoured.

The member for Unley mentioned my family. Of course, I thank my wife, Cathy, and my sons Ryan and Ben, who had a very difficult time during the election campaign. Not only did I have to work long hours on the campaign but my wife, as an employee of the Australian Labor Party, also had to endure long hours. My two young sons did not have a clue what was going on—they probably enjoyed it, actually: they spent more time at their grandmother's place than normal, and they thought that was pretty good.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** No, I did not have my young boys letterboxing—not this time. Next time they will be expected to chip in. They were a little young this time. Clearly, the support of family for all members is vitally important, and I am sure that all members would join with me in thanking their family.

It was a very difficult election campaign. It has been a very difficult four years. Members opposite put on a brave face—and I can understand that—but they are shell shocked.



If reports are true, the Premier considered resignation on the night, according to the media reports. I appeal to Government members to work through their grieving process and the shock of not being returned with the large majority that they had once before, and to accept that, in fact, they are mortal and are not here forever. I appeal to them to get on with the role of Government and not to be distracted by their internal wars—their internal jockeying for who should be leader. I would say that they should all get behind Premier Olsen; or if, indeed, Premier Olsen is not their preferred choice, they should get behind the Minister for Human Services; or perhaps the Deputy Premier could step forward, or the Minister for Government Enterprises, or whoever. Sort that out and start to give this State the leadership it requires.

This Government is now a minority Government, relying on three Independents who will, I know, offer very objective contributions and will vote according to the issues. This means that the Government is on notice and cannot simply rely on the Independents to rubber-stamp its arrogant policies, its arrogant legislation and, indeed, its arrogant decisions. So, the Government will have to provide something which it was unable to do for the past four years—a degree of humility and a degree of acceptance that it has to work with people.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Leader of the Opposition has extended the hand of friendship—or the hand of cooperation, at least—to the Government. He has offered to work—

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

**Mr FOLEY:** I will talk about that in a minute. The Leader of the Opposition has extended the hand of cooperation to work with this Government on the vital issue of jobs. And what has this Premier done? He has simply dismissed it, because he cannot bring himself to work with the Leader of the Opposition.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Deputy Premier says that the reason why the Leader of the Opposition's offer is not accepted is that the Leader could not lie straight in bed. Here we are trying to offer constructive cooperation, and the Leader of the Opposition still has to cop the vilification. The sum of \$3 million spent during the election campaign in slagging off at the Leader of the Opposition is not enough. Every night on television, 10 times a night, having a go at Mike Rann was not enough. The Deputy Premier now has to say that the Leader of the Opposition could not lie straight in bed. If the Deputy Premier wants a cooperative Opposition, he has to learn to be humble and learn to be cooperative. He has to lose the arrogance which he carries so heavily upon his shoulders and work with the Opposition and stop the provocative, inflammatory and insulting comments that he throws across at us, be it in this Chamber, in the media, or—

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Opposition has cooperated endlessly with the Government. In fact, we have offered cooperation to a point of frustration. We have been prepared to cooperate on most Bills.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** The Minister has just asked, 'When did you cooperate on the water contract?' Our cooperation stopped on the water contract when we realised it was an incompetent, wrong, foolish and somewhat questionable deal that has locked away the water supplies of this State for 25 years. That is when we stopped cooperation. We stopped cooperation the day we realised that the whole process stank to high heaven, when the contract as we all know was delivered after

the closing time for all bids, after earlier bids had been opened, and after the Auditor-General found that there was an all but total breakdown in process. That is when we lost confidence.

The Deputy Premier talks about the water contract. He was the Minister responsible for water for five minutes. The Premier was not confident that the Deputy Premier could continue to administer the water contract, so he shifted him. The Minister for Government Enterprises, who was on television the other night, is clearly the man who fixed Bolivar. It was that water contract that gave us the great pong and with it perhaps another two or three points in the poll. So, another piece of electoral brilliance displayed by the Deputy Premier! Anyway, I should not be picking on the Deputy Premier because—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, you chose to come into the Chamber at that time. The fact is that it is time for this Government to offer to work cooperatively with us. The very first thing that the Leader has offered is to work together on jobs, to work together for the betterment of this State. We are prepared to work with the Government. Certainly as shadow Treasurer, I would be keen to work with the Treasurer in this Chamber. The only problem is that we do not have a Treasurer in this Chamber! There is nobody—and I am going to have to do it again—there is nobody in this House in whom the Premier had confidence to be Treasurer. He did not even have confidence in the Deputy Premier to take on the role of Treasurer. He did not have anyone in the Lower House, with all the Ministers, junior Ministers and parliamentary secretaries, in whom he could be confident to be Treasurer. I find it quite extraordinary that we now have a Treasurer in another place and that we will have to put up with the logistical difficulties with that. But it is simply a clear indication that not among any of the Premier's senior Ministers was one competent enough to carry the financial burden of this State. I suspect that the former Premier, now Minister for Human Services, probably had that ability, but the Premier would be hardly likely to give him a high profile portfolio in which he could regain his assent to the leadership. That is somewhat perplexing.

In the few minutes remaining, I would like to make one or two final comments about my electorate, having been distracted again by the brutal attack from Government members opposite. In my electorate, we have worked hard over the past four years to make a difference. We have seen Government plans to build a maximum security prison on LeFevre Peninsula halted—not completely stopped, but halted. That was the work not of the local member but the whole community, and the community should be rightfully proud of our work. We have come a long way in addressing some of the ongoing problems we have with our coastal environment. As to the Port River, whilst I accept that the Government—

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

**Mr FOLEY:** See, the Deputy Premier just cannot wait. I am about to give him some faint praise and—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, it will be faint praise. In fact, I was about to give him a lot of praise, but he interjected at the wrong time. We have seen a significant budget allocation for addressing problems with the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works, to reduce the nutrient outflow into the Port River. Unfortunately, it is not enough, because we still have an unacceptable level of pollutants going into the Port River. But

it would be churlish of me in the extreme if I did not acknowledge the decision, and for that I thank the Deputy Premier, but much more work needs to be done.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** Here we have already the Deputy Premier finally hearing my message. He is now agreeing with me and showing signs of being prepared to work cooperatively. So, perhaps not all is lost. Perhaps in the Deputy Premier we do have somebody, despite my earlier criticisms of his lack of tactical skill when it comes to politics, who might be prepared to at least work with the Opposition from time to time. So, I thank the Deputy Premier for that.

As I have said, it has been a difficult four years. I look forward to the next four years working with the Labor team on this side. It brings great joy to me to be literally surrounded by so many colleagues, not to have the hostile benches that we had previously—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:**—and the quality is for all to see. The fact that we now have nearly 50 per cent of the Lower House Caucus consisting of women is a sensational result for the Australian Labor Party. Having once been the youngest member in this Parliament at the beginning of the last term, we now have a great age profile in the Labor Party Caucus, which means that for the years and decades ahead the Labor Party will be extremely well represented in this Parliament.

We will be the next Government of South Australia. We will provide the leadership, the economic direction and the skill needed to lift this State from the doldrums that it has languished in over the past four years. It causes me great stress and pain to still hear the Premier talk about the need for recovery. The Government has had over four years to fix this problem, and it still has not made one iota of difference. If members opposite think that this economy is humming, that it is firing on all four cylinders, they should come down to my electorate, visit the northern suburbs, visit the southern suburbs, visit the inner western suburbs, and look at the unemployment, the social hardship and the dislocation of families that we see in this economy. We have had nearly two years of Howard and four years of Olsen and Brown, but we have had no recovery. We have had a depressed economy—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:**—for which you should hang your heads—

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

**Mr FOLEY:**—in total shame. Total shame!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 p.m.]*

#### UNCLAIMED SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

#### MAGILL TAB

A petition signed by 156 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install toilet facilities at the Magill TAB was presented by Mr Scalzi.

Petition received.

#### OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table the annual report of the Ombudsman for 1996-97.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier):** I move: That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

#### MEMBERS' TRAVEL ENTITLEMENTS

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table the report on members' travel entitlements, summary of expenditure for 1996-97.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members can read the report tomorrow.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown)—

South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1996-97

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

Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1996-97

Legal Services Commission—Report, 1996-97

Listening Devices Act 1972—Report, 1996-97.

#### PARKS AGENDA

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** South Australia has a magnificent national parks system of inestimable value to our society. However, we have recognised that it does face considerable threat from a range of sources. Feral animals and weeds have invaded many areas; ecosystems have changed. Recognising these threats and the need to take action, the Premier, in June this year, launched a major conservation initiative, the Parks Agenda. This is an initiative to revitalise the management of the State's national parks and wildlife.

In launching the initiative the Government committed an additional \$30 million over a six year period, effectively increasing park funding by 25 per cent. The agenda is based on four key strategies: excellence in park management, community involvement, provision of excellent services to park visitors and building beneficial linkages with our parks.

In six months we already have some excellent runs on the board. The Parks Agenda was launched in early June this year. Over 5 000 people attended the inaugural Parks and Wildlife Festival on 9 June. *The Spirit of the Great South Land*, which is a guide to South Australia's national parks, was released and the Government has made a commitment to increase support to the Friends of Parks through specialist biological support and a doubling of their annual grants moneys.

A corporate launch in late June saw over 100 of South Australia's leading business people support the strategy of partnerships and mutual benefit. A Visitors Services Unit has been established to improve information, interpretation and education services. Further, I inform the House that six new rangers and two park assistant positions have been approved

and will be filled immediately, as well as three additional staff involved in wildlife conservation and visitor management. Works on parks are beginning to bear considerable fruit. Access roads at Pondalowie, Innes, Coffin Bay and Mount Remarkable parks have been upgraded and further design work for a new park headquarters at Innes National Park has been completed and construction will begin next year.

The Wilpena redevelopment, funded by the South Australian Tourism Commission and the lessee, is nearing completion. That in itself is a major win for South Australia. To assist visitors, the major redevelopment of Naracoorte Caves and the construction of a new visitor centre has begun. Improvements to the Dalhousie camp ground are under way. Planning for improvements at Rocky River, Belair and Morialta have also begun and, additionally, I note that the Kidman Pastoral Company has also fenced a substantial part of the Coongie Lakes. As members will notice, we have made an excellent start and we will continue to make a significant impact.

It is heartening to see that excellent outcomes are being achieved through partnerships between the business sector, the department and many dedicated volunteers. These are important initiatives which provide solid grass roots outcomes. Of course, these outcomes stem from the additional \$30 million over six years that has been presented by the South Australian Government, and it represents a very tangible commitment by the Government to effective native vegetation conservation throughout this State.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Following requests by members I intend to extend the trial proposed by my predecessor to allow laptops to be used by members in the Chamber after Question Time. In doing so I expect that they will not generate any noise and will be relatively unobtrusive. Also, having heard mobile phones ringing in the Chamber, I remind honourable members that mobile phones must not be used for receiving or sending anywhere in the Chamber, including in the gallery, and that they should be switched off when members enter the Chamber. If pagers are worn, they must not be audible.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### WATER OUTSOURCING CONTRACT

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises explain how the French company CGE, a parent company of United Water, is able under the water outsourcing contract to establish an export water industry based in Sydney which specifically excludes South Australia; and will the Government enforce its right under the water contract to stop this from happening? An advertisement appearing in *The Financial Review* states that CGE is recruiting engineers for export business in Asia. The advertisement further states:

Candidates will ideally be based in Sydney. However, consideration will be given to exceptional candidates with a strong desire to be based in Brisbane or Melbourne.

There is no mention of Adelaide or South Australia. I would remind the Minister that clause 112 of the water contract which was leaked to the Opposition states:

United Water will be the sole and exclusive vehicle by which Thames Water and the French company CGE will tender for 10 nominated Asian markets and that, in other Asian markets, CGE and Thames will not compete against United Water where it has identified the opportunity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition chooses to try to denigrate a company which is part of an emerging international water industry. Mr Speaker, we just heard you say that computers are allowed in the Chamber. I would like to provide the Leader of the Opposition with a copy of the CD Rom which talks about the international industry which is starting in South Australia because of United Water. Philmac and Pope are two companies that can attest to that because they are part of a global industry.

The fact is that, if people are part of an international industry, they will be able to boost the South Australian economy and, clearly, they will want to have outreaches, I guess, in other areas, and that is very appropriate. Do members opposite not want it to be an international company?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition does not want the international, first-class, benchmarking water industry which United Water is providing.

##### GLENELG-WEST BEACH DEVELOPMENTS

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Will the Premier outline the importance to the House of proceeding with the Glenelg Foreshore Development and the West Beach boat launching facility? After earlier supporting the Glenelg Foreshore Development, I understand that the Opposition is now seeking to frustrate this project.

**Ms HURLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. This is the subject of legislation before the House.

**The SPEAKER:** It is the understanding of the Chair that there is no legislation of that nature being debated before this Chamber.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Here is a major development that we want to establish at Glenelg-West Beach. It is important to demonstrate to the investing community both in Australia and internationally that South Australia is open, yet again, for business after decades of mismanagement, lack of action and lack of resolve by Labor Administrations to put in place major tourism development in South Australia.

One has only to look at Mount Lofty summit to demonstrate the inaction of the former Administration in bringing to fruition major tourism infrastructure for South Australia. We all remember West Beach. The new honourable member might well remember the former Premier, John Bannon, indicating Jubilee Point would be built at a cost of \$200 million. Where is it? The shadow Treasurer would well remember Marineland and the fact that we now no longer have any project in the West Beach area.

What did this Government do? After a decade of inaction, over the past four years this Administration has put together a consortium to proceed with the Glenelg redevelopment. Stage 1 is an \$85 million project, an important project which has been signed off. It is a project that has gone to the marketplace, and the marketplace has responded positively

to the extent that it will look at going ahead with Stage 2 of this development. It will create 2 300 jobs in the construction stage and a couple of hundred jobs in the operational phase after that. It will show that South Australia can put in place major tourism infrastructure in this State to build the economy of South Australia in the future.

The amendment proposed by the Opposition in another place seeks to re-invent the wheel. The Opposition amendment seeks to have another report prepared within three months on other options, including a boating facility using the Patawalonga, the seaward side of the lock or other variations. I do not know where the Opposition has been, because over the past 18 months to two years all those options have been pursued. They have been looked at *ad nauseam*.

The Opposition wants to frustrate this project, put it on stall and put it out of court. The Opposition runs the risk of stalling this project permanently. It runs the risk of pushing away an \$85 million development at Glenelg. That is what the Opposition is playing with at the moment. Opposition members had better front up. Do members opposite want to do as their Leader professes he will do and work cooperatively to bring investment into South Australia to move the economy forward? The first time you can support a major new \$85 million project, what do you do? Frustrate it and walk away from it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** If the honourable member was at the briefing that was provided to the Opposition on Monday and Tuesday he would not ask that dumb question. The simple fact is that you cannot have one without the other, and the briefing explained to the Opposition why you cannot have one without the other. The Opposition wants to re-invent the whole process that has been undertaken over the past 18 months. An international consortium has now signed off on this project going ahead. There are agreements to purchase properties at Glenelg—all there, ready to go, moving forward.

The Opposition cannot have it both ways. West Beach is an essential component of the Glenelg redevelopment. The proposed agreement the Opposition is talking about cuts across the provision of the development agreement between the Government and the consortium, and the relocation agreement established between the Government, the consortium, the Glenelg Sailing Club and the Holdfast Bay Yacht Club. The effect of the amendment proposed in another place is that it will retrospectively override the approval processes that are in place for this development. We have worked for 18 months to put in place this project.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The amendment proposed by the Opposition in another place retrospectively overrides all the development processes that have been put in place. I hope this does not bring about a rethink by the consortium about investing \$85 million in the project. Do not put at risk a major development like this. I simply appeal to the Opposition for South Australia's sake: rethink this amendment and what you are doing on a major new development for this State. For South Australia's sake, rethink the amendment.

#### WATER CONCESSIONS

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. How many people entitled to water concessions have

missed out, and how many people not entitled to concessions rorted the system; and since May of this year what has SA Water done to verify eligibility for concessions? Page 289 of Volume 1 of the Auditor-General's Report states:

SA Water is responsible for administering water, sewerage and council rate concessions allowed to pensioners, and it is responsible for initiating and performing matching runs of their concession files to Department of Social Security files to identify unmatched and unconfirmed claimants.

The report states:

As at May 1997, no matching runs had been performed since January 1996 by SA Water.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I will obviously get detail in regard to the specific matter that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raises, but I would remind the House that the Auditor-General in relation to SA Water issued an unqualified audit opinion.

#### EXPORTS

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** Will the Premier explain to the House the importance of South Australia's merchandise exports to the State economy and provide any details of our recent performance in this area?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** South Australia's export performance in recent times has been outstanding. For the first time in our history, as at 30 June 1997—the financial year—we exceeded \$5 billion worth of exports out of South Australia. There was an increase of 11 per cent—up some \$515 million over the year. It is an outstanding record and is an indication of the goods and services we can produce in the State being clearly acceptable in the international marketplace on price, quality and reliability of supply. Machinery and equipment manufacturing grew by 69 per cent and petroleum-coal by 62 per cent. Manufacturing industries were South Australia's fastest growing overseas exports during the 1996-97 year.

Indeed, for the three months to September 1997, compared with the same period in 1996, data on selected commodity groups revealed that fish and aquaculture products experienced the strongest growth, increasing by 69 per cent. The member for Flinders would be keen to hear that figure, given the amount of aquaculture being undertaken within the electorate of Flinders. Our wine exports, as most people know, have expanded substantially, increasing by 33 per cent over the year.

