

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 October 1998

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

The **Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE**: This Government is committed to positive reform for our emergency services—reforms that will provide better funding, will improve their performance and, most importantly, will help save lives and property. Recently this Parliament legislated for the establishment of an emergency services levy. The levy will come into force from July next year, heralding a new era of fairer and more equitable funding for our emergency services. Now we move into phase 2 of our reform program, which will result in the creation of an Emergency Services Administrative Unit. This unit will bring together administrative personnel from the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service.

The Emergency Services Administrative Unit will bring major benefits in streamlining and cooperation in the running of emergency services. The unit will work together to provide all corporate and support services for the emergency services and enable joint strategic and business planning across the emergency services. Importantly, we will reduce duplication, red tape and the bureaucracy that can stand in the way of providing a dynamic and progressive service for South Australians. It will also work to improve support services to volunteers. The new unit will not include the South Australian Ambulance Service.

Most importantly I stress that operational running of the services will remain the same. There will be no change to their identities or logos. The Chief Executive of the new unit will be responsible for the management and administration of the unit, while the CFS Board and existing heads of the CFS, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service and the State Emergency Service will retain and continue to exercise both their operational and statutory powers as required.

The establishment of this new unit is not about cutting jobs but about improving efficiencies and making the system work better. Non-operational personnel will be placed where they will be of most benefit. Savings will be reinvested to provide a better service for South Australians.

The changes we are outlining will not happen overnight. To work through many of the issues of this latest reform, a special task force will be established as a matter of urgency that will report back to me. This task force will consult with all key stakeholders. When it comes to negotiating budgets and major policy initiatives, such as the introduction of the Government radio network, it makes more sense to be dealing with one administration instead of three.

In effect, the unit will provide a pool of expertise from which all emergency services will be able to draw—expertise that is critical to the success of our emergency services in meeting the challenges posed by changing technology and community needs.

These changes will have a positive impact on the provision of service to South Australians. A better administration will result in the provision of better service. And since we are talking here of emergency services, these changes will help to save the lives, homes and property of all South Australians.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the first report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given serious criticisms by the Auditor-General about key deficiencies in the contract process and the contract negotiated by the former Minister for Health with Healthscope for the management of the Modbury Hospital, and the Auditor-General's statement of the significance these have for contracting out in the wider public sector, will the Minister now release the three reports prepared by Coopers and Lybrand for the Government which led Cabinet to agree to renegotiate the contract and pay Healthscope more money for the provision of the same services?

On 27 June 1996 the former Minister for Health told the House that he had 'out-negotiated' the private sector and said:

The fact is that the contract went through all due diligence processes of Government.

The Auditor-General of the State says that Coopers and Lybrand listed six key deficiencies in the contract and says that due diligence failed to establish an adequate benchmark for patient activity and to identify and value equipment. The former Minister thinks this is funny: the Auditor-General does not; he thinks it is incompetence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, the Leader of the Opposition is wrong. In fact, the new or amended contract required additional services compared with the first contract. We have nothing to hide. We have released the entire amended contract. I tabled it in this House several months ago, and so members of the Opposition have had every opportunity to go through that amended contract. One of the fundamental differences between the first and second contract is that the first contract had a very complex funding formula. The second contract dealt with Modbury in the same way as every other public hospital is dealt with in this State on a casemix model.

That is the appropriate model at any rate seeing as it is now applied through the Medicare Agreement right across the whole of Australia. The second or amended contract specifically picks up casemix funding. I should point out, just to show how good the deal is, that under the contract we get at least a guaranteed 5 per cent saving on the casemix model compared with the funds given to all other major public hospitals in South Australia. We will receive guaranteed savings of 5 per cent, but the savings could be as much as up to 10 per cent less than the casemix model. Who will criticise that at any rate, the fact that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, 5 per cent better savings and up to 10 per cent savings on the casemix model.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will come to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Anyone who understands anything about—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I say to the member for Hart and the Leader that it is highly disorderly to continue to interject after the Chair has brought the House to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let me point out what that means in terms of health care for people in South Australia.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elder for continuing to interject after the House has been brought to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Under the amended contract we are saving between \$4 million and \$6 million a year compared with the casemix model. That is money that can go into treating more patients in our public hospital system, which is exactly what we are about, particularly with the drop out from private health insurance. The Leader of the Opposition asked a specific question about the studies. I will look at those—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Why not release them, if you have nothing to hide?

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have released the full contract. I will look at whether or not it is feasible to release the studies and, if I can, I certainly will.

The SPEAKER: Before I call for the next question, I indicate that some latitude is given to the Leader of the Opposition but with that latitude comes an expectation that some standards are set in this place by people in high office.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Premier indicate whether parliamentary approval is required for a long-term lease of our electricity assets?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As I indicated when I returned from discussions with a number of overseas companies interested in investing in our electricity industry in South Australia, the notion of a long-term lease was of considerable interest to a number of those investors. As I indicated at a press conference, I have sought legal advice on the issue and I have now been advised that the combined view of Crown Law and the private legal team advising the electricity reform and sales unit is that, whilst it is technically and legally possible to construct a form of lease without parliamentary approval, the form and structure of such a lease would be such that it would not be financially beneficial to South Australia's interests. Therefore, if the Government is to consider any form of long-term lease, the value to South Australia will be maximised by the form of a long-term lease which is envisaged in the Government's electricity legislation and which is currently before the House.

FOOD ACT

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Another dorothy dixer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: Given the undertaking to this House on 28 September 1995 by the former Minister for Health that the Government would act on all the recommendations of the Coroner investigating the death of Nikki Robinson, will the Minister explain why almost four years later the Food Act has not been amended as recommended by the Coroner and why recommendation 12 that resources be made available to ensure the effective enforcement of the legislation has not been implemented?

The report by the Auditor-General says that even though a review of the Food Act was commenced in 1995-96 the legislation has not been amended even though Victoria amended its food legislation in 1997. The Auditor-General said that the Health Commission does not keep information on resource levels and the activities of local councils and that the effectiveness of controls exercised by local government cannot be determined.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will deal with those issues one by one. First, in terms of amending the legislation, it has been agreed by the Ministers for Health, commencing with the previous Minister for Health and followed by me, that there should be national legislation. After all, Australia is one country and food is prepared and processed in all States and trucked throughout the rest of Australia. Therefore it is about time Australia had one set of standards to ensure a high quality level of food hygiene in this country.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just wait until you get the answer. As a result, there has been a series of meetings with the Health Ministers. At one such meeting in the middle of the year, we signed off on the principles, and those principles have been through the South Australian Cabinet and have been agreed to by Cabinet. The legislation is currently being drafted. A date has been set for a meeting in December this year at which we are due to look at that draft legislation for the whole of Australia. I stress that I think it would be inappropriate for South Australia to try to write its own legislation.

However, let me make it clear that we looked at whether we would introduce the Victorian legislation on a short-term basis. This matter was raised with me by the member for Mawson several months ago. After that discussion I went off and did an investigation. The department reported back that, by the time it took the Victorian legislation, amended it and introduced it through the parliamentary session, it would be virtually on the same time frame as we would get national uniform legislation through. Therefore, it is quite appropriate—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member knows, because she asked questions during the Estimates Committee. Since then we have signed off on the principles of that legislation and it is currently being drafted. I can only go as fast as the rest of Australia on this issue, but we have put it down as a priority.

Let me take up what the Public and Environmental Health Department has done in terms of monitoring local government. The specific question asked by the honourable member was why recommendation 12 has not been met. Recommendation 12 has been met. That was specifically to put additional resources into the department, and additional staff have been appointed to the department. I repeat: additional resources have been allocated to the Public and Environment-

al Health Department, and that means specifically additional funding and additional staff.

It carried out a review but that review was inadequate. I am the first to admit that, although the review undertook to identify who are the responsible officers within local government for this issue and what their qualifications are, it should have followed that up with a further question in terms of the actual effort that those officers put into food hygiene standards. It should also have carried out a routine monitoring of whether or not that is being done. I have ordered that review to be carried out and I have asked the Department for Human Services why that request, which was made earlier, for it to monitor the efforts of local government is not being carried out as well. The department has gone part way down the process, but it has not completed it, and I have asked why it has not been completed. I believe that is the appropriate action to take.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Premier inform the House of the risk to the State's power assets if they remain in State ownership, as outlined by BHP and Western Mining?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am sure that the House is aware of the public comments by BHP and Western Mining about the cost of power from State-owned utilities. Western Mining, which is the single largest purchaser of electricity in South Australia, has committed approximately \$1.5 billion to \$1.6 billion to double the size of the facility at Olympic Dam. If my memory serves me correctly, something like 10 per cent of the base load goes to Western Mining alone. They do not like it and they say that they are at a disadvantage compared to electricity prices interstate. Their research shows that such power will remain far more expensive than they are prepared to pay.

They intend to make use of the freedom given to customers in the new national electricity market to shop elsewhere to produce their own power. They have advised that they will bypass the system completely by constructing their own generator unless they are able to purchase power at nationally competitive prices. The simple fact is that, when we go into a national electricity market, they are entitled to do so. That is a commercial decision they can make. That decision means that ETSA's annual profits—and this is the bottom line, not the sales—will be reduced by \$8.5 million a year, and the best customer will have been lost because ETSA in public ownership simply cannot deliver competitive power prices.

If we add to that figure the independent analysis of profits lost through voltage step-up, we have ETSA down by more than \$15 million a year, recurring, in profits. So, the forecast increase in dividends from ETSA is seriously at risk upon commencement of the national market, which I point out to the House is on 15 November. If BHP and Western Mining go ahead—

An honourable member: And others.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: And others: that is exactly the point. The point is that some 25 customers take about 17 per cent of the load. If you take away from ETSA 17 per cent of the revenue, what you are doing—because it is off the bottom of the base cost of the operation—is decimating the profits. If they proceed with a plan to build a 300 megawatt power station in the north of South Australia to supply local power as well as their own needs, the loss of profits to our power assets in that move alone is estimated to be as high as

\$25 million a year. They are the risks we are confronting. To say, 'ETSA has served us well in the past; just keep on doing more of the same in the future,' ignores the fact that we now live in a global marketplace.

We have a national electricity market starting, in which we have to be participants; therefore, a Government monopoly that has been there in the past 40 or 50 years goes on 15 November this year. They are the risks that we as a Government responsibly have to manage for the future, and we must put in place policies for the transition that protect investment, protect industry and protect jobs in South Australia.

There are a couple of other points to which I want to refer in responding to the question from the member for Stuart. The Auditor-General's Report, tabled yesterday, shows that South Australia's net interest payments as a proportion of revenue are far higher than those of other States; that is, the net interest cost to us was some 13 per cent in 1997-98 against the average of the other States of 6.9 per cent. Our debt servicing cost was almost double the net effect of the average of all the other States. What we are seeing is those other States reducing their debt levels. If we do not reduce our debt levels, when other States move forward to reduce imposts on business, what will we be able to do? Nothing. We will be constrained.

If there is a movement on payroll tax in Queensland or some other State and if the business community and the Opposition say to us, the Government, 'You've got to match it to protect investment in business,' we will be shackled. We will not be able to move, because we are paying twice the level of interest on our debts than are the other States. They will have the capacity to move: we will not be able to move anywhere. What will the Opposition do then in terms of responding to the demands of the business community and potential investors in this State? What would they say?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Exactly; silence. Clearly, the position is that these are risks on our doorstep that we have to manage.

Regarding the consumption of electricity and the customer base, under the area of risk in his report the Auditor-General describes as significant the number of contestable customers likely to be lost to ETSA in a competitive market—his words. Quoting the Victorian and New South Wales experience, 55 per cent of customers have changed their retailer since the market began. What does that tell you? They chased the better service and the better price. Fifty-five per cent of customers in New South Wales and Victoria went to where they got the best deal. What do you think will happen in South Australia in a national electricity market? So much for the point of view put forward by the Opposition that you just keep it, you carry on as you have in the past and you keep getting the dividends. The simple fact is that the irrefutable evidence interstate is that it will collapse on you and, if it is to collapse on you, you ought to take the right policy decisions now before it is too late.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given the Auditor-General's opinion that the Government remains liable for the due care of patients at the Modbury Public Hospital, did Healthscope breach that duty of care by asking diabetic patients to cancel their forward appointments at the Modbury Hospital Diabetic Clinic and, if so, what action has the

Minister taken to ensure that this never happens again? In his annual report, the Auditor-General says:

The Government will remain liable for the due care of patients despite the introduction of an independent contractor who will be immediately responsible for the provision of that care.

In a letter written by Healthscope on 2 October 1998, patients were asked, because of 'an enormous blow-out in waiting times' for the diabetes clinic, to self-assess their condition and consider cancelling their forward appointments.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, the specific issue in terms of the dietitians' clinical appointments with patients with diabetes has already been dealt with and answered by Healthscope, so it is not—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am just saying that it has already been answered and dealt with by Healthscope. Whether or not there is a duty of care is a legal question, and I will refer it to Crown Law.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Premier inform the House of the latest and very unexpected support for the Government's reasons for selling our power utilities?

The SPEAKER: Order! There was some comment in that question, and I draw that to the attention of the member.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the honourable member for his question, as it is a good question based on comments made by the shadow Treasurer today on radio, and I am disappointed that he is not the Chamber. I am certainly delighted to respond to the honourable member's question. The shadow Treasurer has today for the first time taken an important bipartisan approach to the sale process: he did so publicly on radio this morning. Finally, he has confirmed the Government's argument for selling ETSA and Optima. He told ABC Radio that South Australians would get cheaper power prices in the national electricity market—he is right—thanks to his Party's supporting the national electricity market legislation—he is right again.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will come to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for continuing to flout the Chair.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There must be a sensitive nerve here somewhere.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Is that what it is? I see.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I do not want to remind the House again that it is distinctly against Standing Orders and it is highly disorderly to continue to interject against the Speaker when the Speaker has made a ruling. It is bad enough interjecting across the Chamber, let alone coming in after the Speaker has called the member to order. If this behaviour continues during this session, I will view it very seriously.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Of course, the shadow Treasurer was absolutely right. Within the next few years, South Australian electricity consumers will have access to cheaper electricity prices, and I am sure none of them will knock that back. But those cheaper prices come

at a great cost to ETSA and Optima. They come from competition being allowed into the power market in South Australia. If you are going to reduce the cost of power to customers, you cannot and do not get the dividends from ETSA and Optima, because the ball game changes. That competition comes from other companies being able to take large parts of the market share of ETSA and Optima and remove the Government monopoly that has been there for the last 40 or 50 years. I repeat: it is the only way cheaper prices are achieved.

Importantly, in Victoria, as I have mentioned, some 50 per cent of customers who can change their power company to a new supplier do so, and we are seeing the same trend in New South Wales. People given the choice of cheaper electricity will opt to take the cheaper electricity. That being the case, and with the national market starting up on 15 November, therein is the risk. I know from a policy point of view that the Opposition has not focused on that in the past, but finally the shadow Treasurer has admitted that he agrees with one of the most vital reasons why this Government must sell ETSA and Optima: cheaper prices through competition. We do not want taxpayers to bear the massive financial risks that come from power companies operating in a national market which delivers cheaper prices to consumers through competition. That is a fundamental that cannot be ignored.

I would ask members opposite to ask General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth whether they are concerned that their input cost of power here compared to that of their domestic market competitor—Ford—is higher and removing a competitive advantage for them—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, their own plant in Melbourne, as the member for Schubert indicates, having been out with a number of members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party on a recent visit to General Motors. You can go to other manufacturing and processing facilities in the State that are well aware that their interstate counterparts have far cheaper electricity. The risk is that if we ignore that future reinvestment will not take place in South Australia. If it does not take place in South Australia, it means that jobs will not be created here.

Now, the Opposition—rightfully—calls for focus in terms of employment, as indeed we have done, and that ought to be an issue that cuts across political boundaries: a bipartisan approach in looking at initiatives in relation to employment generation. There is no doubt about that. However, when you hear members opposite say things like, 'But we won't move; we have this philosophical blinkered look', as it relates to the electricity market, involving a major input cost to manufacturing industry, which in turn relates to employment opportunities in this State, you have to ask how fair dinkum they are.

If we want to get new investment, and if we want to secure more jobs, we have to make sure that the input costs for those businesses are at internationally competitive prices. By taking the position of refusing to support the sale of ETSA and Optima, you are consigning South Australia to less investment, less job creation and less job certainty, and I am sure that is not something that you want to actually see inflicted upon South Australia in the future. If it is not, please rethink your position in relation to ETSA and Optima, because this is the right policy direction for this State's future. To ignore it will consign South Australia to less investment and fewer jobs.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training immediately release the \$28 million included in this year's budget to ensure the continuing employment in 1999 of up to 700 teachers and assistants employed by schools and kindergartens with funding for flexible staffing, early intervention and special education for students with learning disabilities and difficulties; or does the Minister intend to withhold these funds as a bargaining chip in negotiations for a new enterprise agreement? On 19 June the Minister indicated to the House that this matter would be resolved quickly. However, because the \$28 million allocated in the budget has not been released by the Minister, schools cannot commit to programs for 1999 and are preparing to put off staff.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: In the 1996 enterprise agreement the former Minister set aside some \$18 million in flexible initiative resource funding and a further \$9.25 million for special education funding. That was a part of that 1996 enterprise agreement and stood for two years. As the member for Taylor has indicated, it is also a part of the enterprise agreement into which we are now entering. My release of our offer this morning to the AEU included a 13 per cent wage rise over three years for our teachers. It also included a guarantee of that \$28 million for not two years but four years—guaranteed funding of that \$28 million for 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 in the enterprise agreement.

I do not know how other people negotiate, but to my mind an agreement is a package. You do not sign off a part of an agreement and then go on and do the rest of it—it is a total package. You sign off on a total package. You do not pick out bits and pieces of a package and say, 'We will sign off on that.' This offer is a very fair and reasonable package for the teachers. It gives a fair and reasonable wage rise under the current State budget conditions. It also guarantees to teachers four years of this flexible initiative resource funding of \$28 million. That is a very fair and reasonable offer. It is now back to the union in terms of discussing this matter with its teachers and deciding whether they will accept that package.

FOOD ONLINE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Deputy Premier advise the House what technology is being used by the Department of Primary Industries and Resources to help our food industry develop into a more market orientated industry? I understand that the Deputy Premier recently launched an innovative Internet system called *Food Online*.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Flinders for her question and her support of the food industry in her electorate. Recently at the Virginia Expo I launched a new initiative for South Australia called *Food Online*, which is a way of using the available new technology to help the food industry both domestically and on the export markets. It is a virtual food centre that represents a partnership, as we are doing with the whole Food for the Future program. It represents a partnership between Government and industry. We are working together for the benefit of the many businesses that comprise the South Australian food sector—one sector that is doing extremely well in creating jobs in regional South Australia.

The *Food Online* program does two things: first, it provides coordinated information and service delivery to the food industry; and, secondly, it provides a showcase of the

products, the services and the people who have helped create the food and wine culture for which South Australia is becoming quite renowned. It is a result of the South Australian Government's State food plan, Food for the Future—Towards 2010, which aims to increase the economic value of our food industry from \$5 billion to \$15 billion by the year 2010, and it has been instrumental in bringing industry and Government together to achieve that target. South Australian *Food Online* is a one-stop shop for food industry information, providing 24 hour access to Government information and services from wherever businesses are located. Whether it be producers, buyers, freight operators or investors in the State's food products, it will be possible to locate a range of Government and non-Government information, service and contacts for the food industry which, for the first time, will be available in one place.

Whether the business focus is local, national or global, the *Food Online* channels connect the people concerned with the information agencies and programs necessary to make informed business decisions. One can learn about the food industry and South Australian food businesses and ascertain information about the food plan on the Food Showcase channel. Through the Food and Beverage Register channel companies, their products and services can be promoted to the global marketplace. There will be a register of South Australian food and beverage companies with their products, export destinations, brand names and packaging specifications.

South Australian *Food Online* is a vital element in the development of our food industry, and I urge everyone involved in the industry to take advantage of this online resource. It will give us another advantage on the export market. The address for *Food Online*, for the information of the loyal *Hansard* subscribers, is www.food.sa.gov.au.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Information Economy explain whether the EDS contract has saved taxpayers \$10 million per year, as promised by the former Premier, when the contract was signed over three years ago; and, if not, what are the financial benefits of this contract and how have they been calculated? Do you want me to wait until Dean fills you in?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will proceed with his question.

Mr FOLEY: I just wanted to give Dean a chance to bring him up to speed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: The Auditor-General's annual report warns that many Government agencies have not yet negotiated final assumed costs or completed their first annual review of service level agreements and that 'the failure to do this may result in adverse service delivery or financial consequences for the Government'. The advice is coming down from Dean to Kerin—you must be worried.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The Minister for Government Enterprises.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is one of the indications of where the member for Hart and the Opposition are coming from, because he interjected that I know that the Modbury Hospital contract was a flop. That is the problem with Labor when in Government and in Opposition: it does not care about how it spends the taxpayer's money. The fact that that contract—

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I know that the Minister is embarrassed by the Modbury Hospital contract, but the question was about the EDS contract. Could we have an answer on that one, please?

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

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am answering the question that he asked just before I stood up. Contracts that save the taxpayer money are the sort of thing taxpayers like, and we will continue to do that. They do indeed save money.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will come to order. He was out of the Chamber a few minutes ago when I reminded the House that the Chair will view seriously this practice of continuing to interject after the Chair has called members to order. It is bad enough for members to interject across the Chamber, but if they continue to interject after I have brought the House to order there will be a lot of naming going on this session.

Mr Foley: Sorry, Sir.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: These contracts are entered into only when certain services are being provided at a certain quality and save money for the taxpayer. That is what we have done.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: With respect to the member for Hart, who we understand is moving northwards shortly on the front bench—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come back to the reply.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am, Sir. With respect to the member for Hart's question, the contracts save money.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elder, who has already been warned.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The EDS contract is another one of those, as has been identified. If there is an ask for the total Government computing bill at X dollars and there is a saving on that across Government, that is something the taxpayers like. The simple answer to the question is that it is a matter for the Minister for Information Services, and I shall relay the question to him.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart for the second time.

EMPLOYMENT, EQUAL PAY

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment. At the recent ALP State conference I understand that a motion was passed calling for equal pay for workers regardless of age. What are the possible implications of such a move for the employment of young people and employment in the wider community?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I always like a challenge, Sir. Like the member for Colton, I was absolutely askance at the motion passed by the ALP because the day before—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I suggest that the honourable member look up the word in the dictionary if she does not know what it means. The day before the ALP met, the Commonwealth—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I would have thought that the Opposition might be interested in jobs in this State rather than prating and making a noise. The day before the ALP conference, the Commonwealth released research prepared by the Productivity Commission which suggested that a 1 per cent increase in youth wages could lead to declines in youth employment of up to 5 per cent. Even more worryingly, the research also warned that adult employment could also fall if youth wages rose. But, despite that very timely warning, the Labor Party refused to remove its ideological blinkers and has pressed on with a policy that may well destroy jobs.

I would say that nothing more amply illustrates the fact that the ALP in this State is stuck in a world of beam engines and steam boilers than what it did at that conference. It is, I believe, completely irresponsible for the Labor Party to ignore warnings such as this and to go on pushing for equal pay regardless of age and experience. Recently I was privileged to attend a dinner for a major industry that employs mainly union labour. People there bemoaned the fact that most employees with experience in that very large work force were largely over the age of 40, and that in and among young people, because of the youth wage structure, that industry simply could not afford to take on and train young people. And so the skills of that industry were in danger of being lost because simply we have not got the training structures—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I would hope that the member for Elder is a little interested in his own workers. Those skills will be lost not only to the workers but to the community of South Australia. I remind members opposite that less than a fortnight ago the Leader of the Opposition said:

There can be no more important task facing South Australians than tackling our jobs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Well, the Leader of the Opposition says, 'Why isn't the Employment Minister the Premier?' Let me say publicly in this House to the person who has the greatest record as Minister for unemployment in recent decades that, if ever I make his substantial achievements in unemployment in this State, the Premier will have my offer of resignation. I would not stand in this House and be responsible for that which the member for Ramsay was responsible for perpetrating on the people of South Australia. What a sad reflection on the Labor Party that someone with his record currently leads it. If he is serious about unemployment as opposed to playing political games with unemployed people, it is about time he immediately repudiated this sort of policy.

The Deputy Leader also laughs. The Deputy Leader would also do well to remember that she described the last youth jobless figures as 'really disgraceful and very bad'—and I am sorry that I must read out what they said, but members opposite will accuse me of misleading the House if I misquote them. The Deputy Leader should be standing in all forums available to her and asking why her Party wants to pursue policies that will only add to the dole queues.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The policy that you are proposing, in case the member opposite does not understand, will increase and not decrease dole queues. Members opposite would do well to listen to the Premier when he said yesterday:

The world is changing. We no longer need the numbers that we used to tied to the drudgeries of the machine age.

Members opposite should go to Mitsubishi and Holdens and see what new and efficient production facilities are like. More needs to be done. We need to have more workers and full-time jobs in this State, but this Government has made remarkable achievements. The Premier, the ministry and the previous Minister have made remarkable achievements. This Government has a commitment and it is an enormous commitment. Members opposite are neanderthals and it is about time they realised it and switched on the lights in Trade Hall instead of giving in to the appalling factional thuggism that goes on there. I note—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his point.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:—with interest that members opposite pride themselves on naming themselves ‘The Machine’. It is about time they switched on the lights and got real.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Information Economy, who I understand is the Government’s senior Cabinet Minister for information technology responsible for the EDS contract. I hope we get an answer. Will the Minister explain why the Government has failed to resolve key issues such as final assumed costs with EDS since it was contracted to run the whole of Government computer system three years ago, given that the criticisms of the Auditor-General in this year’s Annual Report are the same criticisms that the Auditor-General made in his 1995 Annual Report?

In his 1995 Annual Report, the Auditor-General said that in-house costs of individual Government agencies’ computer works should have been known as early as possible and that, unless this was done, the cost benefits and expectations of the clients could not be satisfactorily negotiated. Three years into this nine year contract the Auditor-General has revealed that the final assumed costs, unit pricing arrangements, revised annual price reductions and agency service level agreements have still not been finalised.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The various Government agencies have been operating on costs throughout this time which have been assumed, as the member for Hart said. That has led to a total across Government saving, and I will obtain a response from the relevant Minister.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Year 2000 Compliance advise what action is being taken to ensure all whole of Government information technology systems are year 2000 compliant?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I am well aware of the member for Schubert’s interest in this topic. As a primary producer he is well aware of the need to ensure that his farm operation is year 2000 compliant, and I am pleased to see that his concern extends to Government. The answer I am able to give to the member for Schubert’s question is, in part, considerably assisted by the Government’s very sensible decision on coming into office to bring about whole of Government changes in information technology provision for Government.

The Government now operates with standard systems that are used in common across all agencies. That means that areas such as Government payroll use the one system, CONCEPT; that Government records management is managed through the one system, RecFind; that desktop software is common, using the Microsoft software office suite of desktop software; and that electronic messaging, as it is introduced, uses the Microsoft exchange product. For that reason, unlike the problem that has been experienced in other States of Australia, South Australia has the benefit of simply ensuring that the common system is compliant, thereby reducing considerably our year 2000 risk.

As a result, I am able to report to the Parliament that in the area of human resources the CONCEPT system, which, presently, is not year 2000 compliant—and, if the system continued to be used it would mean that from January year 2000 there would be problems paying Government employees—will be rectified and indeed the new version will be installed in December this year, meaning that we should not have payroll problems in the year 2000.

In terms of Government record management, I am pleased to advise the House that the RecFind system is year 2000 compliant and will continue to operate into the new millennium. That has occurred through version 3 of that product being progressively introduced across Government. In relation to desktop software, Microsoft has confirmed that the version of software now being used by Government in terms of Microsoft Office ‘97 is year 2000 compliant, and again the Government can operate with the knowledge that its desktop system software will be functional into the new millennium.

In relation to electronic messaging progressively being rolled out across Government, that again is compliant and indeed provided an interesting analysis of the year 2000 date problem because the Microsoft messaging system uses the problematical two year date format, for example, ‘98’ for ‘1998’, but its software is programmed so that it recognises only those years between 1950 and 2049, thereby ensuring that it is new millennium compliant.

Our whole of Government financial systems, the Masterpiece suite of products which is provided to Government through Computer Associates, is also year 2000 compliant. However, that software package interfaces with many other financial packages within Government agencies. Many of those are not year 2000 compliant, and that task is being rigorously pursued to ensure that all Government financial and accounting systems are operational and accurate as we enter the new millennium.

I am well aware that the Government has had its critics for embarking upon standard software provision across Government, but we are now able to show to all States of Australia the good sense of that change not only in ensuring we have a common focus and approach to Government but also in demonstrating that when there are problems they are much easier to rectify.