That is the track record in recent times. What of the plan, the vision, for the future? Where are we going with exports and how can we continue to build on them and expand them further? Given the good news we have had from the Centre for Economic Studies, Bank SA, Yellow Pages and the SA Great report, these export figures clearly underlie and indicate the solid foundation in the economy of South Australia to go further into the export markets.

Further opportunities are available in vineyard wine to meet the export market potential, constrained only by the availability of water. Consistently we have had representations from the member for Mawson and others in terms of utilising water to maximum advantage for further vineyard expansion—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —and the member for Schubert—and to ensure that we use to the maximum the finite resource of water to get value adding, processing and further investment in wine, particularly for the export

markets. Water availability and the use of water is particularly important. We are looking at a number of measures to ensure that we can meet the demand for additional vineyard expansion by the availability of further water supplies.

In addition, we have sought in the past four years to develop niche markets overseas so there is not one particular industry sector upon which we are reliant for further growth. That is why our food plan—a further initiative to be announced tomorrow—our wine industry, our automotive components, our minerals and our aquaculture are significant. The Minister for Primary Industries has issued a large number of aquaculture licences in recent weeks to expand that industry in future. We are putting transport infrastructure in place not only with upgrading of the port facilities here in Adelaide but also with the runway and the terminal facility at Adelaide Airport and the rail line to Darwin.

In the Asian region we are getting a spread across those economies, so we are not reliant on any one economy in that region, hence our push into China and the issuing of an invitation to visit China sometime next year by the Vice Premier and the acceptance of it by the Government of South Australia. A trade mission will be going into that region and I understand that we are the only State in Australia to have received an invitation from the Vice Premier to take a trade delegation, which he will host personally in China. That follows his visit to South Australia earlier this year and his seeing the range of not only manufactured goods but other goods and services available for the marketplace. China, with its demand, means that, where other Asian economies will have short-term difficulties for us, we can make that up with the provision and supply of those goods and services in other economies, in particular in China.

Not only is the past an outstanding record in terms of moving forward in export markets but we have in plan an approach to look at a whole range of niche industry sectors. We are looking at a range of economies and putting in place the infrastructure—in other words putting the jigsaw together to build on the export success of the past so that we can have continued success in export markets over the next five to 10 years.

### WATER PRICES

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Will water prices vary in 1998 and will they fall as promised by the now Premier under his water privatisation contract with United Water?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** As the Deputy Leader knows, that will be a matter of public knowledge in a couple of days' time.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** But you don't know.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Yes, I do: I am in the throes of developing the final picture right now. However, I am absolutely delighted that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition followed up her previous question with me immediately. Unfortunately, she has already sullied her reputation by her previous question because, in fact, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked whether anything had been done in relation to this apparently dreadful situation with SA Water and concessions, in other words, trying to create an impression that nothing had been done and that it had been discarded. On page 289 of the Auditor-General's Report, immediately under the line that the Deputy Leader choose to read, I quote the management response, as follows:

The department indicated that SA Water had now recommenced matching runs of their concession files with Department of Social Security files and that matching runs had been performed in June 1997 and August 1997.

So, the management response was immediately under the part that the Deputy Leader chose to read into *Hansard*.

**Mr CLARKE:** My point of order relates to Standing Order 98, that is, that the Minister answer the substance of the question and not retrospectively answer a question he should have known the answer to earlier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If honourable members on my right could constrain themselves, I could hear the point of order. I would like the point of order taken again and members on my right can control themselves so that I can hear it.

**Mr CLARKE:** My point of order relates to Standing Order 98, which requires the Minister to answer the substance of the question. The question that the Minister is now answering is the question put previously by the Deputy Leader, which he is answering retrospectively.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. Ministers traditionally are given a wide brief in answering questions. The pattern has been in place for some time. There is a degree of relevance that I expect of Ministers in keeping to the question, but it is permissible, provided they keep basically on the same subject, for their answers to proceed.

### OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Will the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism advise the House of the achievements to date of the Government's Prepared to Win program in the lead-up to the Australian 2000 Olympic Games?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Why would I get into your shoes? You are the greatest loser of all time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will not respond to interjections.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I am sorry; I apologise, Mr Speaker.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ross Smith.

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

**The SPEAKER:** And the Leader.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** One of the most important programs set up by the Department of Recreation and Sport is the Prepared to Win program, a program to encourage countries to come here in the lead-up to the Olympic Games so that we can develop economic activity for our State. It is suggested that some \$20 million worth of economic activity will be developed with these teams coming here in the next few years.

It is excellent to announce that the Swedish swimming and diving teams will train here in Adelaide prior to the World Championships in Perth in January. The national swimming team will train at the Marion swimming pool for some two weeks. It is fantastic to see that the Marion council has made available its swimming centre for this very important international swimming team, and the Adelaide Aquatic Centre will look after the diving team. Among the major teams from other countries to have come here already was the Chinese women's cycling team, which came here to train

prior to the World Championships in Perth. They initially intended to train at home in China, but they came here because of the similar training conditions. We also have cycling teams from Germany, Japan and China—including the male Chinese team—probably the US and of course our Australian teams here.

Because of the Masters Rowing Event, which was the biggest single rowing event ever held here in Australia, which was the first Masters Rowing Event and which attracted 2 000 competitors from all over the world to West Lakes, the Swedish and Chinese teams, which had representatives in the event, are likely to come to Adelaide to train in the next two years prior to the Olympic Games. Three or four people within the Office of Recreation and Sport are doing a fantastic job to encourage economic development here in South Australia through the Prepared to Win program. It is an excellent program, which will bring fantastic economic development for this State.

### ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises guarantee that South Australian industry will not be interrupted by repeated power blackouts during the coming summer, and will industry be given preference over residential areas? On 2 December the Minister warned that South Australians could face a summer of repeated blackouts unless power consumption was reduced. On 3 December the Managing Director of ETSA Corporation announced that the corporation had started the new financial year with a 4 per cent jump in industrial power sales.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Given that ETSA power sales are up, which is so good for the South Australian economy because it means that small business is actually using more power and hence generating more exports and more jobs, it is interesting that the Labor Party chooses to use that as a great negative. The simple fact is that, as was quite obvious from my previous comments, because of the quite unprecedented growth in demand at times of high usage—that is, on days of very hot weather when industry is working (in other words, not so much on weekends)—there is a potential for the reserve to be stretched. There is a reserve of several hundred megawatts. It is a fact that, as new homes are developed and with an increasing number of particularly, we believe, air conditioners and other electrical appliances, that is a matter with which South Australia will have to grapple. The Government is grappling with it. As has been identified, we have a high level committee of officials working to a number of senior Ministers, and all those capacity decisions are the basis on which that committee is working. We would expect to have some directions available to be brought to the public's notice early next year, because many of these projects have considerable lead time.

Factually, I do not think it is fair for the people of South Australia to try to pull the wool over their eyes. If it appears that there will be a number of days when it will be 41.5° or 42° and it looks as if there is the potential for the reserve to be stretched, why could we not say to South Australians, 'Don't leave your air conditioner on all day; why not turn it on when you come home?' and so on? South Australians respond very well to those sorts of entreaties; look at what has happened with water. Endlessly, year in and year out in the past they have responded to that by conserving water. We

will put the facts in front of them as we make decisions for the future.

### HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** Will the Minister—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr EVANS:** Certainly you won't be doing that. Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House what action the Government is taking to meet the current unprecedented demand for health services in South Australia and also to ensure quality hospital care for all South Australians?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Earlier today I tabled the annual report 1996-97 of the Health Commission of South Australia. That report shows that there has been an increase in the number of patients going through the public hospital system here in South Australia. In fact, compared with 1992-93 under the Labor Government, the last year has seen an increase of more than 10 per cent. So, there has been a substantial increase in the number of patients going through the public hospital system. There has also been a substantial increase in the number of emergency department patients and outpatients. That shows quite clearly an increased demand on our public hospital system.

On top of that, today I am able to release the latest information about waiting lists for elective surgery. I invite the shadow Minister to take particular note of this, because she often asks about it: she was asking for this information only a few days ago. I am able to say that the number of overdue category one patients has dropped from 333 people on the waiting list to September 1994 to only 70 now on the waiting list to September 1997. That is a very substantial drop indeed.

In fact, the best measure for dealing with the waiting lists is to consider what time it would take to completely work through the waiting list if no additional patients were added to it. There has been a substantial further improvement of two months. We are now down to only two months on the waiting lists. That is a 16 per cent improvement on where we were 12 months ago and a 36 per cent improvement on where we were in September 1994. Therefore, quite clearly, as announced by the former Minister before the election, this Government has tackled the waiting lists for our public hospitals in a very effective manner.

There is a very concerning sign on the horizon: the Federal Government has not yet tackled some of the structural problems with the health system in Australia. There is a continuing decline in private health insurance, we have an ageing population and we have a changing medical technology, all of which is increasing the demand and cost pressures on our public hospital system. As we go back to the Federal Government at the end of this year to renegotiate the Medicare agreement for the next five years, I ask the Federal Cabinet to take note of the very severe demand for an increase in public hospital funding throughout the whole of Australia.

Let me tackle one further point, because during the election campaign the Labor Party tried to create the impression that this Liberal Government had cut funds to public hospitals in South Australia. The facts show that in this financial year (1997-98) we are putting an extra \$77 million into the public hospital system compared with 1993-94. That \$77 million is a real increase, over and above inflation. I highlight to the Federal Government that in the same period for the same public hospital system its increase in funding has

been only \$13 million. So, it has been the State Government here in South Australia, as have other States of Australia, that has put additional financial resources into the public hospital system. We now ask the Federal Government to pay its fair share of any increase in demand on the public hospital system occurring as a result of the structural problems in the hospital system.

#### UNITED WATER

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Has United Water fulfilled its contractual commitment to engage Sithe Energies Australia to carry out a feasibility study for a cogeneration plant in South Australia, and is this project feasible? Under the Government's contract with United Water, the company is to carry out a feasibility study into the establishment of a 500 megawatt gas-fired cogeneration plant involving \$475 million to \$525 million worth of capital investment with the potential to make South Australia a net exporter of electricity.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** With reference to the previous question from the member for Norwood, I am very keen to have South Australia at some stage become a net exporter of electricity. Indeed, the Government is looking at that possibility right now. I will get back to the honourable member regarding the detail of her question.

#### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**Mrs HALL (Coles):** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises say what action the Government is taking to ensure that information technology is accessible to all South Australians?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Government Enterprises.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Hang on, mate. Remember that letter that I sent you. I've still got money on you.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** That is exactly right; nor have I, and that is the difference between us. The Government is delighted to be bringing information technology to all South Australians. It is particularly delighted that the Ngapartji Multimedia Centre in the east end of Rundle Street is now able to provide a free e-mail service for all South Australians. That service will be able to provide all South Australians with their own e-mail account that is private and secure. That means that anyone can send and receive e-mail at no cost. As e-mail accounts are provided over the worldwide web instead of through a conventional e-mail program, it means that users can send and receive e-mail at any public access terminal.

As I think most members would know, there are now large numbers of public access terminals. Many public libraries have them, Ngapartji has four public access terminals on the footpath at the east end of Rundle Street, and so on. This means that South Australians will no longer have to purchase a personal computer and buy programs and software in order to access their e-mail account. This will play a major educational role as it stimulates in South Australians greater interest in and knowledge of the potential for the worldwide web. I am sure it will lead to a growing acceptance and an acknowledgment of the potential for electronic commerce, bill paying, education, information, and so on.

Through this venture, Ngapartji is helping the Government in its goal to make South Australians the largest *per capita* users of on-line multimedia services in the world. It is a successful initiative. Ngapartji has reported to me that so far 2 746 South Australians have taken up the opportunity, and the average rate of take-up for the Hello e-mail accounts is one every five minutes in any 24-hour period; during business hours that rate can be as high as one every five seconds. Clearly, South Australians are identifying with this great initiative. I would like to inform any computer literate members in the Chamber or South Australians in general that the Ngapartji e-mail address is: [www.hello.net.au](http://www.hello.net.au).

#### CENTRE FOR PERFORMING ARTS

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Auditor-General's finding that the expenditure of taxpayers' funds on the Wilpena development was unlawful because the project had not been approved by the Public Works Committee and the Deputy Premier's assurance yesterday that this would not happen again, will the Premier explain why work was commenced on the Centre for Performing Arts before this project has been considered by the Public Works Committee? In answer to a question from the member for Fisher, the Education Minister told the House yesterday that work has already begun on the \$23.7 million Light Square development. This project has not yet been considered by the Public Works Committee.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will ascertain the facts. It may well be that \$16 million of Federal funds is being spent first.

#### RYE GRASS

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development say what action the Government is taking to protect our very valuable export hay industry from the threat of annual rye grass toxicity?

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Spence, and I thank the member for Flinders for her question. As the honourable member said, the export hay industry, which is very reliant on the Japanese market, is making a major contribution to South Australia's export income. Recently, the State Government issued an alert to South Australian hay producers urging them to take precautions against annual rye grass toxicity (ARGT), the presence of which in our Japanese market is putting our exports at risk. Farmers, particularly those cutting cereal hay for export, have been advised to take extreme care over the next few weeks to ensure that their hay is not infected with ARGT, which is a disease of the common pasture species of annual rye grass.

Australia's \$80 million export hay trade is dependent on farmers and processors doing the right thing and adhering to an industry backed strategy established last year to assure buyers that hay produced in Australia is free from ARGT. It is essential that all sections of the industry stick closely to the protocols if we are to maintain this export market. Industry approached me about this last year, and SARDI with much cooperation from the processors has led the nation in testing protocols to protect this export industry from restrictions. We certainly must protect these markets, and if we do not do the right thing we could lose valuable trade. I have taken the step during the past couple of weeks to write to all hay exporters urging them to ensure that all hay that is exported is free

from ARGT, and I have outlined to them, whether they be processors or growers, their responsibilities to the industry. We have also advised farmers that those who intend to sow hay crops next year should have their paddocks tested for ARGT and that those paddocks infected with ARGT should not be used to grow hay.

### YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** Does the Premier stand by his election commitment to reduce the State's unemployment rate, including youth unemployment, to the national average by the year 2000? The Government's 1997-98 budget papers forecast a jobs growth rate of 1.5 per cent or 10 000 jobs per annum through to the year 2000. The Centre for Economic Studies in its paper released yesterday predicted a most likely jobs growth for the State of 1.1 per cent or 8 400 jobs per annum through to the year 2010. In order to achieve the Premier's target, at least 20 000 additional jobs per year would need to be created.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I certainly will work towards that target. That is a target that I put down, and the Government will continue to pursue policies that will provide the best opportunity for it to meet that objective. Given the Leader's public comments recently and throughout the election campaign, I would have thought that we would be supported by the Opposition in our efforts to bring about economic rejuvenation—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Well, the first test will come with the \$85 million Glenelg development, because there are 2 300 jobs entailed in the construction phase of that project alone. There is no doubt that we in South Australia will need to work extraordinarily hard, harder than the Eastern States. We do not have the economies in terms of manufacturing industries and the population base of New South Wales and Victoria. We do not happen to have the natural mineral resources of Queensland and Western Australia. The simple fact is that we do have to work harder in South Australia to meet those objectives.

But be that as it may, one should not walk away from those objectives: one works toward them—and in fact we will. That is why, during the course of the past year, the Government put in place the Deposit 5000 scheme, providing impetus for the building industry in South Australia and an almost 54 per cent increase in building approvals, with the smaller and medium size businesses now saying that they are reaping the rewards in terms of carpets, curtains and white-goods going into those new homes. This has given an impetus to the home building industry—

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thank the Deputy Leader for her interjection. This has given an impetus to the home building industry that had not been there for some five to eight years prior to that.

With its youth employment strategy, this Government is committing some \$30 million to assist youth employment in South Australia. Add to that the assistance this Government is providing for local government, involving I believe in the order of \$1.5 million, to assist with employment and traineeships among local councils throughout the State. In country regional areas—north of Gepps Cross, east of Mount Barker and south of Noarlunga—we have created the opportunity for 500 traineeships, where Government agencies and departments will be funded to take on some 500 people under the

age of 24 to give them skills, work force training and experience.

Recent statistics have shown that, where we have taken people on and given them now more than 12 months experience, 80 per cent of those kids have obtained a permanent job as a result. Therefore, they are targeted programs that are working in the interests of young South Australians in particular. In reply to the honourable member (I was about to say 'Deputy Leader'), yes, those targets are there; yes, we will work hard for them; and, yes, we would look forward to the Opposition's supporting us in reaching those goals and objectives.

### YOUTH EDUCATION AND TRAINING

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the House what action the Government is taking to attract and retain young people in secondary schools or training programs in this State?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Secondary school education in South Australia is about to undergo somewhat of a reform. For the past 10 to 15 years, we have been locked into a very general and broad curriculum, which has basically aimed our students at university education. During the 1970s, technical high schools were training young people for vocational areas and for the trades but they disappeared through the 1980s, and certainly in the 1990s. There is some irony in that the anti-vocational forces did not see, however, that the curriculum was already vocationally biased in a way which favoured students with vocational aspirations requiring a university education. The shift that we are now seeing is from bias to a balance. Secondary education is now starting to look very attractive and very relevant to most of our students, and these students now see some real purpose in remaining at school.

Currently, research is being undertaken as to why many students find both senior secondary schooling and the South Australian Certificate of Education an unattractive option. However, the Government is adopting an aggressive multidimensional and multidirectional approach to secondary schooling, planned not only to make secondary schooling relevant but also to markedly improve the student retention rates. Retention must not be seen as a passive quality: it must be seen to be keeping young people voluntarily committed to ongoing education and training, and that is what this Government is all about. As I have said, the Government's plan is multidimensional and multidirectional, and let me illustrate how we will retain young people—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ross Smith will come to order.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**—in education and training. Members would no doubt be aware of the Government's Ready, Set, Go program, which is an \$11.8 million program to ensure that students are trained and ready for work. More than 5 000 students will participate in work placements. Employers are enthusiastically participating in this program. Around the State, we have schools developing training programs and joint ventures with TAFE and the business sector. We have vineyards being established—and I note that the Naracoorte High School has just received a \$240 000 grant from ANTA to construct a vineyard and establish itself in business. There are also aquaculture enterprises, hospitality and tourism ventures, student-run small businesses and, of course, the very successful engineering pathways program. Enterprise is in the air. The beauty of these programs is that



they can all be accommodated within the South Australian certificate. Many of them contain direct credit transfers to courses with TAFE and other accredited training institutions.

Along with the emerging industries that I have just mentioned, the Government will be exploring ways of training young people in the more traditional trades. Many youngsters are attracted to the traditional trades such as motor mechanics, carpentry, plumbing and electrical engineering, just to name a few. The Government believes that there is a place in our secondary school system for one or more schools specialising in preparatory education for the traditional trades, and it will shortly be looking at this option.

There is another dimension to keeping students in the school system which is underrated, and that concerns developing positive attitudes to education in the early years of adolescence—for instance, involving students in the 11-15 age group. Too often, too many youngsters were turned off education, for they saw traditional schooling as irrelevant to their interests and to their needs. The Government will give strong support to those schools setting up innovative, modern middle school programs which keep young people connected to education.

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order. Sir, can I ask you to draw the Minister's attention to the provision of ministerial statements in which to provide this type of information?

**The SPEAKER:** That question was going through my mind. There are opportunities for lengthy information to be provided in ministerial statements, so I would ask the Minister to bring his answer to a conclusion.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I congratulate the former Governments of both political persuasions for their sustained concentration of the education of girls. This was a focus that was well overdue and was very successful, and is still very successful and highly desirable. This Government is now asking: what can we learn from that strategy to improve the attitudes and educational attainment of boys, particularly the retention of boys at schools? Schools will be asked to explore this question, and the Government will strongly support those exploring different teaching methodologies and organisations.

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a further point of order, Mr Speaker. I would ask you again to rule that the Minister use the known practice of ministerial statements.

**The SPEAKER:** Under Standing Orders the Minister can give a lengthy reply, but I encourage Ministers to use ministerial statements, and I hope that in the future Ministers will take my advice this afternoon on board in the preparation of replies. I would again ask the Minister to draw his reply to a close.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** There is just one more point that I want to make. This Government is convinced that the package of strategies which have been outlined will see school retention rates trending upward, with more students moving to combine school-TAFE training programs. The Government believes we have turned the corner and that the shape of modern secondary schooling is becoming very clear. The Government believes that it will soon become the attractive option for post-compulsory age students.

## ASSET SALES

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Premier detail to the Parliament what specific further asset sales the Government is considering over the next four years? In his opening speech on 2 December, the Governor said that the Government had sold assets worth \$2.1 billion over the previous three years. The Governor also said:

The State's debt reduction strategy will continue with equal vigour to that pursued in the past four years.

Specifically what assets will be sold?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Had it not been for the mismanagement of the former Labor Administration, we might not have had to pursue substantial asset sales. The incompetence of Labor Governments in many States around Australia, including Victoria and South Australia, has led to massive debt levels that incoming Liberal Governments have had to clean up. Difficult decisions have been made in the course of the past four years, difficult decisions in terms of restructuring the finances of South Australia. Also included in the Governor's speech—and the Treasurer has referred to this in a number of speeches on a number of occasions—is the fact that the Government is preparing a four year strategy for the finances of South Australia.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** One of those areas, if the member for Hart will show just a little bit of patience, is public sector reform. Public sector reform is designed to give headroom in the budget, to give capacity as a result of those savings, to put those funds into areas of essential services that we would like to expand—health, education and the like. The Minister for Human Services has detailed to the House the difficulties, the imposts and the pressure in the health system. Despite the pressure, South Australia is doing very well in that area and outperforming other States of Australia.

Be that as it may, we see that the Federal Government—and the Minister has referred to this on a number of occasions—has not triggered the 2 per cent contribution to the States when there is a greater than 2 per cent drop out in private health insurance. That has not occurred for the past two years under the current Federal Government. That is why we need—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Minister indicates that that was worth \$42 million last year which we should have received from the Commonwealth but which we did not get to put into our public health system to meet the extra demand as people move out of the private health system. That is why we need headroom in the budget and why there has to be restructuring.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Treasurer will make a detailed statement when he brings down the budget next year indicating the strategy that this Government will put in place. I just go back to the point—

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Pursuant to Standing Order 98, I ask that the Premier answer the specifics of the question. What assets are you selling?

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member for Hart knew it was not a point of order. He is just playing tactics with the House. The statement to be made by the Treasurer in May next year will include those areas referred to by the member for Hart. It will be—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes. If the shadow Treasurer, who has been in this House for four years, and worked for a former Premier, does not understand that, when you put the budget strategy down for four years it covers revenue and expenditure and things like asset sales, he ought not be the shadow Treasurer. So, the honourable member will have to show just one ounce of patience.

When the budget is brought down in May next year, it will detail how we will continue to rebuild the finances of South Australia, to repair the damage done by those members opposite when they were in Government, when they built projects like the Myer-Remm Centre at a cost of \$1006 million and which was sold for \$151 million. We can go through a whole raft of expenditure that has been inflicted upon the taxpayers of South Australia through the mismanagement of Labor Administrations, where they allowed the bank and Beneficial Finance effectively to bankrupt South Australia. However, to this day, they have not had the common courtesy to apologise to South Australians for that which they did.

### WINE INDUSTRY

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Will the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism inform the House whether South Australia can continue to lay claim to the title of the wine State of Australia? Constituents of mine—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:**—asked me recently, now that the McLaren Vale wine area is the shiraz capital of the world, whether South Australia is still the wine State.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The honourable member represents one of the premium wine areas in South Australia, as do the members for Schubert, Chaffey, Gordon and some members opposite. It is nice to see there are one or two. It just goes to show how important the wine industry is to South Australia. A recently released wine and tourism report shows two things which are absolutely tremendous for our State. First, one third of all international visitors who come to South Australia go to our wine regions. What is also important is that 40 per cent of the people who live in South Australia make regular visits to our wine regions.

It is absolutely critical that all South Australians continue to be as proud of this industry as they are of many other things that go on, because we have another State called Victoria, that place over the border, which wants to be seen as the wine State of Australia. We know, without any doubt at all, that that is one of the many things that Victoria seeks but, in fact, we are the wine State. It is very important that we continue to promote our wine growing regions. With the combination of a very good industry, like the wine industry, with tourism, we can get the best of both worlds out of what we are trying to do. There has been a tremendous report. We have only just begun the long trail to make sure we continue to be the wine capital of Australia and that wine remains the continuing force it is in the promotion and marketing of all things in South Australia, and in particular tourism.

### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. What confidentiality clauses have been waived by Healthscope under the renegotiated

contract to manage the Modbury Public Hospital, and does the waiver of confidentiality by Healthscope mean that there is no longer any contractual impediment to the tabling of a copy of the contract in this House? Page 680 of volume 2 of the Auditor-General's Report says that, as part of the renegotiation of the Modbury hospital contract, Healthscope has agreed to waiver claims for confidentiality.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** A summary of the contract was tabled in this Parliament, and I appreciate that that occurred before the honourable member became a member of Parliament. I suggest that the honourable member has a look at that summary of the contract which has been signed off by the Auditor-General—

**Ms Stevens:** That is not the issue.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The question was 'What confidentiality clauses apply in the contract?' Those confidentiality clauses are outlined in the summary signed off by the Auditor-General and tabled in this Parliament.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member may have another issue, but the question was, 'What were the confidentiality clauses that related to that contract?', and they have been tabled in this Parliament under the summary.

### EMPLOYMENT

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heyesen):** Will the Minister for Employment and Training advise the House of some of the recent employment initiatives being taken by his department to assist school leavers and, in particular, the mature aged?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** This Government is ensuring the increased employment of those people over 40 years of age by supporting the unit known as DOME—Don't Overlook Mature Expertise. Last year the Government allocated \$250 000 towards DOME. This year we have allocated a further \$250 000, and I can report that the organisation is currently looking at establishing a presence in the Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie region to look at increasing jobs for mature age people over 40 years of age in that area. DOME has already done some ground work on that and considers that there is excellent potential for DOME to generate real jobs in that area.

---

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** My grievance concerns an answer given today by the Premier regarding the Holdfast Quays development at Glenelg. I believe the Premier's answer was deficient or inadequate in a number of areas. First, the Premier suggested that members on this side of the House do not support the Glenelg development. That is utter rot.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CONLON:** In fact, I remind the member opposite that, if it was not for the original investment of Better Cities money from the Federal Labor Government, it is difficult to see how this project could have got off the ground. When members opposite beat their breast about how good this

program is, they should remember that the Federal Labor Government was a better friend to them than this Federal Government was or ever will be.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CONLON:** I point out to my loud little friend that we do support the project, but what we will not support without better answers than we have been given so far is an ill-advised spin-off with a large number of serious questions hanging over it. I refer to the groyne at West Beach. I would be surprised if the member for Colton opposite does not share some of these concerns.

**Mr Brokenshire:** What's it got to do with Elder?

**Mr CONLON:** You may not be up to speed, but I am a shadow Minister. You may not like it, but that is the fact of the matter, and you should accept it because I will be around for a while.

**Mr LEWIS:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw attention to the fact that the honourable member is not addressing his remarks to you, Sir, but is using the second person pronoun 'you' and is addressing his remarks to this side of the Chamber rather than through the Chair.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair understands the point of order. As this involves one of the new members, I point out that members should address the Chair and be relevant in their contributions.

**Mr CONLON:** I apologise. I will address my remarks through you, Mr Speaker. We support the Glenelg development. We have done so from the first day and will continue to do so. However, we have very serious concerns about the proposed groyne at West Beach, and that is why there are amendments to the Bill before the other place. I want to take time to talk about those concerns.

In his answer the Premier suggested to the member for Hart that he would know more if he had attended the briefing on this matter. I can tell the House that I was at the briefing and I can assure the member for Hart that, in my opinion, it would not have done him much good to attend because the briefing did not address the serious concerns that we have. The first concern which has been raised is the potential for enormous damage to what is one of the longest stretches of beach along the metropolitan coastline between West Beach and Henley Beach. The beach exists at present, but if the groyne goes ahead it may not exist in the future. It is very plain from every report on this matter that there will be a serious impact on sand on that stretch of beach, and it will require a great deal of sand management if that beach is to be protected from future development.

Our second concern relates to what appears to be the enormous cost of this development compared to the benefits offered. The third concern will be highlighted when I address the history of the project. As I understand it, when the original environmental impact statement for the project was undertaken, this part of the project was not included, and it was not included for some very good reasons.

*Mr Condous interjecting:*

**Mr CONLON:** The member for Colton will be able to assist with some of this. It was not included because in the original project, when they designed the marina and the foreshore development at Glenelg, before they proceeded with that they had to fix up the stormwater problem. They were going to fix up the stormwater problem by punching a channel through to West Beach. They were going to punch the channel through to West Beach and pump through the stormwater, which the member for Colton did not like, and they were also going to relocate a sailing club and the Small

Boat Squadron. They found out that not even the member for Colton would cop that, and neither would the residents down there, and so the project was stalled. What has the Government come back with? It is a \$10 million groyne at public expense that may require up to—

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

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I rise today in relation to recent changes that the Attorney-General has recommended concerning the Liquor Licensing Act in respect of small clubs. I compliment the Attorney for his action in this area because it was certainly of great concern to many clubs in the electorate of Goyder. I think I am correct in saying that in my electorate I have some 25 bowling clubs, approximately 20 golf clubs, half a dozen RSL clubs and several other clubs that were affected by the new legislation. This concern was echoed by virtually all of the clubs, and I certainly took representations to the Attorney—together with many other members from rural areas—on this issue. The key problem foreseen was the excessive cost that would be imposed on small clubs. Not only were they to pay \$11 for the required badge but also they would need to pay some \$58 for a licence and, in addition, a fee of about \$120 per person for a training session to become fully qualified.

I know the Liquor Licensing Commissioner sought to amend some of those, but I for one was still far from satisfied and I received many letters from my electorate. I refer to a letter from a bowling club, as follows:

The bar at our club works only with volunteers, most members taking their turn. We do not have the personnel who could spend large amounts of time per week to supervise. The new rules would require us to register possibly up to 20 members costing \$2 000 or more, which would place an impossible financial strain on the club.

The Attorney has sought to move in this direction as a result of discussions undertaken. Before I identify some of the changes, I make it clear that a major reason behind the new regulations is that consultations occurred for what I assume was the better part of a year with the Licensed Clubs Association representative or representatives who supposedly were going to represent small clubs in electorates such as Goyder and throughout the State. Obviously, there was a breakdown in communication because certainly my licensed clubs did not seem to have any knowledge of communications that occurred in the previous six months to a year.

A circular prepared by the Attorney-General reads as follows:

- (i) A 'small licensed club' which does not have gaming machines and agrees to a condition on its licence that it will not trade with the general public would be defined and recognised as a small licensed club.
- (ii) Not trading with the 'general public' is exclusive of trading rights available to clubs under the repealed Liquor Licensing Act 1985, that is, a club member will be able to introduce up to five guests (as approved by the licensing authority) to the premises on any one day. Unlike under the repealed Act a 'visitors book' would not be required. . . If the ratio at any one time of guests to members exceeded 5:1 this could constitute a breach of the licence conditions.
- (iii) In relation to visiting sporting teams and officials, or visiting members of affiliated clubs, this would be covered by a club's honorary members' clause which bestows honorary membership on visiting teams and officials. This is the same as under the repealed Act.
- (iv) The new Act allows small licensed clubs to apply for a limited licence so that the premises can be hired out, for example, for a wedding reception. Under the repealed Act a club couldn't apply for a limited licence because the

club could only sell liquor to a person it was authorised to sell to under the principal licence. However, under the new Act that limitation has been removed. This means a non-member could hire the facilities and the club could apply for a limited licence and sell to the non-member provided this was not seen by the licensing authority as an abuse of the limited licence which may otherwise require the principal licence to be amended to cover the activity.

- (v) . . . A small licensed club would not be required to pay \$58 for approval of any member.

Finally:

. . . A small licensed club would not be required to pay this fee for the members of its committee of management and other persons it wished to nominate as responsible persons.

It will still be required to pay the cost of \$11 for a badge. That is about the only cost that licensed clubs will have to pay, so I believe that the key problems have now been resolved.

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

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** Today is a sad day, indeed, for the law-abiding residents of my electorate. Today, the policing of my electorate is thrown into disarray. Today, this Government's Focus 21—Restructuring of Policing in South Australia comes into being. The problem is that restructuring under this Government has simply become a euphemism for just another cut in Government services, cuts that have been suffered across our State but most significantly in the northern suburbs.

Since that dismal day in December 1993, when the Liberal Party took over the reins of Government in this State, the people of the northern suburbs have been treated with continuing contempt, and this latest move is just another example. Today, the Para Hills patrol base, which services a large portion of my electorate, including Salisbury East and Salisbury Plain, will no longer be in existence. Instead, all policing patrols servicing the vast area of the Salisbury council will operate from the Salisbury Police Station.

For many years the member for Ramsay lobbied to have the Salisbury Police Station established. It was well recognised by both local residents and the police that this large area could not be effectively serviced by just one police station. The new Salisbury Police Station was approved by the Labor Government and, despite its being derided at its opening in early 1994 by the then Minister for Police as being extravagant, the fact is that it worked.

Since the opening of the Salisbury Police Station, since we have had both the Salisbury and Para Hills stations operating, the incidence of crime in that area has dropped. According to the SAPOL statistical review 1995-96, there was an overall drop in reported crime in the vicinity of 4 per cent compared with the previous year. Crimes against the person—that is, assaults, robberies and the like—dropped about 10 per cent, drug offences dropped about 10 per cent and break-ins dropped a massive 35 per cent. This is clear evidence that two police stations, two patrol bases, along with the additional 22 police provided in Salisbury, worked. This outcome is what the community had been crying out for, but today we go back to the future. Today we revert to one police station-patrol base servicing Salisbury and, today, we lose a large number of senior operational police officers.

Earlier this year, when I made the public announcement that this Government planned to close the Para Hills Police

Station and slash police numbers, the then Minister for Police was quoted in the local Messenger newspaper as saying:

There will be no closure of Para Hills Police Station. There will be no cuts to police numbers at the Para Hills station, and the community will continue to receive comprehensive service from Para Hills, Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully stations.

A short time later, the Minister's police adviser was quoted in the same newspaper as acknowledging that there would be a drop in overall police numbers but paradoxically said that this should not be seen as a reduction in police numbers.