PINES COMMUNITY CHILD-CARE CENTRE

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Given the announcement by the Premier on 2 June that a special fund had been established to ensure the viability of child-care centres with \$600 000 earmarked to ensure up to 30 community based centres in low income areas will remain open, will the Minister for Education tell the House why the 39 placed Pines Community Child-Care Centre has had to announce that it will close due to funding cuts; and will the Minister give an undertaking that

his department will negotiate with that centre in order to keep it open in the spirit of the Premier's announcement?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member indicated, in June the Premier recognised that there were considerable difficulties arising from the change in Commonwealth funding of community child-care centres and very generously suggested that we should look at enabling centres to work through that with some additional funding from the State. As a result, \$1 million was allocated and, as the member for Taylor has correctly indicated, some \$600 000 was allocated to lower socioeconomic areas. I am not aware of the exact details of the Pines centre to which the honourable member has referred. I will endeavour to get an answer for the honourable member to determine the current circumstances of that centre.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Employment inform the House of the latest report into South Australia's employment trends by Morgan and Banks? I understand that the survey of hiring intentions showed that South Australia's medium sized businesses are the most optimistic in the country.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I thank the member for his question, and I know he has long held a very passionate interest in business in this State, especially small and medium size business. It is very good news for South Australia that the latest Morgan and Banks survey shows the hiring intentions of South Australia's medium size businesses as the most optimistic in the country, with 28 per cent expecting to put on staff over the next three months compared with an average of only 19 per cent nationally. There is the good news, and members of the Opposition are falling asleep because they do not want to hear it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Mike Rann said:

South Australia has to change its business culture and drop kick the whingers to the sideline if it is to exceed economically in the future.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: That is not Mike Terlet at the chamber's dinner last Friday, although it could well have been, but Mike Rann in a speech to the American Chamber of Commerce. I suggest that the honourable member opposite take the advice of his Leader and shut up or put up some good constructive thoughts on employment in South Australia. In the IT industry, which is the fastest growing employment sector in this State, 61.7 per cent of companies plan to take on staff compared with 52.3 per cent nationally.

The honourable member opposite said that this survey is flawed, but I remind him that less than a fortnight ago another major recruitment agency, Drake, predicted 7 000 new positions would be on offer over the next three months, with hospitality and tourism leading the surge and with more jobs also expected to open up in the IT sector, Government, retail and education. In case the honourable member doubts that, that was reported on SAFM and Triple M on the 7 a.m. news on 15 October. Yesterday the Opposition spent—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the member for Schubert.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Yesterday the Opposition spent the best part of Question Time in what most charitably must be described as trying to scare investment away from South Australia. It was whingeing, cringing negativity of the sort that we do not need in this State.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will come to order. The Minister will complete his answer.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Let us tell the truth about a few performances, and let us start right now with the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition made some very interesting comments on unemployment on radio 5AD on the 1 p.m. news when he said:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics every month release figures on the job situation in each State. The simple fact is that South Australia is losing thousands of jobs each month and we cannot continue to sustain that kind of loss of job.

There is a measure of performance, and I ask the Leader publicly in this House to sustain his accusations.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order and draw your attention to Standing Order 98 that no debate is allowed. Standing Order 98 provides:

In answering such question the Minister or other members—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not need to read the Standing Order. I uphold the point of order. In the past few minutes the Minister has started to stray into the area of debate, and I ask him to return to the substance of the question that was asked.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I apologise, Sir. I was sidetracked by the Opposition's remarks. My reading of the Bureau of Statistics figures shows a different story. They show that, since July, employment in South Australia has grown by 15 700. It has grown in each of the last three months and the participation rate has grown as well—not, as the Premier said, as much as we would like, but it has grown nevertheless. Labor is not just out to scare off investment in this State and the things that it brings: it is also prepared to completely misrepresent facts to suit its political goals. If the Leader has other figures that he is aware of and I am not, I hope that he will share them with me. In July, Mr Rann released a public letter giving a commitment to provide a constructive and positive Opposition. We are about to announce the program for the jobs workshop. We as a Government, at the Premier's initiative—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member opposite plays semantics. I was never—

The SPEAKER: The member opposite is out of order because interjections are out of order.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We will listen to people from the length and breadth of South Australia, not have a talkfest for a privileged few. We want to listen to the community, and I challenge all members opposite to be part of that jobs workshop, to get out there with us and to listen to the constructive comments of the people of South Australia. We in this place will have time to debate the issue. The Opposition should be part of that debate. We are all elected to the privilege of serving the public of South Australia, and the public of South Australia is starting to say to us all, 'Shape up or ship out.'

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Attorney-Generals and Justice, Departments of—Report, 1997-98.

INTOXICATION AND THE CRIMINAL LAW

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I table a ministerial statement made by the Attorney-General in another place.

CRIMINAL LAW (UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS) ACT

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I table a ministerial statement made by the Attorney-General.

RIVERLINK

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I table a ministerial statement made by the Treasurer in another place.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I compliment St Paul's School which is in my electorate because, as part of its year 12 assessment, it has become involved with the Frank Quigley Homes for the Brain Injured. The Frank Quigley Homes are a remarkable achievement of the dedication of caring family and friends who wanted a better environment for those who have suffered a brain injury. They wanted something better for them to live in. They wanted a place where there could be integration with the community and where the residents could have independence with good support so that they could lead as normal a life as possible. There are a cluster of five homes at Gilles Plains which now provide that support and the opportunity for people to live in proper accommodation with dignity, giving them a greater degree of power over the decision making in their own lives.

Once a house is built, we know that is just one step in establishing a home because there are gardens and paths to be developed and shade areas to be constructed, and it is for that that I compliment and thank St Paul's College, which is sited across the road from the Frank Quigley Homes. I particularly want to thank the students. St Paul's College students have enthusiastically embraced the opportunity to become involved in the tenants' support program. I understand that 20 or more students volunteered for the first program, making the selection of the 12 students who would participate a very difficult task.

Last year the students from year 12 constructed four pergolas at the rear of the new homes and, this year, 10 students have taken over the care and management of the gardens. The students' commitment to the project is highly commendable and the students raised funds to cover the cost of and continue the landscaping work. Peter Shanahan, the school's Principal, and John Cameron, who is a teacher at St Paul's and under whose direction the students work, are

to be congratulated on their community-minded spirit. They have given these young students an opportunity to work with members of the community who have a disability and open their minds to the needs of those people in our society which may be different from ours.

The boys built pergolas which have been through one winter and which will stand proud for many more. As I said, a team of students is now managing the gardens in these homes. None of the boys were seconded: they volunteered to participate in the project. From what I have seen of their work, I can say they are dedicated to giving their best commitment with great enthusiasm. The gardens are looking very bright, they are well manicured and they are commented on by many local people passing by. This joint venture between community and schooling is a great example of our community working together, and it makes life and society a better and fairer place for everyone.

The students will learn many skills perhaps not available to them if they were not involved in the project but, more importantly, their eyes and minds are open to the differences between people in society and the fact that we have individual needs because we are in some way different. They will learn that we are all equal, although a little different, but that we are important and it is also important that we work together and care. I know quite a lot of these students, and they will make caring and listening leaders because of this project. I most heartily commend St Paul's, Peter Shanahan, John Cameron and, especially, the children for their involvement. I would like to quote the Treasurer of Frank Quigley Homes, who said:

Governments want to deinstitutionalise, their policies make that very clear. They want people to live in the community. Yet living in the community involves Government in a sustained partnership so that appropriate accommodation is provided, adequate support and services are provided, standards are established that allow people with a disability to live in a dignified manner, with at least some quality of life.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Today I understand that all members of the House have been provided with *The Book of Best Kept Secrets*, which was put out recently by the Tourism Commission. I for one was delighted to receive that long-awaited publication, which has 148 pages and which will be distributed to some 105 million specifically targeted households in Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide and the ACT, as well as selected regional areas in Victoria and New South Wales. The publication is bright and it is innovative, as are the cinema and television advertisements associated with the campaign.

I am delighted that the Minister for Tourism is in the Chamber at present because, while I am particularly pleased with this publication, I am also extremely disappointed, because the Adelaide Hills has been left out of it. I express extreme disappointment and frustration that the Adelaide Hills has been largely excluded from the Tourism Commission's latest publication, *The Book of Best Kept Secrets*, released last week. I have already expressed my frustration and made my concerns known to the commission. I led a deputation with a very positive response from Roger Cook, the Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Commission, and Bill Spurr, the Deputy CEO of the commission. It was a very positive and worthwhile meeting.

The meeting was arranged to discuss the omission of the Adelaide Hills from the publication. Both Mr Cook and Mr Spurr were made aware of the strong concern and disappointment that had been expressed, particularly by tourism

operators, at the Adelaide Hills being largely excluded from this major marketing push by the commission.

This is not the first time that the Adelaide Hills has been left out of State tourism promotions, and a large number of operators with an interest in tourism have shown their displeasure at this situation. I realise that it is far too late to do anything to rectify the situation regarding this and previous publications, but at the meeting that was organised with Mr Cook it was agreed that it was important that dissatisfaction with the current situation be put on the record.

The Adelaide Hills guide is the only regional visitors' guide not illustrated on the inside back cover of this publication, and the area is not even included with those listed on a reply paid coupon that can be sent to the South Australian Tourism Commission seeking more information. No Adelaide Hills events appear in the calendar of events, although some Hills tourism facilities are featured in the 'experience' section of the book, but with no Adelaide Hills listing generally. Perhaps the most damning feature is that, according to the map showing South Australia, the Adelaide Hills does not even exist. I am very concerned about this situation. Tourism is flourishing in the Adelaide Hills: we need only to look at the outstanding Hills Affare held recently, as well as the successes coming from the Yellow Pages SA Tourism Awards for this year.

We have so much to offer, and this has been recognised by the many private operators who have invested in tourism in various parts of the Hills. The new publication can hardly be described as supporting or encouraging further investment. It is unbelievable, really, when we consider the economic benefits gained by South Australia as a whole from tourism in the Adelaide Hills. The Adelaide Hills deserves better and I hope that the situation will be improved in the future. I am particularly pleased, as I said earlier, that the Minister is in the Chamber at present, because I am sure that she will take on board the concerns of people in the Adelaide Hills. I know that she recognises the true value of the Hills, as do the majority of South Australians.

Ms KEY (Hanson): During Question Time the new Minister for Youth raised the issue of the ALP Convention that was held a couple of weeks ago. Just for the record, I would like to clarify some of the misinformation that he presented to the Chamber. First, there were a number of motions under the youth affairs portfolio and the industrial relations portfolio relating to young workers—or young people who would like work if they could get it, I should say. The motion actually said that a future Labor Government will promote the value of equal pay for equal work of equal value by removing discriminatory rates of pay based on age, and that the ALP will endeavour to introduce pay structures that are based on skill and competency levels and demonstrated experience.

I am pleased to say that a number of enterprise agreements that various South Australian employers have been involved in, not the least that of the vehicle industry, have recognised the fact that many workers, whatever their age, are able to complete tasks within the level of their competency as identified by either the award or the enterprise agreement. The Minister for Youth may like to talk to me about the policy that was actually passed because, on his information, he presented misinformation to the House on this issue.

A number of other policies were passed in the youth affairs area. It is important to say that the policy came from not only the young people in the ALP but also a number of

youth organisations in South Australia, from the Young Christian Workers Association through to the different youth councils and forums both on a regional level and in the metropolitan area.

The interesting point about youth wages is that this issue has been raised a number of times by young workers. I believe that there are a number of United Nations Conventions that look at the rights of workers and the rights of the child in relation to their receiving equal pay for equal work done in the workplace. As I said, the policy that was put forward for debate came from a number of sources. One of the concerns raised with me was that in the past 22 months there have been at least four Youth Affairs Ministers in this State. I have been told there were five, but I cannot remember who the fifth one was.

Most of the youth organisations were saying that, whilst they were not criticising Minister Hall (when she was Youth Affairs Minister) and are prepared to give the new Minister for Youth a go, they were concerned that, first, there had been so many Ministers within such a short time and, secondly, that the ministerial council which was to be set up in South Australia (and which was, in fact, announced in the Liberal Party's policy) still has not been set up. Many questions were asked about consultation in the youth affairs area and where that was going. That is something I will be taking up with the new Minister.

The youth affairs issue is obviously important but is not the major point I want to make today: that is the Adelaide Casino dispute. I had the privilege of speaking to a number of workers who were holding a meeting at the front of Parliament House last night. Some 300 workers were present, concerned about the future with regard to their jobs and the industrial conditions at the Adelaide Casino. I am really concerned to hear that the Adelaide Casino, in its wisdom, has decided to pursue Australian workplace agreements (AWAs), despite the fact that negotiations are taking place with regard to an enterprise agreement. I am also concerned to note that, if these Australian workplace agreements come into force, employees can be fined up to \$2 000 for breaching secret Australian workplace agreements; they are not to take industrial action of any sort while the AWAs are in force; and the employer can bring action against the employee at any time up to six years after the breach of an AWA by an employee. I ask this Government where is the fairness in not only being forced into an Australian workplace agreement but also in having no rights.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House today the fact that it is Universal Children's Day, and to say a few words about how UNICEF (the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund) is marking this day, which is traditionally held on the fourth Wednesday of October each year. Since its inception in 1953, Universal Children's Day has grown to involve more than 100 countries and is now the primary day of promotion and celebration of UNICEF's work to achieve its mission statement, which in part states:

UNICEF is guided by the Convention of the Rights of the Child and strives to establish children's rights as enduring ethical principles and international standards of behaviour towards children.

Many members may already know of my long involvement with UNICEF, of which I am very proud to be a life member. This morning I was absolutely delighted to continue that association and open the Junior Ambassador section of today's Universal Children's Day celebration, in the Old

Parliament House Chamber. The UNICEF Junior Youth Forum held this morning involved more than 60 students from Balaklava Primary, Craigmore South Primary, Lobethal Lutheran School, Mansfield Park Primary, Noarlunga Downs Primary, North Adelaide Primary, Northfield Primary, Prince Alfred College, Ridley Grove Primary, Rostrevor College, Saint Peter's College, Scotch College, Seaford Primary, Saint Michael's Lutheran School, Stradbroke Primary, Tarpeena Primary and Walford College.

After opening the forum I was particularly fortunate to be able to stay and listen to some of the outstanding young speakers, and I thought it appropriate to share some of the comments made by these very thoughtful young South Australians. There were Daniel and Michelle from Stradbroke Primary, who spoke about what they valued most about living in Australia. They spoke of our cultural diversity, education opportunities, environment and climate. They finished with the following positive words of hope:

Australia is a 'good Samaritan' to other countries, and it is honourable to be associated with its global activities. It is great to appreciate the fact that all Australians have their say and that we're all working towards reconciliation, and a better future for everyone is something to look forward to.

Michelle and Daniel were followed by Orlando of Rostrevor College, whose address was entitled, 'I am Australian: my background is Italian.' Orlando spoke of the reactions his ancestors encountered when they first arrived in Australia and the decline of such reactions today, and said quite simply:

European migrants are now treated as citizens and most racism is gone against the Aboriginals and Asians, and now all we have to work on is making Australia a better place to live.

Two young students from Tarpeena Primary School, Amie Leigh and Stacey followed Orlando and spoke of 'some of the things we treasure about living in Australia'. They mentioned the diversity in our food, our peaceful way of life, our wide open spaces and our natural environment. When discussing their home of Tarpeena, they said with great pride:

As a matter of fact, the name Tarpeena actually means 'redgum country'.

The final speaker in this first part of the morning's proceedings was Helen of Mansfield Park Primary who spoke with great confidence and presence about 'my multicultural home'. Helen opened by explaining the bright future her parents had pursued by migrating to Australia and said proudly that she considered that Australia was her home and no other place in the world could substitute it. Helen spoke of the 15 different cultures and backgrounds of people at Mansfield Park Primary and then went on to speak of her views on racism and the responses of herself and her friends on the much publicised views of the One Nation Party.

There were many other fabulous speakers, and I congratulate all those involved in today's proceedings. I know that my colleague the member for Hartley opened this afternoon's session of the senior ambassadors which again included more than 60 students from schools across Australia. I concluded my remarks this morning by reminding people that all legislators and parliamentarians should have some conscience that we are in a world with a global economy of \$28 trillion, yet more than a quarter of the world's population live on the equivalent of \$1 a day. I would like to conclude with the following quote from one of the UNICEF publications:

Childhood is a time of hope and promise. It can also be a time of hardship, particularly in developing countries, where the burdens of poverty are so often felt among the young. I commend the work of the UNICEF activities today.

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

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): I rise today to talk about the 1998 Federal election campaign, especially the campaign in which the Hon. Legh Davis was involved.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, it cost me the vice presidency. I had to pack away the cigars and throw away my intern.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I got done by the machine. The Hon. Legh Davis made some comments during the Federal election campaign about something called Atkinson land. We have here what I would assume to be a senior backbencher—that is his one claim to fame after 20 years in this House; he is a professional loser. The Hon. Legh Davis was the person in charge of running my opponent's campaign in the Federal election, and he did a fantastic job: he held the swing down to 12.1 per cent! I understand that he was also involved in Ms Gallus's embarrassing campaign to hold the seat of Hindmarsh. She started the campaign on 8.1 per cent. I humbly say that I managed Mr Steve Georganas's campaign, and I was worried, because I knew that the Hon. Legh Davis was in there fighting for Ms Gallus. He made accusations about our campaigning techniques. He complained when we sent out surveys for people to fill in, and complaints were sent to the Premier or the Attorney-General. He feels that this is unfair and unwarranted. The Hon. the Legh Davis has been left behind in modern campaigning techniques. He is outdated and obviously backward.

An honourable member: He is a dilettante.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. To use the words of the member for Unley, he is a Neanderthal. He does not understand modern campaigning, yet he has the courage to rise in another place and criticise my intellect, my campaigning techniques and the way I work in my electorate. This man is a disgrace. I do not like getting up in this place and having to defend myself using personal attacks, and I certainly do not like personal attacks. There is only one person in this place with whom I have not had a friendly conversation, and that is the Hon. Legh Davis. I have had conversations with every other member in this House and, in fact, would call some members friends. I would call the members for Hartley, Colton and Unley friends. Of course, I would call everyone on this side of the House a friend, and they were all supportive of my candidacy for Vice President, especially the member for Torrens.

Of course, the member for Ross Smith could not wait to inform me of his decision on his voting intention. If my only claim to fame after 20 years in this House were to be that I was a senior backbencher, that would be a disgrace. The Hon. Legh Davis is a failure not only in the Upper House but also in his attempt to reach the Lower House. Apparently he has failed in some five attempts to enter the Lower House—in his attempt for preselection within the Liberal Party, in his attempt to knock off the member for Hartley, in his attempt in Glenelg—I think twice—and in his attempt in Adelaide. I think he got rolled in Bragg as well, but I stand to be corrected on that. What a great list of achievements for the Hon. Legh Davis! This man is a giant within the Liberal Party. I only hope that Legh Davis is championing the cause of Chris Gallus again in 2001.

There is a tradition in the House of Representatives—unfortunately it has fallen away somewhat in recent years—

regarding members of Parliament challenging other members in contesting Lower House elections. I challenge the Hon. Legh Davis to resign his seat in the Upper House, move to West Torrens and challenge me in the next State election. There can only be one member for the district, and I will stand behind my record and challenge Legh Davis to fight against me in the next State election. I can tell you the result. It will be the same result as that in Hartley and Adelaide, and in Glenelg twice. I will roll this person, because he has no idea of modern campaigning techniques. He is an ineffectual member of Parliament and an ineffectual backbencher, and he is a disgrace to the Liberal Party and a disgrace to this Parliament.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Like millions of Australians, I was absolutely appalled to see in the *Advertiser* last week a photograph of young Matthew Nemet, who is better known as the Boy in the Box. It was even more tragic to read, when this young child was eventually saved from the horrific couple with whom he lived, his mother and her partner, that his first words were, 'Don't hurt me.' However, even more horrific than that were his words, 'You're not going to put me to sleep, are you? I get hurt when I go to sleep. You're not going to put me in that box again.' What is even more unbelievable is that his mother, Michelle Robinson—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

Mr CONDOUS:—and her partner, Jason Leigh Stokes, both of whom, in the Maroochydore District Court, were given 9½ years gaol, are reported in the paper as possibly being able to get out in four years time. It would not matter what sort of person you asked: if you went out into the street today and asked anyone out there whether you thought that four years or even 9½ years gaol was an adequate term, they would tell you, 'Definitely not.'

The mother's boyfriend (Stokes) has admitted to punching this young child, burning him, hitting him with a broom handle, tying him up with strips of sheet and placing him in a box in a closet. Here is a young boy who suffered 100 cigarette burns to his eyes, mouth, ears, genitals and buttocks. Here is a woman—I will not call her his mother, because in my opinion—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS:—that is right—she deserves to rot in there for the rest of her bloody life. But even more alarming is what she was quoted as having said in the court, that she was prepared to kill her son rather than risk losing her boyfriend. It gives a new dimension to women who bear children, although I know that 99.9 per cent of women would kill rather than let anything happen to their child. However, here is an exceptional case and, instead of treating it in exceptional circumstances by giving the woman 25 years with no good behaviour bond, we are sending out a message that these sorts of atrocities against a child can happen in a home and you can be out of gaol after four years. Is that the right message?

I am delighted to have at least read one thing in the paper, which quoted the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown) as saying that he will have a say as to whether the child should see his mother while she is in gaol. Let us hope that the Minister makes sure that that young boy never sees his mother while she is in gaol, and that by the time she gets out he is mature enough to remember the pain and agony he

went through and never wants to see her again. Any human being who could treat another in this fashion does not deserve to bear another child.

If this had been a case where somebody had done exactly this to a dog, the RSPCA would ensure that the person concerned would get 10 years in gaol and not be released any earlier. When two horses were severely injured recently at Lockleys in my electorate, the hue and cry among members of the community was unbelievable. Why aren't we doing something? We are talking about human beings here—children in the community.

Members should think of the mental anguish of that child and consider how he can get back again to normal thinking and growing up, loving the things that children his own age are allowed to love. Thankfully, he has a father who really cares about him, and he is now back in Adelaide doing normal things that kids love to do such as going to the zoo, the beach and to the River Torrens. Let us hope that a human being can be safe. The reason I wanted to bring up this matter is that I know that we all feel the same about it. Let us make sure that the people concerned do the time they deserve.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:

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

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MINING ADMINISTRATION) BILL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act 1971 and the Opal Mining Act 1995. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Bill has been prepared by the Government to enable several amendments of an administrative nature to be made to the *Mining Act 1971* and *Opal Mining Act 1995*.

An important amendment to both the Acts deal with the establishment of a Mining Native Title Register. Native title provisions introduced in June 1996 provided that proponents wishing to explore or mine on land subject to native title must negotiate mining native title agreements with the holders of native title. Alternatively, if agreements cannot be reached or there are no parties with whom to negotiate, the proponents may seek a determination in the Environ-

ment Resources and Development Court to enable such exploration or mining to proceed.

The parties to such mining native title agreements may not want the terms of the agreements made public as they may contain private commercial dealings which could set unnecessary precedents. This Amendment Bill therefore provides for the parties to such agreements to nominate whether the terms of the agreements should be kept confidential or be available to the public for viewing.

Regardless of the process nominated by the parties, the Mining Registrar will be required to keep a Register for public inspection which will include details of the land involved, the exploration authority or production tenement to which it relates, the parties bound by the agreement or determination and any other information that may be prescribed by regulation.

The details of agreements and determinations will be cross-referenced to other parts of the Mining Register but those details required to be kept confidential may only be inspected by persons authorised under the Act.

Other proposed amendments outlined in this Bill relate to the charging of fees for services provided by the Mineral Resources Group of PIRSA. Following a review in November 1997 of the services provided by the Group and those services provided by similar interstate agencies, it became apparent that fees were not being charged for a range of services provided.

Accordingly, in line with Government policy, it has been decided that, where appropriate, the Mineral Resources Group should charge fees for services provided to industry and the public and, where possible, those fees should contribute towards full cost recovery.

Due to the comprehensive assessment process of all agreements and determinations relating to native title being lodged with PIRSA, it is agreed that a lodgement fee should be imposed under the *Mining Act* which will be in line with the fees provided for the same service under the *Opal Mining Act*.

In addition, one of the major areas of concern centres on the advertising of exploration licence (EL) applications. The requirement to advertise the proposal to grant an EL in both a state-wide as well as a regional newspaper came into effect in June 1996 with the State's new native title legislation. Since that time, the cost of the additional advertising has increased to \$145 000.

A scaling system of fees for advertising based on the size of the EL area sought by the proponent was therefore considered the most appropriate way to charge industry for the cost of advertising. The larger the area applied for, the higher the advertising fee to be imposed.

Other areas highlighted in the review were the need to remove an anomaly in the *Mining Act* in relation to the charging of rental for exploration licences, and the introduction of fees to cover administrative procedures involved in assessing and preparing applications for Safety Net Deeds, special approvals and variations of tenement conditions.

The Bill, when enacted, will also remove certain fee anomalies which exist within the legislation and therefore provide a consistent approach with respect to both the *Mining Act 1971* and the *Opal Mining Act, 1995*.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This is an interpretative provision.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 6—Interpretation

A definition of 'Mining Register' is to be included for the purposes of the *Mining Act 1971*.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 15A—Register of mining tenements, etc.

Section 15A of the *Mining Act 1971* is to be amended to make it clear that a right to inspect the Mining Register operates subject to the other provisions of the Act.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 31—Fee

This amendment will make it clear that the regulations may fix various methods for calculating a fee for an exploration licence, and may fix differential fees.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 34—Grant of mining lease

This amendment will make it clear that a mining lease can be granted to the holder of a retention lease.

Clause 8: Insertion of s. 63ZBA

This clause provides for the creation of a Mining Native Title Register as part of the Mining Register. It will be possible to keep

various registered agreements and determinations confidential, subject to specified exemptions.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 92—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation—making powers under the *Mining Act 1971* with respect to the prescription of fees under the Act.

Clause 10: Insertion of s. 70A

This clause provides for the creation of an Opal Mining Native Title Register in a manner similar to the Mining Native Title Register.

Clause 11: Transitional provisions

Existing agreements under Part 9B of the *Mining Act 1971* or Part 7 of the *Opal Mining Act 1995* will be taken to be agreements that are to be kept confidential under the new arrangements unless the parties to an agreement notify the Mining Registrar otherwise.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES (SHARE BUY-BACKS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Stamp Duties (Share Buy-Backs) Amendment Bill 1998* seeks to amend the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* to ensure that both existing and future assessments of stamp duty in relation to share buy-back schemes are dutiable.

The need for the legislation has arisen from a recent decision of the Victorian Supreme Court of Appeal (in *Coles Myer Ltd v Commissioner of State Revenue*). That decision effectively held that the transfers associated with share buy back schemes were not strictly 'transfers' and hence were not subject to duty in that State.

Whilst the advice received in this State is to the effect that the State Taxation Office can continue to charge duty on share buy backs as it has always done, it is considered prudent to amend the legislation to put the matter beyond doubt.

The *Stamp Duties Act 1923* will be amended to ensure that both existing and future assessments are valid.

My advice from the Commissioner of State Taxation is that he is unaware of any objection having been lodged, prior to the *Coles Myer* decision, as a result of an assessment of duty relating to a share buy-back. Following, the *Coles Myer* decision refund applications and objections relating to share buy backs have been lodged. The case has thus put in question the previously undisputed interpretation—an interpretation that seems to accord better with common sense than the rather esoteric reasoning of the Victorian court.

The changes to the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* will thus not impose any new obligations, but simply maintain the previous position as recognised and accepted in this State by companies and their advisers. The amendment should therefore provide consistency and certainty for taxpayers and their representatives.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Insertion of s. 90AB

Clause 2 inserts new section 90AB into the principal Act. The new section provides that an instrument (whether created or executed before or after the commencement of the new section) under which a shareholder transfers or divests shares to give effect to a transaction under which a company buys back its own shares is a conveyance of the shares. The new provision will not, however, apply to a transaction for the redemption of redeemable preference shares unless they are bought back on terms other than those on which they were on issue.

Mr FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I move:

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

May it please Your Excellency—

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

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

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

In moving this motion, I will make a few comments. Yesterday His Excellency issued a challenge to all 49 elected members of the Parliament of South Australia. I intend to reissue that challenge—

Members interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: Sorry, 69 elected members. I am glad you are awake over there—just testing; thank you.

Mr Clarke: I would hate you to abolish the Council!

Mr McEWEN: There was no indication on my part that I wish to abolish the Council or even support such a move. I reissue the challenge to the 47 members in this Chamber, but first allow me to pause briefly to reflect on the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Parliament. The first session will be judged by history as an opportunity lost, resources wasted and our electors neglected. We showed a lack of will, a lack of leadership, a lack of vision, a lack of desire to make a difference. The Opposition too often proved to be just that—an Opposition rather than an alternative. The Labor Party, to my mind—

Members interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: Just wait for it—you have plenty of time yet. The Labor Party, to my mind, showed a desire to simply destabilise the Government rather than to present a plausible alternative. It is so easy to criticise and so much more difficult to present an alternative. There are exceptions. The member for Spence in particular set about to use the legislative process to make a difference, and by gaining the support of the three non-Government members on this side he did make a difference. I applaud that approach, but too often the Opposition set about to create a cannibalistic feeding frenzy amongst the Liberals, and sadly for the Liberals this negative approach was too often successful.

While the Liberals are distracted from their true purpose by such Labor tactics, with an added dose of internal plotting, it is the bureaucrats who steal the day. Most of the 120 different pieces of legislation we dealt with in the first session were limited, visionless, restrictive and regulatory. Most added further to the over regulated environment within which we are forced to live and work. None took away regulation or red tape, yet the Liberals claim that they stand for deregulation. It is their policy plank, but unfortunately it is more about rhetoric than reality. So the first session was an opportunity lost.

In his address on 2 December last year His Excellency spoke of the need to rebuild South Australia. He spoke of a program of recovery and growth—not a program of selling all we have. He spoke of the need to engender trust in the political system and in politicians. He advised of plans to create a two-tiered ministry. He indicated that there would be a challenge to revisit Standing Orders. More importantly, His Excellency spoke of the potential for growth and development that exists and remains untapped in this State. Tourism and mining, the wine industry, the State food plan, value

adding to our primary products, and information technology are among those opportunities that await development through leadership and vision.

We need an energy vision and an education vision and a total rethink of the education system, and that is a lot more than a couple of technical high schools. We need to revisit our transport infrastructure. There is a lot to be done and it needs commitment and application from all of us. We need to raise our collective gaze above the horizon and agree on where we wish to be. Then and only then can we have a debate on how we wish to get there. Any philosophical differences that exist between us and within Parties ought to be about means and not ends. We owe it to the people of South Australia to conceive a vision that will give hope and inspiration, create opportunity and optimism. In this emerging world of borderless economies we need to call into question the relevance of the nation State and our place in it. If nation States are becoming increasingly less relevant in the global village, what of this State and this Parliament? What is our purpose? What are we here for?

Globally, nations will disintegrate and reaggregate. We are seeing this in western Europe and the old Soviet Union at this time. No such fate faces us. As an island State the pressures will manifest themselves differently, but nonetheless we have far less sovereignty and will be dictated to far more strongly than in the past. The old fortress Australia solution is no longer tenable—protectionism is not the answer. So what is?

In his book *The End of the Nation State*, Kenichi Ohmae talks about the four building blocks of the future. He says the four building blocks are industry, investment, information and the individual. He calls them his four 'I's. We all ask for an ever improving quality of life for ourselves and our children. As individuals and as a nation we recognise that we are not and will not all share equally in these circumstances, but we wish for continuous improvement. Many of the forces that will shape our future are beyond our control and, if they cannot be brought within our sphere of influence, we ought not waste our time and resources on them.

In my maiden speech I alluded to Steven Covey, who would make exactly that point. He said we must learn to operate within our spheres of influence and not our spheres of concern. I will look briefly at each of Kenichi Ohmae's four 'I's and hopefully use them as stepping stones to articulate a clear vision for us in South Australia.

The first of those 'I's is industry. Industry will go wherever opportunity exists: opportunity for its shareholders, borderless opportunity. Mark Latham in his book *Civilizing Global Capital* makes the point that 40 of the largest 100 economies in the world are not nation states, and that number is rising. They are corporate entities and not nation states. That number is rising, unlike Mark's star. He has now been banished by Labor to the back bench. He will rise again. He understands the impact of global capitalism on the sovereign state.

The second of the 'I's is investment. Investment will go where there is a market advantage. Investment will work hand in glove with industry and transfer management experience and technology to wherever the advantage exists. Governments can unwittingly play into the hands of this powerful combination by redirecting its own capital to the competition. Just one such example is the superannuation guarantee. It has had an enormous impact on reducing the investment available to rural and regional Australia—an unintended outcome with devastating consequences. Much of the future capital that would normally be reinvested by small business has been

gathered up by Governments and now is often invested in international marketplaces. This is the first of many warnings for those who claim to represent rural electorates. This is the first example of where the Liberals have abandoned non-urban Australia.

The third of the 'I's is information technology. IT has underpinned the globalisation of industry and investment. Data is now available instantaneously, irrespective of time and place. Inefficient industries cannot hide. Benchmarking is continuous and opportunities move quickly to exploit any natural or artificial advantage.

The individual is the fourth 'I': what impact are we having on our own future? It is the individual who allows all this to happen by exercising choice. The invisible hand of Adam Smith, price is all conquering. A nation's own citizens can become that nation State's worst enemy if they fail to embrace the consequences of this invisible hand. Every product, every service has a shelf price and a real price. If we choose to pay a discounted shelf price, we act against the principles and values we purport to uphold. The concept of connexity says that everything is linked and that, if you choose not to pay the true price up front, unfortunately you will eventually end up paying. I will give a couple of examples.

Mr Lewis: And paying more.

Mr McEWEN: Much more besides—I thank the member for Mallee. The shirt I am wearing is made in China, possibly without due regard for human rights or the environment. Human oppression and environmental degradation, no matter where it occurs, will eventually impact on us. We will in the end pay the true price.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: You are absolutely right—why did I buy it? Because, like other members, I fail at this time to recognise that we should be investing in our own vision and future. The recent article in the *Financial Review* entitled 'Why Australian oranges are lemons' points out that oranges picked in Brazil at 20 cents Australian per 40 kilogram box by children who are afforded no health protection, no accident compensation and no social security compete in Australian supermarkets with our own produce.

Price driven marketing undermines all that we stand for. We wish for a continuous improving quality of life, yet we set about to destroy our own interests with such competition. We are allowing the globalisation of the economy to create new global fault lines—global economies that dwarf national interests—but we recognise that there is no turning back. We must also recognise that we believe in a civil minimum—a social security safety net—and that this civil minimum needs to be funded. The environment within which we must underwrite this civil minimum is further complicated by the emergence of global generations that have more in common with each other than they do with the older generation.

They struggle with solving Final Fantasy Seven, and they post cheats on the Internet. Nintendo and Sony play stations are part of a technology driven convergence achieved in nanoseconds, not centuries. Our youth relates to information not location. The new generation will build their own futures despite us, so where do we fit in and what is our role? Clearly we must, in partnership with other spheres of Government, create the circumstances where taxes can be generated to fund the civil minimum and stimulate opportunity. To do this we need to be the best, to encourage investment, to focus on centres of excellence, to generate industry clusters and to ensure that our wealth generators are not exposed to unfair

or unprincipled competition, which is exactly what we are doing to our primary producers at this time.

Michael Porter talks about the competitive advantage of nations. Our competitive advantage will know a number of forms. Our human capital must be developed to be the best there is. This means that investment in initial and continuing education is vital. It means that we cannot realistically subsidise or offer incentives and inducements to industry because, when that cuts out, they go. That is a message for all of us: do not waste taxpayers' money on incentives or inducements as part of global capital because industry will continue to move to wherever the advantage exists.

It means that we must attract investment to areas only where we are and will remain the best. It means that we must exploit our natural advantage and add value to it. We cannot hope to be all things to all people. We need to build a critical mass and to develop a sustainable and competitive advantage in a focused way. Porter would claim that this needs a population base of around 10 million. We obviously cannot achieve this at a State level. We need to bulk up and build the relationships that give us this critical mass. In some commodities we can market only at the Australian level.

To try to market wine, say, at anything smaller may not achieve the sustainable presence and long-term penetration that that market needs. In forestry and fishing we need a national strategy, but in tourism, perhaps, we could get away with something less: a southern State strategy, say, in through Sydney to Melbourne and out through Adelaide. Michael Porter would also claim that we need to develop clear points of entry and exit: sea, air and IT. Ports for knowledge and ports for services. The concept of a north-south railway link makes sense, but we also need to be the intersection of the world's IT. The underground cables to Asia, Europe and the Americas need a connecting point—this could be us.

I am putting that we need to clearly identify what we wish to be and it must be focused, strategic and of sufficient bulk to be sustainable. We must also maintain control of our competitive advantage and add value to it. We know that the producers of unprocessed basic commodities will not be protected but rather will be abandoned to unfair and unprincipled competition. We have seen that done by the Liberals and by Labor. We must differentiate the product and position the output in markets that will bear the price. All of this needs a very different approach to the one we have seen thus far. Over the past 12 months Parliament has offered nothing in this regard.

It requires some intellectual rigour, some vigorous debate, some independent thinking and a lot of hard work, but I ask: do we have the wit, the will and the wisdom to do it? Before I move to what the Governor suggested we will be doing in the next 12 months, let me expand briefly on what is meant by a 'civil minimum'. We must actually underpin and therefore fund rather than compete with unprincipled and unfair markets. We believe in a living wage. We believe in accessible welfare, pensions, free education, natural disaster assistance and emergency services.

We believe in secure essential services and superannuation guarantees, in annual and long service leave, public holidays, occupational health and safety, equal opportunity, Legal Aid, disability support, emergency shelters, public transport, an accessible legal system, a fair health system, public and private security, a democratic Government and support for the arts, to name just a few. To believe in these things as a society, we must fund them; and we fund them out of taxes on wealth generation. If we then insist that the wealth

generation must compete unfairly with unprincipled markets, we will not survive.

The Governor in his speech yesterday talked about dedicated and sustainable economic growth in tandem with social responsibility. That is exactly what I am talking about: social responsibility is underpinning and funding the civil minimum. So, sustainable economic development in this country is economic development which will yield the financial rewards to underpin that which we believe in. The Governor talked about self-esteem, self-reliance and confidence. That means that we must be prepared to champion and to celebrate success, and we do not do that well.

We must put our winners up on a pedestal. We must support and champion those who have achieved and been successful. That will send the right signals to small business across the State. The Governor said:

My Government seeks to deliver the above outcomes while all around us challenges and issues are outside the State's control.

That is the point Covey makes: if it is outside our sphere of influence, leave it alone. In the next 12 months we must direct all our energies to the areas in which we can make a difference. It must be an area in which we can actually challenge and make a difference. He also talks about a bipartisan approach. We must have a bipartisan approach to describe our vision. From that point there can then be a point of difference. We can move on and, due to the differences in our philosophical beliefs, seek different roads, but the destination must be underwritten by all of us. That is the challenge.

Unfortunately, the Governor also spoke about a notion of reducing State debt to a point that would free up \$2 million a day. That is not achievable. If we sold all of the assets we own as a State we would still not achieve that objective. I hope and trust that this is not a signal to move towards a challenge that was put to us earlier: the wish to be a debt free State. We do not wish to be a debt free State. Debt itself is a positive economic instrument. Debt managed properly is a powerful tool that helps develop capital and create opportunities. I neither believe in nor support the concept that, as a State, we should seek to sell off everything we own to become a debt free State.

Even with respect to the ETSA debate there is no great advantage in selling off strategic assets for the sake of a short return because, in effect, all you are doing is bringing forward a future dividend and paying and accepting a discount for it. There is no point in bringing forward the revenue that will be guaranteed to this State upon owning the ETSA distribution network. It is a valuable asset, and it is an asset that will continue to pay a dividend. We are not interested in taking that dividend today and therefore accepting a discount on its true value. We do not need to own the rest of those generating assets. If Western Mining wants to produce some generating assets of its own, please allow it to do it.

It will take the pressure off the rest of this State in terms of underwriting a guarantee to supply electrons to the small consumer. It is the best thing that could happen to the State, but that has nothing to do with the ownership of the distribution outlet. It is amazing that they take A and try to link it to B when they are fundamentally different issues. Let this Liberal Government encourage Western Mining to build its own generation capacity, but never allow this Government to sell a strategic asset, a monopoly, the distribution network. It is too valuable. It will pay a dividend in perpetuity. It is just one example of where a preoccupation with debt is being

destructive and not helping us serve the vision that we ought to be projecting for this State.

The Governor talked about the drift of our youth to the Eastern States. The real issue for most of us in rural South Australia is not the drift to the Eastern States but the drift to Adelaide. The Adelaide-minded people are concerned about the drift of our youth to the Eastern States. They have already denied and abandoned rural and regional South Australia; they have done nothing to check the drift. If members think a series of jobs workshops will check this drift, they are sadly mistaken. Jobs workshops are a second order activity. The real question is: how will we generate wealth? We need wealth generation workshops in this State and out of wealth we will create sustainable jobs.

Another talkfest about jobs will achieve absolutely nothing and I can tell members that regional South Australians are not interested. They have been asked too many times over recent years to attend talkfests—an expensive exercise for small business leaders—by all sorts of people—SA Great, the South Australian Training Strategy and economic development boards. They have given the same message too many times now. The message from small business in rural South Australia is, 'Help us to help ourselves.' With a focus on wealth generation, the jobs and opportunities will come, but a jobs workshop *per se* will be no more than another talkfest. If we are dinkum about regional South Australia, we will focus and work hand in hand with small business to create jointly our own richly imagined future.

The Governor talked about telehealth in the home. What the Governor was alluding to is the opportunity for broad band IT into all homes in South Australia through which a product such as telemedicine can then be provided. Infotainment will be the stepping off point for broad band into our homes and the real challenge will be access and equity, because we must find some way to ensure that all South Australians have the opportunity for broad band IT in their homes. That is the challenge, not just telehealth. Telehealth ought to be an outcome, a product, of an IT vision and, if it is dealt with in isolation, again expensive mistakes will be made in the margin. This is a huge opportunity and, if we do not step back, it will be an opportunity lost. The GRNC can be part of this opportunity. The whole notion of rebuilding the communications infrastructure of this State—the data and voice infrastructure—is a tremendous opportunity; we must not lose it.

The Governor talked about reviewing the Education Act. I applaud the fact that the Education Act will be reviewed, because the human capital is our future. It is probably the most important and strategic investment that we can make. We must invest in our human capital and out of that opportunities will be generated. I do not believe, though, that the review of the Act will be anywhere near that visionary. I believe that the focus again will be on managing resources rather than leadership.

As part of that review, under computing skills, we see that every pupil in South Australia will have the opportunity to become computer literate. The only people who are computer illiterate at the moment are the teachers, not the students. We do not need a strategy to make our students computer literate: our students are IT literate, our students understand and, again through information technology and infotainment, they embrace this technology. It is the education system and the teachers that are being left behind. You can talk to them about internets and intranets but, when students ask whether they can hand up their homework on a disk, the teachers' eyes just

glaze over. It is our teachers and our system that need to accommodate the enormous opportunities being offered by the information technology explosion.

We heard about another 2 400 young people being offered traineeships over the next two years; that is, 1 200 a year. We must remember that three years ago there were 1 500. So, over the next 12 months 300 opportunities will be taken away under this budget. I applaud the 2 400 traineeships, but we need to acknowledge that there would have been 3 000. The number has been reduced. I also support the notion that 600 graduates are to be employed, giving our young skilled people, our human resource, the opportunity to apply their skills in the work place. I welcome that approach.

The Governor talked about access to safe and secure water resources. The real challenge for South Australia in terms of water is far bigger than that. Water is the gold of the twenty-first century. I am sure that the member for MacKillop will expand on that aspect and will point out that again a one-off opportunity exists for us to embrace water and to drive the agenda, not just squander it and lose control for all time of what is part of our vision, part of our wealth generation. We heard about waste management. Waste management is yesterday's descriptor: today we talk about resource recovery. I ask the Minister: where is Recycling 2 000? I am told that Recycling 2000 is again an opportunity lost and that, as a State, we are not embracing resource recovery but rather bickering about parochial issues. I hope I am wrong, but I need to ask more.

We hear about the Darwin rail link, which is scheduled to start in 1999. There is a real risk for me and for my community in terms of the Adelaide to Darwin rail link: we have a great fear that we will not be part of it, that we will be cut off from it. We understand that ASR is not interested in a freight line from Wolseley to Mount Gambier. The last thing the people of the South-East would wish is to be part-funding an Alice Springs to Darwin rail link which they cannot access. That would be a major concern to our region, which would be alarmed about paying for something to which it did not have access.

It was interesting to note that we are to trial air-conditioning in school buses. Again, that is in the margin. The real issue with school buses is that many of them are old and tired and the funding arrangements that are in place do not allow for depreciation, thus do not allow for reinvestment in our bus fleet. The other thing we are seeing is more bus routes being cut; therefore, there are fewer buses feeding small schools. Parents are driving past the small schools into the major towns, where they are employed; they are taking children out of the small schools, thus an educational option is being eliminated. This is not done purposefully or in a focused way but as an accident of a pathetic school bus strategy. Again we are reacting to a funding issue in the margin rather than having a vision about our schooling, particularly our primary schooling, and the future of our small rural schools. Members can see what happens when we become preoccupied with debt and the short term.

We talked about celebrating our success, and an attempt in that regard is the publication we received today entitled *The Book of Best Kept Secrets*. Sure, a fair few secrets were missed out and there are a few aggrieved people. We need to get it right the second time around but it was not a bad effort for the first time. I am sure that, when everyone looks at it, they will give them a hand, and the real people will make an improvement. But at least it is a start in terms of championing

opportunities and being proud of what we have to offer in the tourism industry in South Australia.

We heard about the opportunity for call centres. Call centres are not an opportunity for Adelaide at the expense of the Eastern States: they are an opportunity for the whole of South Australia. I had the pleasure recently of visiting the 013 Telstra call centre in Mount Gambier. This is a great opportunity. Technology will allow the development of these opportunities, irrespective of place, so that we can help to underpin the regeneration and revitalisation of our small rural economies. Let us think about call centres but let us use them as a springboard to address the damage we have done in rural South Australia, not just grab them for Adelaide and again abandon the bush.

The task force on regional development needs to come to grips with the real issue, that is, that we need a holistic approach at a regional level. As funding was cut and as Government services were restricted, every one of them clawed back. Like a great octopus, the tentacles were pulled in and one by one families were pulled out of small rural communities. From the vantage point of the bureaucrat in the central bureaucracy it was nothing because it was only one family here and one family there but, when viewed from a different plane, as a member of a small rural community, 20 different agencies were doing the same thing and suddenly it was 20 families. Down came the critical mass: there were fewer teachers, nurses and police so more people left. Let us hope that the regional development strategy understands in a holistic way what a critical mass is about and what is required to justify the levels of service that we all have the right to expect. That is the challenge for the strategy but, on past performance, I doubt whether that is the view that those people will take. They struggle to look on the other axis.

There are a couple of other points that I would like to make briefly in terms of the Governor's address in opening the Second Session yesterday. He alluded to the fact that a re-elected Commonwealth Government has a mandate to restructure taxation. He is absolutely right. It does have a mandate and it is a one-off opportunity for this State. It is another opportunity for us to step back from asset sales for a minute and look at what the problem truly is. Horizontal and vertical fiscal equalisation is the challenge—the tax base, the mix in the tax base, between State and Federal Government. It is in the black; we are in the red; it is our money. It is our tax and we want it back. That is the challenge for this State and that will help redress a lot of the wrongs. If we get the overall tax balance right, we will not have to worry about asset sales to anywhere near the same degree to alleviate what is perceived to be a difficult State debt.

The challenge for all 47 of us is to agree. We have some challenges in common. We need to describe the vision. We need to sign off on the centres of excellence and the best practice that we believe is possible in this State, and then start debating a strategy to get to that end. Then we can start to debate how to invest in our human capital and how to do something about the bureaucratic red tape and all the other barriers to wealth generation. We should do that second, but first we should show some optimism and pride in the opportunities that exist in this State and demonstrate that we can lead this State through a vision, not implode through further internal fighting and scrapping in this place.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I take this opportunity to congratulate and thank His Excellency on his address to the

people of South Australia in setting out the agenda for his Government for the Second Session of the Forty-Ninth Parliament.

On 4 December last year I had the privilege and pleasure of making my first contribution to debate in this House as the representative of the people of Chaffey. I spoke then of the message delivered by South Australian voters in the election of 11 October 1997. It was clear from the election results that rural South Australians were demanding nothing less than a new deal from the major political Parties and this Government. I do not believe that the expectations of people and businesses in rural South Australia are unreasonable. They expect parliamentarians and Government appointees to the various community boards, agencies and organisations to listen to rural views and concerns and to communicate and represent those views and concerns in Parliament and all the other policy forums in which we as elected State political representatives operate.

Secondly, I believe that they expect a positive commitment on the part of the Government to economic advancement of rural communities as well as recognition and support for individual effort at a local level. They expect consistency and coordination of Government policies and programs in rural areas. They expect a decent level of basic services and infrastructure. I have to say that, after 12 months, the expectations of rural South Australians are a long way from being met. There is a strong feeling that as a State we are still going backwards, that we are being held back by Government indecision, endless political point scoring and factional infighting.

I am concerned that this Government has failed to develop a visionary plan or to pursue policies to generate optimism and confidence that would trigger economic growth in this State. I am especially concerned that the Government has failed to recognise and nurture the economic growth and development potential of regional and rural South Australia in a coordinated and consistent fashion.

The Premier has staked his political standing on a pledge that South Australia will be debt free before the next State election. His commitment to lift the ongoing burden on South Australians that is a legacy of the last Labor Government in this State is undoubtedly a good policy objective and I support it, but by itself that policy is not capable of achieving all that the Premier has promised. Of itself, the reduction or elimination of the State's debt cannot, to use the Premier's words, give us a positive, optimistic future.

It is clear that the Premier has in mind a sweeping privatisation agenda. To achieve the nominated debt-free target by 2001, the Premier and the Government will have to sell off various other State-owned assets in addition to those already earmarked for sale. Those assets now on the list for sale include ETSA, Optima Energy, the Ports Corporation, SA Lotteries, the Motor Accident Commission and the TAB. To this list can probably be added SA Water and the State's forest resources. Such a massive program of privatisation of publicly owned strategic assets over three years would be unprecedented in the history of this country.

If one thing is certain about the effect of privatisation it is that Governments neglect community service obligations after the sale of public enterprises and public services takes place. The effect of cutbacks in basic services has already caused more pain in rural areas than anywhere else. That is because the level and availability of basic services and infrastructure in regional areas has traditionally been lower and the cost higher than in metropolitan areas. In my view,

what has happened to services and infrastructure to date in rural South Australia casts considerable doubt on the Government's rhetoric about its commitment to regional economic development.

When this House next considers Government proposals for privatisation of public enterprises and the important services that the public sector now provides in rural South Australia, it should keep in mind a simple economic reality. The reality is that the private sector will not maintain or expand services, infrastructure and enterprises in rural areas unless there is an economic pay-off. Profitability and rate of return on capital is a key consideration for the private sector. It is rarely in the interests of potential investors or existing businesses in rural areas to provide the essential community infrastructure and services which are necessary and which enhance a region's attractiveness to new investment.

The reality is that, under our system of competitive federalism, South Australia competes with every other State and Territory for new development dollars and new industry. At a regional level, every new investment in regional Queensland, New South Wales or Victoria is a lost opportunity for regional South Australia. Jobs and skills follow investment. Regional communities live or die on the basis of their ability to attract new investment. To keep and attract worthwhile industries and businesses to rural areas, we need to offer competitive community service standards and competitive infrastructure options.

Any rural or remote region in South Australia that loses health, education and other basic community services will struggle to maintain its infrastructure for future economic viability. The loss of community services, economic infrastructure and new investment becomes part of an accelerating downward spiral. By contrast, rural regions that can retain a basic, reasonable standard of community services and infrastructure options find it easier to attract new industries and new investment.

As members of this House are well aware, the wine industry is one of the few bright spots in a generally slow South Australian economic scene. In the Riverland, there is an ongoing surge of new investment due in particular to the booming export demand for our region's wines. For example, BRL Hardy is investing \$25 million to \$30 million in the expansion of its winery operation; Kingston Estates, \$6 million; Normans, \$3.5 million; Australian Vintage, \$3.5 million; and Southcorp more than \$7 million. Total new investment in regional wineries is more than \$45 million and that is just in the Riverland. Vineyard expansion continues to be substantial. Already the value of the Riverland crop is about half of the total South Australian crop.

Even the bare statistics for the industry tell a remarkable story. In 1998, the Riverland crushed 234 000 tonnes of grapes. Within five years, this figure is projected to increase to 400 000 tonnes or more. In 1999 alone, the estimated increase in the crush will be 50 000 tonnes. By 2002, grape production in the Riverland is projected to increase to a level that is higher than total South Australian production in 1997.

This poses some logistical and processing problems for the industry moving into the future as these vineyards come into production, and needs to be addressed by the industry with the support of Government. Many other industries in the Riverland are benefiting from the flow-through effects of wine industry investment and expansion. In a very real sense, the region is leading the way in State economic recovery and revitalisation, yet even the Riverland struggles to retain basic services and attract the kind of economic infrastructure that

encourages new investment and development. Recently, QANTAS made a commercial decision not to continue with the regular Adelaide/Renmark/Mildura service. QANTAS has passed on the contract to O'Connor Airlines, which has decided that it will no longer include Renmark as a stopover, apparently because it will be using larger aircraft, which are not economical to land in Renmark.

This purely commercial decision means that the Riverland has lost its only regular commercial commuter air link with Adelaide and the East Coast. From the Renmark area there was an average of 1 000 pickups and drops in Adelaide, plus a business of around \$35 000 in freight. This is not, however, financially viable for O'Connor. Business transport costs will now increase, and many Government organisations and agencies will be forced to absorb additional costs involved in chartering flights. For example, the Riverland Health Authority will be required to charter flights for visiting specialists at an estimated additional cost to its travel budget of \$40 000 a year. This is in a budget that is being continually stretched by increases in costs, and without a lift to the ceiling of the budget.

I would need a good deal of convincing that the privatisation of QANTAS, although it is a Federal privatisation, has provided a better deal for Riverland businesses or residents. Let me give another example, involving natural gas infrastructure. Recently, Boral and Investra announced their intention to extend the natural gas pipeline from Berri to Mildura, bypassing Renmark. Thanks to the lobbying efforts of the Renmark community and Renmark council, Boral is now considering the viability of a spur line to Renmark, after initially declaring that it was not economically viable to provide a service to Renmark. I do not single out these two examples or these two corporations for mention because they have done something wrong. As private sector businesses, they are required to march to the drumbeat of profitability and the balance sheet bottom line.

To my mind, however, the two examples go to the heart of the problem that privatisation raises. Community service obligations will always run a poor second to corporate profitability when any formerly publicly owned enterprise goes private. I believe there is no way that the Government can guarantee that all community service obligations will be met in the transition from public to private ownership. This may not matter very much in metropolitan and city areas, where the provision of services and infrastructure is much less likely to be at risk following a change from public to private ownership, but in regional areas it is clear that privatisation has been and will continue to be accompanied by service withdrawals and cutbacks.

The challenge for Government is how its privatisation policies will deal with the private sector decisions that have the potential to disadvantage an entire region. What, for example, will the Government do when Investra, a South Australian company, takes a hard-nosed decision, based on economic criteria, to run a gas line to Mildura, thereby giving our regional competitors a significant infrastructure advantage and, on the same basis, decides to bypass Renmark if the economic feasibility is marginal? This is the kind of basic question that the Government must satisfactorily answer before it can expect the support of regional South Australia for its sweeping privatisation program. When economic feasibility studies are finely balanced or when the numbers do not stack up, will the South Australian Government be prepared to make an appropriate contribution towards the cost of the service or the infrastructure in order to ensure that this

State's major regional economies remain competitive with comparable regions in the Eastern States when it comes to attracting and retaining business investment and business services?

Government help and involvement in the form of funding for feasibility studies can usually be relied on to confirm what is already known. In reality, no amount of Government funding for consultancies and feasibility studies will assist a region when commercial or economic viability clashes with Government service obligations. Unless the Government is prepared to pay the funding shortfall or an appropriate operating subsidy, a private sector provider is highly unlikely to recognise or shoulder service obligations that are properly the responsibility of Government. There comes a point when a community loses its critical mass of essential infrastructure and services, at which point it ceases to be an effective competitor for new business investment and development.

In my view, we should be very clear about the neglect of community service obligations that has been and will continue to be an inevitable consequence of the program of privatisation planned by the Government. I have yet to be convinced that there will be safeguards or incentives to ensure adequate service provisions and infrastructural development a decade down the track from the privatisation of currently State-owned businesses and assets. As well as exercising great caution in considering any proposal to sell off the strategic assets that this State has painstakingly built up over the decades, I suggest that this House should turn its attention to changes needed to attract new investment and economic development to South Australia, which includes regional South Australia.

Whilst the Riverland is currently experiencing an economic boom, mainly due to the success of the wine industry, the region needs to diversify from its horticulture dependency by attracting alternative and value-adding development that will secure the future of the region by establishing an economic base not solely dependent upon horticulture and agriculture. The Government's \$2 million package that secured a future for Berri Limited in the Riverland is to be applauded. Berri Limited is the Riverland's largest employer and, whilst rationalisation has seen the administration business withdraw from South Australia, employees in the Riverland can now feel secure about their future.

Initiatives such as the recently announced Riverland Rural Partnership Program are a start, and should also be commended. This \$5 million program is jointly funded by State and Federal Governments and will provide assistance to existing growers to improve quality standards, and assistance to businesses with a view to export expansion. It is a program designed to establish partnerships between the Government and existing enterprises to create opportunities for economic growth. I commend the Government for these commitments. I particularly would like to commend the Minister for Primary Industries for his contribution to rural communities through programs developed to enhance the efficiency, sustainability and profitability of rural industries.

Programs such as the Riverland Rural Partnership Program and Food for the Future, and his commitment to projects such as the Loxton irrigation rehabilitation and the Qualco-Sunlands drainage scheme, indicate his commitment to the Riverland and to the rest of regional South Australia. However, much is still to be done from an industry perspective, and I look forward to working closely with the new Minister for Industry and Trade in the future. To date we have been only tinkering around the edges. What is lacking

is a coordinated and consistent approach to regional development. In the past 12 months this Government has done little to restore the confidence of rural South Australians that it is serious about its regional development policy direction. In fact, the general perception is that this Government does not have a long-term policy direction, apart from the Premier's privatisation agenda.