Well, like the rest of the community, I am confused. Today, the Para Hills patrol base is no longer in existence, police numbers are cut and the Tea Tree Gully patrol base no longer operates from the area it serves but, if we are to believe the propaganda put out by the Government, cuts, slashings and closures are not to be seen as cuts, slashings and closures: they are simply restructuring. They claim that they are providing a better service. They will provide more with less.

If that is the case, why have the police themselves, those men and women who are out there doing the work, fought so hard to prevent this from happening? Why have they fought so hard to stop the restructuring and the introduction of a new rostering system? It is because they know, just as the public knows, that to do it better, to have a real impact out there, we need more police, not fewer. We need police to be visible, to be out there with the public, not just concealed in cars and forced to react rather than providing a proactive, effective policing service.

But the confusion does not end there. We are constantly told that the Para Hills Police Station will not close: indeed, it is becoming the temporary location for the Tea Tree Gully patrol base. When I have asked, 'For how long?', no-one seems to know. When Para Hills is no longer the temporary home for Tea Tree Gully, I am told that it will not close but will become a community police office—not a shop-front police station but a community police office. My residents have shown very well in recent times that they are not so easily conned.

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

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Yesterday, during the grievance debate, the member for Hart, in his usual inaccurate and misleading fashion, tried to impute improper motives to me and to the Hon. Peter Dunn (former President of the Legislative Council) in relation to the tabling of the Auditor-General's Report. Let me give this House the clear facts in relation to that matter.

**Mr Atkinson:** As you always do.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** At least I do not have to go on the Bob Francis program and use that cheap, two-bob program to malign and misrepresent people, and you can tell Big Bob Francis and his two-bob program that he ought to be ashamed of himself; he is just a promoter of untruths. The honourable member is a disgrace. He calls himself a Christian: he is the greatest hypocrite that has ever been in this building. He does not have a Christian tenet in his body.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. I take offence at the term 'hypocrite' and I ask the member for Stuart to withdraw.

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

**Mr ATKINSON:** It is unparliamentary language. It is in Erskine May. Every ruling in this House is that 'hypocrite'

is unparliamentary language and has been for hundreds of years.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** In the context in which it has been used there is some question in regard to the point of order that has been made by the member for Spence. Is the member for Stuart prepared to withdraw the statement?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Only if you request me to withdraw, Sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would so request.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** In that context I am always happen to comply with rulings of the Chair, but I have no respect for the honourable member. Let me draw to the attention of the House and the member for Hart what the Public Finance Act provides in relation to this matter. The Act provides:

The President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of House of Assembly must no later than the first day after receiving the report under this section lay copies of the report before both Houses of Parliament. The Auditor-General is required to provide to the Presiding Officers before the 30th day of September each year his annual report.

That process took place, and I sought advice in relation to that matter. That is the advice which is tendered to all Presiding Officers—unbiased, professional, accurate advice. I accepted that advice. The President of the Legislative Council then determined that we should get a Crown Law opinion and that supported the course of action which we had already taken.

However, I determined that I should seek some outside advice in relation to this matter, so I sought some advice interstate and that confirmed the course of action we had taken. I would suggest to the member for Hart that he read the ruling that Speaker Betty Boothroyd gave at the time of the general election in the United Kingdom to see what she had to say in relation to a similar matter.

Let me say in relation to this political stunt put forward by the member for Hart that a few days before the last State election, in late afternoon I was walking along the corridor and along came the beaming member for Hart. In his usual flippant manner, he walked past and said, 'Don't take any notice about tabling that report; it's only a political stunt we are engaged in.' Therefore, the honourable member proved that he has no credibility and that he will say and do anything no matter what the cost.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Whenever you want to, mate, because I have lots of interesting things to relate. I have plenty on a number of people. This particular matter was nothing more than a crude political attempt to cast reflections on the Crown Solicitor and his or her officers and upon the professional advice tendered to all presiding officers, because they took no regard to the law and no regard to the practices that take place not only in this Parliament but also in other Parliaments around Australia and in the House of Commons. I believe that the member for Hart has again demonstrated to this House that he is a great exponent of hot air and when it comes to fact—

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

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I draw the attention of the House to issues concerning the current mismanagement of ETSA under the present Government and the way the events experienced by a couple in my electorate illustrate what is happening with the run down of Government bodies such as ETSA—our valuable public asset. On page 19 of the

Ombudsman's report tabled today he draws attention to the fact that complaints about ETSA have increased. The number of advice only complaints rose from 78 last year to 136 this year and the number of informal and formal complaints rose from 136 last year to 147 this year. The report also indicates that at least two others of those complaints have been about fluctuations in voltage, and that is the experience of Eric and Rosalene Swann of Brodie Road, Reynella. Mr and Mrs Swann were pleased this year in late June when the factory across the road from them was again occupied by a thriving small business. They welcome, as I do, small business in the electorate of Reynell.

However, they noticed quickly that their lights seemed to be suffering damage. The light globes kept on dimming. 'Something wrong with the light bulbs', they thought. Mr Swann went out and bought new bulbs and replaced them, and bought more lights and replaced them. 'This is terrible,' he thought, 'What is wrong with these globes? They are all defective. The lights are dimming.' Then they noticed that the vacuum cleaning had developed strange whirrs; the convection oven likewise was developing strange whirrs, and slowing down and speeding up.

Eventually they contacted ETSA and said that there seemed to be a problem with their power supply. ETSA sent out officers to install a volt metre, which confirmed their belief that something was happening to the power supply as the voltage was dropping dramatically between the hours in which the bakery supplies purchaser in the building across the road was operating.

ETSA decided that it was necessary to install a new transformer, despite the fact that the bakery had applied for ETSA approval before commencing operations. Grants Bakery was assured that the power supply was adequate. In about mid-July ETSA tried to commence the process of rectifying the deficiencies in the power supply in Brodie Road, Reynella. It was only at the beginning of the grievance debate today that I was advised that the transformer had finally been installed across the road—at about three o'clock today. In the meantime Mrs Swann had developed breast cancer. She underwent surgery and was advised that it was extremely important that she not get hot or sweaty, yet we had considerable hot weather in November, during which time the cooler that the Swanns had purchased could not function properly because the power supply during the day was not adequate for this purpose. We contacted the local media last week and as a result on Friday we were told that the problem would be fixed on Monday, yet it has taken until today to, hopefully, have the problem fixed.

That is one aspect of the problem. In the meantime Mrs Swann developed an infection in her wound—we cannot tell whether or the not that was due to the fact that she had not been able to keep cool as instructed by the doctor—and was readmitted to hospital. The Swanns are a retired couple. Preparatory to retirement they did as many older couples do: they bought a new fridge and freezer to see them through their old age. They had all appliances checked. They are now concerned, on the advice of their electrician, that these appliances have been damaged by the power surges they have effectively been experiencing over the past four months. ETSA has yet to admit that it has liability in such cases, despite the advice of Professor Allan Fells of the Competition Commission that power authorities in these circumstances do have liability. I sincerely hope that this Government is able to rectify the problems confronting ETSA at the moment and

to treat it again as a service to our community, business and consumers.

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

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I will raise several issues of concern to the electors of Fisher. The first relates to the Aberfoyle Park Kindergarten on Sunnymeade Drive. It was built years ago underneath the 133 000 kVa powerlines—not next door to them or near them but right under them. This has become a very difficult issue in my electorate, because the parents of the children at the kindergarten wanted action taken to have the kindergarten relocated. There is no danger—and the official study shows no danger—from electromagnetic radiation, but those powerlines are maintained: as part of the maintenance program, helicopters fly over the powerlines and members can appreciate that there is considerable danger when you have helicopters flying over powerlines of that voltage that are over the top of a kindergarten.

The Department for Education (and I notice that the Minister is in the House) is supportive of having the kindergarten relocated. Up until the middle of this year there was an understanding that ETSA would come to the party in helping with the relocation. I believe it should pick up almost the total cost of relocating that kindergarten to a more appropriate site. I urge the Minister responsible for ETSA to encourage that organisation to move quickly to remove the uncertainty about the future of the kindergarten so that parents can enrol their children there knowing that they will have an appropriate and new location. That uncertainty needs to be removed and I urge the Minister to move quickly in that regard.

The second matter concerns an issue that affected residents in Witton Street, Flagstaff Hill on Monday night. I was contacted at approximately 10 p.m. to be informed that, as a result of a sewer choke, raw sewage was back flushing through the house of one of the residents in that street and the people could not use any facilities. They contacted United Water, which said it was not the normal practice to come out at night to fix something like a blockage in the United Water sewer main. Consequently, the constituent rang me. I rang United Water and was told that it was reluctant to come out. It was put to me that staff were often threatened if working at night in easements and so on. I indicated strongly to the person from United Water that, if something did not happen quickly, something might hit the fan the following morning. In the case of these residents, fortunately late at night the matter was dealt with. I understand that that night alone something like eight sewer chokes occurred in the metropolitan area.

There are always two sides to a story, but once again I would urge that in his dealings with United Water the Minister responsible insist that they have appropriate staff available to address the issue of sewer chokes that occur after 5 p.m. It was ironic that the local plumber was in attendance, but he was not allowed to touch the sewer main where the blockage occurred, even though it was close to the house, despite the fact that he had the skills and equipment that could have unblocked that sewer. Perhaps United Water could have an arrangement with registered plumbers that in such circumstances they may deal with the problem.

The next matter concerns trees on arterial roads, and I know that in your former role, Mr Speaker, you were very supportive of greening the metropolitan area. My constituents use many arterial roads in Adelaide which are still as bare as

a baby's bottom. Some examples are parts of Marion Road, Diagonal Road and Daws Road West. I am pleased that the council for that area and other local councils will address that issue, but we often see that the adjacent residential streets are attractive, when the arterial roads are very bare and barren. I am strongly encouraging councils, not only the City of Marion but also others, to work in conjunction with the Department of Transport to ensure that trees are planted along arterial roads in appropriate locations. I was in Pretoria in June, and about 8 000 jacaranda trees were planted in that city, which looked magnificent.

---

#### **GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION (EXTENSION OF SUNSET CLAUSE) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 17.)

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** The Opposition supports this Bill. It makes only one change, amending a sunset clause allowing the Act to continue for another year to enable the review, which I understand is now under way, to be completed so that we can then consider appropriate amendments when the job has been done. I will make a couple of points in speaking to this measure, however. The Guardianship and Administration Act and the interdependent Mental Health Act 1993 came into operation on 6 March 1995.

We all know that some issues in the final passage of that Bill led to the sunset clause (clause 86) being inserted with the idea in mind that there would be a review to revisit some of the issues that had arisen during the debate and conference on the Bill. The sunset clause was inserted to ensure that a review occurred. We certainly supported that Act: it was the former Labor Government that introduced it. This South Australian Bill is unique in Australia in that it combines legal and health issues. Obviously it is a very important piece of legislation and one that we must get right. When the review is complete and the amendments come back I will look forward to debating them in this House.

I will put some issues on the record, and I would like some answers from the Minister on the record about the review that is being undertaken now. I understand that the review commenced early in 1997, and when I was given that briefing I questioned why we were at the point of having to extend the Act and why the review had not been able to get to the bottom of things in time. The person concerned mentioned to me that in order to undertake a review on a new Act you have to allow some time to pass so that you gain an understanding of it and any issues or problems become evident. He suggested that a number of complicated issues are under discussion in the review process and that is why things have not been wound up in time.

I understand that the review commenced early this year, that the group in question has met quite often—15 or 16 times—quite intensively and that a range of legislative issues will be addressed in a later amendment Bill, along with some operational issues. I would be pleased if the Minister could advise on some of those operational issues, because I would have hoped that some that have come up through the review could be dealt with as the review was proceeding.

I understand that some of the operational issues that have been raised include support for people who are attending meetings of the Guardianship Board; issues about inappropriate referrals to the Guardianship Board and the need for some sort of diversionary process enabling people to be referred on to a more appropriate officer; the need for mediation services and solutions rather than legal ones; and also some procedural failures. Those are the operational matters arising that have been mentioned to me, and I would be interested to know what has happened in relation to them. Finally, I would also like an indication from the Minister about when we can expect the review to be completed and the amendments to come down. Let us hope we are not back here moving yet another amendment to extend the provision for another 12 months. That being said, the Opposition supports the Bill.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** First, I thank the honourable member for her remarks. I think the best way of answering her questions about some of these operational issues is to read to her a paragraph from the letter that the President of the Guardianship Board sent to me on 20 November. The purpose of the letter was to ask for the Act to be extended for another 12 months, and it reads as follows:

In addition to the above I raise two other matters for your consideration. Firstly the legislative review has raised a number of operational matters which need to be addressed by both the Guardianship Board and the Office of the Public Advocate. These matters will be referred to in the review report which is currently being finalised. I believe that it would be helpful if we could begin the task of dealing with these issues earlier rather than later. Options have been suggested for addressing the operational matters. No decision had been made by your predecessor about this matter. I believe that it would be helpful if you could meet with Randall Barry and myself for a short discussion to resolve how you wish the matter to progress. I also raise with you the question of a possible limited internal fine-tuning of the Mental Health Act 1993. I believe that a number of technical and policy matters should be addressed.

I read that out because it clearly indicates that they are still finalising the report to me on operational matters. I have not yet received that report, but they want to discuss those matters with me. The honourable member has asked why 12 months is necessary: when you have been in Government you realise that the process of preparing legislation and putting it through the Parliament takes approximately six months and perhaps as long as nine months, once you know what you want to put in that legislation. Even by deferring it for 12 months I think we will be struggling to get this matter finalised before the budget session of Parliament next year, and there is a possibility it may have to spill over into the September-October sitting of next year. That is why it is necessary to extend for 12 months.

I assure the honourable member that shortly I will meet with the President of the Guardianship Board, and once I have received the report I will look at those operational issues ahead of a possible new Act so that we can put those matters into effect as quickly as possible. I thank the honourable member for her comments on the Bill and her support of it. It is a fairly routine procedure simply to extend the existing Bill by a further 12 months. I urge all members to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

(Continued from page 90.)

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** It gives me great pleasure to contribute to the Address in Reply debate as the member for Unley. The time which has elapsed between a Liberal member holding the seat of Unley for two consecutive parliamentary terms is about the same length of time since the Liberal Party has held the Treasury benches in this place for two consecutive terms.

I have listened with interest to the contributions to this debate. I sincerely wish to congratulate my new colleagues on both sides of the House for their well prepared, thoughtful and sometimes challenging contribution. If they continue as they have begun, to think through their problems, to make a genuine commitment to be constructive and to engage their mind before their mouth, this Forty-Ninth Parliament will discharge its duties well to the people of South Australia.

However, unfortunately, the Opposition has not rid itself of the brass section of its orchestra. When it comes to sounding brass and clanging cymbals, the member for Hart tried to demonstrate during his pre-lunch diatribe that South Australians should once again believe that they really are inhabitants of the land of Oz. He is obviously one of the few who have failed to learn the lessons of the last election. He seeks to instruct members on the Government benches in lessons which quite clearly he himself has yet to learn—and the greatest of those is humility. For one who would hold himself out to the people of South Australia as being capable of controlling this State's finances, he has yet to learn even elementary arithmetic. If he were here, I would ask him to look across the Chamber and to count. Even counting by conventional means—that is, by using his fingers and toes and whatever other parts of his body he cares to use—he will find that on this side of the House there are 23 Liberal members and three Independents—

**Mr Evans:** One is a National.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I count anyone who is on the conservative side of politics and not a Liberal to be independent from the Liberal Party. There are three Independents who, both according to the seating arrangements and their contribution thus far, seem to be absolutely committed to effective and stable government in South Australia. I do not say that lightly. I realise that one of the Independents is a member of the National Party, but the National Party is not the Liberal Party. The honourable member herself has made that point on a number of occasions. She may be conservative, she may belong to a Party with which traditionally the Liberal Party is in coalition, but she is simply not a Liberal. Therefore, from a Liberal point of view she is independent.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I hope the member for Peake is somewhat independent of mind, because if he just follows the mindless claptrap and diatribe in which his Party generally indulges he might have a somewhat shorter career than he would have if he followed his intelligence. Hopefully to the benefit of this institution I acknowledge that the last depressing four years of gazing across the abyss and hearing nothing but the wailing and gnashing of teeth coming out of the pit opposite appears to have diminished somewhat at least and that in the new members there appears to be a glimmer of light on the hill, but that remains to be seen.

*Mr Snelling interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The honourable member opposite says, 'Wait and see with the dental technicians Bill'. Indeed, we will. For the benefit of all members, one thing I have learnt is that it can be a great danger in this place to come in—as I freely admit I have—and think you know the answers to a lot of questions, but then the debate takes place and you suddenly realise that all those things which you were convinced were black and white have got all sorts of parameters and shades of grey and other points of view of which you were not aware. I mean that constructively. Anyone who has been through any of the moral debates in this Parliament would know that they are neither easy nor black and white. The only thing that can be guaranteed is that, no matter how much you try to exercise the best of your ability and due diligence, you will upset a lot of people who, for very good reasons, do not agree with you, especially regarding issues where there is no right or wrong.

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes. Therefore, it is sometimes a very good idea to be cautious. Far from being shell-shocked, as the member for Hart said of us, I believe that every member of the Government is looking forward to the challenge of taking this State into the next millennium. As I have stated previously, judging from the impressive comments of some of the new members, this Parliament should work cooperatively. For instance, the member for Kaurna said that the difference between the rich and the poor is greater than it has ever been. It is a pity that his predecessors in this place did not realise this. They subjected our hospitals, roads and schools to 30 years of continual neglect.