Where is the aggressive approach? Where are the plans to get out there and aggressively target specific industries to attract new investment to regional South Australia, not just metropolitan South Australia? I suggest that, in terms of policy, this Government has become one-dimensional, having become obsessed with privatisation. The Government does not seem to have yet grasped the link between economic growth, attraction of new development and jobs creation in rural South Australia. There is no need for the Government to attempt to pick winners or waste taxpayers' funds in backing business ventures. There are plenty of entrepreneurs who have the energy, drive, resources and commitment to succeed in their own business without the Government holding their hand.

What regional industries and regional communities need are basic community services and basic economic infrastructure. Where community services and infrastructure are adequate, economic growth, development and jobs are created by individuals and businesses. All this talk about jobs workshops, job summits and job creation is merely political rhetoric. Politicians from both major Parties have failed to find solutions to this State's unacceptable employment problem, and this Government's latest commitment of a mere four weeks of community consultation to address a problem of this magnitude is laughable. Politicians do not create jobs: industry does. Industry will grow, expand and employ, given the right economic conditions. Governments can work with industry to maximise opportunities within the boundaries of their control.

What is needed is an industry driven task force, and not a politically driven task force, that will identify the barriers to economic development in South Australia—a task force that will compare this State with other States and benchmark the performance of our Government agencies against our more aggressive neighbours. Why is it that we accept that it is okay for developers to be continually frustrated by over regulatory red tape? When our State is on its knees economically, why do we continue to tolerate a bureaucratic approach based on asking, 'Why?' or exploring 'Why not?' instead of asking, 'How?' and 'How soon?'

Complacency and the dead hand of bureaucracy are problems that must be addressed by political leaders with the intestinal fortitude to take tough decisions and make the necessary changes. This approach probably will not win bipartisan support in this House but it will certainly have my support, and I am pretty sure that it will have the support of the great majority of rural South Australians. This Government can make a difference to the future prosperity and jobs creation in South Australia, but only if it challenges the traditional boundaries that have bound us to mediocrity and the anti-development culture that has been ingrained over many decades. For South Australia's sake, every member in this House must put aside personal ambitions, put an end to the endless witch-hunts, both by the Opposition and internally within the Liberal Party.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs MAYWALD: That is a good point; maybe we need to clear it out and start again. We must concentrate on re-

establishing confidence in the political process and in the future of this great State. I look forward to developing a positive working relationship with the Government for the next session for a better future for all South Australians.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): It is a privilege to rise in this place in the second session of my first term as a member of the House of Assembly. I would like to congratulate the Governor on his speech. Although I might disagree with some of the sentiments in His Excellency's address, he has served this State well as our Governor. We must ensure that our Governors can maintain their independence and defend their non-political role. We must guard against Governments' attempting to use the office of Governor for Party-political reasons. I am sure that the Parliament and the community will agree with this sentiment. I would also like to congratulate the Speaker of the House of Assembly and his Deputy; they have overseen the running of this place with dignity and fairness. I am sure the Opposition will be of one voice in congratulating them, unlike the case involving the Speaker's predecessor.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I was in the Speaker's Gallery watching.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I did. I recently wrote to the Premier of South Australia discussing the proposed sale or lease of our electricity assets.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No, he has not asked for my views, but I will give them anyway. I will read a letter that I sent to my electorate regarding the sale of our electricity undertaking, as follows:

Did anyone ask you if you wanted your electricity supply sold off at the last State election? The Liberals promised they wouldn't, now John Olsen has announced that he wants to sell our ETSA. I believe this is wrong and is a complete breach of trust with the people of South Australia.

Last year before the State election the Liberals promised they would never privatise our electricity. Tom Playford's Government—and he would now be looking disapprovingly over the Liberal benches—

was right when it said ETSA should be under South Australian control and direction.

ETSA not only runs a reliable electricity supply, it also pumps hundreds of millions of dollars into our hospitals, police and schools. John Olsen says there are massive benefits for our State if we sell our ETSA. But that's exactly what we were told about John Olsen's water privatisation deal.

We were told that the water contract would mean cheaper water, would create jobs and that the company running our water supply would be Australian owned. Instead water prices went up 25 per cent, hundreds of South Australians lost their jobs, and the company is now 100 per cent foreign owned.

Let John Olsen know South Australia is not his to sell, fill in the reply letter and send it off, no postage stamp is required. Yours sincerely, Tom Koutsantonis, Member for Peake, 229 Henley Beach Road.

The response I received was overwhelming. I mailed out—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: My mother has nothing to do with this, and I would appreciate the honourable member's leaving my mother out of it. You might laugh, but I do not think it is funny. I wrote a letter to the Premier about the overwhelming response I received, as follows:

Dear Premier Olsen,

Over the past few months I wrote to my electorate, seeking their perspective on the sale or the lease of our electricity assets. More than 12 876 letters were letterboxed.

Given the huge local community involvement we have in our local sub-branch in the Labor Party, it was easy to letterbox. I am sure the Liberals would have more difficulty than we had in getting material out. However, they can afford to pay for it to be mailed. My letter continues:

The letter included a reply paid card which constituents could use to indicate their opinion on the sale.

Mr Premier, I write to inform you that over 1 439 people wrote back to me, all indicating their opposition to your Government's sale of our electricity assets and you would be delighted to know that 11 people wrote back indicating their support for your proposed sale.

A total of 1 450 people have responded to date, and I am sure I will continue to receive more as time goes on.

I received an 11 per cent response to the letter I sent out. I am sure some of the harder heads opposite would understand that a response of 5 to 6 per cent on a survey is good; 8 per cent is very good; and 11 per cent is massive—through the roof and over the top.

An honourable member: Exceptional!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Exceptional—and what surprises me is that in some of the suburbs that would be considered more traditionally Liberal—for example, West Beach, Lockleys and Lockleys North which, of course, are no longer safe Liberal booths: they are now marginal Labor booths—the response was even higher, amounting to between 18 and 20 per cent. That signals to me that a lot of traditional Liberal voters are looking at the Government's legislative package and saying, 'We voted for you in good faith at the last State election, and now you have betrayed us.' They are switching to an alternative, that is, the Australian Labor Party. I will agree with members opposite that that did not happen as much as we would have liked at the last State election. Our primary vote is still not as high as we would like it to be; we would like it to be about 42 or 43 per cent, and it will reach that.

An honourable member: But 49 or 50 per cent would be better.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. However, realistically, 43 per cent is a good result.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: If I were the member for Unley, I would be more interested in counting the numbers involved in his own preselection rather than worrying about what happened in the Federal election. The letter that more than 11 per cent of my electorate has signed included the following plea:

I object to your Government's proposed sale of my electricity supply. You gave us your word you will not privatise ETSA before the election and I expect you to keep your word.

You promised when you sold our water supply we would get cheaper water prices, it would create jobs here in South Australia, and the new company would be Australian owned.

But instead prices went up by over 25 per cent, South Australian workers lost their jobs and the company is now 100 per cent foreign owned.

Mr John Olsen, South Australia is not yours to sell.

I will read into *Hansard* responses from 11 people who responded in favour of the sale. I have included the names of a number of people in my letter to the Premier who were supportive of the sale. Mr J.N. of Brooklyn Park writes:

I fully support the sale of ETSA. I do not wish my taxes wasted supporting a public utility.

He goes on:

I would be very happy in my lifetime if the Australian Labor Party never gained office again.

He further writes:

The only two Parties I take notice of at present are One Nation and the Liberal Party.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He cannot tell the difference. His last comment is:

Sell it all.

Mrs E.B. of Kidman Park just simply wrote:

Sell it, John.

Mr W.G.F. of Underdale said:

Sell it!

Mr Robert L. Peake, 12 Rose Avenue, Lockleys, a member of the Liberal Party and Treasurer of the Peake sub-branch, wrote back to me:

I am prompted to ask whether you and your Party have seriously considered the opportunity cost of the proposed sale of ETSA against possible future earnings from a depreciating State owned asset.

Mr T.B. of Lockleys writes:

The other day I listened to your Leader, Mike Rann, make comments about the Liberals being in disarray and, whilst I agree that they are in disarray, all political Parties break or change promises.

I want to talk about that comment. Unfortunately, our community believes that politicians are expected to break their word. Our current Prime Minister expects people to believe that there are core and non-core promises. I know of only one politician who promised never to lie—President Jimmy Carter in his inaugural address. I would like to see a bit more of that here in South Australia.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: What about Mr Keating and his L-A-W promises?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Those were fully fulfilled. The tragedy about the L-A-W tax cuts is that you broke your promise on superannuation payments after the election, but of course that was not a core promise. What this person is saying is that he expected the Liberals to break their word. He said, 'I expected them to lie to me during the election campaign.' We have to do something about it. South Australians deserve better than this. We have to change it on both sides. We have to stop making promises we cannot keep and start making all our promises core promises so that we start rebuilding some trust amongst the community. I believe that the Hon. Nick Xenophon is starting the work in the Upper House, but it must also be taken up by the two major Parties, especially the Labor Party. We have already taken the lead. We will keep all our promises. All our promises are core promises.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mate, after your little foray into Question Time when you said you would resign, I would be very quiet if I were you about what you put on the record. I would sit there very quietly if I were you. I regret that I am being disrupted by the unruly member for Unley, Mr Speaker. I will return to my contribution to this debate. What I will do in this session, in my first term as a member of Parliament, is try to bring back some credibility to politicians.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I mean this seriously. I am sick and tired of hearing community groups say to me, 'You tell us one thing, but you will not keep your word.' They expect me to break my promise. When I go to see school children who are very young, they make it known that they expect us to lie. They say to me, 'How many lies have you told?' I tell them, 'I have not told any lies. Like George Washington, I cannot tell a lie.' There are people out there who expect us to

lie. We have to change that perception. I am saying this seriously. Mrs D.T. of Lockleys says:

Please get on with the business. Very annoyed voter.

Mrs M.M. of Flinders Park says:

We are too small to fight. Go on with it.

This lady has been convinced by the Premier that South Australia is a small backwater State that cannot compete with Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. What message are we sending our children? What are we telling them about the future of South Australia? Our Premier thinks we cannot compete with Bob Carr in New South Wales, Jeff Kennett in Victoria or Mr Beattie in Queensland. I believe that South Australians can do it and can do it better than the rest of the country. That is a remark I made in my first speech in opposing the sale of ETSA. The Premier is selling our young people short.

I hope the Minister for Employment, who is in the Chamber, takes notice of this message. The message we are sending out to our young people is that South Australia simply cannot compete. In the 1980s, although we had many flawed policies in place, South Australia was seen as the marker of the rest of the country. We were seen as leading the way. We had the Grand Prix, and the economy was good. In fact, in 1985 our economy was seen as the best in the country. It was better than Queensland and New South Wales. We were doing it better than everywhere else. But with all the negativity poured out by the current Government, we have slowly eroded that to be a State where a majority of the young people are moving to Victoria and New South Wales to find work because they cannot find work in South Australia. Mr T.G. of Lockleys states:

As an ex-member of the Liberal Party, if ETSA is such a liability, why would anyone want to buy it? I have always voted Liberal, but at the next elections, both State and Federal, I will vote Labor. I do not know why John Olsen and Howard insist on pushing such unsavoury policies, e.g. ETSA sale, GST. They have lost touch with reality and the electorate.

I thought I would also write to the Premier about the 1 439 people who opposed the sale of ETSA. Mr A.T.W. of Lockleys writes:

If you wish to sell something, do it with what you own, not what belongs to the people. You have proved that you cannot be trusted. This State needs another Tom Playford, not a little John Olsen.

Mrs M.A.H. of Flinders Park writes:

Try looking at the real long-term solution instead of a quickfix that will take the pressure off you and leave the problems for the next person to handle.

Mr J.P. of Brooklyn Park writes:

And tell your mate John Howard not to sell Telstra.

Mrs J.B. of Underdale writes:

Despite what our Prime Minister thinks, never means never. Not until the next election. I have this dream: one day I will be able to believe something a politician says. One day, maybe.

Mrs C.C. of Lockleys writes:

I am [expletive deleted] very upset at the Government's handling of the whole affair.

Mr H.L. of Lockleys, an 84 year old retired pensioner, writes:

I have been a supporter of your Party for many years and I do not agree with your eagerness to completely sell ETSA. The outcome of the decision on this matter will determine my future voting pattern.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: Have you been opening the Premier's mail?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: They were in envelopes addressed to me. Mrs J.T. of Flinders Park writes:

What happens in 20 years' time if they go bankrupt, Mr Koutsantonis? What do they care about our State? Isn't that why we have public utilities owned by the Government?

I could go on and on and on—and I will! Mrs P.P. of Torrensville writes:

This is so short-sighted as almost to be blind. ETSA is South Australia and not yours to sell.

Mrs V.N. of Underdale writes:

I have nearly always voted Liberal but I am getting sick of them. They are not listening to people who put them where they are now.

Mr N.O. of Torrensville writes:

What happens when there is no more to sell?

Mr J.N.J. of Torrensville writes:

Sir Tom's ghost will purge you. So will a lot of us ex-ETSA people who built up the service. The section I finished running in ETSA always made a profit. The reconditioning section in the service branch. Thumbs down to Mr Olsen.

Mrs B.S. of Brooklyn Park writes:

Until now, I have always voted Liberal.

In terms of the Premier's getting us re-elected, he is doing a fantastic job. He is doing his best to make sure that the Labor Party is in Government after the next election. In terms of your Party room decision on whether or not to let Upper House members vote for your Party Leader, I hope you do. I hope the Premier is there until the next State election. I hope he is leading this Government until the next election, because he will do us a great service. I conclude my letter as follows:

This is just a sample of the comments people have made in addition to the earlier statement of opposition. On behalf of my constituents, I urge you, Premier: please reconsider your sale of ETSA and honour the promise we both made in the 1997 State election. Yours sincerely, Tom Koutsantonis, member for Peake.

I refer to the number of people coming into my office to talk about the ETSA sale. Many people in this place are probably sick and tired of talking about ETSA, but the community is not. Our citizens believe that they own ETSA, and they do. They believe that ETSA is their's and not John Olsen's to sell. In my Address in Reply contribution, I urge the Government to reconsider its decision.

I turn now to the jobs summit that we proposed at the last State election. The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mike Rann) urged the Government to consider a jobs summit and in fact promised that, if we won the election in 1997, we would have a jobs summit.

Of course, during debate, the Premier could not bring himself to say that he would work with the Leader of the Opposition. He denied us a job summit until the latest reshuffle when a new Minister for Employment was introduced into the junior ministry—the member for Unley. After seeing the abysmal performance and rating of South Australia in the employment surveys, he decided that the best thing to do for the State was to take an Opposition idea and make it his own. I commend the Government. If it wants to use our ideas to govern the State, fine, we will help. We are an Opposition that will help the Government in a bipartisan way. We are here to offer new ideas and constructive criticism.

However, I was devastated to see the junior Employment Minister cut off at the knees by the Premier. I hate to think what the Premier said to the Employment Minister, but unfortunately it resulted in a good idea being stifled. We would not have played a political role but a good and constructive role in a jobs summit. We would have offered

new ideas and a different perspective from that of the Government. Good government is about the flow of different energetic ideas. I think the Minister for Employment realised this, but the Premier refuses to allow the Leader of the Opposition or the Opposition to become involved in a jobs summit. It disappoints me greatly that he refuses us and the people of South Australia a jobs summit. We would have been applauded across the country for that bold move, but the Premier's short-sightedness has failed this State.

I also have a few things to say about the behaviour of members in the House of Assembly. Mr Speaker, you have been a very good moderator of this House—fair and honest. I cannot talk of past Speakers because I was not here when former Speakers presided. I have noticed that members from both sides are becoming increasingly loud, which is natural because members want to get their voice heard to express an idea across the Chamber. I have brought a number of people into the House to sit in both the Speaker's Gallery and the Strangers' Gallery to watch proceedings, and I get the same comment time and again: 'You behave like a bunch of children; you belong at a football match rather than in the House of Assembly; and you are unruly and too loud.'

Mr Speaker, you do a good job of controlling the House and making sure that there is a fair exchange of ideas and debate, but the use of a sin bin, which you are considering putting to the Standing Orders Committee, Mr Speaker, is a very good idea. It is a way of disciplining members of Parliament without having to name a member as the first course of action when dealing with unruly behaviour. Mr Speaker, you have been cautious in respect of naming people, having done it only once or twice. You have been very fair in terms of naming members.

Previous Speakers were quick to name a member at the drop of a hat. Mr Speaker, you have been more cautious and fair. Sometimes the House can get out of control to a point where more authority is needed, and I know, Mr Speaker, as a fair man you will name a member only as a last resort. The sin bin is an adequate way for a presiding officer to use his or her discretion to remove a member of Parliament from the Chamber while not restricting their right to vote in a division. That is very important in terms of the procedures of the House and its ability to function properly. Anything we can do to improve our standing in the community, especially in terms of the way we behave in this House, would be a benefit.

The other issue is the right of reply being given to ordinary citizens in our community who wish to come into this place and respond after being defamed or spoken against by a member of Parliament. Privilege is very important and absolutely necessary for our democracy and something we must guard against ever losing. But, there are a number of people who use privilege for Party political purposes and to defame people in the community who have no right of reply.

My predecessor attacked me in this House when I was a candidate and before I became a member. He accused me of being involved in organised crime. I had no right of reply, and there was no way that I could defend myself. I asked him to repeat his statements outside this place but, of course, he would not. My only recourse was talkback radio and television news cameras and press releases. The only way I could clear my name was to be elected to this place so that I could come in here under privilege and defend myself. It is an expensive procedure to do that. You have to gain pre-selection with a major political Party, go through the campaigning process, and then hopefully you win. Not every citizen who has been defamed would want to take up that

option. So, you, Mr Speaker, the Government and the Opposition are proposing that the public have a right of reply in this House. I believe that that is a great idea. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, and the others behind that proposal.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am glad the Minister is listening. He has nothing better to do than listen to me. I thought you were a Minister of the Crown and had something better to do. In conclusion, my Address in Reply has been about your excellent performance in the first session, Mr Speaker, the independence of the Governor, and the jobs summit. I just wish that the Minister for Employment had not been cut off at the knees but could have got up the jobs summit. Hopefully one day someone with stature within his Party will make it an important portfolio. We will just have to wait for that day. When our shadow Minister for Employment becomes Minister, he will be a member of Cabinet and so will have more credibility. In conclusion, behaviour in the House will be much improved with the introduction of a sin bin, and the right of reply for members of the public is an excellent idea.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): It is a privilege to be given the opportunity to speak again in the Address in Reply. It is an important speech in this Parliament for all members and one that I am thrilled to participate in again. In the Governor's speech there was a clear message about sustainable economic development and the consequence of good social responsibility. That is fundamentally what all Parliaments ought to aim for. The only issue about it is how we do it and what are the social responsibilities of the different sides of politics in terms of the different issues they see as being important.

There are three major social responsibilities at which Governments ought to be looking and on which they ought to be spending the majority of their money in a way that the private sector would not normally do. Government ought to fill in the gaps in many of these major areas. The first area is education. There is no doubt that the role of the Government in education is probably its most important role. The education of our young people to enable them to get opportunities in the traditional work force or in the area of academia, which is the other option, is the most important issue for a Government.

A few issues are important in the education area and ought to be picked up further by this Government, and hopefully future budgets will make them possible. The first issue relates to computerisation. No single issue is more important to our schooling and our kids than to ensure that they have the opportunity to have access to modern computerisation. If there is one thing that we—

Mr Clarke: Can you use one?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes, I actually can. If there is one thing that I do not think we have done as well as we might it is making available a much broader and more modern computerisation system within schools which enables young people to be better trained and which enlightens them to the opportunities within the area of information technology as our society changes over the next 25 years. Our schools have an excellent computerisation program but it is an area in which we ought to be improving and spending more money.

Another area about which I am concerned is the updating of school facilities. In my own electorate—whilst it has what

many people would say are pretty good schools—the schools are old in a facilities sense. They need a tremendous amount of infrastructure.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I qualified that and I want it to be understood that it is a qualification. Schools in my electorate are seen as having very good facades but internally their facilities need a lot of maintenance, and I believe that is common right across the State. It is one of the major problems Governments need to face up to. We need a decent policy of maintaining capital works and, of course, school facilities is a major aspect for this and future Governments.

Teacher satisfaction is another issue on which we need to work harder, not only from a finance point of view but in an academic sense. We must ensure that all systems within our education process enable continuation of academic training so that teachers are better academically at the end of their career than when they commenced. That is an area in which we could do more. Another area relates to support for teachers. There is no question that, in most of our public schools, teachers have a very positive attitude to their profession in terms of the outcomes they want to achieve, but sometimes support for them is not as good as it could be. All these issues, obviously, are very much dollar related but they are issues which, as an individual, I believe are important. They are areas on which we need to work very hard.

Another area with respect to education relates to the modern teaching of our children for the opportunities that they will have in life. I believe that many programs within our education system have absolutely no value at all. They add nothing in terms of academic or social value and they add nothing in terms of opportunities from a job sense at the completion of the first part of a child's education process. It is a matter of looking at that area and asking: how do we relate what we teach our children to their opportunities? That was a major issue about which, when I was Minister for Industrial Affairs and Minister for Industry and Trade, business people would come to me.

How do we get the message through that kids going out into the work place today do not have the education capabilities that we need them to have in a very general job sense? I think that that comment has been made to all of us and it is something that we ought to try to bring closer together. We need to get the Chambers of Commerce, the Education Department, the industries and the trade departments to sit down more often and talk to each other in a continuing sense—not just in a one-off sense but in a continuing sense—so that, when we educate our kids for their future, they have job and academic opportunities available to them. Obviously, I will be criticised for generalising, but the reality is that it is a major criticism that is made today and it is something that we ought to be looking at.

The second major area in which Government must take a very significant role (and this one does) relates to the area of health—the delivery of services to and the care of people. If there is one criticism of us, Federal Governments and the previous Labor Government, it is that we did not care enough, in the health area, for our patients. Having come from a health background some 20 years ago as a pharmacist—and I have lost contact with that very direct relationship with consumers—I know that it was an issue then and, in my view, it has not changed.

Facilities in some of our hospitals are second rate compared with what they ought to be. Again, it is a capital works issue. You must have good maintenance programs, you

must be able to finance those maintenance programs and you must be able to keep them up to standard. On the subject of hospitals, I would like to make a positive comment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Recently, my wife Judy's father died in that hospital. The service, the quality of staff and the care he received in that hospital were absolutely outstanding. I have heard a lot of criticism, both politically and within the community, of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but the service that he received in particular and for Judy as his daughter, in a caring sense, was just outstanding. The family and I have already written to the particular ward, because it is important that, when good things happen in our community, we put them on the public record. We in this place are all very keen to whack each other and have a go when mistakes occur, but what we do not do enough is to put on the public record the good things that our staff do in departments, hospitals or wherever. We do not do that often enough.

There is no doubt that, in the area of health, private health insurance is a major issue for Governments, particularly State Governments. Clearly, that is a major area of concern for me and, as a community, we must do something about it. We cannot keep going with a declining level in private health insurance membership if we intend to maintain the health care services that we want for our community, because it spins back in terms of funding for the States. It is a major issue. I do not know the answer: it is too expensive, clearly. The community always makes decisions about how it spends its money. It does not matter whether or not the issue is health or a motor car, if it is too expensive—even if it is needed—there is a move away from it. There is the balance between Medicare—everything for nothing—and having to pay for something if you can afford it. It is a balance of the equation that we must turn back the other way. We must find ways to sort out that problem.

The third most important issue, as far as the State Government and I are concerned, relates to security. Clearly, that picks up our police force and emergency services. It picks up generally how we feel about ourselves in moving around our community. In the 15 years I have been in this place, the perception about security in our community has lessened. In other words, many more people now believe that we have an insecure society.

That is a perception more than a reality, but we cannot walk away from the fact that there is a view that our community is not as safe as it was. We should be doing something about a lot of little things. Knives is a major issue, as the Leader of the Opposition has said. I do not think his solution is correct but the issue must be sorted out. The Attorney, I know, is looking at introducing major legislative amendments. My view is that individuals in our community should not carry knives. The airlines adopt that policy. If you board an aeroplane and you have a knife, you must hand it in. Why should there be any difference between an aeroplane and our normal community?

I do not believe people should be carrying knives at all unless there is very good reason for it. This is one area in which I am right of Genghis Khan. We ought to do something about it, because that sort of simple issue, in my view, would set a new perception about what you can do in public.

There is no doubt that we have the best police force in Australia. At one stage I had the privilege of being the Minister for Police and it was a honour that I enjoyed, because our police force is the best in Australia—and there is absolutely no doubt about it. However, there is a perception in the community that we do not have the police presence we

used to have. That is an issue about which I have talked at length with the Commissioner. We ought to do something about it. There ought to be a way in which we can show clearly that there is again that presence in the community and that there are better ways of doing it than the present system. I know that some changes are taking place at the moment and I support them very strongly.

I have been very broad brushed when talking about those three areas and, clearly, if we are to do all those things, we must have a very sustainable, economic development policy, which relates back to the fundamental view that the export business has to be what we are all about. If we do not expand our economy outside our existing business area—and it does not matter whether it is within our local area, statewide, nationally or internationally—we will not go anywhere in an economic development sense. Therefore, the export culture is the most important culture and one which we have to encourage and develop. I do not believe we are doing as well nationally—that is, exporting to the other States—as we ought to be doing in a host of areas. Many businesses look upon the export opportunity as selling overseas—Kangaroo Island being the exception—but, in reality, within our own country we have a huge opportunity to develop a lot of markets in the small to medium size business area. We as a Government have been concentrating on that area. It is an area in which we need to grow significantly.

Manufacturing is the fundamental area of economic growth and we need to ensure that our manufacturing areas turn around and grow, because that is where the real quality and value jobs are and will be in the future. For example, the automotive industry, electronics, defence and IT are fundamental base development areas in any manufacturing community. We have them in South Australia and we have good businesses that are doing very well. We need to encourage them to get bigger and develop. We need a policy that encourages small businesses to become medium size businesses, medium size businesses to become large businesses and large businesses to get bigger. We need to encourage growth and wealth and, as a consequence, we will achieve more jobs in the manufacturing area.

One absolutely specific area (and I see that the Deputy Premier is in the House) that we need to continue to develop is food and wine. We have the best wine in Australia and in the world. We need to ensure that we do not let Victoria and New South Wales succeed with what they are trying to do, that is, to ride on the back of growth in the wine industry and be seen as the wine areas of Australia. If we as a Government and a community are not careful, or if we are apathetic, Victoria in particular very quickly will be seen as the wine State of Australia. It is an area on which we need to work very hard, because we are the best. However, when you are the best, you have to ensure you stay there, thus all of us must talk about the great things that we do in this State, particularly in our wine industry, wherever we go. It is the single most important thing that we as politicians, whether Liberal, Labor or members of that other group—and I can never remember the name—in the other place—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes, but that was different. The reality is that we all ought to be promoting our wine and food industry because we are the best in Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I know that some of us do. The other food area which is experiencing most exciting growth is the aquaculture industry. The member for Flinders

has probably the most exciting development in aquaculture in her area—the tuna industry. Its future is enormous. Also occurring in her area are developments in abalone, snapper and many other aquaculture aspects which are very important for our State. We have touched only the surface in aquaculture. A couple of weeks ago I had the privilege of going to Japan to look at a range of opportunities in the aquaculture area. I realised very quickly the size of the market just in Tokyo.

The reality is that the Japanese supply about 80 per cent of the fish they eat either via aquaculture or by traditional fishing methods. Therefore, they import about 20 per cent. It is expected that by 2010 they will be need to import about 40 per cent of the fish they eat. Therefore, there is a huge opportunity, but again the opportunity is about ensuring that we get the market right and that we grow and export what they want. Our snapper have a bump on the head but the snapper that the Japanese eat have a very straight head. It is a religious fish. Their view, which was made very clear to me and to others who were with our group, is: 'Your fish is okay to eat but, because it does not shape up correctly, you will not sell the quantities at the price level that you want.'

Research needs to be done into all our food products being exported to any country, whether Japan or somewhere else. It is a very important cultural issue. Aquaculture provides a huge opportunity and we are doing it reasonably well. We as a Government put a reasonable amount of money into it but not enough in my view. It is a research and development area. It is a great opportunity for us to develop a brand new industry in this State. One of the prime reasons why we should do well is that on our shores we have the cleanest water in the Commonwealth and we have a great opportunity. We need to sort out the planning laws. We need to get hold of a few greens and stitch them up, and show them how the industry, when properly undertaken, is of tremendous value, instead of having this automatic knocking that, where you have fish cages, you automatically have problems. That is not the case, but there can be problems if you do not do it properly. We ought to be insisting on and providing proper guidelines—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You have heard it. I have referred to the wine industry. I now refer to the role of the media in the promotion of South Australia. In the past fortnight five South Australians received national awards in tourism, and those awards were fantastic for our State. There was a tremendous lift-out in the *Australian* setting out the awards that those five people won. The *Advertiser*—on page 47, I think it was (falling off the back page)—listed that group. I am very proud of all the sporting achievements of people in this State: they are fantastic and we need to promote them, and we do a great job in promoting them, but we ought to encourage our newspaper—and I will do this—to visit those five people and give each of them a full page run-down on how good their products are. I will not talk about them in the House today but there were five major award winners.