I listened with interest and some sympathy to some of the new members opposite as they pleaded over the past two days for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am quite sure that no member on this side of the House would not acknowledge the needs of our hospitals. It is a matter of how quickly we can get on with the job. However, I would say with collegiate responsibility to the members opposite that had there not been 30 years of neglect preceding the past four years the situation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital might well have been different.

While it is best to put the past behind us, we should not forget that, while that gap between the rich and the poor has been ever growing, there were people in this State who were most pleased to invest in South African goats, New Zealand forests and plywood cars rather than roads, transportation, hospitals and other things that were to the benefit of South Australia. When they came closer to home, sure, they invested in this State: they built edifices that cost just over, I believe, \$1 billion, that made some workers very happy.

I met someone whom I had known years ago—in fact, I taught him—standing outside the Myer-Remm Centre and I said to him, 'Why are you working here Greg? You are normally up on the mining sites all around the north-west of Australia, where you can earn a lot of money.' He said, 'This is the best site in Australia.' I said, 'What do you mean? You do not drive the big terrexes down here?' He said, 'No, I am a tradesman's labourer.' I said, 'What does that mean?' He said, 'I carry the box from one floor to another and I can take home on this job more money than I can on any mining site in Australia.' He was working in his home State, so I am sure that he was very happy and prosperous. I wish him nothing but good luck. However, that was not building roads, repairing schools or helping hospitals. I do not know that he has really benefited in the long run, in any case. A lot of

money was poured down the drain and wasted on that development, and it is to no-one's credit at all. I do not say that in terms of pointing the finger. I say that constructively to the Opposition in the spirit of acknowledging that there has been waste and that there is a difficult task ahead.

The Opposition can either do as Oppositions traditionally do, which is nark, carp and criticise—and I am not saying that it should never do any of that—or it can look at the problems. I am saying that there is another thing that it can do, which is look constructively at what this State has ahead of it and try to work cooperatively, as the Leader of the Opposition has said repeatedly (the words are right: whether the actions are, four years will test) to achieve good outcomes for this State. This Government is not sitting on this side of the House just because it wants what goes with being in Government—enjoyable though that might be. We are sitting on this side of the House because we want to try to do our best for this State.

I am honest enough to acknowledge that those sitting opposite probably want to sit on this side of the House one day so that they can try to do what is best for this State. If I give them that credit, they should at least give the Ministers and all members of the Government the same credit—and then on with the constructive criticism and then on with picking on that which needs to be picked on in a constructive way. Perhaps we would all be a little more highly regarded if there were a few less cheap shots and a little more of getting on with the job and intellectual capacity in this place, rather than smart tricks.

Returning to the Myer-Remm project, I believe that a builder's labourer on the Myer-Remm site at its height was taking home \$1 500 a week. Members in this Chamber who go to a lot of trouble, put in a lot of hours and really work hard on behalf of their constituents to become members in this place take home nothing like that. If it was a fair day's work for a fair remuneration, I believe that that wage may, by any stretch of the imagination, have come in the slightly excessive bracket.

I note the member for Kaurna said that he was most interested in education. I acknowledge the member for Kaurna's long and dedicated career in education. He said he was particularly interested in that sphere. I remind the member for Kaurna quite seriously that it has been under a succession of Labor Governments, basically dating from Whitlam's great experiment with education, that the children of middle and upper class parents have increasingly squeezed from our universities and tertiary institutions children from isolated and disadvantaged backgrounds. People from disadvantaged backgrounds—such as the suburbs that many of you have the privilege to represent—and the isolated children of this State are increasingly not represented in our universities.

I do not stand here saying that I know the answers: I do not believe that anybody in this country does. In fairness to Whitlam, he said that the solution to increasing educational opportunity was free universities. Clearly, that experiment has not worked. If participation of disadvantaged people was, as he stated, his criterion, that experiment has not worked. I do not want to be misquoted as saying that I now advocate full fee-paying universities. I do not know what the answer is. I know that the experiment, which was probably started in good conscience and for the best of reasons, has not worked, so it is time to look at different forms.

What those forms are, I do not know. Hopefully, the new Minister for Education, with his broad responsibilities for education, can continue, as he has started, to look at some of



those problems. It is not his problem alone. It is a problem which requires the attention of this whole House, and which would require the combined efforts of this House in terms of all political Parties going to their colleagues and mates in Canberra and saying, 'Let us give some proper attention to this. We think that this might work if we can come up with a proposition.' It is the sort of thing that together we can do, but on our own we cannot achieve a thing.

I was particularly heartened by the lucid maiden contribution to this Chamber by the member for Waite. I particularly noted his comments on future Governments of Australia. It is a point of view which, as a fifth generation South Australian, I can find little with which to disagree. In passing, however, I would like to make the following contribution. I believe that the previous Prime Minister, Mr Keating—again possibly for his own good reasons—has gypped the people of Australia. If there is a need for the people of this country to evolve new forms so that this country can take a new place in the world, the first question which I believe should be debated in all the fora of this nation, in the Parliaments, the service clubs and everywhere else, is the appropriate one for a comparatively new nation: what is the appropriate form of Government?

A republic is undoubtedly one answer. But many, including me, would argue that a republic still has all the hallmarks of monarchy, albeit an elected monarchy—an elected form like a monarchy, not a bred one—and it is a little bit like shuffling the deck chairs on the *Titanic*. If you are going to move from a hereditary monarch to something like a monarchical organisation but you elect it, what is the difference? I remind the House that the founding fathers of this nation deliberately styled the confederation of States 'the Commonwealth of Australia', and they did so fully mindful of the fact that Cromwell's United Kingdom was styled 'the Commonwealth'.

Historically, the word 'Commonwealth' was chosen by the founding fathers deliberately because Cromwell styled the United Kingdom 'the Commonwealth'. Members would be aware that, for those 30 years, the United Kingdom did not have a head of state. The arguments for a head of state which are often put forward are that the head of state embodies the separation of powers and that, because we have a head of state, a president or a queen or a king, no member of Parliament, no leader in a House, can usurp the role of the judiciary, the armed forces or the policing forces. It stops the concept in a democracy of a totalitarian State. Yet, for 30 years the United Kingdom supposedly functioned without a head of state. It embodied the separation of powers in its various institutions rather than in the institution of monarchy.

While I do not put that forward as the final solution for Australia, what I do say is that this is a unique country, a country that is the synthesis of nearly all the nations of the world, a country that can and should develop its own proud traditions. If we have one to this point, it is the tradition of egalitarianism, the almost fetish that we have for cutting down the tall poppies. New members need look no further than the fallen leaders in this place. The greatest sport in this place, on both sides of the Chamber, is hurling abuse at the poor guy who lost last because he was once a tall poppy. Once you have cut him down, he is the butt of everybody's derision.

That practice in this Chamber is no different from the practice all over Australia, if that is the nature of our country. If the nature of our country is to be egalitarian, surely we should look at a form of structure for our institutions which

as far as possible reflects the egalitarian nature of this country. I would therefore put to members that, if that is the case, perhaps we do not need some poppit at the top to embody all things Australian. Perhaps the thing that embodies Australia is that we are Australians and we need no head of state to run our country.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith asks whether it is a philosophy I follow. I have sometimes been accused of being a maverick, but generally I do believe that political Parties, without somebody leading them, tend to be rather directionless, because politicians generally do have strong opinions and, when there are 32 different opinions, you need a bit of leadership and guidance to get everyone heading in the one direction at the one time. The last election was a very good result for the Government. A Liberal Government has for the first time—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Ross Smith laughs. I say again to the honourable member: look to this side of the House and count the numbers.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The honourable member seems to feel that the strength of a Government is in the size of its majority. I point out to him that the strength of a Government is in the calibre of its members, and I repeat—

**Mr Clarke:** That is why I laugh!

**Mr BRINDAL:** I repeat that the result was good for the Government. We lost some very good members; we gained some very good people; and we still have a good working majority. Members on this side of the House will probably have to work harder because of the increase in the number of members opposite. However, if the Government is forced to work harder by virtue of the diligence of the Opposition, I believe that that will make for good government in this State. I am mindful of the fact that, unlike the member for Ross Smith, who entered Parliament at the previous election, I was elected when his own Party formed a minority Government. For four years it could govern only by the good graces of the member for Elizabeth and the then Speaker, Mr Peterson. They were exceptionally—

*Mr Scalzi interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** And the member for Hartley. That was latterly. He saw the error of his ways and left the fold and then came back. You could never work out quite where the Hon. Mr Groom was, even though he might have been a good member. Anyone who was in the Chamber at the time would know that it was a very good Government—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** —in terms of working within the Parliament. It had to work within the Parliament. It had to use the forms of the Parliament. It had to listen to the Opposition, because of the numbers on the Opposition side, and it had to listen to the Independents. In that sense it was more a good Parliament than a good Government, but it was a good institution. This was a good institution in which to work by dint of the numbers.

I want to complete the few minutes available to me by speaking to new members especially about everything not being what it seems. Members would realise that for the first time we have an Independent from a different Party from the usual three that we have in another place. There is the Hon. Mr Xenophon from the anti-pokies Party. We read almost daily in our local press of the inherent evils of pokies. I should inform this House, for those who do not know, that I

voted against the introduction of poker machines, and for reasons which I explained to the House at the time.

However, I have always tried to be fair, and I will share this information with the House. In my electorate in Goodwood, there is an exceptionally good organisation, Goodwood Community Services. Members would know that, while Unley is in many ways a very affluent and well heeled electorate—

*Mr Evans interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** There are certainly many heels in Unley. Some of the best minds in the Labor Party are in Unley, and I place them in that category. Seriously, members would know that there are some other parts of Unley not as advantaged as other suburbs, and Goodwood Community Services has for many years provided an excellent service to those who need it, especially around the Goodwood area. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the work of my predecessor, Kym Mayes, in helping them get going. They have survived him and they have survived me and they are still there.

I received a phone call from them yesterday, because they have just received a National Australia Bank national award for health, welfare and community service and, even better, a cheque for \$17 000 that goes with it. I spoke to the coordinator and asked her, 'What are you going to do?' She said, 'What do you mean?' I said, 'Well, you normally come to me for grants for \$1 000 or \$2 000.' All members would understand how wonderful these community service organisations are; they eke out an existence from hand to mouth, stretch their money and work in \$1 000 and \$2 000 amounts. However, they are to receive a cheque for \$17 000. She said, 'I don't know; we have never had so much money.'

They received the award for their Endeavour program. I am sure all members would be interested in this, because the Endeavour program helps families at risk. Various government, welfare and church agencies identify families who are in crisis or at risk. The Endeavour program takes them away for five days, puts them in a camping sort of situation and helps them to modify the family by providing assistance, counselling and so on. The program has worked so well that, whereas Community Services was thinking of placing some children in care, mum and the kids went away on the program and, as a result, the threat of placement was completely removed. It is a successful program, between Government and non-government agencies, which uses volunteers.

The Endeavour program received a national award for excellence in volunteer management and for its assistance to the community. All members of the House would applaud that sort of initiative. The interesting thing is that the seeding money and ongoing money for that program flows from Community Benefit SA which, as members opposite probably realise, receives funding from revenue raised through poker machines. Here we have a good initiative which has received national recognition and which, I would suspect, has been possible only because there is some additional and flexible money flowing through the system to try to help such organisations. I am not sure, but I doubt in the current economic climate in this State, whether any Government—Labor or Liberal—would have that sort of seeding money available in its general recurrent revenue sources.

While I am not a major advocate for pokies in South Australia—nor will I ever be—I am saying that everything is not as bad as would be painted in the *Advertiser*. In that context, I would urge members to look behind the headlines and things like the statement by a very prominent car dealer in this State who supposedly went broke because of the

pokies and ask a few questions around this town. It might not have been only the pokies that were the cause of his demise.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The honourable member opposite seems to indicate that he rode to his doom—I presume on a chariot! The matter on which I would like to conclude is something which members who have served in this Chamber for more than a term would know is very dear to my heart, and I refer to the Goodwood Orphanage.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** No, quite the contrary. The member for Ross Smith says that it almost cost me my seat. I would pay considerable credit to the previous Minister for Education and Children's Services and the Premier for their wisdom and the sageness of their advice and their support. I would say straight out in this Chamber that, rather than almost costing me my seat, I think it got me votes.

In the end, I was enabled, because there was a controversy and because I took a point of view, to do what I am sure you, every other member opposite and I hope every member on this side would do, that is, when there is a conflict between your community and your Government, you take the community's side. It is as simple as that: you stick up for your community. It may well be that at the beginning I did not like the conflict but in the end, because it was resolved, it was a matter which did not do me any harm at all in the ballot box.

However, the City of Unley complained to the Ombudsman about this matter and the Ombudsman actually reports on it in the report tabled in the House today. The council took up a number of issues with the Ombudsman and I would like to read to the House his conclusion. As to the matter being improperly resolved, the Ombudsman said:

The arrangement with the potential purchaser only came about because there was a proposal which was of benefit to the potential purchaser and the department. On this basis there was no need to declare the land surplus.

On a second point of contention that there was an agreement with the Catholic Archdiocese, the Ombudsman concluded:

The department was able to produce a letter from the Catholic Archdiocese indicating that the Catholic Church held no opinion on the future use of the land. Accordingly, I held the opinion that this basis of the complaint had no substance.

Finally, on the matter of valuation, the Ombudsman concluded:

My investigation revealed that the Valuer-General's Office had made a proper valuation of the land and that the price accorded with that valuation.

Therefore, the Government acted with honour and integrity on this matter, and I thank it for its consideration of my views as the member.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Chair notes that the member for Hanson made a small contribution to a question this morning and that technically her contribution this afternoon may not be her first in the House but I would ask that all members give her the courtesy afforded to a member making a maiden speech. The honourable member for Hanson.

**Ms KEY (Hanson):** First, I join with other members in the House, Sir, in offering my congratulations to you as Speaker. I have had the privilege of working with you before when you were the Minister for Housing and I was on the Housing Trust Board and I appreciated your guidance, listening skills and general understanding of the area during

that time, and I would like to put that on the record. Also, I would like to congratulate my colleagues for their marvellous win, particularly the members for Elder, Reynell, Mitchell, Lee, Wright, Norwood, Peake, Florey, Giles and Playford, and I particularly note the number of women who are now on this side of the House. I also offer congratulations to my Labor Party colleagues in the Upper House. I must say that over the past few days I have just started to appreciate the tremendous effort by the previous Labor team both in this Chamber and the Upper House and I pay a special tribute to the shadow Ministers and to our Leader, Mike Rann.

I am honoured to represent the people of Hanson, because I believe that the electorate of Hanson is made up of people who are battlers and who are just trying to make a reasonable life for themselves. I also appreciate the way in which, since I first became the candidate and now the member, I have been welcomed into that community.

I am pleased to note also that the electorate of Hanson is named after Sir Richard Hanson, who was one of the early colonial Premiers (1857 to 1860) and who was one of the people responsible for drafting the first Constitution. It is important to note how the seat was named because, as I was door-knocking during the election campaign, many people were concerned that I was in some way connected to another person called 'Hanson' and that the views of that person might be my own. I can say for the record that I probably hold the totally opposite point of view to that person, especially with regard to culture and race, because I recognise the celebration of diversity in our society.

I would like to talk a little about Hanson itself because, unlike the district of some new members who have already spoken, the electorate of Hanson is a young electorate. Australian Bureau of Statistics census figures indicate that the electorate has a population of 29 382 people. The average age in the electorate is 35 years and people aged 20 to 24 years make up 10.6 per cent of the electorate. This is particularly interesting to me, as I now hold the shadow portfolio of youth affairs. We have a fairly high marital status in the area: 46 per cent of the electorate are married, mainly people 25 years and over. Another interesting demographic fact is that 71 per cent of the electorate of Hanson were born in Australia but at least 4.6 per cent were born in Greece and 3 per cent in Italy.

The most prominent language used by people in the electorate of Hanson is English, but Greek is the second most spoken language at home followed by Italian. It has certainly been obvious to me from the door-knocking that I have done and from meeting people in the electorate while campaigning that the Greek and Italian communities are very strong in Hanson and contribute greatly to the rich fabric of the Hanson community. Sadly, though, many of the people in Hanson are unemployed, particularly young people in Hanson between the ages of 15 and 19 years. We have an unemployment rate—people who have actually registered for unemployment—of 23 or 24 per cent. For 20 to 24 year olds, we have an unemployment rate of nearly 19 per cent. This is of great concern not only to the people who are seeking employment but also to the parents and families who are now having to support children right through to their mid-20s because they are unable to gain paid work.

It is also interesting to note that in Hanson many people do have a mortgage: 40 per cent of the electorate own their house or are paying a mortgage, and 33 per cent are renting a house. So, there are a number of people in the rental market in our area. The average household income is \$20 000-\$25 000 and people who are buying their house have

an average monthly housing loan repayment of \$476 to \$550 per month. When looking in the rental market I have not seen it myself, but I understand that the average rent is between \$78 to \$107. For people who are unemployed or relying on a social or very low wage it is obviously not cheap to live in Hanson.

One thing that my predecessor Stuart Leggett was known to say—he certainly said it in a number of forums that I was at with him—was that, 'The west is the best.' As much as I agree with that principle—and I am sure some of my colleagues would agree with that comment—we still have a long way to go.

A number of issues have been raised by local people and I see this as the charter that I need to follow while working in the electorate of Hanson. Obviously, jobs are a big issue and, as I said, because of the high unemployment rate it is an area that will need a lot of work to ensure that people get into paid employment.