Last Friday night at the Chamber of Commerce there were four major award winners. They received a mention in our local paper but there has been no individual follow up or a one page editorial about them. There was a fantastic effort from those people.

Last week Minelab won the Small Business Award. Approximately 80 per cent of its goods are exported from this country. That company employs 170 people. The Crows do not employ 170 people. They did not employ 50 people three

years ago and they have not developed their business to employ 170 people now. Business has fantastic stories and they ought to be given editorial coverage in our media in this town. We ought to encourage our media to do that because those stories are as important to the attitude problem we have in this State as is the success of any sporting team, be it the Crows, a netball team, a basketball team or whatever. They are also important—indeed, they are critical—but other good news stories are happening, people in business are achieving these sorts of outcomes, and we ought to give industry and development people the same sort of encouragement when they are successful as we give our sporting heroes. That is a very important issue. It is not enough to talk about it in editorials or to mention good news stories: we should encourage media people to go out and interview and write stories.

I turn now to the political process. I remember as well as any one of us a promise made by the Leader of the Opposition at the last election that if he became Premier he would work together with the Opposition of the day on a whole range of issues to develop our State. Clearly, that has been missing in this Parliament for 10 years. It has not just happened: it has happened over the last 10 years. Prior to that there was a tremendously strong Opposition, which I was part of when I first entered Parliament. I was only one of the junior boys in the Opposition and there was criticism of the Government on process, but there was a hell of a lot of working together on major issues that needed to be addressed in the community. We agree on a lot of issues in this place, but there is not that same sort of support. If we asked the public whether the two sides of Parliament support each other, they would say 'No', but we in this place know that a lot of things are done that are not carried forward.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: To answer the honourable member's interjection, I reply that I had the privilege of being the Minister when we had the biggest ever Grand Prix.

Mr Clarke: You complained about it in Opposition.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We complained about a whole range of issues and asked the questions that needed to be asked. That is the sort of thing that the Opposition has to do, and I accept that. I have always accepted that. On some matters we ought to sit down together, promote the State together and work together. When a Minister is working in any given area—it might involve the wine industry or a tourism project—we ought to involve the Opposition more often, and the reverse also ought to be true. That does not happen as often as it ought to.

The last election was a magnificent result, and an interesting result, for the Liberal Party. I remember in 1989 coming up in the lift with the Leader of the Opposition (Mike Rann), and I was complaining about our losing with 52 per cent of the vote. I remember him saying to me, 'One of these days you will learn how to win the marginal seats and then we will be in trouble.' It was a very important lesson for Mr Rann this time. We have learnt how to win in the marginal seats and we will continue to do the same thing.

I recently read the following interesting quote: 'You can have the swing and I will have the seats.' That statement was made by a gentleman by the name of Mr Wran, when he was Premier of New South Wales. He was a very clever man and his statement is true. It is worth while my repeating those statements by two Labor Leaders because at the end of the day political Parties have to win seats: that is what it is all

about. The Liberal Party is learning that and it did it very well in the Federal election.

The Labor Party did pretty poorly and at a recent conference that was reflected in the urgency and the concern about the Labor Party's vote. That is good to see because a lot of nonsense was written after the last State election about how well the Leader did. The Leader did not do very well at all. Through the preference system, the Democrats basically put him into the position. The reality is that the primary vote was worse in the Federal election, bad in the last State election and even worse in the election before that. There has not been much improvement. That very salient point needs to be made.

I want to finish with an issue that will be discussed in the Upper House at length, namely, gaming machines. I have stood back, watched, listened and heard comments about gaming machines and the major problems with them. Yes, there are some major problems with gaming machines, and one of those problems is that we have to face up to the fact that about 5 per cent of people who gamble, whether it is on gaming machines, racehorses or some other form of gambling, will always have problems. That is what we ought to do something about—the problems. We ought to put in some money that really counts, and I have argued this point within my Party for a long time.

Mr Xenophon would not have had half the coverage he has received if we attacked the real issue, and that is the social problems that gaming machines create. Only 5 per cent of the public have a problem. The other 95 per cent spend their \$10 or \$20 and enjoy themselves. We should encourage people to enjoy themselves. Instead of going through the nonsense about banning these machines, we ought to do something about the real problem. We should get the churches involved and give them enough money to carry out the social task of rehabilitation. I will have a lot more to say about this matter in the months to come.

Mr HILL (Kaurua): Today I wish to talk about a range of environment matters and in particular I want to talk about some of the things that I have learned in the 12 months that I have had the privilege to be Labor's shadow Minister for the Environment. I intend to sketch a rough policy framework for handling some of the important environment issues facing this State. This will be more of a mud map than a polished statement. I make these statements in part to clarify my own thinking and in part to encourage debate in this place and outside. The first issue that I will address is that of a bureaucratic structure.

It was only relatively recently that Environment Ministers and Environment Departments were formed. That makes the current department a relative youngster compared with the traditional Education, Health and Primary Industries Departments, which have their origins in the last century. Unlike these older departments with their relatively clear precedents and areas of responsibility and authority, the Department for Environment and the Environment Protection Authority, in particular, are still evolving.

Sometimes environment has been linked to planning functions, sometimes water, sometimes land administration and sometimes not. I believe that we need a debate in this place about the functions that should be properly grouped together as 'environment'. We need a sharper and clearer focus. One major problem with the current structure is that environmental issues often only arise as the last step in a process. We need a process that puts the environment up front. Not only would this make for cheaper and quicker

decision making but it would mean that we would avoid the tiresome and damaging development versus environment debates which frustrate developers and characterise anyone who is concerned about environment issues as anti-jobs. It is time that we evolved some processes where there can be win-win results.

One issue that has perplexed and irritated me since arriving in this place is the issue of dumps. Over the course of the last year I have been approached by at least half a dozen local residents groups protesting about the possible placement of a dump in their neighbourhood. Under the current planning processes, any entrepreneur can put in place a process to open a dump site. It would be theoretically possible for all six communities mentioned to end up with dumps, all of which would be in competition with each other, all of which would have some detrimental effect on those communities.

Why is this possible? The answer is simple. Rather than having a primary role in identifying an ideal site, the Environment Protection Authority is confined to imposing licence restrictions after decisions have already been made.

What should happen, in my view, is that the EPA should be responsible for identifying appropriate landfill sites. It should choose on the basis of maximising environmental outcomes, not minimising environmental damage. Having identified an appropriate site, it ought then to call for tenders from among landfill operators and license the best operator for a limited period of time—and, if they have not performed, get rid of them and get in someone who can. Not only would this produce better environmental outcomes, it would be simpler for business. If I can borrow from the language of the law, I would say that the EPA should be less of a shield and more of a sword. What I would like to see is a Department of Environment analogous to the Department of Treasury; that is, central, instrumental and just a little bit feared.

I would now like to address the issue of targets. As part of this process, the Environment Department should be obliged to set long-term targets and means to achieve them, and then regularly monitor progress towards these targets by way of annual environmental audits, as promised by Labor Leader Mike Rann during the 1997 State election. During that campaign, the Leader promised that Labor would undertake a comprehensive audit of the State's environment. We would then lay down a 10 year action plan and each year would publish the results of how we are meeting key targets to improve the environment. This would make us publicly accountable.

Over recent years, industry has talked about 'world's best practice' and 'zero tolerance' when it comes to measuring economic performance. I believe that we must do the same with the environment. Let us, as a society, give ourselves the world's best targets, such as zero pollution of our waterways and beaches; the elimination of feral species in our national parks; and a complete recycling strategy for our waste. We must be idealistic with our targets and realistic with our time lines. We are not going to eliminate pollution of our beaches in a four year parliamentary term, but if we can develop broad community support, commit resources and work hard, we might achieve our goals in, say, 30 to 50 years time. In 10 years, I am confident, we will be able to see significant improvements. One thing is for certain: unless we set goals and take deliberate action to achieve them, we will just muddle along, and our children and grandchildren will be left with the problem.

Briefly, I now address the issue of waste management. Currently, in South Australia we have a policy vacuum when it comes to waste management. A combination of local government and private enterprise determines the nature and placement of our landfill sites. Recycling is hit and miss. We have a deposit scheme in place in relation to some soft drink containers but not others, and there is no central agency driving the issue. I believe that South Australia needs comprehensive legislation to deal with all aspects of waste creation and disposal. We should have measures in place to minimise the production of waste, maximise the reuse and recycling of materials and maximise the replacement of products that are resistant to recycling with those that are readily reused.

I have already spoken in this place about the possible replacement of plastic shopping bags with biodegradable corn starch equivalents. We need a central waste management authority to manage waste from its creation to disposal, an agency that can find ways to reduce material going into the waste stream, maximise recycling and minimise landfill. It could explore all the latest waste disposal technology and oversee statewide systems. In short, we should aim at state of the art solutions to this endemic by-product of twentieth century consumerism. Ray Gilbert (Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga) recently called for national leadership in this area. I certainly support this. If we are smart, we may be able to produce new industries out of our waste.

Recently, I invited Gary King of MCI Environmental to brief Labor's Caucus committee on his company's new technology, operational in Texas and in Europe, which is able to recycle most if not all non-organic waste and return those elements to the production cycle, creating new industries and jobs and reducing waste. This company is also working on methods to convert organic waste into valuable products. The point is that the nature of the technology and its scale of operation makes it too expensive and too difficult for a single council or local entrepreneur but just the right size for a progressive and committed State Government.

I turn now to the issue of the EPA and pollution. Recently, the *Advertiser* ran a series of articles pointing out the incredible pollution some of our biggest industries create in South Australia, particularly in the Port Adelaide area. The *Advertiser* article pointed out the relatively puny licence fees that these companies pay for the right to pollute. I was invited by one of the journalists to comment on whether or not the licence fees were too low. I resisted the temptation to score an easy point, because it seems to me that the issue is not whether a company pays a little or a lot in order to pollute but, rather, that it pollutes at all. The goal of public policy should be to stop the pollution, not to make the polluter pay more for it.

To this end, I support the EPA and its environment improvement programs (EIPs) for polluters. I am not certain how successful the EIPs have been overall and how strongly the Government is prepared to support the EPA in pursuing recalcitrant industries. But if we are serious about stopping pollution we must give the EPA the legislative, financial and moral support to ensure that EIPs are prepared and adhered to. As I have noted, the Opposition Leader has undertaken that a Labor Government would produce an annual environmental audit. Among other things, this will allow the community to assess how effectively industry is complying with the EIPs. If industries do not comply, a mixture of public exposure and tough penalties would provide the necessary stick. In particular, Labor is committed to the toughest anti-

pollution laws in the nation, doubling penalties and giving the EPA the power to seek the confiscation of serious polluters' property until the pollution is cleaned up and the problem remedied.

I now turn to coastal protection. As we all know, 1998 is the United Nations International Year of the Ocean. In the first week of this year, Robin Williams of the ABC's *Science Show* presented a talk on the Year of the Ocean by Dr Keith Suter, President of the United Nations Association of New South Wales. I would like to quote briefly from that talk. Dr Suter said in part:

Humankind continues to do to the oceans what is now outlawed on land: using the oceans as a refuse tip for non-biodegradable substances, for old chemical weapons and radioactive material, and as a depository for fertilisers washed off the land. Unlike the rivers, which wash pollutants to the oceans, the oceans have no outlet. In short: the muck stops here. . . The oceans were for thousands of years traditionally viewed as: inexhaustible (no matter how many fish or whales were taken there were always more left); indestructible (the oceans could always absorb the garbage of humankind); and the oceans were limitless (a person could sail for years without necessarily retracing their route).

As Dr Suter says, this view is now changing. He makes the following analogy, which for me puts the issue in very clear perspective. He says:

The sea covers 70 per cent of the earth's surface, but compared to the diameter of the planet the sea is shallow. If the planet were reduced to the size of an egg, the total amount of water would be the size of a teardrop.

Earlier this year Mike Rann and I circulated a 'Discussion Paper on New Directions for South Australia's Coastal and Marine Environment', as Labor's contribution to the Year of the Ocean. The paper deals with a wide range of coastal issues. In essence, the paper is saying that it is about time that we stopped taking our coastal and marine environment for granted. Since settlement we have poured sewage and stormwater into the ocean, plundered the fish that inhabit the sea and built our houses over the sand dunes. We do not see the marine environment as an integrated whole, and we subject it to a wide range of often contradictory legislative and administrative processes. Our basic principle ought to be that over time our beaches should be as pollution free as they were 200 years ago.

We must find ways of reusing treated sewage and stormwater on land. Initiatives such as the pipeline from Christies Beach to the Willunga Basin are to be commended and must become the standard means of dealing with sewage, not the exception. In addition, we must protect fish breeding grounds and unique underwater environments through the expansion of marine protected areas. Rather than threaten the fishing industry, this is the only way to guarantee that this industry has long-term sustainability. I know from my discussions with some of that industry's representatives that there is growing recognition that environmental and industry goals are not necessarily in conflict. In particular, we need to recognise that, while aquaculture can produce significant economic benefits for our State, it too must be developed as part of an overall marine strategy. We also need a new legislative and administrative framework to manage coastal issues and concerns. In government, Labor will review coastal and marine legislation and create a single agency that is both responsible and accountable.

I turn now to national parks. Some 21 million hectares of South Australia are protected in some way. National parks cover about four million hectares, conservation parks make up about six million hectares, and regional reserves cover

some 11 million hectares. However, about 78 per cent of that land mass is able to be mined, and 7 per cent is currently grazed. The protected area classifications include the terms 'conservation parks', 'conservation reserves', 'game reserves', 'national parks', 'recreation parks', 'regional reserves', 'shipwreck reserves' and 'wilderness protected areas'. We have a right to be proud that so much of our State is protected in some way. However, with this pride should come the acknowledgment that the parks system has developed in an *ad hoc* manner. Not all key areas are represented. The level of protection that applies is not necessarily as a result of objective criteria, and resources are often inadequate to provide appropriate protection. It is time that we had a fresh look at our protected areas.

We should be addressing the following issues. Does the current reserves system adequately represent the 15 or so bioregions that have been identified in South Australia? The answer is 'No'. We need an audit of what has been left out, what is over represented, what could be traded to get a better fit, and what is available that should be included. As I understand it, at least seven of the bioregions are under represented or not represented at all. It is strange that this most critical ecological issue is not central to the Government's parks agenda. However, I understand that all State and Federal Governments have signed an agreement to establish a comprehensive and representative reserves system (called a CAR) by the year 2000. This is essential for the preservation of South Australia's rich biodiversity. Unfortunately, at its present level of activity, the State will not be able to meet this goal.

We should also look at a new way to classify our reserves system. What areas are absolutely no go for mining or other activity, where is it okay to have four wheel drives, and where is it okay to have tourism facilities? We also need budgets and protection plans for each of our reserves. I was staggered during Estimates that the Minister could not tell me what the budget was for any park or reserve under her authority, and nor could she tell me what was spent in the previous budget year on particular parks. Clearly, not enough resources are going into our parks. Despite the excellent work of the friends groups and rangers, feral animals and plants are rife in our reserves. We must find new ways of resourcing our parks system as it provides us with the foundation for South Australia's ecological and economic sustainability. Maybe it is time to look at commercial sponsorship of some of our parks, and it is certainly time to reinstate the green corps, known as the Youth Conservation Corps, established by Mike Rann when he was Minister for Employment and TAFE.

On the issue of mining, it is time that we were able to reach a consensus in South Australia. I am one who believes that mining is one of the real potential areas of growth for our State. Our mining industry should be expanded. We need the prosperity and employment that mining can bring. However, we need a mining industry that accepts that it cannot go everywhere. There are some areas so sensitive and precious that they should be agreed on as no-go areas by everyone, including miners. Both the mining industry and the conservation movement should work together to establish proper protocols for mining. With a bit of give and take we should be able to both expand our mining industry and increase the level of protection of key areas. It is to be hoped that the establishment of a truly comprehensive and representative reserves system will go a long way towards the resolution of many ongoing disputes.

I turn now to uranium and sustainable energy. In South Australia we are well on the way to having three uranium mines, and I dare say before the change of Government we are likely to have more. Labor is opposed to the expansion of the uranium industry, more mines, to the enrichment of uranium and to South Australia's becoming the nuclear dump for the rest of Australia. However, having said that, we also recognise that there are or will be three mines in South Australia, that about 17 per cent of the world's electricity is generated by uranium and that, no matter how much we dislike it or disapprove of it, it will be around for a while yet. Maybe we should be using some of the royalties received from the mines in South Australia to fund research into more sustainable forms of energy—or green power as it is sometimes called. Solar, wind and water energy are all on offer in our State.

I invite those members of Parliament with an interest in environment issues—and I know there are many on both sides of the Chamber—to participate in an active debate on the environment. I offer these draft policy ideas as a contribution to that debate. I also invite members of the wider community to have their say about what kind of environment policies and structures South Australia should have in place for the next millennium. To encourage that dialogue, I look forward early in the new year to convening, along with Labor Leader Mick Rann, a Labor Listens program on environmental issues.

In the time that remains, I would like to address a number of issues involving my electorate. In particular, I want to address the issue of transport. The current Minister for Transport has made much of the great contribution the Southern Expressway will make to the southern suburbs, and half of that expressway has been built. It takes three or four minutes off my daily trip into the city, and for that I am grateful. When the other half is built, I dare say it will take off another three or four minutes as well, and I will be doubly grateful for that. Even though this expressway will be completed 12 months after it was promised, it will be completed. However, that does not excuse neglect in other areas of transport in the south. I would like to talk about two particular aspects that are of concern to my constituents and to me. The first is the quality of the buses that are available to the Lonsdale bus depot for the provision of bus services in the southern suburbs.

I recently asked a series of questions of the Minister for Transport in relation to the age of those buses, and I was interested to discover that the average age of the Lonsdale fleet is some 16.85 years, compared to the State average of 12.06 years. In other words, buses serving the southern suburbs are on average about 4½ to five years older than the average age of buses across Adelaide. The Minister has told me that TransAdelaide operates 75 buses from the Lonsdale depot. They include one bus which is 20 years of age; 51 buses which are 18 years old; 20 buses which are 16 years old; and only three buses which are two years old. The three buses that are two years old have special provisions for people who are disabled. While the community is grateful that some of those buses have those capacities, the percentage of buses that have that capacity is much lower than the overall average across South Australia.

The Minister has told me that at some stage she intends to provide new buses in the south, that we can expect newer buses in the future. It seems to me unfair and an example of this Government's neglect of the southern suburbs that the buses in the south are much older than those in the rest of the

State. I suspect that what happened is that, when the contracts were being given out for the privatised bus system, the Government decided to leave TransAdelaide in charge of the southern suburbs and put Serco in charge of some other depots, and Serco and the other private suppliers got the newer buses.

If you look at the buses that are travelling around town, it is easy to see that the Serco buses are much newer. That is because some sort of arrangement must have been made for that company to get better buses, because TransAdelaide, the poor old public provider, is driving around with much older buses. Air-conditioning is non-existent, and I have been told by constituents that water leaks through the roof of the buses. When all these points were brought to the attention of the Lonsdale depot, the following was reported in the *Southern Times* of 14 October:

Lonsdale Operations Manager, Jim Nikas, said the age of the fleet caused 'no major drama' for TransAdelaide staff or customers. We work with what we have got.

However, another Lonsdale employee, who preferred not to be named—no doubt he would have got the sack if he had been—painted a bleaker picture. He said, 'It is a stretch in the morning to find enough buses to go out on the routes. The maintenance guys are almost having to stick them together with chewing gum. It gets even worse in summer when the buses break down quite regularly.' So, that is the state of the public buses in the southern suburbs. As the headline states in this paper, 'South being treated second best.' That is what is happening under this Government: the southern suburbs are being treated as second best in terms of transport.

However, it is not just in respect of buses. In the case of Commercial Road, which runs through my electorate, prior to the 1997 election the Government spent an enormous amount of money—and I have a question on notice to find out how much money it did spend—going through a so-called consultation process with the people in the south. That consultation process, which went on for months, involved a private company which went through the consultation process. A number of public meetings were held, with drawings, documents, displays and advertisements in the local papers—no doubt all of this was designed to give the impression that something was about to happen.

No doubt this process was designed to assist the then Liberal member for the seat of Kaurana, Ms Lorraine Rosenberg, and no doubt it was sad for Ms Rosenberg that it did not support her sufficiently because, as we know, she did not win the seat. Not surprisingly, after the election, the plans to upgrade Commercial Road disappeared. All of the money that was spent on consultation, planning, drawing and all the rest of it disappeared. I corresponded with the Minister and asked her what was happening, and she told me they had reviewed it and there were no specific plans for the road to be upgraded. Well, this road is in dire need of attention.

Residents of Maslin Beach have written to the Minister about the section near their area where there are all sorts of problems. In their letter to the Minister, signed by Emma Boss, their Secretary, they say, in part:

For many years now, the community association has been asking for your help to repair a dangerous traffic problem that exists in our area. We have noted that the new bridge in Port Noarlunga is now not going to be built for another 10 years—

another broken promise—

We are now at the stage that we cannot wait another 10 years. Something must be done now and not in the future before a serious fatal accident occurs on this very dangerous corner.

The Secretary also says in her letter to me, in part:

I wrote to her [Minister Laidlaw] some three months ago reminding her of her promises but to no avail. My correspondence in this last instance was not even replied to.

The promise mentioned by Ms Boss was contained in a letter to her dated 4 August 1995. I will put the Minister's promise on the record, because she has tried to avoid her commitments. She says:

I am pleased to advise, however, that works on the upgrade of Commercial Road are scheduled to commence in the 1996-97 financial year. You will be happy to know that the treatment you have suggested at the Eastview Road, Gulf Parade, Maslin Beach Road and Commercial Road intersection will be incorporated as part of that upgrade.

That was in 1995. There was much consultation through 1997. The election came at the end of 1997 and, suddenly, there were no plans. There was no upgrade of that intersection or of Commercial Road, and the bridge over the Onkaparinga River which had to be upgraded and was part of the promised plans is no longer to be upgraded. In fact, the whole of Commercial Road is dangerous. There are continual traffic accidents along that road. At the beginning of this year there was one very serious accident at a set of traffic lights on the corner of Seaford Road and Commercial Road quite close to where I live and, sadly, a person was killed in that accident. There have been a number of other accidents at that intersection this year.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr HILL: The member for Unley says that I am the local member, and that is very true. A set of traffic lights were installed at that intersection at the behest of the former member who tried valiantly over a four year period to get a set of traffic lights installed there. Interestingly enough, at a public meeting addressed by Department of Transport officers, they said the decision to put the traffic lights there was not based on good road sense but on the then member's political interests, and a set of political traffic lights was placed at that intersection. As a result of those traffic lights, there have been a series of very bad accidents, including one fatality.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr HILL: Yes, I did. I cannot recall the name of the person at this stage. It was at a public meeting of the Onkaparinga forum held in Seaford a couple of months ago, and it was said by officers of the department. I am not suggesting that the Minister or the former member had any intention of trying to make the situation worse. The fact is that the situation is worse at that intersection because of the traffic lights, and it is because of the very poor state of Commercial Road generally that these accidents happen. So, on two issues, in the case of buses, where we have the oldest buses in the State, and in the case of Commercial Road, which runs through my electorate and which the Minister promised to upgrade back in 1995, here we are in 1998 with no action, no plans, no budget lines, nothing at all—no commitments. She will not even reply to those members of the community who have written to her about this issue. I will take up the remaining two minutes so as not to embarrass any other member.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr HILL: I have no intention of talking about Glenthorne at this stage. No, I will. I am glad the honourable member raises the question of Glenthorne, because Glenthorne is an important issue and was subject to a very interesting promise by both the Premier and the Prime Minister during the recent

Federal election campaign—a very interesting promise. The Labor Party had made a commitment to Glenthorne to keep it as public space and not to have housing on that piece of land. The Federal Leader of the Labor Party said that he would grant that land to South Australia at no cost to South Australian taxpayers.

During the Federal election campaign, I was surprised to learn that the State Government, which always cries poor, was able to find \$7 million to buy that piece of land from the CSIRO. At the time, the Government said that no housing would be built on that estate but that something would happen. However, no details as to what would happen have ever been released. I believe that a review has been conducted into a wine institute on that piece of land but, very interestingly, during the election campaign, none of those plans came forward. The report was not released and it has not been published.

I am waiting with great eagerness to see how the Premier will get out of that promise that he made, because I am absolutely certain that housing will be part of the solution. He will come in here and say, 'Look, we have this great idea for a wine centre. Unfortunately, 25 per cent or 30 per cent of the land has to be sold for public housing to raise the capital to allow us to develop that institute.' It will be very interesting to see the Premier try to get away from his words.

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It gives me great pleasure to support the motion for the Address in Reply. I commend Sir Eric Neal, Governor of South Australia, on his speech to the Forty-Ninth Parliament on the opening of the Second Session. Much is said about our economy. Much is said about how we are meeting the challenges placed before us for the twenty-first century. There is much debate and discussion about whether or not we are on track and whether we can do more and, most importantly, there is always talk about debt and debt reduction.

Although there is disagreement on both sides of the Chamber, there is no doubt that both the major Parties, the Independents and the Democrats in another place believe we have to try to position South Australia for the challenges placed before us for the twenty-first century. But, before anything can be achieved, we must be truthful and realistic about where we are at as a State and as a nation, and put that in perspective regarding our place in the world because, if we do not, we are not being realistic about what can be achieved by a State Government. There is no doubt that in 1993 this State was experiencing poor economic circumstances. Members opposite would agree.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Mitchell says that nothing has changed. I say to him that much has changed. No longer is South Australia short-changed and without a sense of direction. No longer are we in a financial situation that makes us spend helplessly in trying to find solutions to our problems. In saying that, I do not want to belittle the efforts of the previous Government, because the circumstances that brought about that financial crisis were not all of the previous Government's doing. We cannot give credit to the former Government for such changes as the floating of the dollar, the deregulation of the financial system, the structural changes in the global economy and the challenges brought about by those changes. No Government can. We are responsible for the responses to the changes and the challenges. We have to

be realistic. We as a State can do only so much. When we talk about unemployment—and there are questions opposite about what we are doing—we have to put it in perspective.

What has been South Australia's employment record in the past 30 years? We know that South Australia has always lagged behind some of the other States, and whether a Liberal or Labor Government has been in office that is a fact. We know that structural changes have taken place. We live in a time when the information revolution is placing pressures on the population just as the industrial revolution resulted in changes in England in the 1700s and 1800s. South Australia did not start the information revolution. England, however, started the industrial revolution and should be given credit for that but certainly, at the time, no particular political Party was responsible.

When we look at that aspect, we have an idea of what we can do as a State. I believe that this Government has done its best since it came to office in 1993. Sure, we can do more, but I believe that we have headed in the right direction. We have taken control of the debt; we have tried to restructure the economy; we have encouraged new industries; and we have put a lot of effort into information technology, and that area alone is bearing fruit. I think that both sides of the House would agree that that has occurred.

In the past year or so, the international climate has changed, especially with respect to our trading partners. We recognise that no-one could have foreseen the changes that have occurred in Indonesia, Malaysia, Hong Kong and, of course, Japan, which really was the second greatest and most important economy in the world. It was said that, if America sneezes, Australia catches a cold. I believe that Japan has sneezed, America has caught the cold and, no doubt, we are not insulated from it either.

Mr Snelling: Inoculated.

Mr SCALZI: We cannot be inoculated from the business cycles but we can find a way to respond in a sensible and creative way that is sensitive to the needs of the community. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for the South Australian labour force for September indicate a sharp rise in employment of 8 100 in seasonally adjusted terms. This comes on top of a similarly large rise of 7 600 in August, and a strong increase in full employment underpins the figures. The increase in employment reduced the unemployment rate in the State from 10.4 per cent in August to 9.9 per cent in September.

We could say that there has been an increase in employment; we could say that there has been an increase in the number of job vacancies; and we could say that we are doing well. The reality is that we are not doing as well as we should, and no-one can argue with that. We should do better. No-one would agree that we should accept a youth unemployment rate of more than 30 per cent. It is one thing to admit that there is a problem and that we must do something about it, but to blame one particular Government for the circumstances in which we find ourselves is really, at times, political point scoring, but all Parties in opposition do it.

We must realise that the time has come when we must be honest with ourselves and that, given the current economic situation, there is no easy solution to the unemployment problem. I agree that 9 per cent unemployment is unacceptable. We should move to a more realistic unemployment target, and I believe that that is the aim of this Government; indeed, giving priority to finding jobs for youth has been a priority of this Government and will continue to be so. No responsible Government can ignore the social consequences

of having a high unemployment rate, especially among the young. It cannot ignore that, otherwise it will have to face the social implications.

Enough about the world economic situation. In the short term the stimulus that South Australia or indeed Australia would want will not be provided. We have to accept a lower GDP growth rate in the short to medium term. To believe that we can have increased growth rates of the magnitude that we thought three or four years ago is unrealistic. For about the past five or six years it has been a matter of concern to me that, when the growth rates of the economies to our north were 6, 7 or 8 per cent and we had much lower growth rates, we almost became apologetic for our poor performance. I believe that the time has come for us to stop apologising. We must accept that as a country, if we are in a stable democracy, a 2 or 3 per cent GDP growth rate is much better than a 12 per cent growth rate in an unstable democracy.

Therefore, we should rethink our position in relation to the countries that we admired for having such high growth rates in the past and to which we almost apologised for our position. We should be proud of what Australia achieves. We must look at the base and we must acknowledge that a 2 to 3 per cent growth rate in an economy that is responsible to the social needs of its community is better than one that has a 6, 7, 8 or indeed 15 per cent growth rate, because economic growth without political stability leads to the social ramifications that we have seen around the world which none of us would support.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Mitchell says that I believe in low growth. Look at me; I cannot believe otherwise. Putting that aside—and I do look up to the member for Mitchell, but then I look up to a lot of people—there is a difference between economic growth and economic development and we do not often distinguish between the two. When referring to economic growth we talk about increasing GDP (gross domestic product) nationally or gross social product at a State level and, in dollar terms, what is produced from all goods and services in an economy. We all know that; it is basic economics. However, economic development involves more. It involves increasing structures in the community, capital investment, goods and all those things that deliver a better standard of living for the community.

In the past we have concentrated too much on growth rates and it is about time we started to look at the overall picture of what is really economic development. We cannot have economic growth without social responsibility and political stability. Otherwise we would lose the whole lot. One has only to look at a country like Russia or some of our Asian neighbours. Without political stability and without the institutions that are necessary to give parameters to that economic growth, in the end it will not be sustainable.

We are fortunate to live in the most democratic country in the world and we should be proud of that fact. We should not be apologetic for what we have achieved. If we look at the way in which Australia has responded to the crisis, we can see that we have been able to retain our stability because we are basically a sophisticated democracy. We have the institutions in place, we have the separation of powers and we have a judicial system. We have the institutions that are necessary to maintain that standard and to cope with business cycle fluctuations without endangering those things that we believe are important to us, and the recent election showed that.

There is no doubt that the pressures of national competition policy and the centralisation of services have hurt people not only in South Australia but throughout Australia. The changes brought about by global economic pressures have hurt, and that is why One Nation rose to its short-term prominence. People were hurting, they thought that the major Parties were not listening and they thought that Pauline Hanson cared, that she was listening and that they might as well give her a go. However, they discovered that in the global economy it is not good enough to simply say to someone who is hurting, 'We care.' One must have realistic solutions, and One Nation did not have them.

The One Nation story is a bit like this: someone has been hurt on a country road and Pauline comes along. She holds that person's hand and says, 'Don't worry about it. I know what you are feeling, you hurt, just calm down.' She puts a blanket over the person's feet to keep them warm and she says, 'You come to my car and I will take you to hospital.' The person drags himself or herself to her car only to find out that it has four flat tyres. That was the simplistic approach of One Nation. No-one can govern with a simplistic approach and with policies that are out of kilter with the complexities and the demands of the twenty-first century. The Australian public flirted with One Nation for a while, but the result was clear, and to me it was a great result. It has renewed my faith in the Australian people because—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: And our democratic system. The Australian people realised that there was no real prospect of addressing the nation's needs by supporting Parties such as One Nation. That has become clear.

I refer to the cooperation among the major Parties, the National Party and the Democrats. I must commend the Democrats for the way in which they took on One Nation. However, we must not be complacent, because the reason for One Nation's popularity still exists. If we do not address the source of the problem, another Party with simplistic solutions may also become popular. It is time to look carefully at where we as a country and a State are heading in terms of our national competition policies and how we deal with rural areas. We need to understand that the closure of a school, the closure of a bank, decentralisation and centralisation of facilities in the major cities hurts the rural areas. We must address those problems and we must deliver services in those areas, otherwise that cynicism and concern about the major Parties' performance will remain. We must not look at the Federal election result and think that One Nation is no longer a threat. One Nation was not the threat: it was the Labor and Liberal Parties' failure to address the fundamental problems.

I believe that the Federal Government has a mandate to reform the taxation system. I agreed with Paul Keating in 1985 when he proposed 'Option C' and a 12.5 per cent broad based consumption tax. I support the hard work he did within the Labor Party to introduce a broad based consumption tax. I am sure that, now he is no longer leader of the Labor Party, with the benefit of hindsight he would say, 'If we had introduced the GST in 1985 we would have dealt with a lot of the problems and perhaps our system would have been more productive.' I am sure he thinks about that from time to time.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: That shows the member for Hart's political opportunism. We are talking about reform of the taxation system and what is good for Australia, but what does the member for Hart do? He makes some jibe about the next

State election result in Hartley. It is precisely that attitude, where politicians simply make jibes and try to point score, which has increased the cynicism amongst the electors of South Australia and Australia. All they want us to do is get on with the job. There is no question that some people fear the GST, but what they fear most is economic uncertainty. They fear our hotchpotch taxation system where there is no certainty, and they want some reform.

If we need to make some adjustments to care for people on fixed incomes, pensioners, and so on, let us ensure that within our political forums we do that by standing up and representing those people, because I can assure the member for Hart that I do that within the Liberal Party. I jump up and down for people on fixed incomes, and I will continue to do that. But to make a few political points about the GST and to associate that with the next election result in a State seat is really cheap—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr SCALZI: I support a goods and services tax because, provided that people on a fixed income have been catered for, that there is compensation for them, it makes sense. I agree with Paul Keating, the Labor Party's great Leader, who wanted to introduce it in 1985: a broad based consumption tax, option C, 12.5 per cent. I should know, because I was teaching economics and that was part of the economic situation at the time. Now, all of a sudden, members opposite completely reject it. Of course they must, because they must oppose. But, privately, they know that the taxation system has to be reformed. They know that, and they know that we have to reduce our debt. They know it and everyone else on their side of politics knows it.

All members opposite know about the national competition policy and the changes that have taken place, and they know that we no longer have a choice. Members must remember that the system has to serve man, not man the system. We do not stick to a political philosophy or an economic theory for the sake of sticking to it because, in the end, we have to serve the community. What is best for the community is really what we should be on about. If we come back to debt reduction, there is no question that we cannot reduce our debt unless we make some major changes, for example, the sale of ETSA.

Mr Foley: Why didn't you say that at the election, Joe? Why did you lie to the people of Hartley?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley: Why did you lie to the people of Hartley?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Hart to withdraw the use of that word as unparliamentary.

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hartley.

Mr Foley: Why did you lie to the people of Hartley?

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Hart has just repeated the word 'lie'.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

Mr SCALZI: I thank the member for Hart. After all, not only is he a member of the Labor Party but he also has a social conscience. The situation is that everyone on this side—if we had an option not to sell ETSA, if we were in a situation before national competition policy, before the national electricity grid—would keep the asset, but the changes that have occurred give us no option. At least our Premier has had the guts to say, 'We have had to change our

policies for the good of the State.' Our Premier has said that. I commend the Hon. Terry Cameron in another place for putting the interests of South Australia before his commitment to the Party that he grew up with.

It was not easy for the Hon. Terry Cameron to say, 'In the interests of all South Australians and of jobs for our kids, we have no choice and we have to sell.' It was not easy, and he should be commended for doing so, as the Premier has taken the lead in saying, 'Yes, we had to change our policy because, given the circumstances and what we know, it is in the best interests of South Australia.' And it is not just about some economic theory of reducing the debt; it is about what reducing the debt can do.

It is about increasing expenditure to hospitals so that the queues get shorter; it is about increasing spending on education; and it is about increasing spending on transport. If we get an extra \$2 million a day, we can do those things. Managing the economy is not a goal in itself: we manage the economy in order to deliver the political goals that society expects. That is what it is about. If there must be a policy change in order to deliver for the wellbeing of the community, then you change the policy.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: You do not become a slave to an economic theory.

Mr Foley: You just make sure you win the election and do a backflip.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: You have done that for years.

Mr SCALZI: That might be the way the Labor Party does things—the L-A-W tax cuts, for example. That is the way it does business, but we have the courage to tell the people of South Australia. As I said previously, why does the Labor Party not let the 69 members of Parliament—both Chambers—decide in a secret ballot whether or not they want to sell ETSA?

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Do you know why not? It is because the pledge is more important than the pledge to the people of South Australia.

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

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I rise tonight to acknowledge the speech of His Excellency the Governor made at the opening of this Second Session of the Forty-Ninth Parliament. I welcome the undertaking in that address for the Government to dedicate itself to sustainable economic development—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey has the call and I ask members to respect it.

Ms BEDFORD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I welcome the undertaking in that address for the Government to dedicate itself to sustainable economic development in tandem with social responsibility. I also welcome the call for willing negotiation and compromise. However, I wonder how this can be equated to the Government's proposals being the only strategy which can deliver. Everyone knows that there is more than one way to skin a cat and that, with time, even more effective ways will be developed, whichever method is adopted.

I especially welcome the identification of jobs as the key element to self-esteem and quality of life, and I trust that this is meant in relation to the State as well as to each and every individual South Australian. It is the right of every individual

to work. On 10 December 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations, under the presidency of Australian Foreign Minister Dr H.V. Evatt, adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This document, now in its fiftieth year, was crafted under the direction of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, widow of the late US President.

Earlier today, the member for Gordon spoke of the four 'I's. Mrs Roosevelt spoke of the four freedoms: freedom of speech, freedom of belief, freedom from fear and freedom from want. These freedoms form the philosophical foundation for the declaration. It took three years of work by the commission before the final declaration was promulgated without dissent in 1948.

Let us reflect upon the unrealised hope that the declaration promised. Foremost among these is the commitment to make humanity free from fear and want. Among the declaration's provisions is the commitment to the creation and maintenance of employment and economic security for all as a fundamental criterion of humane society. Article 23 provides:

Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment.

These provisions are supplemented by the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and various conventions of the International Labour Organisation. They make clear that a fundamental part of a truly democratic and progressive society is the right to employment, which is not merely an economic right but a social and cultural one.

According to ILO convention No. 168 concerning employment, promotion and protection against unemployment, work and productive employment are important not only because of the resources which they create for the community but also because of the income which they bring to workers, the social role which they confer and the feeling of self-esteem which workers derive from them. The Governor's speech yesterday mentioned self-esteem three times on the first page alone.

These instruments of international policy make clear that it is not enough merely to facilitate employment but that Governments have a positive duty to create opportunities for all to work under just and favourable conditions. They require Governments to work to achieve employment for all. In common with many developed nations, Australia seems to have given up on this ideal. The proof is in the upward trend of unemployment and decline in real wages over the past two decades.

Since the recession of 1982, unemployment has persisted at a rate never lower than 6.1 per cent. It has been a period of great change and instability for most Australian workers, a time of upheaval and tumultuous political and cultural shifts. Employment, far from being seen as a universal right, is now subject to the whims of competition, market fluctuations, the need for flexibility and greater productivity. Our industrial relations system, established to provide workers with just and fair conditions, has been subordinated to the need for economic growth with disastrous consequences for working people.

Statistics published in a study by Griffith University show that Australians are now among the lowest paid workers in the OECD. Over the period 1983 to 1991, Australian wages fell behind the rate of inflation by 26.3 per cent. Meanwhile, the award simplification process initiated under the Workplace Relations Act is now putting in jeopardy many of the rights won by workers over the past 100 years. Continuing high unemployment has contributed to attacks on employ-

ment conditions. Australians have come to regard unemployment and lower wages as an acceptable part of the political and social landscape of the 1990s. They have become accustomed to corporate collapse and mass redundancies, and they have resigned themselves to the fact of job insecurity.

The emergence of precarious work as a fact of life has meant that a full-time permanent position in the 1990s is no more secure than casual or part-time employment. The conditions and wages of permanent employees are under siege by employers and Governments, calling for labour market deregulation and greater labour flexibility. While permanent employment is still the most desirable form of employment, it is by no means stable or predictable anymore.

The promotion of a decentralised wages system has led to the destruction of collective bargaining, the growth of the individual contract and the casualisation of work. It is important here to note that employment is worthless if it does not guarantee a fair and reasonable wage under just and equitable conditions and, when Australian workers feel as secure in their jobs as workers in Poland, little debate ensues about terms and conditions of work.

Is it any wonder that Australian workers are adopting an ethic that emphasises the individual rather than the collective? This is why unions are suffering a massive decline in membership. We have lost not only the belief in employment as a right but also any confidence that collective action is still capable of success. Collective action continues to be the ideal which I believe we must advance. The market is not always right, and a truly civilised society must intervene to correct market aberrations. When we work together we can achieve outcomes that are of benefit to the whole community.

I want to talk about two recent examples of working class collectivism that have delivered results. Both are shining examples of how ordinary workers acting together can achieve significant results for themselves and working people. The first is a dispute between Serco and members of the Transport Workers Union. This took place earlier this year and resulted in a snap strike on 30 July, called by the unionised work force in protest against the company's refusal to offer any substantial wage increase to its drivers. Serco drivers earn considerably less than their counterparts at TransAdelaide. In fact, under present Serco awards, drivers who worked for the former STA employees are guaranteed a higher wage than other Serco employees.

The reality is that the Government outsourced our public transport system as an exercise in breaking the grip of the unions. Serco, the bidding company chosen to run Adelaide's northern bus services, is well known abroad for its anti-union attitude. Moreover, through the agency of the Public Transport Board, the Government has effectively prevented Serco from making productivity gains in any way other than labour costs, as the Public Transport Board prescribes the timetables, the schedule of fees, the vehicles to be used and the routes. The northern Adelaide contracts are up for renewal next year, and you can be sure that the negotiations will be fierce. That is why it is so heartening to see Serco drivers win their dispute, not only as a sign of what working class solidarity can achieve but also as a symbolic victory over the forces of economic rationalism that seek to dismantle publicly owned and operated services.

The second example to which I wish to refer is the recent Adelaide Brighton Cement dispute. This dispute, which grew out of the company's decision to make redundant another 60 work workers from its Birkenhead plant, was resolved only last Friday in a win for the union members who stood

in peaceful assembly outside the plant, in cold and wet weather, for days on end, with belief in their cause and each other, and much tenacity and commitment. The four entrances and exits to the site meant that workers had to remain vigilant 24 hours a day. I do not envy them the task they set themselves; however, I do congratulate them on their gritty determination and can only express my admiration for the solidarity which they displayed in the face of the most trying circumstances.

Though visited by many during those days, the workers at Adelaide Brighton Cement can truly say that it was a struggle which they fought and won largely by themselves. It is a sad indictment of the current age that these workers are the exception rather than the rule. As do many others, they share a deep mistrust of the system. They are not interested in the economic rationalist concepts that have been the driving force behind the so-called reforms of the past decade. 'Downsizing' and 'outsourcing' to them are code words for job losses, and they will pay us back in kind, for voters can outsource politicians.

The voters have been walking away from the political process in droves over the past decade. An obvious reason for this, in my opinion, has been the readiness to adopt an ideological manner of speech which has little to offer ordinary workers. We have been too ready to adopt the language of the markets, limited government and individual choice. We have to ask ourselves whether we truly believe it is good enough to live in a society which values only the economic good and places so much store on the dictates of the market. The reality is that many ordinary people still believe strongly that there is a place for collectivist politics. They do not want to privatise their electricity system; and they do not want to outsource water and public transport. They still believe there is a fundamental role for government and public enterprise.

George Bernard Shaw wrote about every house having its own separate meal: the people in other houses do not contribute to that meal and therefore do not expect to share it. Although each family buys its own beer separately, they all get their water communally. Each family pays what is called a water rate into a common fund to pay for a constant supply of water to every house, and they all draw as much or as little water as they need. It used to be the case that sharing the costs for the communal good was the honourable thing to do. The absurdity of arguing that it is somehow inevitable and necessary that Governments withdraw from any kind of collectivist action has been demonstrated most recently in the failure of the private sector to manage outsourced utilities effectively. For instance, in South Australia we had the 'big pong'. This makes a mockery of the claim that Governments do not have a role to play in ensuring the effective functioning of essential services. It makes a mockery of the suggestion that there is no longer any place for collective intervention by Governments and communities.

The ideological drive for economic rationalism has also found expression in the outsourcing and privatisation of Government welfare services. In South Australia it has seen the privatisation—or whatever the Government wishes to call it—of the Modbury Hospital, the corporatisation and destruction of the Housing Trust and the gradual privatisation of the public transport system. How can we stand by and watch while policies continue to destroy the fabric of our communities? As Don Dunstan said in his Whitlam lecture earlier this year, if we do not intervene, we sink. He also said

that, if we do not know where we have come from, we cannot make judgments about where we are going.

It is time, therefore, for us on this side of the House to reflect on our origins as a movement and a Party. It is now more than 100 years since the formation of the Australian Labor Party at Barcaldine, a town in central Queensland, which had been the centre of the historic shearers' strike of the early 1890s. Those struggles were essentially about widespread unemployment. As the shearers saw it at that time, it was necessary for the working class to have a political Party and its own representatives in the Parliament. In geological time, 100 years is not long. Stephen Jay Gould, the American evolutionary biologist and popular science writer, would call it a micro-moment. In human time, however, the past 100 years encompasses a whole era of historical development, which has been a truly momentous period. Eric Hobsbawm, the eminent British historian, called the twentieth century the Age of Extremes. If by that he means that the past 100 years has been a time of bitter struggles for the working class, most would agree with him.

The past 100 years has seen two major world wars in which Australia has been involved, along with a number of localised wars. Arising out of the First World War, we saw the major signs of the instability of the capitalist system of society. Once the destruction caused by the war had been attended to, lack of jobs again became the bane of the workers in the capitalist world. The period immediately following the First World War was a time in which the Labor Party was supportive of the trade unions in achieving improvements in pay rates and working conditions. As did the rest of the world, Australian capitalism lapsed into what was referred to as the Great Depression in the 1930s.

The 1930s was a period in which ordinary men and women met extraordinary challenges and made sacrifices in defence of the working class and the Australian people. There was no time for summer holidays or for the faint of heart. Following the Wall Street stock market collapse in the United States in 1929, conditions rapidly worsened throughout the capitalist world. The Australian capitalist class took immediate action through the arbitration courts and savagely slashed wages and working conditions. Thousands of workers were thrown onto the industrial scrap heap and unemployment reached 30 per cent of the work force.

When the Scullin Labor Government was replaced by the Lyons Conservative Government, it intensified the attack on the working class by attacking trade unions. It was during this time that Menzies was the Attorney-General in the Lyons Government and brought in his infamous 'dog collar Act' relating to the wharf labourers at Port Kembla. After the Second World War, it was the Chifley Labor Government that initiated the building of the Snowy Mountains Scheme, established Trans Australia Airlines and sought to nationalise the banking system in 1947. It would be interesting to see what would be the outcome if a plebiscite to nationalise the banking system were to be held today.

The Howard Government has been returned at the recent elections and, whilst it obtained a majority of seats in the House of Representatives, it failed to win the support of the majority of the Australian people and consequently does not control the Senate. The Howard Government has no mandate to institute a GST and a tax on people's food. Despite claims by John Howard and Peter Costello that the economy is in good shape, unemployment is more than 8 per cent and there is no economic boom.

If the Olsen Liberal Government and the Howard Coalition Government are sincere and really want to reduce the level of unemployment, they should sponsor massive capital works programs across the country. It will only be by the initiation of such programs that the unemployment problem can be relieved. Such programs approved and put into operation, employing workers at union rates, a 32 hour week with no loss of wage rates, will do more to create jobs than all the pious platitudes at present emanating from Federal and State Government sources. Business activity would receive a boost by creating a demand for cement, steel and other commodities, and through the demand for the products of basic industries required to carry out capital works programs. The additional purchasing power placed in the hands of employed workers would give a significant lift to small business.

I see many similarities between the struggle that workers faced in 1890 and the struggles that the labour movement faces now. Our history should teach us that it is a struggle that never dies, one that is never over. When Liberal Governments turn a blind eye to unemployment, Labor must and will take up the challenge. We cannot be complacent. We cannot forget our heritage, nor will we. Martin Luther King once said, 'We shall have to repent in this generation, not so much for the evil deeds of wicked people but for the appalling silence of good people.' I do not accuse members opposite of being evil. No; they are the complacent ones who have been content to accept what they must know is unfair and unjust.

As we approach the end of the first century of Federation, many ordinary Australians must be asking, 'How much has really been achieved?' Workers will ask whether they are really that much better off than were their counterparts of 1901, and parents will ask whether their children's future is really that much brighter. Instead of quality expenditure in employment services, we have seen the farce of the Job Network, a scheme which miserably fails our obligations under ILO conventions to provide for adequate promotion of full employment.

Instead of protecting people from the economic insecurity of unemployment, we have the ill-conceived 'work for the dole' scheme, a system whose political basis in the so-called doctrine of mutual obligation is a sad twisted caricature of the noble spirit of the Declaration of Human Rights. In the meantime, according to the official figures, unemployment continues to stand at 8.3 per cent while the Governments in this place and in Canberra debate the merits of yet another tax.

It is time for those of us who see the economic rationalist approach to unemployment as inadequate and unworkable to stand up and be counted. It is time for a new Left approach to this pressing social problem—a collective interventionist approach to job creation and economic growth. We do not live in an economy, we live in a community, and Governments have a duty to intervene in the free market whenever its consequences are detrimental to the community.

Howard Florey, after whom my seat is named, was a high achiever from modest origins and a symbol of the importance of never underestimating our fellow South Australians' ability to excel at the highest level. His exploits are an example of how it is possible to achieve against almost impossible odds, problem solving at its best, when necessity truly became the mother of invention. For him, whether it was finding a way to finish medical school or obtaining vast quantities of supplies in a war ravaged country to continue his

research, Florey delivered. How important it is now, as we in this State face the epidemic of an uncertain future, that we observe and learn from our mistakes and combine to overcome the dilemmas that threaten the way and quality of life in this State and nation. Florey's legacy must surely be: set the goal and then make it happen.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): The speech by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Eric Neal, opening the Second Session of the Forty-Ninth Parliament set the scene for a most productive Parliament in the run up to the twenty-first century, setting out as it does a plan to reach a goal that we can all believe in, that is, to deliver economic growth with social responsibility.

The Governor's leadership in the business of the State is an inspiration to all. I am delighted that he and his wife, Lady Neal, have accepted an invitation to again visit Port Lincoln in my wonderful electorate of Flinders early in the new year. Here they will see evidence of what can be achieved by people who are self-reliant, self-confident and dedicated to the sustainable economic growth, in particular, of the fishing and farming industries, which are daily increasing the job opportunities of this wonderful State of South Australia.

If this State is to create the wealth and jobs we need to provide the kind of socially responsible State we want for our future and that of our children, as the Governor has stated we need to be bipartisan. We have to work together. Only by working together can we produce the wealth of which this State is capable and which will provide the funding to give South Australia the best health, education and services in the country and indeed in the world; especially needed as we gear up to provide for our generation, who will be the largest group of retirees in history.

We as the people of this State have good reason to be more self-confident than we are. We need to appreciate that South Australia often leads not only our nation but also the world. This fact was commented on only last week by writers in the *Advertiser's* letters to the Editor column and is regularly promoted by the SA Great campaign.

Our State Government is committed to its social responsibilities, and I applaud the mobile health services that our Government, through the Health Commission, provides to South Australia's women. I am particularly appreciative of the mammography units. Breast screening for cancer was one of the issues for which I worked for many years, so I was pleased when the Liberal Government acted to provide mobile units. Additional funding of \$300 000 this year boosted the previously announced \$1 million capital expansion for this program. The message from cancer experts is that early detection is a key to successful treatment. I can personally testify to that, having had breast cancer that was caught very early and not having to have debilitating chemotherapy and radiotherapy. It is not well enough understood that this outcome can result from early detection. The Government provides the service free of charge, and access through mobile clinics and various units is very convenient. I urge women 45 years and over to have this procedure.

I also commend the Government's South Australian Health Plus strategy aimed at empowering and educating people to take more control over their own health, bringing about a healthier community, thus resulting in fewer visits to doctors, fewer hospital admissions and a lower cost to the State's health budget. Preliminary evaluations of the trial show that among participating patients there has been a 40

per cent reduction in hospitalisation compared with the control group. The Health Plus trials on Eyre Peninsula involve about 1 400 patients with chronic conditions such as diabetes and complex medical problems. General practitioners on Eyre Peninsula participating in the Health Plus trials have been provided with personal computers to support the preparation of personal care plans, education and improved medical record keeping. The aim is to have all computers linked in a network and for that network to have links with hospitals and specialists. This program is being monitored by the Federal Government with a possibility of its becoming the basis for the provision of health care across the nation. Prevention is not only better than cure—it is much less costly. Hence the State Government this year introduced free influenza vaccine for people 70 years plus. With a number of 90-year olds in the electorate, let alone those in their 70s or 80s, this move was appreciated.

South Australia has led the nation in the field of organ donations. This was recognised with the appointment of the South Australian Governor, Sir Eric Neal, as Chair of the new National Council of Australians Donate in July this year. All State, Territory and Commonwealth Health Ministers agreed to set up the council's secretariat in South Australia. In instances where young adults have died, usually although not always as a result of accident, it assists families in the grieving process to know that organ donation has been a positive result of an untimely death. I commend the Liberal Government for the money put into upgrading the health system infrastructure, especially in rural areas. It has been a major undertaking to overcome the neglect of previous years.

In my electorate of Flinders both Ceduna and Port Lincoln have benefited from hospital upgrades, while the upgrade on the Kingscote Hospital on Kangaroo Island has also demonstrated the Liberal Government's positive concern for rural and regional South Australia. Stage 1 of the Ceduna Hospital redevelopment was opened about a year ago and now the \$100 000 redevelopment of the north-east wing is about to be opened while \$80 000 has been provided for an anaesthetics machine. Further redevelopment is in the planning process. The final stage of the \$17 million upgrade of the Port Lincoln Hospital is progressing well and is on track to be completed by early 1999. The hospital management, staff, doctors, specialists and visiting specialists are working together to use to the fullest our state of the art facilities.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to see the positive results flowing from the hard work that this Government has done in helping to get overseas doctors into rural areas which are unable to get Australian trained doctors. Doctor Bishop from the United States of America is filling in his 12 month working holiday at the Ceduna-Koonibba Health Service, while Doctor Mason from Wales is with Doctor Griffin at the Ceduna medical practice until December this year. The practice is negotiating with a South African doctor to begin in December. Dr Wolf du Plessis, who came to Wudinna from South Africa, has taken up flying as one of the ways of coping with the remoteness of his rural practice. Two highly skilled and experienced general practitioners are working with the Investigator Clinic in Port Lincoln on a two year contract, which I understand they would like to extend. Cowell has a new doctor starting practice in December.

It is very gratifying also that the University of Adelaide Medical School, along with the State Government, has recognised the need to attract doctors to rural areas by retaining up to one-third of its entry positions for applicants from rural areas. It is a known fact that professionals from a

rural background tend to practise in the country. This is additional to the rural health scholarships worth \$5 000 each for up to three years to medical, nursing and allied health students, conditional on the students practising in the country upon graduation. Jennifer Bubner of Wudinna benefited from one of these scholarships while studying social work at Whyalla University. The excellent work undertaken by Dr Talina Vizard of Cleve on an internship program was recognised with a grant of \$60 000 for its continuation. The program has been instrumental in attracting medical students to rural practice upon graduation.

Mental health has been identified as an area of need. The issue of suicide continues to be a major concern. The 24 hour mobile crisis service that also provides telephone and telepsychiatry video conferencing support in rural and remote areas is just one of the Government's initiatives which are a positive response to an identified need to combat suicide especially in rural areas.

The area of child mental health was excellently addressed by the Tumby Bay community, where medical professionals, the school, hospital and the public combined under the leadership of Dr Graham Fleming to initiate a program which has been expanded to other schools.

The money coming into the electorate from grants from the gaming machine fund has been well received. Constituents do not sit around waiting for a grant to fall into their lap but use grants on top of their own efforts. The Ceduna Sports Club is an excellent example. The club, under the leadership of its President John Tonkin and secretary Marcus Knill, is undertaking a \$330 000 redevelopment using a \$100 000 sports and recreational grant, added to the \$100 000 members have saved over six years and a bank loan. We hear about opposition to gaming machines but seldom do we hear the other side of the argument. Active club grants have assisted a range of sports, including pony clubs, gymnastics, bowls and hockey. The Eyre Peninsula has more clubs and groups than in an equivalent metropolitan population due principally to distance. I continue to lobby for an equitable distribution of gaming machine funds taking social factors into account.

The Eyre Peninsula continues to produce top athletes who appear in all sorts of sports. Shaun Rehn from Arno Bay is a star of the Adelaide Crows, as is Nigel Smart whose family roots go back to Wudinna and Cowell. One of the best players in the North Melbourne Football Club is Byron Pickett from Port Lincoln. These stars look to return something to their communities, as is evidenced by Jenny Borlase from Cummins, who has recently conducted clinics in netball across the Eyre Peninsula.

The \$1 million grant from the Centenary of Federation Fund for the redevelopment of the Port Lincoln Civic Hall as a regional arts facility caused great excitement. Within a couple of weeks Bill Watkins, Chairman of the Lower Eyre Peninsula council, announced that the council would contribute \$100 000 to the project. The Port Lincoln arts community, with public support, has about \$60 000 to contribute. The Port Lincoln City Council has promised \$600 000 and the State Government has also supported the concept, with funding expected. A theatre for Port Lincoln has been on the agenda for about 50 years, going back to the time when Colin Thiele was president of the Port Lincoln Players in the late 1940s. It will, indeed, be a cause for celebration when it becomes reality.