Another issue on which we have spent time in this House is the environment. The electorate of Hanson has the airport right in its middle; we have West Beach; and we also have on the eastern border Railway Terrace at Mile End. As well we have considerable problems with traffic and access to facilities.

A number of people from non-English speaking backgrounds to whom I have spoken and who come from South-East Asia have said that they have suffered from racism and victimisation within the community. A number of people I have talked to in the areas of Kurralta Park and Camden Park in particular have complained about the racist attitude of some neighbours and some people in the local shopping centres.

As I said earlier, the issue of 'Hanson' being the name of the electorate and what it stands for was raised by those people with me and was seen as a great issue. Most days, I wear the orange ribbon which I know a number of other members of this House have also chosen to wear and which signifies that we should celebrate cultural diversity. I also know that a number of members participated in demonstrations and peaceful marches which took place in front of the Adelaide City Council and which celebrated diversity and signified that we did not support discrimination against people on the basis of their race. I am pleased to say that a number of people in the Hanson electorate have been, and will continue to be, part of those campaigns.

Other issues have been raised and I see them as part of the charter I need to work for as the local member; those issues include health and education (what I call 'core' issues), along with jobs, child care provisions, decent health care, particularly community health care, and ensuring that people have an opportunity to have decent living conditions.

A number of suburbs are in the electorate of Hanson, including Cowandilla, Mile End, Glandore, Camden Park, Brooklyn Park, West Richmond, Hilton, Richmond, Kurralta Park, Netley, Plympton Park, Plympton South, Ashford and Keswick, and it includes West Beach Caravan Park, although not too many constituents actually live there—six, if I remember correctly—West Beach Trust and Adelaide Airport. There are a number of very important suburbs where workers and people who are battlers live and are looking for proper representation. My commitment is to ensure that those people do get the representation for which they are looking.

It is also important to note the number of industries in Hanson, including a transport centre. Having come from the Transport Workers Union, I am aware of industries and

workers in that area. The airport provides an enormous amount of employment for people living in the area. The district also includes State printing and other printing facilities, light industry, and textile, clothing and footwear. Members may not be aware that there is also a big community of artists, actors, painters, jewellery makers and sculptors, and they have already been lobbying me about ensuring that people in the arts are actually recognised as an industry.

I would also like to mention the portfolios for which I have been made responsible—industrial affairs, youth affairs, and also assisting in multicultural and ethnic affairs. I did not ask, but I could not have asked for better portfolios. I am pleased to be working in those areas, despite the lack of resources available to me as a shadow Minister. I am concerned on a number of levels with the ‘blaming the victim’ mentality which seems to be prevalent in the community and which is reflected in our media. Certainly a number of my conservative colleagues on the other side—I would not say all of them—‘blame the victim’. They say that, if there is a problem, if there is high unemployment or youth employment, it must be young people’s fault, or, if there are issues in the workplace, it must be the union’s fault or the workers’ fault.

Having been here only three days, I am amazed that already I have heard a number of negative comments about trade unions. There seems to be a total lack of understanding about what unions actually do. It is obvious that people do not realise that most unions, certainly those with which I have been involved, are extremely democratic. Their leaders are elected on a regular basis, similar to the cycle under which we are elected, every three to four years. If people do not like what the union is doing, they have an opportunity to get involved with the activities of that union (as with other organisations) to make a change.

The comments which have been made show a lack of understanding about how unions work. Of course, some unions do have a strict and undemocratic way of doing some of their work but, as I said, there is always an opportunity to take action or to take up issues with the trade union if one does have a grievance. It is also forgotten that trade unions work in this community. As a trade unionist since I was 15 years old, I have had the opportunity through the trade unions with which I have been involved—the Clerks Union and the Transport Workers Union—to lobby for major changes in this State.

I would like to refer to the equal opportunity legislation in this State. Being a trade union person, I had an opportunity through that forum to be involved with the drafting of the Equal Opportunities Act—to make a contribution as an advocate in the community and, as a person who had a good understanding of equal opportunities, to suggest what would be appropriate as far as changes were concerned. Most members would agree that this State’s Equal Opportunities Act has led the way in this country and that it has been mirrored by other States and Territories in their legislation. That is just one example.

Trade unionists also work on a number of issues for people in the community, sometimes not directly related to the paid work force but in most cases trying to ensure that the wages and conditions of their members are protected, and that the members and their families have a reasonable standard of living. I take great exception to there being only negative comments made in this House about trade unions, and I will continue to point out the positive work that trade unions do

as community organisations involved with other community organisations and also the great changes that they have made over the years to improve the living conditions of people in this State and this nation.

In relation to the ‘blame the victim’ mentality, I would like someone to answer the following question for me at some stage: why is it the workers’ fault that so many workers die annually in Australia as a result of health and safety mismanagement? I understand that about 2 700 workers die annually as a result of health and safety mismanagement. I did not make up this figure: it came from the Industry Commission Work, Health and Safety Report No. 47 (1995).

I would also like to know why it is now considered uncool to actually argue against people’s being discriminated against. I do not think any member should support discrimination against another group of people, especially when it is based on gender, ethnic or cultural origin, religion, race, sexuality, political persuasion, ability or disability. It is important that members of this House ensure that progressive legislation is kept up to ensure that we protect these rights. This is one of the issues about which I will continue to campaign. I know from my colleagues on this side that people do have what has become popularly known as ‘the fair go’, whether in the work place, at home or in public to make sure that they are not discriminated against.

My last point is that, despite being labelled by the Liberal Party in some of its election material put out during the State election as a feminist, trade unionist, socialist and environmentalist—these were considered to be shameful things or things for which I should be criticised—when I spoke to the people at whom the material was directed—some of the little old ladies in Housing Trust homes and some of the people in the Greek community who did not speak a lot of English—and they asked whether these things were true, my answer was, ‘Yes, they are true,’ and they said, ‘Good on you. I really reject the fact that the Liberals are using this as some sort of criticism of you.’ They would say, ‘I do not agree with all those things they say but, in the main, at least we know where we stand with you and we know that, if you do hold those beliefs, you will be an advocate and a representative for us.’

That was a positive exercise in campaigning, and I am proud to say that I am all of those things. In closing, I take this opportunity to thank my campaign committee, in particular Steve Georganis, who was my Campaign Manager, and the Hanson sub-branch. The Party office and the shadow ministry particularly helped me in my campaign. I put on record my thanks to Caroline Pickles, Mike Rann and Anne Levy who helped me, particularly with doorknocking and meeting people in the community. Most of the people we met were impressed to meet Caroline, Anne and Mike and are still talking about it, so we will have to make sure they come back.

I pay tribute to Senator Nick Bolkus, who supported me in the campaign, Emily’s List and, in particular, Joan Kirner, who was not only of great support on political issues but also a great supporter emotionally. I publicly thank her for that. My husband, Kevin Purse and my family—the Key and Purse families—gave me tremendous support during the campaign. Other than my husband, most of them had never been involved in a political campaign before but certainly showed that they had the translatable skills and rose to the occasion. A number of friends also helped me in the campaign. I now have two people from the campaign working in my office—Manuel Chrissan and Michael Subacios—who did a fabulous

job during the campaign and are continuing to do so in my office. I thank them for that.

A number of people who helped me in the campaign were not Labor Party supporters in the past. As some Independents said in their first speeches, such people supported me because they supported my politics and my political point of view. Some of them have now joined the Labor Party, I am pleased to say. They have seen the error of their ways and have decided to join the Labor Party. Cheryl Kernot certainly helped. Support came from people who hold dear the principles of equal opportunity and of not discriminating against people—classes of people—involving all the issues I mentioned before, and also because of their view of community organisations and trade unions as being important. That sort of support from those people, along with all the people I named before, got me over the line. I am pleased that I won. I will take this job seriously over the next four years. I intend to ensure that I stick to the charter as outlined and, where possible, contribute to major changes in this State so that we have a better place to live.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** It is awkward and difficult for us to get used to a change of name. I invite members in the Chamber to contemplate what it would be like if their names, by which they have been known from birth, were suddenly to change and they were to be addressed by some other name forthwith, never again using the name by which they are known presently. I am talking not of their electorate names but their personal names. It has the same effect when the name of the electorate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask members on my left who are leaving the Chamber to do so quietly.

**Mr LEWIS:** The electorate that I have the honour and responsibility to represent in this place has had its name changed four times in the time I have been here, starting out as 'Mallee'. There was confusion between Peter Fisher and myself, he being the Federal member for Mallee and my neighbour across the Victorian border. On regional radio we were often quoted as, 'Peter said. . .' and 'The member for Mallee said', and so on. People did not know who was being quoted in the news item. He was a member of the National Party. For better or worse sometimes it worked in my favour and other times to my disadvantage.

'Murray Mallee' seemed a more appropriate name and described the area of the State and continent in which the electorate is located. Ridley was appropriate in the context that it is a cereal growing area and Ridley was the first of a number of inventors in South Australia who have become internationally and historically famous for what they have contributed to the wealth and welfare of this society. I did not mind that too much. I do not even mind the name of the electorate of Hammond now, but the Ngarrindjeri people hate it. They are spewing about it. The Electoral Commission, in trying to be politically correct, got it absolutely 100 per cent dead wrong, because Ruby Hammond was descendent in part from people who were of Aboriginal extraction. As far as I know, she is third generation at least of the desert area of South Australia, none of whom knew anything about or had ever had any contact with the Ngarrindjeri people, who are the most substantial part of the groups of tribes who were in the electorate that I represent prior to European settlement.

They resent having the electorate in which they live named after an Aboriginal person who is in no way connected to their forbears or any of their cultural roots. Poor Ruby, rest

her soul, in her earlier life, for reasons obvious to all of us, denied the fact that she was in any way related to Aboriginal people, but in later life acknowledged it and worked hard for those who were disadvantaged and came from the same ethnic background, regardless of which tribe they may have descended from. She worked hard in Port Adelaide, and it may have been appropriate for them to change the name of Hart to Hammond rather than my district had they wanted to name an electorate after a prominent Aboriginal woman. Hammond the town and Hammond the council were in the north of the State and not anywhere near the area I represent.

Having made that point, I go on and say that the composition of this Chamber and the way in which the boundaries are drawn I hope is done on a better basis this time around than last time.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Maybe so, and I do not quarrel with the member for Spence on that point. The commissioners can do better than they did previously in that respect and can do better in the way in which they attempt to strike the balance of population. The 10 safest Labor seats prior to the last election were substantially under quota in total, whereas the safest 10 Liberal seats were not only over quota but huge in area. There is a natural disadvantage in being able to reach one's constituents during the course of a campaign if you seek to be elected to represent one of those larger seats, regardless of your Party affiliations. It was therefore quite wrong of them to have presumed that they could get it right: they got it dead wrong. In fact, the districts of Gordon and MacKillop were substantially above quota at the election and way out of kilter in that regard. Had it not been for the redrawing of the boundaries that we suggested in response to the draft, the electorate of Hammond would have also been above quota.

To the Parliament itself, I worry about the future of this place and worry about the future of the Federation. I have a strong commitment to the structure of Government we enjoy on this continent as human beings in a multicultural society—a very strong commitment.

I see the successful campaigns being waged by elements of the Left to destroy that system of government, to get rid of the Federation and to replace it with a unicameral Parliament in Canberra and regional administrations that are elected to make regulation under the statute law provided by that unicameral Parliament. That will be a joke. It will be the kind of Government which brought a mighty nation (in terms of the natural resources available to it) and the confederation around that nation to their knees in abject poverty. I refer to the Republic of Russia and the United Soviet Socialist Republics, which were the satellites around it. That excludes the Warsaw Pact countries, which were also governed by exactly the same system, where one constitutional supreme soviet makes the law and regional and subregional soviets or councils administer the law within a framework of regulation, which is then approved by central bureaucrats who are all members of the Party in Government. In that instance they were the Communist Party. That is the kind of modern Stalinist model that still exists in Korea. If that is the model of the kind of successful society that members of the Left really want, then I invite them to go to Korea now and see just how—

**Mr Atkinson:** North Korea.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am talking about North Korea; I thank the member for Spence for reminding me of that point. It is not the Republic of Korea about which I speak: it is the North.

Thousands of people are dying daily, and the numbers are increasing as we go into the northern winter. To deny it is the case is ridiculous. They are all brainwashed; radio transmissions from outside are jammed by expensive equipment while the population at large is starving. The food they have been able to grow with the meagre resources at their disposal is confiscated from them by the army and provided to the most senior Party officials in Pyongyang for their sustenance and comfort—and that includes the senior officers of the army. Of course, the troops are well fed, even if the diet is dull and uninteresting. They are nonetheless strong and healthy enough to put down any insurgency there may be. I dare say that that regime will collapse in fairly short order.

I do not want that system of Government here in Australia. Any idiot in this place or elsewhere in this country who believes that is the way forward ought to go and visit such countries and do a little study of what happened in the USSR, before they attempt to inflict their wish on all of us. Yet, I see a substantial proportion of the people who were driving the debate about a republic in this country being committed to doing so on the basis that it would enable them to get the public of Australia to accept the notion of constitutional amendment and then do away with the notion of the head of State being separate from and independent of the head of Government, and that of the separation of powers between the Parliament and the courts. To my mind, that is very dangerous and will result in some very unfortunate consequences for all of us.

At this moment I am saying that the republic is a bad thing in prospect. The Parliaments of Australia are in the main bicameral and have served their communities very well over the past 100 years of Federation. They served the communities for which they made the laws extremely well prior to that, and they are models for legislating and administering the affairs of society and providing for the release of political pressure through the organs that they contain in ways which are best illustrated by the decisions, for instance, in the United Kingdom now to establish regionally constituted separate legislatures in Scotland, Ireland and Wales.

**Mr Atkinson:** Not in Ireland.

**Mr LEWIS:** The proposition has been made; it has not happened yet, and until the peace can be established it is not appropriate to do so.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Notwithstanding the member for Spence's interjection, I have to say I agree with him. They will be better served. In any case, I have not seen this system of Government bettered anywhere. While we have this system of Government we will never have a Watergate. The devolution of power makes it impossible for anybody to get such control of the essential services to sustain the democracy and bastardise their function, whilst we have what we have in this country; whereas in America and countries based on the American model that can happen and will no doubt happen again.

Whilst I am talking about those matters, having made the point about my concern for this Parliament, let me say that I am still a very strong supporter of the notion of diversity within our culture. As part of this great multicultural nation, South Australia probably leads the way in that we have fewer types of ghettos here than you will find in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane or Perth. We are less likely to get the development of ghettos in South Australia. Australia overall has less ghettos than you will find in societies that have

diverse racial or cultural backgrounds, such as Canada or the United States.

**Mr Atkinson:** Fewer.

**Mr LEWIS:** It can be either. I will correct the member for Spence; less in number.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Whatever the case, I am saying 'less', because an amount represents some gravity. I have seen the effects of ghettos and the tensions that arise between them, and they are not tensions between WASPs (white Anglo-Saxon protestants) and some other ethnic group but rather between different ethnic groups. It is tribal, and it is not just dangerous: it is deadly. It boils over and results in murders and even such massive civil disobedience as to result in numerous deaths from any one incident. If members want to see the kind of thing that can generate those outbreaks of violence, they might remember what happened in Indonesia after the double-cross Sukarno did on the Indonesian community and the way in which Chinese people were murdered. I saw the same thing happening in Malaysia 30 years ago, to stateless people of Chinese extraction, without going further into that. I do not ever want to see that happen in Australia, and I therefore believe a greater measure of tolerance must be continually and consciously advocated by ourselves as members of this place.

I read an article in today's paper which referred to tension between the Muslim community and the surrounding residents of the mosque at Holden Hill, where those residents resent the way in which, through their imam, members of the Muslim community call their believers to prayer in the mornings. I respect their need and right to do so, but it is difficult to reconcile that with the wishes of the surrounding home owners and families then who in their opinion are disturbed by the inconvenience of these practices. I will not go into that now; there is not sufficient time, given the other matters to which I wish to draw attention today. One of those is the proposal to work for the dole, which I believe to be excellent and not in the least ill-conceived, in that it provides people with the opportunity to obtain training and get into habits that are conducive to their becoming more employable and acceptable. It gives them work experience and something to refer to when they seek a job with an employer.

I am disappointed that only two people out of several who were invited turned up at Paralowie House yesterday. That is sad. However, I want to acknowledge them during the course of my remarks if for no reason other than to commend them for having recognised this as an opportunity and having got in there and got on with it. I refer to Kristy Potts of Elizabeth East and Nathan MacNamara of Elizabeth Vale. Congratulations! Well done! There needs to be more of that sort of thing.

At the same time, I wish to draw attention to the advocacy that I gave to the national purchase of Canadair water bombing aircraft almost four years ago in this place. Indeed, I have advocated that for even longer. The Commonwealth has not made a deal with the States to do that. Consequently, we are unable to control the bushfires which presently bedevil the communities of New South Wales and Victoria and which confront us as we go into this hotter than normal summer where the fuel load is greater and drier. We could end up with a substantial number of deaths in consequence of a day such as Ash Wednesday.

The importance of dumping a large quantity of water on a fire at any time is best illustrated by pointing out that when you dump water on a hot spot it must do several things. First,

it cools down the temperature of the atmosphere so that the combustible gases within the atmosphere are much lower in temperature than their spontaneous flashpoint. The water evaporates, and through that process it removes the heat from the atmosphere—latent heat vaporisation. Secondly, that water vapour makes the air heavier. Indeed, it will dissolve some of the gases and cause them to recondense so that they are not flammable. Thirdly, it wets the combustible material to make it more difficult for it to burst into flame, because it requires a greater amount of heat from combustion occurring nearby—however far away that may be—through the destructive distillation of the organic substances of which it is made to get that combustible material to give off the combustible gas that will then burn.

If you drop a thimbleful of water onto a hot plate gas ring it will not extinguish it. If you drop a cupful of water onto that hotplate, it is more likely to extinguish it. It will certainly set it back, and the gas that has been burning will splutter because it becomes too cool too suddenly. If you drop a bucketful (a couple of litres) of water over the gas ring, it will most certainly extinguish it, because the rapid removal of heat from the atmosphere in which the flame (the combustion—the combination of carbon and oxygen) is occurring is so great that the combustion ceases.

So putting a thimbleful of water on a bushfire is useless—and that is the kind of thing which helicopters carry. You might as well take a group of drunks up in a balloon and leave them there to relieve themselves either out of anxiety or whatever else that might stimulate such a response. The second thing you could do is to use air tractors, which we are using, and which is also virtually useless. It does not have the same performance capacity which the Canadair has in variable atmospheric density where windshear is not just a real risk but a real problem. It is there. You do not know what the gas movements are in the atmosphere through which you have to fly. You have to train a greater number of pilots to get the same amount of water onto the fire during every minute available to you to extinguish it. So, the air tractor is all right in circumstances where you could otherwise have used ground crews and a number of trucks. It is quicker; you need fewer personnel to get the water onto the site; and it may be safer. However, it requires the aircraft to land on a strip to be refilled before it can go back over the fire.

The advantage of the Canadair is that you can mix the wetting agent into the water (whether it be salt or fresh water) as you pick it up with the scoop. You can fill the tanks of the Canadair far more quickly. It will travel more quickly from its source of water—in our case, the Murray at, say, Mannum, or the gulf and into the hills—than an air tractor landing at, say, Parafield or even on a local airstrip. If at present we were to have a Canadair water bomber available to us, the fires in New South Wales would not pose anywhere near the risk that they have, nor would they have caused the damage or perhaps even the loss of life that has occurred. When we tote up what we will lose because of the fires in New South Wales alone, it will be substantially greater many times over than the cost of buying a Canadair so-called super scooper.

I now wish to draw attention to another furphy that worries me, and it relates to fires. I refer to the practice of planting Australian native trees around our houses. You only have to look at page 5 of today's *Advertiser* to see the consequences of that. Native trees burn very easily. In the suburbs of Sydney, such as Menai, which is shown in that photograph, most of the trees are Australian natives. It is crazy to do that, yet I still see that the bulk of people who live

in Adelaide choose to plant natives. Whether they be eucalypts or other members of the myrtaceae order or acacias, it does not matter: they all contain the same compound which we commonly call eucalyptus oil—and it is very flammable. In fact, it is more volatile than any of the materials that come out of the European or deciduous ornamentals that could otherwise have been planted. The scent is given off on very hot days without a fire being present: you can smell it if you go into the bush on a hot day.

The proximity of that vegetation to dwellings in some measure probably explains the reason why some dwellings burnt and others did not. Those trees are not sound and sensible trees to be planted throughout suburbia. They cause pavements to heave because their roots swell in the footings of roads and footpaths. Because they swell especially close to their trunks, they lift the kerbing and cause puddles. Mosquitoes breed in those puddles, and the dog dung rots down and increases the number of faecal coliforms and other intestinal worms of a variety of kinds, including hydatids, which children can pick up on their shoes and then transfer onto their fingers when they take off their shoes. Clearly, they contribute to the health risk in more than one way.

If we had half a wit we would stop doing it. We do it only out of misguided sentiment. If the member for Norwood were to stroll down the middle of Norwood Parade and look at what has happened there with the blackbutts which have been planted in the middle of the median strip, she would see what I am talking about. I am not being critical of her in particular, but I am pointing out an incidence of where members can go and see the enormous damage that is being done when we simply plant these species in inappropriate locations. It is destroying what we would call our social infrastructure: our roads, footpaths, kerbing and pipes. Having made that point, I want to relate that to where I think this belief comes from. It is a mistaken belief that by planting trees we can somehow or other ameliorate the effects of the greenhouse—

**Mr Atkinson:** Which is nonsense.

**Mr LEWIS:** Which is drivell. The CO<sub>2</sub> that is going into the atmosphere to cause the greenhouse effect comes from the combustion of fossil fuels that were produced at a time when the ambient temperature and the circumstances of the topography of the earth were entirely different from what they are now.

By planting a tree, all you are doing is taking carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere daily and stacking it up in the tree. When a bug eats a leaf of the tree, it respire and uses the energy that is stacked up there and gives off again the carbon dioxide after it has done so. Whether that bug is fungi or caterpillar or bacteria does not matter. Sooner or later, the tree falls over and rots—and I am talking about a time frame of within 20 to 80 years—and all the carbon dioxide which it absorbed from the atmosphere returns to the atmosphere. And it is a short time frame. We are not stacking up from 400, 600 or 700 million years ago the carbon reserves that were laid down at that time in the earth's history: we are not stacking that away in a way in which it will be permanently out of circulation. It is daft to believe that to be the case.

To say that we must plant more forests is equally silly. To say, also, that by cutting down old growth forests we are somehow or other contributing to greenhouse is dopey. I ask members to think about it for a minute. In old growth forests, rainforests, every day the sun shines and that excites the chlorophyll in the leaves—so long as every day it rains and there is water there that can be converted by the chlorophyll in the chloroplasts that make up through photosynthesis the

production of the carbohydrate, and the rest of the metabolism of the tree builds the lignins and the cellulose, and so on, that makes the tree. Every day trees fall over, leaves drop off, insects eat parts of leaves, fungi rot away the logs that are there. Every day the amount of carbon dioxide being absorbed by the vegetation on that hectare of rainforest equals the amount of carbon dioxide that is being given off by the life on that hectare of rainforest. It is absolutely neutral in its effect on atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, and it is therefore what one refers to as masculine bovine excreta to say that any difference is made to the greenhouse effect by clearing or not clearing rainforest. So, I am upset by the lie that is being taught to our children and perpetrated through the media—electronic and print—to the population at large.

At present in Tokyo the Australian Government is being lambasted. The fact is that if we today stopped burning any fossil fuels in Australia and stopped eating—indeed, if we all jumped on the First Fleet and sailed off to some other continent and closed down Australia completely—it would make absolutely no difference, no bloody difference at all, to the greenhouse effect on this planet. This country contributes less than 1 per cent, yet it will have devastating consequences on our society if we go in the direction that the Left and the Greens want us to go in.

It will have devastating consequences on our ability to improve with the marginally poor employment levels that we have at present; it will make that rapidly worse. Worse than that, it will most certainly reduce the level of services that, through our efforts daily, we can deliver to those who live amongst us and who need them but cannot care for themselves. It is a madness, and I cannot understand why people persistently pursue it with such vigour. We are not just cutting off our nose to spite our face. We are simply committing harakiri to go on that way and leave out the Third World countries. To assist them to rapidly develop technologies which will not contribute to greenhouse for the sources of their energy is the way to go, and we should do that as quickly as possible. If there is a greenhouse effect, then the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere that has been put there already will continue to do what it is doing for eons to come. And if there is not, the sooner we wake up to it the better.

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

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** Sir, if you were the Speaker I would congratulate you on your appointment, but since you are not the Speaker I will congratulate you on retaining your seat and on your recent promotion. I begin by welcoming the new members to the Chamber—there are a few on the other side and there are lots on this side. In particular, I welcome my friends and colleagues on this side of the Chamber. A lot of talent has come into Parliament, some people who have run pretty impressive election campaigns and who, I am sure, will make very good contributions to Parliament in this next term. So, to the members opposite, watch out: there is a lot of talent on this side.

I acknowledge particularly, in reference to the election campaign, the very hard and sustained work and success of our Leader, Mike Rann. Mike's electorate neighbours mine so I see, perhaps more than a lot of other members, the very hard work that Mike does. Certainly in this election campaign the result of all of Mike's work and his leadership has brought a smile to all our faces and some pretty good optimism for the coming four years. In the three years in which I have been in this place and the three years that Mike

has been Leader of our Opposition team, he has taken a small number of mostly inexperienced Labor MPs—the result of 1993 left us a fairly small group—and directed us to a pretty good result a month or so ago. A lot of talented people have come into the Parliament on our side, and there are some pretty tough characters amongst them. Like myself, who ran in 1993 for a seat and was unsuccessful, there are two others, the member for Kaurua and the member for Lee, who ran in 1993, and for all of us who ran in that campaign it was a pretty hard campaign to start with, and I believe that it built up quite a bit of toughness. To those opposite, that is what you are facing again in this session.

There is one other very important person that I acknowledge in relation to the election campaign, and that is our campaign director, Kay Sutherland, acting secretary of our Party; and, finally, but most importantly, I acknowledge my own campaign workers, who dedicated many hours and persevered and put in a great effort to support me in my campaign.

The numbers in the House reflect the two Party preferred swing to Labor in October—a great swing to Labor. On a personal note, I take great delight in being surrounded by Labor members for a change, rather than the Liberal members of last session. It is a bit of a change for us and it is an ever present reminder of the increase in influence that we, as an Opposition, feel post October 1997. I believe it is indicative, too, of our potential to achieve so much more than was possible in the last Parliament, and I am very optimistic about how we can use that to improve the lot of people in South Australia. For my part, I intend to exploit that increased influence to bring about positive changes for the citizens of this State, particularly when it comes to the provision of education, training and employment opportunities for South Australians.

After the effective representation of my constituents, that will be the main job that I set for myself in this term of Parliament. Over the next four years, I will contribute to changes which improve the retention rate of our children in schools. I intend to contribute towards the improvement of literacy of our students, enhance the application of technology in educational institutions and schools and, importantly, address inadequacies in the provision of educational opportunities in regional and rural South Australia.

In His Excellency's speech, the job of ensuring that South Australians have the skills and capacity to contribute to society and become part of a fast-changing work force was nominated as one of this Government's most vital responsibilities, and it is. But, in the last Parliament, the Liberal Government ripped more than \$130 million out of the public education system in this State. Class sizes were increased, and retention rates amongst our school children have plummeted. It seems clear to me that the driving force behind the Liberal agenda for education is the treatment of education as a cost rather than an enabling investment in our people and in the future of South Australia. I do hope that the Liberal Government will in this term of Parliament realise that a decreased standard of education will actually cost South Australia at the end of the day.

One of the issues that I highlighted earlier this morning when introducing the Bill concerning school closures—and I referred to the Government's attitude towards the decision-making processes of closing schools and its defiance of the community when the community does not wish schools to be closed—was that educational opportunity is not the driving force in the Liberal agenda. I hope in this current Parliament



that, by some means, we will be able to change the Government's thinking on that for the betterment of South Australia.

One of the most important agendas from the Labor perspective in the election campaign was the issue of job creation in this State and security of tenure for South Australians. In an environment that is increasingly incorporating privatisations, casualisations of labour and the downsizing of people's jobs, job insecurity is becoming a standard plight for many South Australians. Those who have jobs are feeling unsettled and they want security. Of course, with our leading unemployment rate, the need for new jobs, particularly for our young people, has to be of highest concern. The Labor Party concentrated on that issue as one of its priority issues, and it will remain so. The number of young South Australians who feel they have to leave the State in order to find work is truly alarming, and I hope that in this term measures introduced by the Government or pursued by the Labor Party can influence this Parliament to take action that redresses the large number of young people leaving our State for jobs elsewhere.

It became evident in the election campaign that people place very high priority on their need and desire to have schools in this State prepare their children properly for a lifetime with the skills that will provide them with opportunities to find work. For the elderly in South Australia, one of the prime concerns was being able to get a hospital bed when it was needed, and the standard of hospital care. Those are issues that the Opposition will pursue in this term.

Another issue that the Labor Party took to the people as a priority of a potential future Labor Government was the principle of keeping control of our water and power supplies in public hands. As it turned out, that was something that the people of South Australia did indicate they had serious concerns about, concerns that run deeply and concerns that were expressed in the campaign to all candidates, I am sure.

Above all else, the agenda that the Labor Party took to the people in the campaign was one in which we said we would foster a culture of enterprise and opportunity. When you do not have a job or you do not feel secure in your job, it is not possible to create the conditions to be enterprising and to feel that you have much opportunity. Hopefully, that will change in the next four years. One of the things that I know the Hon. Mike Rann repeatedly talked about in the election campaign—and it was certainly reflected in comments right through the campaign, as perhaps a little hint about some of the dissatisfaction that South Australians felt with the present Government—was the Liberal Party's—the Government's—fighting itself rather than fighting for South Australia. This was strongly heard in all quarters from people worried about the standard of education and hospital care, through to business and local companies worrying that the Government was spending much more time looking outside the State, spending much more money and effort in trying to attract interstate and overseas companies to South Australia than in protecting our local industry and promoting the conditions for our local industry to grow.

The Liberal Party's campaign seemed to me to be quite negative, whereas there was quite a positive, forward-looking campaign by the Labor Party. It seemed to me that we heard very little of the vision of the Liberals for this Parliament. We heard a lot about its condemnation of Labor's past, and it seemed to me that the Liberals certainly relied on Labor's past to define their future. Perhaps in this term we will see from the Government much more of a vision for this State, because it is only when we see and understand the vision that

we will be able to see the introduction of measures that will lead to better living standards and conditions for people in South Australia.

The release of policies during the campaign caused me to think very clearly about the differences in the approach of both Parties. The Labor Party put quite a deal of effort into constructively releasing detailed policies about our vision and about where we want to take this State into the future. As to many of the Government's policies—I was spokesperson for five portfolios—all those that I read were simply a list of existing programs. I hope now, with the election out of the way, we will be able to understand what it is that the Government envisions for the State.

I conclude by saying that we have had a big boost on the Labor side of politics from our election result. It does give us increased influence in this Parliament and it is my intention and the intention of all my colleagues to harness that increased influence and use it to drive the policy agenda in this State, either directly or through influence of Government policy, for better outcomes for the citizens of South Australia. I hope we can achieve an arrest in the crippling unemployment rate, particularly for our young people, and perhaps there will be the realisation that it is not only dollars but the human condition that needs to be taken into account with Government decision making so that at the end of the day our strategy will necessarily bring South Australia far closer to the sort of place in which we all want to live.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** First, I pay tribute to the work of Sir Eric Neal, our Governor, and commend him and Lady Neal for the great effort they are putting into representing this State in that high office. I thank the people of Fisher once again for their confidence in me. I have a great affinity for and with the people of my electorate and I thank them sincerely for once again endorsing me as their local member of Parliament.

I would like to canvass a range of issues, the first being the so-called head of state issue, which is rather a simplistic heading, because it does not do justice to the range of matters we should be considering. We often hear the debate expressed in terms of a republic or monarchy. My position is fairly clear: I believe a constitutional monarch is a preferable system if the monarch lives in the country. At present, as we know, our monarch does not live in Australia and for that reason I believe that, unless you can have that system, it is highly likely that we will move to a system where we have a president.

Clearly, the powers of a president can vary enormously and in part of the ongoing debate leading up to the convention next year we need to clarify the role of a president, if we are to have one, and also clarify further the sort of Constitution we should have. Clearly, you could have a president who opens fetes and fairs or you could have a president with greater powers than that. Part of that debate has to be an assessment of what sort of powers the president, if you are going to have a president, should have. I strongly believe that the powers of a president, if that is the way we go, should be codified. I do not believe a republic is inevitable, but I indicated earlier that it is highly likely, given the fact that we do not have a resident monarch. The Queen of Australia has done an excellent job but it is a geographic situation in which we find ourselves with our monarch living a long way away from our country.

For reasons of national identity and international recognition, it is important that we have a head of state who is

resident in this country. I believe it should happen naturally, without great division in the country. I am not naive enough to believe that we are not going to have a vigorous debate—that is good—but at the end of the day the head of state issue should bring us together and not divide us and cause disunity. So, let us have vigorous debate and discussion about what sort of system we will have, the structure of the Constitution, whether we have a Bill of Rights, and whether we make reference to the indigenous people, the environment or whatever; let us have an ongoing vigorous debate but, at the end of the debate, when that debate comes to an end, let us unite under whatever system or head of state we adopt so that it all becomes very much a focus for unity.

One of the unfortunate aspects of this whole debate—and I am in no way putting down the head of state aspect—is that I believe we should be focusing on wider and broader issues encompassing such matters as the various levels of government in Australia. Indeed, we should be prepared to examine what should be the role of the Federal Government, the State Governments and local government. We should put aside, as was mentioned by my colleague the member for Waite last night, the sacred cows, including our own sacred cow here and in other Chambers and jurisdictions, and see whether we can come up with a system that is best for Australia—not one that is best for ourselves necessarily but one that is best for the nation. That would involve our looking at the role, responsibility and resourcing of those various levels of government. Whilst a head of state is very important as an issue or focal point, we should also examine the wider context of the form of government that we have in this country.