The great success of the Eyre Peninsula in Concert (EPIC) at Minnipa's Tcharkulda Rocks, attended by about 3 000 people, including the Minister for the Arts (Hon. Diana

Laidlaw) last weekend, illustrates the great need within the community for a greater opportunity to participate in the arts. I cannot mention all the many people who have contributed to this event, but South Australian Country Arts Trust officer Sue Du Bois of Wudinna and coordinators Jan White and Narelle Kurtzer of Minnipa are typical of those who have put in countless hours to make this spectacle a success. EPIC was part of the very successful work of the Eyre Peninsula Rural Strategy, and I commend their very hard working and visionary committee.

Strategy committee member Brenton Ramsey of Wudinna initially came up with the idea of inviting Philip Satchell to broadcast from Eyre Peninsula to publicise EPIC. Philip said that the broadcast from Graham and Elaine Waters property at Wudinna in early October was the best outside broadcast he had ever done. On the Satchell program, Eyre Peninsula Rural Strategy chairman Jeff Pearson outlined the uptake of new techniques to improve the sustainability and viability of farming on Eyre Peninsula.

The Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy Task Force, chaired by my colleague in the Upper House the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, was set up by the Liberal Government in 1996 to increase the standard of living and to promote a more secure future for farming businesses concentrating on sustainable agriculture. The resulting strategy is an outstanding example of the Government's encouraging sustainable economic development and self-esteem delivered through self-reliance and self-confidence. The EPRS has more than succeeded in fostering a positive image for the Eyre Peninsula and in generating a feeling of pride in the community.

A series of forums held recently in Wudinna, Ceduna, Cummins and Cleve provided opportunity for local communities to receive an update on the progress of the strategy, as well as provide feedback and suggestions for the future. Those attending the forums agreed that the strategy had been successful in progressing towards its objectives and that a positive image of the Eyre Peninsula had been projected. Keith Freeman of Ceduna, Tas Sundberg of Streaky Bay, strategy chairman Jeff Pearson of Cummins, and PIRSA's Jim Cawthorne and Hilton Trigg of Port Lincoln have already met to discuss issues raised through the forums. The quick action is typical of Eyre Peninsula get up and go. Most farmers attending the forums had a positive view of the future, but recognised that it was important to be prepared for the inevitable bad seasons. An acceleration of change has occurred through the strategy and it was generally agreed that the momentum of change should be maintained. The point was made that it is important for farmers to take responsibility for their own future through a commitment to ongoing training and education. Financial management and planning were considered paramount to ongoing viability.

EPRS is a member of the National Rural Partnership Program where its initiative and experience has seen it take a leadership role. The first gathering of regional partnership program people from around Australia is being held in Adelaide this week. Representatives of south-west Queensland, Atherton Tablelands, Desert Uplands from Barcardine in central Queensland, West 2000 from central New South Wales, Gascoyne-Murchison based in Carnarvon, Western Australia, north-east Victoria, Loddon-Murray, Sunraysia (Mildura), Riverland and Eyre Peninsula will meet to discuss mutual issues.

It would be remiss of me not to mention the good work being done on Eyre Peninsula and in other regional areas of the State by the regional development boards supported by

their relevant councils and our Government. Much of the groundwork for necessary change to occur within country communities is initiated by the pro-active people to be found on these committees and within their staff. It is my hope that as a member of the Premier's South Australian regional development task force I will be able to help them by identifying and providing a strategy to remove constraints that are holding back regional development.

In promoting economic development the Government has put its money where its mouth is by contributing \$1.9 million through SARDI, PIRSA, GRDC and the University of Adelaide to upgrade Minnipa Research Centre's infrastructure, research personnel and programs. In the 1980s it was the Minnipa Centre that picked up the reason for Halberd wheat's better productivity on Eyre Peninsula than later wheat types. Many Eyre Peninsula soils are high in boron and Halberd was more boron resistant than newer varieties of wheat. Work on boron tolerance in cereals is continuing. Currently, well-known plant breeder, Dr A.J. Rathjen, is researching the inheritance of boron tolerance in wheat.

Minnipa Agricultural Centre Chairperson, Andrew Polkinghorne of Lock, launched the Minnipa Research Foundation at the 1998 Wudinna Agricultural Expo. The foundation will give the people of Eyre Peninsula the chance to contribute to the work of the centre. If the success in fundraising found for sporting facilities, halls and recently the Marine Science Centre in Port Lincoln is anything to go by, once again the self-reliant people of Eyre Peninsula will put their hands in their own pockets to ensure that they are at the forefront of progress.

The Liberal Government's commitment to rural and regional Australia is strong and practical. I participated in the opening of Ruralink Government service centres at Kimba and Ceduna, two of six set up initially in the State. The service centres will be reviewed in two years. This initiative of the State Government was a response to the difficulties faced by rural communities in accessing services and information. Each of these service centres is a 'one stop shop' where people with a need for information about or access to State Government services will be able to get the assistance they require. The service centres operate from the Centrelink offices at Ceduna and from the Kimba Learning and Business Centre at Kimba. The South Australian Rural Communities Office is working with the Government departments to identify other services that may be delivered from the centres.

During my time as a member of Parliament I have worked actively for the establishment of wind farms in South Australia to generate electricity. This is one form of alternative energy that is environmentally friendly and sustainable. Solar power is another such resource, and an enterprising group in my electorate has researched and developed a solar distillation unit to supply clean drinking water to those who currently do not have access to this at a reasonable cost. Research scientist, Dr John Baxter, is backed by an energetic and forward thinking board headed by Judy Longmire, Valda Glover and Malcolm Hancock.

Eyre Peninsula people are known for their initiative and this has again come to the fore with the establishment of a manufacturing business for this desalination unit in the small rural town of Lock. Consumers want water that is safe, environmentally sound, chemical free, healthy, convenient, good tasting and cost effective. The Solar Pure water distillation unit produces water which meets these criteria. Initial research on global demand for the machine is also encouraging.

Education and training are essential if people are to be able to grasp the job opportunities which will help to bring to them the self-reliance, self-confidence and self-esteem mentioned by the Governor.

The Government's emphasis on information technology is evidence of forward thinking. Already technology is breaking down the tyranny of distance that rural students experience. I have great pleasure in mentioning that Jason Collins of Wudinna Area School was among the top 1 per cent of students in Australia in the 1998 Australian Mathematics Competition. Jason has been invited by Dr Keith Hannan to participate in a workshop of talented students within the Australian Mathematical Olympiad. Today's technology will enable Jason to accept the invitation and to correspond with this group in solving mathematical problems.

I and my staff consistently watch for possible sources of grant funding to bring to the attention of appropriate people and bodies. Lock Area School took up the initiative of applying for an EDS grant and was successful in gaining \$2 000 for computer technology.

The opening of the Minya Bunhii Child Care Centre at Ceduna was a milestone for the Aboriginal community. Director Margo Walker outlined the 20 years of effort that had gone into setting up child-care and working for the new facilities that were opened by the Federal member for Grey, Barry Wakelin, and me in July. The two eldest members of the local Aboriginal community, Leon Kent and Pearl Seidel, cut the ribbon to the entrance.

A new library and administration centre currently under construction for the Cowell Area School is expected to be completed and ready for occupation at the start of the 1999 school year. The project has been funded by the Department of Education, Employment and Training and Franklin Harbor District Council. The upgrade will provide improved facilities for the community library and school administration.

A community based board of management has been formed for Cowell Area School's aquaculture course. The board works as an incorporated body, not a subcommittee of the school council. However, the board still reports to the school council which is represented on the committee. Industry and community members elected to the initial Cowell Area School Aquaculture Board of Management were Steven Pope, Richie Baker, Simon Turner, Trenton Hardie, George Tovo and Ron Elleway.

I am proud to be part of the Liberal Government of South Australia that is eliminating the debt while still managing to fulfil its social responsibilities and to be the catalyst for sustainable economic development. There are many more examples that I could provide from my own electorate that indicate that we are heading in the right direction to help provide the opportunities for a wonderful future and high quality of life that should be our right and that of our children in a State such as South Australia. I support the motion.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I rise tonight to speak in response to the Governor's speech. In my Address in Reply speech tonight, I intend to cover a few areas which are mentioned in the speech and which I think are important and to canvass a few issues which are covered in the Auditor-General's Report. Hopefully, during the course of my speech tonight a theme will become evident.

I think it is important at the outset to comment on an issue on which I touched briefly during a radio interview this morning, and that is the Governor's speech. Protocol dictates

that it is not appropriate for much to be said in the way of criticism of a speech by the Governor of South Australia, but I think it is important from my perspective to say this. I have been involved in a number of capacities in the preparation of Government speeches. I understand the process within Government, and I think it is a little unfortunate that this particular speech, which was presented by the Governor of South Australia to the Parliament yesterday, was somewhat heavy when it came to strident political commentary.

The member for Newland may shake her head and go 'tut-tut', but at the end of the day the Opposition will respect the office of the Governor and will not be drawn into overly criticising the Governor's speech. However, I must say that I wish the Premier and his staff had had the same consideration for the office of Premier because it is not appropriate for a speech to be drafted in such a manner that is so overtly political in its message on such a controversial issue. I believe that that is most unfortunate. The speech has been delivered, and we in the Labor Party obviously will accept it, but I believe it is important that my comments be noted on the public record. The Governor's speech outlines the Government's political agenda. Mr Acting Speaker, I believe you will find that I am entitled to make reference to my views on the Governor's speech. I could make more—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): I have not made a ruling on anything.

Mr FOLEY: I could certainly elaborate on my views about the Governor's speech but I will refrain from adopting that course, if the Government is of the view that it will deal with this issue carefully.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Continue.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Sorry; what was that?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, I am just having—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Poor old Dorothy! The Governor's speech outlines the Government's legislative agenda, and I was somewhat underwhelmed by the content of the Government's reform and legislative agenda. As we look at and read through the speech, there is very little that we on this side of the House find particularly exciting or stimulating, when we look at the Government's legislative agenda for this next session of Parliament. I know there is some speculation that the period leading into Christmas could be shortened and, after a cursory look at the parliamentary agenda for next year, I note that it looks shorter than what would normally be the case—perhaps that is indicative of the Government's lack of real effort to perform its role in terms of producing quality legislation. Perhaps in some quarters it may, indeed, just outline the relative declining roles of State Governments. I will now move on from the Governor's speech because, as I said, there was nothing of great moment in the Government's agenda as outlined in that speech—except, of course, to remind us of the Government's view in respect of the need to sell ETSA.

Yesterday was another very important day, with the tabling of the Auditor-General's Report. It is a weighty document containing a number of volumes and, over the course of the next few days, we will work through it. However, there are some important issues that I would like to briefly touch on. The first is the Government's record in the management of its outsourcing of contracts—in particular, the EDS contract, which is special to me in the sense that I have been tracking this contract since before it was signed.

It would appear that, after three years of operation, the criticisms of the Auditor-General of but three years ago continue to be part of his commentary in this year's report—that is, that in many cases agencies are not yet able to say what their assumed costs will be, what the final bottom line costs will be and, indeed, what the savings will be.

On top of that, the Auditor-General, as he does with many of the Government's contracts, makes commentary about the degree to which the Government is open in terms of its accountability and transparency in relation to these contracts, and expresses his concerns about the process of further removing Parliament from the operations of government—indeed, of removing government itself from its responsibility for a number of its major functions as it enters into the significant outsourcing contracts.

The Modbury Hospital contract is also scrutinised by the Auditor-General. It really is a disgraceful contract. I watched the very pathetic attempt today by the former Minister for Health to try to salvage some credibility over the Modbury Hospital contract, but it is just an outright disaster. Perhaps the Minister in the Chamber now, if she has as much concern about her local community with respect to Modbury Hospital as she tends to have about upholding the principles of this place, might have had the ability to intervene. This contract has clearly been a drain not just on the taxpayer but on the community and, in particular, on those good staff who work at the hospital. But the Minister's handling of it, the Government's handling of it and the department's handling of it was absolutely appalling. The reference to the contract states:

It is a matter for concern that the Government has been placed in the position of having to amend a contract in a manner which required it to pay more money to the contractor because the Government agency concerned had not properly carried out adequate due diligence.

It is remarkable that a Minister still in Cabinet, who has now been given the responsibility for major Government operations, could have overseen a contract where the agency involved did not carry out proper due diligence. That is an absolute disgrace. I wonder what the Minister present in the Chamber did in Cabinet when Minister Armitage was so incompetently handling the outsourcing of a public hospital within her electorate. We may never know, but I am sure that the Labor Party will not remain silent on that issue at the next State election with respect to the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, and the member for Florey and the member for Torrens have already raised those concerns in their communities.

This report vindicates the continual attacks by the Opposition on this contract, led well by my colleague the shadow Minister for Health and member for Elizabeth. As the Auditor-General says:

The proposed contract not only ensures that Healthscope receives more money but has the potential should certain events occur to shift some of the financial risk back to the Government.

This Government has been very critical of former Labor Governments and, as I have said, in most cases deservedly so. However, having had to sit back over the past four or five years and watch this absolutely incompetent Government mishandle any significant business transaction, I wonder where the Government gets its expertise from.

Whether it was the EDS contract, the water contract or the Modbury Hospital contract, there has been a pattern and a theme, and that is incompetence. As this Government has moved to push out into the private sector major functions or operations of government, one would have hoped that it

would get the commercial side of those contracts right. But with contract after contract, the one constant has been that this Government has got it wrong.

Another disturbing feature of the Auditor-General's Report were the numerous references to the management of the Health Commission. Whilst it is not my portfolio responsibility, I will be measured in my comments, except to say that, as shadow Treasurer, because the Health Commission appropriately receives in excess of a third of the State's budget, it is of concern to me to note that in many areas of its functions there are a number of serious issues that go to the fundamental core of its management and administration. I am referring not just to Modbury Hospital but also to health standards, to foreign currency transactions involving the purchase of equipment, where over \$700 000 was lost, and its non-compliance with the year 2000 millennium bug.

Given that it is the largest bureaucracy within the State Government, that is a concern for all of us and the alarm bells should be ringing within the Government. I know that they are ringing for my colleague the member for Elizabeth. We will continue to pursue the Health Commission and we hope that some of these quite serious issues are addressed in the forthcoming year.

I made a brief contribution yesterday afternoon about the appointment of a Minister to handle the year 2000 millennium bug. I note that, according to the Auditor-General's Report, seven agencies are not yet ready to put in place adequate controls. My first reading of the report indicates that those agencies will not be in a position until June 1999 to prepare themselves to address the issues involving the year 2000 bug. I would have thought that June 1999 is a little late for that.

I refer again to the Minister for Government Enterprises. We watched with much amusement today at the Minister's inability to answer any questions about the EDS contract. The Minister was all at sea when he tried to answer my question about the EDS contract by talking about Modbury Hospital. When the Minister realised that that was almost as bad as the EDS contract he mumbled a few words, sat down and then said that he was not the Minister responsible. That is not bad, given he actually is the Minister responsible. The Minister's answer to the second question I put to him was equally appallingly answered. It should send a shudder down the spine of any of us in this place who have any concerns at all about where the EDS contract is going, when the most senior Cabinet Minister responsible for information technology simply does not have a clue.

Minister Armitage is not travelling that well. This relates not just to the Modbury contract or to EDS or to his getting his nose out of joint because the Premier would not let him sell ETSA—and I think for once John Olsen got that one right, in terms of the Minister's ability to handle such a complex task—but also to the issue of the TAB board. I know my colleague the member for Lee, the shadow Minister for Racing, is monitoring this one very closely; but I must pass comment on the resignation of Phillip Pledge, Chairman of the TAB. He is a highly respected, well known business person in Adelaide and someone many within this Government know well. In my dealings with Phillip Pledge I found him to be a very competent administrator with obvious ability. He did preside over a significant period of growth in terms of the turnover of the TAB.

Mr Pledge resigned because he was totally frustrated with this Government's handling of the TAB scoping study and its preparation for a position, should one be arrived at, in

terms of the sale of the TAB. Of course, another board representative, Mr Neil Sarah, a well known and highly respected proprietor of a building company in Adelaide, also resigned because of this Government and this Minister's incompetence. We were told that many on the board were also going to resign but that in the end they did not. If one looks at the remaining members on the TAB board one gets a fair idea why.

Some of those board members—and I am not critical of this—obviously had allegiances to the Government of the day. People such as Vicki Chapman realised, particularly in the run up to a Federal election, that a mass resignation from the board would not have served the Liberal Party well. The point of the matter is that this Minister has so little to do these days in his portfolio responsibilities one would have thought that something as basic as administering a scoping study for the sale of the TAB would not have been an overly taxing task. But for the Chairman of that organisation, somebody as highly respected and well connected both within politics and business in this State to feel so frustrated with this incompetent Government that he had to resign, along with Neil Sarah, should yet again ring alarm bells about the way in which this Government administers its general management of Government trading enterprises.

This Government, now in its fifth year, is showing all the signs of a Government in rapid decay. Unfortunately for the taxpayers of this State, barring any unforeseen changes, they will have to endure this incompetent Government for another three years. Fortunately for the people of South Australia, they will have an opportunity in three years to dispense with this Government if, of course, there is anything left to govern when this mob is finished.

I refer to the Federal election outcome and, in particular, the GST. The Howard Government has an election result which has seen it returned to government. Clearly, the Labor Party won 52 per cent of the vote. I remember quite well the hue and cry of the Liberals opposite, particularly from the now Premier, about the fact that the Liberals had won 52 per cent of the vote in 1989, and their arguments that the then Labor Government did not have a mandate. It is funny how things change. Plenty has been said about the injustice and inequities of a GST and about how those of us in politics, including the Premier and the Minister opposite, can receive a \$100 plus tax cut when, according to Treasury forecasts, pensioners in our electorates with no other sources of income might be \$2 better off, if they are lucky. I defy anyone to tell me that that is not an injustice, except, of course, the Liberals, who seem to like the idea of rewarding the rich and making the poor and those in difficult circumstances in our community suffer even more. The Minister smirks. Well she may: she gets a \$100 a week tax cut while someone in her electorate on a pension gets a \$2—

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: On a point of order, the honourable member has just suggested that I smirked. This is incorrect.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr FOLEY: The Minister smirked at my comments, and she takes offence at that. I know that she is a bit sensitive. I will get on to her incompetence shortly. I just want to finish with Minister Armitage and John Howard.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Do you know how to spell your own?

Mr FOLEY: No, there are too many syllables for me.
Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will continue his speech and not react to interjections.

Mr FOLEY: The GST, as I said, is a massive injustice to ordinary working Australians—to people on fixed incomes. But, as I said, the Liberals like to reward the rich and make the poor suffer more.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: But it is true, John, it is true. Why do you, John, want \$100 a week more when a pensioner at Maitland in your electorate will get only \$2? Do you think that is fair?

Mr Meier: I will have to get the figures and correct you.

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

Mr FOLEY: Do you really think that is fair, John?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will address the Chair.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I thought the Speaker asked you for advice, Geof: it does not normally go the other way.

An honourable member: Don't belittle the Parliament.

Mr FOLEY: Sorry? Don't belittle Parliament?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Exactly.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr FOLEY: I just like to see a bit of fairness when it comes to the administration of the Parliament.

Mr Meier: You are trying to denigrate Parliament. Stop it.

Mr FOLEY: John, you're a bit sensitive. Then again, I suppose that if I were a Liberal and receiving a \$100 a week tax cut and a poor old pensioner only got \$2, and if I were greedy, I would accept that. What concerns me—

Mr Meier: With your intelligence you don't deserve to be in this House because you don't—

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

Mr FOLEY: Poor old John: he's been here for 20 years and he can't get past the second row. Never mind.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I suggest that the member for Hart address the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir, for protecting me from the rabble on your side. The GST as it affects the States is something that presents me with some concerns. The reality is that the Howard GST proposal was warmly embraced by the current Premier (John Olsen) because he had to; he had little choice. But we have noticed from comments since that the Premier is starting to back away a little, and that he is now saying that he wants to be certain that our State will not be worse off. It is a little late for Premier Olsen to be getting concerned about what John Howard's GST may or may not do as it affects the States.

I recall a speech given just before the election campaign by an arch conservative, someone with whom I thought I would never have anything in common in terms of economic or any policy, namely, John Stone. The former National Party senator quite rightly said that if the small States sign up for the GST package they are mugs, in his terms, because the smaller States can only lose under the proposals put forward by the Howard Government.

It is not just a question of the maintenance of horizontal fiscal equalisation—not that I expect members opposite to have a clue what that means, although some will. That will

be in place, because it is easy for a Commonwealth Government to ensure that that remains. However, it will be difficult and almost impossible to ensure that we as a small State do not get ripped off by the larger States when we start to work out the various State taxation and stamp duties that will be eliminated. Those Treasurers in New South Wales and Victoria will say, 'Look, I will cop horizontal fiscal equalisation; I will cop the fact that we have to subsidise the smaller States for the cost of providing services in those smaller States'. But I will not cop giving the New South Wales or Victorian Treasurer more money to compensate for the fact that they have had a higher stamp duty or taxation regime than we have.

That is where the issue will become very difficult. I am convinced that at the end of the day the smaller States, unless they receive some sort of compensation from the Commonwealth, will be at a real and severe risk of being duded by a GST. It might be only \$30 million or \$40 million but, at the end of the day, we will be worse off. For a State Premier and a State Cabinet to have endorsed John Howard so blindly shows not only that they are incompetent as a Government but also that they are prepared to risk this State's funding base in terms of Commonwealth-State financial relations simply to see their Federal colleagues re-elected into Canberra. I suspect that, come the next State election, they will probably wish that they had not done so. The Minister in the Chamber might scrape back in her seat, but many of her colleagues will not.

I understand that the Premier flies to Canberra in November to sit down with the Premiers of other States. Let us just see what comes out of that; let us see what happens over the course of the next six months; let us see what occurs when the smaller States have to do a deal to withstand the enormous political pressure that will be applied to them by Victoria, New South Wales and, to a lesser extent, Queensland. I think members will then find that our State will be under serious pressure.

I promised the Minister for the Environment that I would also comment on her handling of her portfolio. As yet, I have not been able to find reference to any significance errors in her area, but I have not yet got to that volume. But, in relation to water policy, my colleague the shadow Minister has moved a motion—which, hopefully, will be supported by the member for MacKillop—to conduct a select committee inquiry into the funding, operations and issues involving the water catchment boards. I think it would be fair to say that water policy in this State is of major concern. Whenever I pick up a copy of the *Border Watch* or the *South Eastern Times*, I always see the member for MacKillop having a crack at the Minister for the Environment; he is always critical of water policy as it relates to the South-East.

We therefore look forward to the member for MacKillop supporting the Opposition's motion for a select committee—and I have no doubt that the member for Chaffey will support the Opposition. We will be keen to get to the bottom of what is clearly sloppy administration and, in conjunction with the Independent members, sort through this issue. Having just toured the South-East on a parliamentary visit, I believe that water policy in the South-East, particularly the upper and middle South-East, is a major topic. Whether the Minister for the Environment can survive the final conclusion of that select committee, we will have to wait and see.

Overall, it is a disappointing legislative and reform agenda that the Government has put forward. It offers no vision for the State and it is an ideology that we in the Labor Party

reject. I can only hope that this time next year members will see a more imaginative, a more well-planned, a more considered and a more strategic approach to resolve the many complex social and economic problems that confront this State and not just a continual running up the flagpole of Liberal Party policies and ideologies which have so poorly failed this State over the past five years and which will, clearly, continue to fail the State over the years ahead.

The reality is that this Government is a bad Government; it is an incompetent Government; it is a Government which is torn apart by internal division; it is a Government in which the ministry has been expanded to 15 to keep the factions happy; and it is a Government in which even the most long serving and capable members are not able to participate because it cannot find room for them as it needs to ensure that disloyal members to the current Premier are rewarded. I find this Liberal Party quite extraordinary: it seems to me that the more disloyal you are to a Leader, the more chance you have of promotion.

The more you seek to undermine somebody in the Liberal Party, the more you are guaranteed a promotion. The more you show loyalty to your Leader, help your Leader and befriend your Leader, the more you go to the back of the bus. There is something in that, and the Liberal Party best have a close look at how it rewards treachery and division within its own Party because, if it continues to reward those who are disloyal, it will need a Cabinet of 30 and not 15 members.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): It is with a great deal of both pride and pleasure that I support the motion. I was pleased to hear the Governor in his speech refer to the critical housing shortage that is impacting upon the ability of people to move into the northern and central parts of my electorate to take up job vacancies. It is a critical problem in my electorate. It is a good news and a bad news story: the good news is that there is significant potential for further employment in that area, but it is being stifled by the problem that families and potential employees have in securing somewhere to live so that they can take up those jobs.

I will devote the rest of my contribution to an issue that is of importance to me personally, to my electorate and, in fact, to most of the people in the South-East, that is, water, water policy and water allocation. I will give an overview and a considerable amount of background on this issue, because it has been ongoing for several years, and we are no closer to resolving it now than when we started several years ago. In the South-East, we have a relative abundance of water, which is stored under the surface of the land in a large limestone geological formation of two parts. Even though the layers of limestone are pervious to water, within them is an impervious layer of clay that separates the aquifers into two. The lower aquifer is known as the confined aquifer as it is confined under the impervious layer and the aquifer above is known as the surface or unconfined aquifer.

The depth of the impervious layer varies greatly. In some areas, it is only 10 to 20 metres from the surface, whereas in other areas it could be as much as 400 metres or 500 metres from the surface. This variation across the region presents at least one problem for policy making as there are different ways of getting water out of the various aquifers and different associated costs. Most of the problems in policy making have involved the unconfined or upper aquifer, and I will address my remarks in that regard. I will also refer to what is known as the Lacepede-Kongorong proclaimed wells area, although I will touch on some of the other areas. Those other areas are

Comaum-Caroline, the Naracoorte Ranges, the Tatiara and the Padthaway proclaimed wells areas. Those areas have been proclaimed since the 1980s, and virtually all the water has already been allocated. I will return to those areas later, because there are some associated problems.

In the Lacepede-Kongorong area what we call a permissible annual volume (PAV) has been established, which is what we believe to be the sustainable yield of an aquifer. The PAV is calculated on the basis of the amount of annual rainfall that escapes into the ground beyond the root zone of the plants. So, it is that rainfall which is not used on an annual basis by the plants growing on an area, which escapes that root zone and which percolates down through the soil profiles and into the aquifer. The PAV varies across the area, as does the rainfall. It is higher in the south and lower in the north, and also the evapo-transpiration is greater in the north where the weather is warmer, so in the time available less of the water escapes the root zone of the plants.

The policy makers have considered each hundred in the area separately and have worked out a permissible annual volume for each. Right across the area, that represents an amount of water which would be available for irrigation and which would irrigate about 20 per cent, give or take a little, of the total region. In some areas it is in excess of 20 per cent and in others it is down to only about 10 per cent. So, if you wanted to irrigate an area in any particular hundred to the sustainable yield of the aquifer, that percentage represents the amount of the land area you could water. It gets more complicated, and I might have an opportunity to expound on that further.

Several years ago the Government decided that it wanted to develop an allocation policy for the Lacepede-Kongorong area. The Government was also working through the development of the Water Resources Act 1997. I will quote one part of that Act which illustrates what has happened to the ownership of water in the South-East through Government intervention. Principally, people in the South-East, when they bought land, believed that they were also buying title to the water beneath the land, and that has been reflected in the prices paid for land in the South-East for many years. I quote selectively from section 7(4)(a) of the Water Resources Act as follows:

Subject to subsection (5), a person must not take water from a watercourse, lake or well that is not prescribed if to do so . . . would detrimentally affect the ability of another person to exercise a right to take water from the watercourse or lake or from the same underground aquifer. . .

That little statement basically tells us what the common law rights used to be before we had water Acts in South Australia, and those rights have indeed been taken away by this and previous Acts. Those are the rights that the land holders in the South-East believed they had. But, by prescribing the water, those rights have been taken away.

In the process of developing a policy in this area and in the process of developing the Act, the previous Minister, David Wotton, did a lot of work in the South-East in trying to come up with a workable policy which would be acceptable to the people in the region. He told this House on 5 February 1997:

The management of the South-East's water resources is extremely important, not only for the people of the South-East but also for the State. There appear to be two main areas of concern: . . . fears that allocation policies in the South-East will lead to alienation of the available water from the majority of land-holders, concentrating it in the hands of a few and encouraging the formation of a 'monocrop' economy in the region.

How prophetic! On 18 February of the same year he wrote to all land-holders in the South-East, including a copy of that speech and a couple of other papers. One of the papers he sent out to all the land-holders in the South-East had the following to say about the allocation of underground water in the South-East (and he was talking about meetings that had been held in the South-East to discuss the policies):

What was suggested at the recent public meetings was a form of allocation policy for proclaimed areas that would see all land owners receive an allocation, regardless of present or intended use. The allocation received would be a part of the total water available and would reflect the amount of land owned. There were lots of variations on how such an allocation policy should work, but this was the basic thrust of the suggestion.

That was 18 February. By the end of May, the Minister had released a policy—a policy which I will call 'Policy Mark I'—which basically did what he described in those statements: it took all the water available in the South-East for the purpose of agriculture and horticulture use, firstly allocating enough to those people who had already been irrigating so that they could continue irrigating at that same rate. So, it recognised the historic use of the water. The policy then stated that the rest of the water would be allocated on a pro rata basis. So, if a farmer had a certain number of acres in a certain hundred, and in that hundred there was enough water to irrigate 15 per cent of the total area of that hundred, that farmer would be able to get a water licence to irrigate up to 15 per cent of his farm. The policy was fairly simple and straight forward, and it was very acceptable to nearly everybody in the South-East.