Another issue which very much concerns me is employment. I can put it in the positive or express it in the negative and say 'unemployment'. As a former Minister involved in this area, I was very happy to be able to initiate programs involving self start-up, skills and so the list goes on but, in a sense, while those programs are innovative, ongoing and helping to provide employment, we have a much more fundamental dilemma than that. The level of unemployment in Australia is at least three times the official rate indicated in statistics. We have an under-utilisation of labour: we have discouraged job seekers who add up to many more hundreds of thousands beyond the 800 000 unemployed in Australia.

What is particularly disturbing about unemployment in Australia is that at least 40 per cent of those 800 000 unemployed are long-term unemployed, which means that it is very difficult to get them back into the work force. Also, I believe we should look at the statistical analysis of unemployment, because the suggestion that one hour's paid work constitutes employment is really missing a vital element. That focus on statistics is very important, given that we have moved more and more away from full to part-time employment. I supported the concept of work for the dole, although I was disappointed that the Federal Government did not include a training component, because I think that should be involved. The scheme has some potential but, once again, it will not solve the underlying key issues.

Last month I had the privilege of attending a conference on employment at the Melbourne University Graduate School, and one of the elements of what I would call the new orthodoxy in tackling unemployment is to move away from the rigid award structure that we have at the lower end of the wages scale. I believe that within the next few months and years we will be hearing a lot more about approaches which will encourage us to move away from that fixed bottom end

award system to encompass the use of negative income tax and the welfare system to ensure that people at the lower end of the income scale get a top-up provided through negative income tax or through the welfare system.

In other words, anyone who did not, through their paid work, achieve a reasonable standard of living would, in effect, receive a tax rebate, preferably on a monthly or fortnightly basis, so that everyone in this country would have a decent standard of living. We need to move away from a situation where we use the wage system as the welfare system, and that is part of the problem that have today.

The reality is that economic growth does not guarantee increased employment, and that is particularly true of the long-term unemployed. What happens with economic growth, which is an increase in productivity per person via that the people in the work force work longer hours and overtime (and that is what we are now seeing), with the short-term unemployed soaked up to some extent and long-term unemployed left behind.

People who argue that economic growth in itself will solve our problem are missing the point. There is not one approach, but I believe that we should look at some countries which have been successful. The Netherlands has a very low rate of unemployment whereas France has a very high rate of unemployment. We need to look at things like industrial relations (I have already hinted at that in one respect), tax reform (including abolishing payroll tax) and some of the measures that were highlighted by the member for Waite last night. Time does not allow me to go into a lot of detail here, but I am signalling that we will hear more in the near future about the use of a negative income tax system and the welfare system, particularly for the bottom-end wage earners.

In relation to other issues I would like to put to the House, I believe that we had an unfortunate situation earlier this year with the introduction of school speed zones. I believe it has been a confusing, unfortunate exercise and I am delighted that the Minister for Transport will review the whole situation through the Pedestrian Facilities Committee. If one is a tourist, one does not know what a school day happens to be in South Australia. Is a pupil-free day a school day? We now have a kindergarten near my electorate (it is actually in the member for Davenport's area) which has applied the school zone all day. I have only ever seen one child go into that kindergarten.

What about the speed limit outside those hours, for example, when children and/or adults are attending a concert at the school at night? I believe that we urgently need to address the question of adequate signage. I think there should be only one exception to the colour code: it should be burnt orange coloured signs for school speed zones. It is done on arterial roads in Victoria and elsewhere and I think we should do the same. On the road surface we should look at using an appropriate paint colour to indicate that a school speed zone is coming up. The signs need to be simplified so that we provide a clearer message to motorists.

On a related traffic issue, I believe that the matter of speed camera usage needs to be reassessed, because we are finding more and more that these cameras tend to be located in areas where a slight increase in the speed limit will not pose any great danger to anyone. At the bottom of Shepherd's Hill Road, you will find someone waiting to catch a 'criminal' travelling just above the 60km/h speed limit. You will find someone waiting to catch that nasty criminal! I am not against policing where there is a danger to others. I would like to see

greater emphasis on red light cameras and people breaking the law in those very dangerous situations.

In terms of the penalties applied, I think there is merit in the Attorney-General's examining a situation where people pay the fine, whether for a traffic breach or otherwise, according to capacity to pay. I do not believe there is any fairness or social justice in having a pensioner pay the same as, say, a high-earning professional or a wealthy business proprietor. I do not believe that the system would be all that difficult to implement. We do it for a range of other areas, but I cannot see the fairness or justice in pinging a pensioner the same amount as for a millionaire. That is a gross injustice. In this day and age with computer technology, if we cannot do something about it there is something sadly amiss.

Tourism is an area in which we can do more. We need to market ourselves more effectively. The Government could use its vehicle fleet much more effectively to promote South Australia. We do not have to turn them into travelling neon signs, but they could be used to promote positive messages about visiting South Australia. Government envelopes should promote various tourist regions of South Australia. Available at post offices well before Christmas, I would like to see a personal message typed up or printed from the Premier or the Governor inviting people to come to South Australia. Indeed, I think we should encourage all people living in South Australia, when writing overseas or interstate, to have a personal invitation for their friends and relatives to visit and stay here.

We need decent airstrips in various locations to cater for larger sized jet aircraft, for example, on Kangaroo Island and at Port Augusta, and we need improved hotel and motel accommodation in some of our tourist areas. The reality is that Japanese and other overseas people do not have the length of holiday periods that we enjoy and therefore their time is limited. They tend to participate in organised tours and they need to access these areas quickly by larger jet rather than having to endure the slow, time-consuming arrangements which exist at the moment.

The possibilities for South Australia in terms of creating employment opportunities and other economic development are considerable. One area which may surprise members is that I believe we could encourage Victorians and others who are seeking retirement to retire here rather than necessarily heading for Queensland. I realise there is a cost involved in regard to hospital facilities and other facilities for retirees, but on the positive side we can offer cheaper housing. It is not far from Melbourne and, whilst we do not have to become the State for retirees in total, it is an industry, an activity that would do a lot to help reinvigorate our State and create employment and other opportunities.

The Alice Springs to Darwin railway is a project that I am keen to see proceed. We need it for psychological and economic reasons. As part of that process we will require an upgrade of the railway line from Melbourne to Bordertown because when the rail line from Bordertown was upgraded properly it was never done on the other side of the border. All that happened was that they shifted the rail width from 5ft 3in. to 4ft 8in. If we are going to maximise the potential of an Alice Springs to Darwin railway, we must have a good connecting link to Melbourne to bring double boxes (double containers) on trains. Tunnel and bridge work must be undertaken so that it is possible to have fast 'double decker' trains travelling between Melbourne and Darwin via Adelaide that can produce the delivery times industry and others seek. The cost of upgrading that line between Melbourne and

Bordertown would be a minimum of \$100 million, but it is something that must be happen, and I believe that the Commonwealth in all fairness should involve itself in that process.

A matter which is always close to my heart is the environment. We have made considerable progress in this State, and I was delighted to hear the Minister say today that there was going to be an increase in the number of park rangers. We should not kid ourselves that we have saved the environment: that sort of talk is nonsense. In this world and in South Australia we face two key areas: a shortage of good clean water and diminishing habitat—reduction in biodiversity. In South Australia our record in terms of destroying native flora has been appalling, not to mention the native animals which are now extinct. Who knows what medicinal or other benefits have been lost—possibly a cure for cancer—because of the destruction of botanic specimens? I think people should reflect on the need to ensure that we retain biodiversity in South Australia, and that means having a very effective park system, conservation system, not just in dry areas but also in the wetter areas.

It is always sobering to remember that the words 'ecology' and 'economics' both derive from the same word of Greek origin *oikos*, meaning 'home' or 'housekeeping'. The tragedy is that the two concepts have become separate when we should be bringing them together. Good economics is good ecology and *vice versa*.

I was heartened to hear the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training say that he was looking at some changes in the secondary school area. We need a lot of changes in the primary school area also. Our whole education system in this State should be closely examined to see whether we can improve its effectiveness, efficiency, and outcomes. Much time is spent doing various things within the school system. The Minister mentioned the vocational area. Getting rid of technical high schools was a mistake. We should be focusing on technology high schools in an updated form of the older technical high schools.

Another relevant issue is the reform of our parliamentary system. I strongly believe that people who are criticised here under privilege should have the right of at least making a written reply read out by the Clerk or appropriate person in this place. Members of Parliament should not be allowed to attack someone under privilege without that person having the opportunity to at least respond in at least a brief written statement to put their side of the case. It is basic fair play. I know the Leader of the Opposition has talked about a sin bin. I do not like the term, but it would be prudent for Parliament to have a situation where people who offend on a minor matter can have time out, say, for half an hour, an hour or something like that, so that they can have a think about what they are doing rather than being excluded for a whole day.

Members should also read petitions to the Parliament and not have them read by the Clerk. That is not a reflection on the Clerk, but the public believes petitions are important, and therefore the member who has been given the petition should be able to read it out to the House. It would do a lot for the public to know that their petitions are presented by the member to whom the petition has been given. We can make this place more inviting to the public. When you come up the front steps it is not that inviting. We do not want to turn it into a circus or sideshow, but it is the people's House and people's Parliament and they should feel welcome to come in and observe the proceedings.

Similarly our educational facilities here are totally inadequate and out of date and we need to ensure that school children, tourists and others who come here are able to understand the process going on in this place. Ultimately we are judged by the behaviour we exhibit here, and it is important that we focus on what we say and do so that we are judged on the basis of appropriate behaviour.

In the few minutes that I have left I will briefly mention a couple of further issues. I am not against foreign investment in South Australia, but it concerns me that simply a change of ownership is occurring rather than job creation or other benefits. There is little benefit in simply transferring the ownership of a local facility into the hands of someone overseas. As a community we should have a close look at what is happening. I am sure members would be surprised to find out the extent to which our facilities are now owned by foreigners.

I believe that an opportunity exists for some innovative policing, and in metropolitan areas I would like to see country-style policing where we have police who live in the area looking after that area. They are entitled to free time; they should not be on call seven days a week, but the concept of country policing, where the police officers know the locals much more intimately should be replicated in a suburban setting and we should set up pilot programs to do that. I encourage the Minister responsible to move in that direction.

Finally, I was keen as Minister to support our young people, who are not only our future but also part of the present. One of the initiatives introduced while I was Minister was to have youth workers in police stations. I would like to see that practice continue. The two workers at Holden Hill are doing a great job, and it is a way of reducing the load on police if we can tackle the issues relating to family or personal problems before they extend into the area of criminality. Likewise it was a mistake to disband the youth support group that used to exist in Hindley Street, and we should look at the possibility of bringing back that integrated force of youth workers and police in Hindley Street.

I suggest that our public transport system tends to look rather dull, especially the railway stations. I often travel on the Belair line. We should put colour into our railway stations, for example, painting them in Crows colours. On the Port and western lines we could paint them in the colours of Port Power. Let us do something to make our railway stations look attractive and bright. Neighbourhood Watch has done a bit in some areas, including Hallett Cove, to make stations look attractive. Let us do something with them to make them look bright, exciting and welcoming so that people will be more inclined to travel on our public transport system, particularly on the trains.

I have canvassed a whole range of issues. There are a lot of other issues I could address but, given the hour and the fact that we have had a torrid week, I am happy to draw my comments to a close. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to the position and welcome all new members to this House. They have possibly been excited by this week's proceedings and they can look forward to the remaining four years with great enthusiasm as we all work together for the betterment of South Australia.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## STATUTES AMENDMENT (MINISTERS OF THE CROWN) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** 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.

These amendments put in place the legislative changes which are necessary to implement changes to the composition of the Ministry which were announced by the Premier on October 20, 1997. The new Ministry is to consist of ten Cabinet Ministers and five Ministers who will not be Cabinet Ministers. These five Ministers will assist Cabinet Ministers with responsibility for Departments with merged portfolios. The changes have been partially implemented by the appointment of ten Cabinet Ministers. Once these amendments are enacted five Ministers who will not be Members of Cabinet will be appointed. The amendments also provide for the appointment of a Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier.

The changes to the Ministerial structure are bold and innovative. They are intended to create opportunities for better whole of government integration and a more effective and unified service delivery.

The appointment of ten Cabinet Ministers, five Ministers and one Parliamentary Secretary instead of the traditional thirteen Cabinet Ministers will be at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

The amendments needed to implement the changes to the Ministry have to fit into the existing constitutional arrangements. Cabinet is not established by Act of Parliament nor is its existence referred to in the *Constitution Act 1934*. Accordingly some way of distinguishing between Cabinet Ministers and Ministers other than by reference to Cabinet had to be devised. The method chosen to distinguish Ministers from Cabinet Ministers is to provide that Ministers are not members of Executive Council.

There is nothing in the amendments about the relationship of Cabinet Ministers to Ministers. This is not something that can, or should, be spelt out in legislation. The relationship will be set out in an agreement between the Premier and the Minister. Consideration was given to putting something in the instrument of appointment of Ministers. The Solicitor-General's advice was that the relationship can best be set out in an agreement between the Premier and the Minister entered into prior to the Minister being sworn in. The agreement will cover such matters as maintaining Cabinet confidentiality, agreeing to be bound by Cabinet decisions, an understanding that the Minister will not attend Cabinet unless invited and an undertaking to act in accordance with any directions given by the Premier and the Cabinet Minister.

Under the scheme the administration of Acts will be committed to the Cabinet Minister and the Cabinet Minister's powers and functions under the Acts will be delegated to the Minister. To ensure that there can be no arguments as to whether a Minister is authorised to exercise a power or perform a function the delegation to the Minister will be done by the Governor appointing the Minister as the delegate of the Cabinet Minister. The delegation of a power or function does not prevent the Cabinet Minister from carrying out the function or exercising the power. Which of the delegated functions are to be performed by the Minister will be for the Premier to determine in consultation with the Cabinet Minister. These provisions are contained in clause 8 of the Bill that amends the *Administrative Arrangements Act 1994*.

Several other Acts are amended. Section 65 of the *Constitution Act* is amended to increase the number of Ministers to fifteen. It is then provided in new section 66(2) that if the number of Ministers exceeds thirteen the Executive Council will not consist of more than ten Ministers. The schedule to the *Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990* is amended to provide that Ministers of the Crown who are not members of the Executive Council receive the basic salary and an additional salary of 41 per cent of the basic salary.

New section 67A of the *Constitution Act* provides for the appointment of a person who is a member of Parliament as Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier. Section 45 of the *Constitution Act* is amended to ensure that the office is not an office of profit. The remuneration of the Parliamentary Secretary is provided for in an amendment to the schedule to the *Parliamentary Remuneration Act*

1990. The Parliamentary Secretary will receive the basic salary plus 20 per cent of the basic salary.

A consequential amendment is made to the *Juries Act*. Members of the Executive Council and their spouses are not eligible for jury service. This has been changed to Ministers of the Crown and their spouses in recognition that not all Ministers of the Crown will now be members of the Executive Council.

The *Oaths Act* is amended to require Ministers who are not members of the Executive Council and the Parliamentary Secretary to take the official oath. The official oath is that the person will well and truly serve Her Majesty the Queen in the office to which the person has been appointed.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

*Clause 3: Interpretation*

These clauses are formal.

PART 2

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION ACT 1934

*Clause 4: Amendment of s. 45—Disqualification of members holding offices of profit*

Section 45 of the *Constitution Act* vacates the seat of a member of Parliament who accepts an office of profit or pension from the Crown with certain exceptions including an exception for an office of Minister of the Crown. This clause adds a similar exception for the office of Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier which it is proposed will be remunerated (*see clause 11*).

*Clause 5: Amendment of s. 65—Number of Ministers of the Crown*

Section 65 of the *Constitution Act* limits the number of Ministers of the Crown to 13. This clause increases the limit to 15.

*Clause 6: Amendment of s. 66—Ministerial offices*

Section 66 currently makes every Minister *ex officio* a member of the Executive Council. The clause makes an exception if a ministerial appointment is made taking the number of Ministers to more than 13. In that case, while the number of Ministers exceeds 13, the Executive Council is to consist of not more than 10 Ministers appointed to the Council by the Governor.

*Clause 7: Insertion of s. 67A—Parliamentary Secretary to Premier*

The proposed new section would empower the Governor to appoint a member of Parliament as Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier.

PART 3

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
ARRANGEMENTS ACT 1994

*Clause 8: Insertion of s. 9A—Appointment of delegate Minister*  
The proposed new section would empower the Governor to appoint, by proclamation, a Minister as the delegate Minister of another Minister. Under the provision, a delegate Minister would have all the functions and powers of the other Minister (but the other Minister would not as a result be prevented from carrying out or exercising any of the functions or powers).

PART 4

AMENDMENT OF JURIES ACT 1927

*Clause 9: Amendment of Schedule 3*

This clause makes a consequential amendment reflecting the possibility that not all Ministers may be members of Executive Council.

PART 5

AMENDMENT OF OATHS ACT 1936

*Clause 10: Insertion of s. 6A—Oaths to be taken by Ministers who are not members of Executive Council or by Parliamentary Secretary to Premier*

As suggested by the heading, the proposed new section provides for the oaths to be taken by Ministers who are not members of Executive Council or by a Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier.

PART 6

AMENDMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY  
REMUNERATION ACT 1990

*Clause 11: Amendment of Schedule*

The Schedule is amended so that the additional remuneration for a Minister is 41 per cent of the basic salary of a member of Parliament in the case of a Minister who is not a member of Executive Council, while the additional remuneration for a Minister who is a member of Executive Council will remain at the current 75 per cent of basic salary.

The clause also fixes additional remuneration for a Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier at 20 per cent of basic salary.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 December at 2 p.m.