All the problems started in the middle of June last year, when the then member (Hon. Dale Baker) was contacted by two of his constituents, one a dairy farmer, the other a vigneron. Those two constituents said, 'We are in the process of some developments, and this policy will have some restriction on the amount of water we can get for nothing.' I emphasise the word 'nothing'. They said, 'We really need more water than we will get under that policy for our development, and we will spend some money in South Australia.'

The honourable member then came back to Adelaide and said he would solve the problem, and indeed he did. He was solely responsible for changing from the policy that the then Minister had invoked to the policy under which we have been suffering ever since. The policy that we have now is one where 60 per cent of the resource is allocated on what we call demand, so any landowner can go into the office in Mount Gambier, pay an application fee of about \$120 and be allocated any amount of water he wants; so he could irrigate his whole farm.

That policy is in place until 60 per cent of the total resource has been allocated. After that, a trigger is set, and the next 30 per cent is allocated on a pro rata basis. Without going into the definition of 'pro rata' used there, I can assure all members that it does mean at the end of the day that many farmers will be left with no water at all because it has been allocated in the first 60 per cent. The last 10 per cent was left for contingencies. That is what the previous member for MacKillop did in June last year. I talked to him in August about this subject. He told me he was responsible for it, and he told me that he did that solely to try to promote investment. I will come back to the promotion of investment in a little while.

What he did was create what has become known in the South-East as 'the horse race'. As soon as everybody saw

this, they realised what was going on. They realised that all the water would be taken up, and that the water was an integral part of their asset. I omitted to say at the beginning of this speech that I do have an interest in this issue. I am a landowner, farmer and irrigator in the South-East, so I do have an interest in this and I apologise to the House for not expressing that interest earlier. However, this horse race was started in the South-East.

We all know that one of the few things farmers have these days is an asset. They are all asset rich and income poor. What we have done by this policy is set in train a way of ripping out part of that asset from those farmers or landowners in the South-East. This Government has had no compunction about that whatsoever, and it is an amazing situation that the South-East was indeed the heart of the constituency of this Government.

Since that time, every time an argument has been put to try to revert to the earlier policy, we have been told we cannot go backwards because of COAG—the Council of Australian Governments.

A huge number of COAG documents say many things about separating water entitlements from land titles, etc. The COAG documents were basically written for the river systems and the city water supplies. They were not written at all for the situation in the South-East, and this was confirmed only last Monday—and I will come to that in a moment. Before I get to that, I will quote from a letter from Senator Grant Chapman, written to one of the people in the South-East, in which he says:

As I previously indicated, I raised this matter with the Prime Minister and subsequently with the Minister for Primary Industries who, in relation to these issues you raised, provided a response which I want to consider in the light of the State Government's continuing negotiations with interested parties. At the outset let me say the COAG policy to which you refer has not caused the problems which you have highlighted. COAG policy simply identifies the principles and objectives of improved water management—not the means of achieving it. Implementation is a State responsibility; COAG does not prescribe the means of achieving the objectives—that prescription remains in the hands of the State Government. In other words, the solutions being implemented by the State Government are not a specific consequence of COAG policy.

I could also quote other jurisdictions which do not have this problem with COAG. I have documentation here from the Alstonville Plateau in northern New South Wales, concerning which one part of the policy released last year states:

As volumetric entitlements are related to property and plantation sizes, a record of these areas is necessary.

That is proof that you can indeed have associated water entitlements with property rights and COAG does not preclude that.

Last Monday, 19 October, I went to a South Australian Farmers Federation irrigation seminar held at Coonawarra in the South-East, in the heart of my district. Richard Evans, from the consulting firm Sinclair Knight Merz, gave a paper on COAG at that seminar and told us that he was the author of many of the COAG water documents. He said, 'We almost finished the COAG discussions on water policy and somebody said, "What about ground water?"' 'Oh, ground water!' he said, 'So, we wrote a few things about ground water.' He went through many principles of the COAG papers and said that every one of them has an out. They are the broad principles, as Senator Grant Chapman said in his letter.

Indeed, the 1994 COAG communique, the report of the working group on water resources policy, on page 21 states:

... management arrangements relating to ground water be considered by the Agricultural and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand.

That council goes on and establishes the policies regarding ground water. It says, among other things:

With respect to the initialisation of property rights, a community and stakeholder partnership in the planning process is essential to ensure local issues are incorporated into resource allocation and management rules.

I repeat 'local issues are incorporated into resource allocation and management rules.' The only person in South Australia who believes the propaganda about COAG is the Minister and her staff. There are many other examples I could quote to the House to illustrate that point.

We can safely, for all practical purposes in the South-East, ignore the COAG documents. We can safely adopt policies based on strong moral principles and study the situation and listen to the wishes of those people on the ground. What are those wishes? David Wotton knew what they were way back in February 1997. I knew in mid-1997 from the public meetings I called in response to the change of policy. I would have thought, after the 11 October election last year, that everybody in South Australia would know what the people of the South-East wanted. This is a clear case of democracy not in action. I can tell the House that Ian McLachlan supported the first policy—mark I—and indeed spoke to the Premier about it. Anybody in the House who has been following this issue would know that Angus Redford, the Liberal Party spokesman for the South-East, supports policy mark I.

Anyone who is a keen reader, as obviously is the member for Hart, of the *Naracoorte Herald*, would know that Patrick Secker, the new member for Barker, supports my stand on this matter. Everybody, apart from the Minister responsible for this issue, understands what the people in the South-East want.

What is happening in the South-East? We are handing out assets at no charge to a small proportion of the population. We are handing them out in perpetuity. There are some people in the South-East who support the current policy, and I will explain why they do support it. They support the policy because they are interested in development and this relates to three industries. I question the Government's supporting this policy because I do not think the Government should ever be trying to pick winners, particularly in the circumstances we have in the South-East, because we all know that the economics of primary industries varies up and down cyclically by great degrees over time.

First, let me talk about the wine grape industry, because the viticulture industry has expanded and spent millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars in recent years in the South-East. However, the wine grape industry uses very little water. Growers in most parts of the South-East if given a *pro rata* allocation, which is in the policy mark I. On average, they would be able to water about 60 per cent of their property to grape vines.

Recently I had the opportunity to visit Israel to look at what it is doing with micro irrigation and irrigation systems and it also came out in the Coonawarra forum last week that today's technology in the wine industry is such that we are still using twice as much water as the grape vines need to produce both quality and quantity of product. The latest research shows that we are still using twice as much water. At the moment the industry needs a little more water than growers would get under a *pro rata* allocation system, but

they certainly do not need that additional water in perpetuity, yet that is how we would hand it to them. This is an interesting situation. Once growers get up to speed with world's best practice, what will they do with their excess water allocation? They will sell it at a huge windfall profit back to the people from whom it was taken in the first place. That is very interesting.

I now turn to the potato industry, which is supposed to be a sunrise industry in the South-East. It is an important industry in my electorate but many people would not realise that the potato industry relies on rotational farming. Potato farmers can plant a potato crop on the one spot every five or six years in order to break the cycle of crop disease. Again, potato farmers do not need water every year in the same paddock. Under a *pro rata* water allocation system there is enough water to plant potatoes as well. Potatoes are also grown under centre pivots, a round irrigator, which irrigates round sections of land. Most land in the South-East is subdivided into square paddocks and corners do not get watered. As much as potato farmers might claim the need for water, they do not need as much water as they claim. They claim that water because they know it will be worth a lot of money in future years.

The same thing applies to the dairy industry. Dairy farmers in the South-East today use a large percentage of water to irrigate a larger percentage of their farm but, again, in Israel I saw the world's best practice and dairy farmers there told our group that they were specialists at running dairy cows and milking and they could not afford to grow grass in the paddocks and have the cows walk out and eat it. They imported their food from the United States. They brought the feed for the cows half way across the world, yet dairy farmers in the South-East said to this Government, 'We need the water from under our neighbours' farms,' and they were given it. What will they do when they get up to world's best practice? They will turn around and want to sell it back to their neighbour. This is an amazing situation.

Do we really want to hand to a select few in perpetuity an asset while knowing that, at the end of the day, those industries will suffer no adverse effects under an equitable and moral allocation system? Do we wish to ensure that these people will make huge windfall profits at the expense of their neighbours? I think not. Indeed, if the Minister in fact read and understood the COAG documents, she might come across excerpts such as:

The need for a requirement for right holders to beneficially use entitlements diminishes in proportion to the exclusivity of those entitlements.

In other words, the very aim of the policies COAG is expounding—which are trying to achieve the most economic use—by COAG's own admission is destroyed by that system of exclusivity, because once you give someone a right to that asset in perpetuity they can then not use it. They can then set up false water markets and they can then speculate, and this is already happening in the South-East in the Naracoorte Ranges, the Tatiara, the Padthaway and the Comaum/Caroline. In most areas where the water has been proclaimed for some years, 100 per cent of the water is allocated.

Even though 100 per cent of the asset in the Naracoorte Ranges has been allocated only 54 per cent of it is actually being used, yet farmers are paying thousands of dollars per hectare to buy a water right. Farmers in that area are making hundreds of thousands of dollars of profit from an asset which they were given but which they do not want to use: all they want to do is sell it. That is halting development in the

South-East. Recently one family from the northern part of my electorate came to me and advised that an investor wanted to spend \$20 million on their farm. The water was worth about \$3 000 on irrigation equivalent when they were first approached.

Over a period of about six months of negotiation the value of that water they would have had to purchase, from a neighbour to whom it was given, increased to \$5 000 an irrigation equivalent. The investor said, 'Well, we need the water.' They now find that they cannot even buy it. Why can't they buy it? Because the speculator sitting on it said, 'If its value has risen by \$2 000 in irrigation equivalent in the past three months, we will see how much it goes up in the next six months.'

How should this issue be resolved? We should recognise from where the resource comes. It comes from the action of every landowner in the South-East because his land contributes to the water which percolates down past the root zone on his land into the aquifer.

We should recognise that pumping from a well is not the only way of using the resource. Every time you plant a tree in the South-East you are virtually putting a pump in the ground. The Federal Government's Forestry 20-20 Vision program is asking Australia to increase its forest plantations threefold and the South-East is one of the best places to do that in Australia. Forestry is the most important industry to the South-East and we could be stifling it. We should recognise the immorality of taking one person's asset forcibly and giving it to another. Section 101 of the Water Resources Act 1997 provides:

A water allocation plan must, in providing for the allocation of water, take into account the present and future needs of the occupiers of land in relation to the existing requirements and future capacity of the land and the likely effect of those provisions on the value of the land.

Does this policy open future Governments and taxpayers of South Australia to litigation by farmers wondering what happened to the value of their land? If I had time I would quote from letters I have received from the Valuer-General's Department about what happens to the value of a farmer's land when a water licence is revoked. All the available resource to be used for agriculture and horticulture production in the South-East should be allocated on a *pro rata* basis. Every piece of land should be allocated an amount of water commensurate to the amount of water that it contributes to the aquifer.

There should then be a water bank so that that water can be distributed amongst those who want to use it by those who do not want to use it, but the asset stays with the land. This problem has not been solved for two years because there is a lack of will, and that begs the question: why? There is just a lack of will. The South-East now has a water catchment management board which was established by the Minister after a couple of backflips and several fiascos earlier this year. The advertisement seeking nominations for that board states:

Before nominating a person for board membership the Minister must seek and have regard to the advice of the independent Water Resources Council.

I can tell the House that I am informed that the Minister did not do that: the Minister nominated people to that board for reasons other than being so advised by the Water Resources Council and one would ask, why?

We have had an independent report from Messrs Cox and Baxter, and one must ask why they rely heavily on COAG. One must ask why that is so.

After stating that a greenfield situation would be easy—for example, 'You just have a *pro rata* allocation.' However, they walked away from it.

One must ask why on pages 29-30, when comparing the economic, social and environmental impacts of all suggested options, the *pro rata* allocation, with full training, comes out on top, yet they walk away from it. Why?

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

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): In reply to the Governor, today I will give two examples of how residents can work together as a community to achieve common goals. Both issues are especially important to residents living in the southern part of my electorate. First, I refer to Glenthorne Farm, a large area of open space which local residents overwhelmingly wish to see remain free of housing. I will also comment on the issues and needs of youth in the suburb of Trott Park and surrounding suburbs.

I was very pleased to hear the Premier's recent announcement, made jointly with the Federal Environment Minister, that the State Government would purchase Glenthorne Farm at O'Halloran Hill and that the land would not be used for housing. The Premier has not yet announced what the land will be used for, but he has hinted that it may be the site of an educational and research viticultural facility.

The Premier's announcement was long over due. Labor Leader Mike Rann, at the last State election, assured the electorate that Glenthorne would be free of housing under Labor Party policy, and the Federal Labor Leader, Kim Beazley, committed a Beazley Labor Government to retaining Glenthorne as open space. David Cox (now the Federal member for Kingston) campaigned hard to save Glenthorne, as did the outgoing Federal MP Susan Jeanes. Credit must go to the many residents of Trott Park, Sheidow Park and O'Halloran Hill for their immense efforts in working together to achieve a common goal.

Through the Sheidow Park and Trott Park Residents' Association, a community organisation, local residents ensured that most of their elected representatives on the Marion council and in State and Federal Parliament were committed to keeping Glenthorne open space. Community representatives attended meetings of the City of Marion Council's Glenthorne Steering Committee. They met with politicians and CSIRO representatives and spoke with other local residents to ensure that the interests of as many locals as possible were fully represented. The Sheidow Park and Trott Park Residents' Association collected the signatures of over 2 000 local residents on a petition as part of their 'Keep Glenthorne Green' campaign. I was happy to help with that.

The campaign to save Glenthorne was made much more difficult by the fact that the consultants hired by the CSIRO were clearly briefed to promote housing development on the site. The consultants' report identified a series of potential options for the sale of the land, all of which included a substantial amount of land being used for housing. Even after

the proposal to establish a national viticultural research centre at Glenthorne was made public in May this year—a proposal that would maintain a degree of open space while providing benefits for the South Australian wine industry—there were still some calls for housing to be developed. Local residents were forced to keep lobbying politicians and others involved in the decision right up until the Premier's announcement that the State Government would purchase the site.

Local residents were grateful for the Premier's 'no housing' commitment, but they know the campaign to keep Glenthorne green is not over yet. The Premier must now publicly release the plans he has for Glenthorne. To assist him, tomorrow I will formally propose that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee formally investigate options for the site in light of the Premier's commitment.

Another issue of great concern to the southern residents of my electorate is the lack of appropriate support for our young people. Trott Park and Sheidow Park developed rapidly in the 1980s at a time when public spending clamps prevented community infrastructure from ever catching up with the growth in population. These suburbs currently have a very high proportion of families with school-age children. Two months ago a forum was held at the Trott Park neighbourhood centre to address youth issues. I am grateful to the Marion council and the Hallett Cove youth project for organising it.

The forum included local young people, parents, business people, youth workers and the senior police officer from the Sturt Police Station. All up, there must have been about 100 people there. Young people aged from seven to 17 identified a number of issues of concern. The lack of local facilities and the lack of public transport to other facilities inevitably leads to boredom amongst local young people, which explains why groups of young people congregate in public places such as the Heysen Drive shops and the Hallett Cove mall. Many residents feel uncomfortable about this.

We need more youth-specific facilities such as a youth centre or a similar venue where young people can congregate safely and play pool or listen to music, preferably under the supervision of a youth worker. There is one thing for sure: if young people are not given the opportunity to engage in sociable and constructive activities, some of them will find other things to do which may be less acceptable to the community. Local youth called for greater acceptance and respect within the community. These young people felt excluded from the community at large. They felt ignored. Open and clear communication between youth and the council and other levels of government is clearly an issue.

The solutions proposed by the forum all tended to involve greater community involvement in youth issues and greater youth involvement in community issues. The young people at the forum realised that, in order for the council or other local organisations to help them to meet their needs, young people or their families might have to meet some of the costs of the facilities required. Fundraising programs were discussed as one means of achieving this. It was very encouraging to see young people being prepared to work together constructively for a common goal. They are prepared to put in some effort in order to gain community respect and inclusion.

I am glad I attended the Youth Forum. Many of the young people present spoke very impressively. It really was very encouraging. In summary, both the Glenthorne campaign and the Youth Forum show that community spirit is not dead. There are worthy goals which can bring communities

together, and I will help wherever I can to see these goals realised in my electorate.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I welcome this opportunity to respond in the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech. At the outset, I pay tribute to the work that is being done by our Governor, Sir Eric Neal, and Lady Neal. South Australia has been well served in recent years by its Governors. We only have to think of Dame Roma Mitchell, who was exceptional. I believe that each Governor brings a different style to the position, and I am delighted with the way in which Sir Eric Neal carries out his duties. He is approachable and dignified and a credit to the position.

One other aspect relevant to Sir Eric Neal is that he attended Thebarton Technical High School. Not many people may realise that. I attended Goodwood Technical High School. I am not trying to get a spin-off bonus, but I think that highlights once again the value of technical high schools of years ago. Obviously, Sir Eric Neal attended much earlier than I, but it shows that many people of note—and I do not count myself among them—have emerged from technical high schools.

Once again, I would like to thank the electors of Fisher for their ongoing support. It is a privilege to represent the people in my electorate, but if the Boundaries Commission has its way—which I suspect it will given that it is usually reluctant to modify its first proposal—I will lose from my electorate almost 5 000 people with whom I have worked closely for nine years. That is a cause of great sadness for me because, as members know, you become attached to your constituents (not physically but in other ways) and you deal closely with schools and other organisations. I understand the rationale behind the changes to the boundaries, but there is a cost, and that cost is the fact that we lose an ongoing connection with people with whom we have worked.

I would like to address a range of issues. One of the privileges of not being a Minister is that during the parliamentary recess you are able to travel. I did not go overseas, so members need not rush to organise postcards for me in the next election, but I did go to the Northern Territory.

I was very impressed with the activity taking place in Darwin. I had an opportunity to look at the east arm port that is being developed there—that is the port that will link with the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, which I trust will be built in the very near future. I believe that that linkage to the east arm port and, hence, into Asia will provide enormous benefits not only for South Australia but also for Victoria and the Northern Territory. So, I am keen to see that project finalised. And I am pleased that the issue with respect to the Land Council—which had some opposition to the railway, because it was debating the royalties and the use of its land—has now been resolved.

I would like to touch on one issue which is very important and one which has always been dear to my heart, and that is employment. We know that it is an ongoing difficulty in South Australia and, as has been said on many occasions, it cannot be fixed overnight. But I am keen for the Government to revisit the notion of being able to take on an employee and try them out for a period of, say, three months without the threat of legal action—that is, you give away the right of unfair dismissal during that time. I know that, in the past, the Government has proposed a 12 month and a six month period, depending on the size of the business. I believe that we should revisit that, and I trust that we will gain the support of the Upper House to bring about that change.

I believe that three months is a reasonable time in which an employer can try out a new employee to see whether or not that person is suitable for the business, and vice versa. I say that because I have spoken to many people in small and medium business, and they say that they do not want to take someone on because of the risk that if they get a dud they could be saddled with significant legal costs and associated expenditure. I believe that that is a serious impediment to employment in this State—particularly in relation to young people—that employers cannot, if you like, try before they buy the employee. I think that is worth pursuing.

Earlier tonight I heard an honourable member criticise the work for the dole scheme. I do not know whether members realise, but many years ago I proposed such a scheme, and many of my colleagues were very nervous. I drafted the letter proposing the scheme that went to the now Prime Minister. Unfortunately—and I still say unfortunately—the Federal Government did not include all the aspects that were proposed in that letter. One of them was, of course, the provision of accredited training. Whilst it is good that young people—and not so young people—get out of bed and go and do some work, it is important that they also receive accredited training as part of that process. So, it is not the total answer, but I believe members should realise that that scheme, even though it was modified and did not follow entirely what was suggested, originally came from South Australia.

We have many innovative schemes here, many of which could be expanded. One scheme which was introduced while I was Minister was called Upskill, and that was designed to increase the range of skills of people by requiring people who obtain Government contracts to take on young people. I would urge the Federal Government to follow suit, and when people obtain significant contracts from the Government they should be required to train and employ a percentage of young people. The percentage is usually that at least 10 per cent—one in 10—of the staff be a young trainee, and I believe that there is merit in that. I believe that the Self-Starter Scheme (which is to assist young people to start their own business) could be expanded, because I believe that there is an opportunity for people to create work for themselves by establishing their own business.

So, the challenge ahead for Minister Brindal is enormous, and I wish him well in that portfolio. I look forward to making some positive contribution as the workshop is developed and ultimately we have extended discussion here in the Parliament, as outlined by the Premier.

I would argue in relation to employment that some capital works could be of significant help. In that respect I would argue for upgraded transport systems. I still believe that we need a north-south road corridor. I do not know whether members have travelled recently from the northern suburbs, say, Gawler, down to Seaford, but it takes a very long time, particularly for heavy vehicles. It will not happen overnight and it will not be easy because the former Labor Government flogged off some of the land that had been set aside. It is necessary for us to revisit that idea, even though it could well be in a different format. Another transport initiative that would be very productive would be the creation of an electrified rail system, whether that be light rail or heavy rail, in the metropolitan area. We are now the only mainland capital city in Australia that does not have such a system and that would be useful to pursue.

With respect to employment and the sale of ETSA and debt, a lot of people get confused because they lump all debt together. Debt in itself is not necessarily bad. The point is

whether the debt is used for productive purposes or for speculative, non-productive purposes. A large percentage of our debt in South Australia has gone into unproductive speculative purposes, that is, through the State Bank fiasco. When we talk about debt, we should not assume that all debt is evil. Businesses and individuals use debt. It is how we use that debt in creative ways that is important and whether it is used to develop infrastructure or related activities.

Another topic which is very close to my heart is our education system, and I was pleased tonight to be one of many members on this side who participated in the Minister's advisory group. I am pleased that he is working to improve what is already a good system. I make no apologies for speaking strongly on behalf of the State school system. Like all school systems, it can be improved, but we have dedicated teachers, principals and support officers in that system. It is important that we do not allow the Commonwealth Government to short change that system in terms of funding, and some of the arrangements in place at the moment work to the detriment of the State school system, and that is unacceptable.

I come from a large family, which was poor in material terms, and education was the stepping stone for all of the six children, except one who married someone who is very rich. So I am a great believer in the State school system. I am not saying anything against the private school system because we have a system of choice, but the State school system is a community education system and it needs to be funded adequately so that it can provide opportunities for children irrespective of their family's financial circumstances.

One part of the education system that is causing me grave concern is our universities. They have been squeezed by the Commonwealth, and I make no apologies for my actions when I was Minister. I did not get many cards from Senator Vanstone, although it was nothing personal between the two of us. I saw it as important—

Mr Clarke: Are you a friend of Susan Jeanes?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I regard her as a friend. Susan is a nice person. I make no apology for fighting for the universities to try to maintain a decent level of funding for them. What we see now are the consequences of a process that started with Dawkins, and I am not sure why one of our universities recently honoured him. The Dawkins process led to the downgrading of our universities, and sadly that seems to have become an ongoing feature of Canberra. Our universities have to be very careful because not only do they face a threat from the Internet or similar technology including competition from Harvard and others but a fall in their reputation. I know the universities are subject to tight financial constraints, with tutorials being removed at other than first year level, and class sizes becoming very large, not to mention other pressures being put on the quality of our universities.

I repeat: if the universities lose their good name, they are in very big trouble. We should all be concerned to make sure that the Federal Government not only funds universities adequately but also that it makes it possible for anyone who has the ability and talent to attend university. I will always fight strongly to ensure that the universities do not become the province of the rich. Universities should be available to anyone who has the ability to benefit from them. Sadly, through the increase in HECS and other charges, we are making it harder for people from poorer families to access that education.

One other issue in relation to universities which concerns me is the extent to which they are handing out honorary

doctorates. People might ask, 'What is wrong with that?' What is wrong is that the tradition with an honorary doctorate is that they are used only within the province of the university; it is a courtesy title. In recent years, two of our universities have been dishing them out in significant number, to the point that some of these people are now using them in everyday life. That is a nonsense. I have no objection to people such as Professor Mike Tyler, who obtained a PhD by doing equivalent work, receiving a doctorate. But for other people to use them in everyday life is farcical.

I say to those universities—and it is essentially the University of South Australia and Flinders University—that they should be very careful with that practice. It is a practice in which the University of Adelaide does not indulge. They should be very careful, lest they devalue what should be something of worth and note in the community. I am not against acknowledging people who have made great social contributions, but it should be recognised that it is an honorary title, a courtesy title. For people to use it in other ways is quite ridiculous.

I refer also to the Motorola expansion, which we hope to see in the future. As the Premier indicated in the House yesterday, I met last week with one of the senior executives of Motorola, Terry Heng, who indicated that Motorola needs many IT technicians. Previously, Motorola said that it needed people with a Master's degree or a PhD, but it has come to recognise that if you are in the IT industry you need not only systems engineers (I guess it is equivalent to a lieutenant running a platoon) but also the foot soldiers, the technicians. This is where we can provide a lot of jobs for people at the diploma level.

I have suggested that the company, in association with the Government, look at bonding people on the basis that we help pay for their training or assist them to be trained, or retrained in the case of adult workers, on the condition that they spend so many years working for Motorola or whomever. That system worked very well in education. I believe that many members of this House came through that bonded system, and I think there is merit in resurrecting it not only in education but also in terms of the IT industry.

Basically, the reality is that young people who leave school today and who have little or no skills face a lifetime of unemployment. We need to make sure that we do not have a system which makes it easy for young people to leave school at 15, go on the unemployment list and stay there for the years and years ahead. In fact, we should move more towards the Scandinavian-Swiss scheme where young people stay in education and training and in that way upgrade their skills base to improve their employability. The days of leaving school and hoping to get a job are over. I think it is a form of child abuse to turn people out of school and to say, 'Good luck, I hope you get a job when you are 15,' when we know full well that their chance of getting a job is zilch.

One of my hobby horses for a long time has been men's health. I am certainly supportive of improving women's health, too. I was interested to hear from one of my female colleagues who felt that, when I suggested in 1992-93 that we should improve men's health programs, I was having a go at women's health.

It is quite the opposite. In fact, an improvement in men's health would also lead to an improvement in quality of life for women. To illustrate the interest, 240 people turned up at a meeting recently in Laura to hear a discussion about men's health, so it is an issue. Men are becoming more aware of the dangers of prostate cancer and colon cancer, just as women

have been in relation to breast and cervical cancer. So, it is not a question of one or the other; rather, it is a question of putting in resources, educating and making people aware, and this relates particularly to men, who are often reluctant to seek medical advice because the old macho syndrome comes into play. Whilst many men might be reluctant to be physically examined in terms of their prostate, the embarrassment of that, which is very small, is much less than having to endure prostatic cancer.

Members might recall Derek Llewellyn-Jones, the gynaecologist-obstetrician who devoted much of his life to women's health and who wrote many books, including *Everywoman*. Sadly, a year or two ago he died from prostatic cancer. There is an irony in that, and sadness to see someone like that, who had devoted his life to women's health, succumb to what is a very common killer amongst men, namely, prostatic cancer.

I am therefore pleased that the Minister for Human Services has agreed to push this issue of men's health and to continue to push the issue of women's health through awareness, education programs and meetings. In the very near future members will see some practical examples of how this issue will be conveyed to the male population.

Other matters of interest to me include tourism, and I am pleased to see the Minister for Tourism sitting at the front bench. During the break, my wife and I went up through the Flinders Ranges—and it was at my own expense; there was no claim. We went to Quorn, and then up through Wilpena to Arkaroola. One of the things that we need to address—and I know that most of it is in the member for Stuart's electorate—is the lack of signage for tourist points. For example, in relation to Mount Brown—which I am told was named after one of Matthew Flinders' party, not after the former Premier—there was no signpost in Quorn to tell you how to get there and, when we did get there, all the information material was missing. Nevertheless, we persevered and climbed the mountain, five hours up and back, and it is an excellent tourist attraction.

Similarly, with Dutchman's Stern, which is out from Quorn, there is no signpost—nothing to tell you how to get there. I went part way out on the road and came back in, and someone said, 'Yes, that is the road,' but there was no sign. Talking to many Victorian tourists who were up there with their big Lexus wagons and Mercedes sedans, while we were travelling in a 1977—

Mr Clarke: All Liberal voters!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No, probably Socialist Left. We were travelling in a 1977 Toyota Corona, which many of them looked at and laughed about but which never missed a beat. But the Victorians said, 'Look: tourism here in South Australia is largely of the 1960s,' and they were very critical. One of them said that they had had a meal at one of our prominent places near Wilpena Pound, and they waited an hour for service and then were told that most of the things on the menu were not actually available. They said to me, 'If you want our business, you have to give us service. We don't mind paying, but we don't want to come over here and find that what is supposedly available is not available.'

Likewise in Hawker, we went and had a meat pie which, sadly, was made in Western Australia. I think it had been in the oven since Western Australia was founded, because it was so rock hard that it was unbelievable. Yet, in Hawker and Quorn there are excellent cafes, for example, the Quandong Cafe, and that is the sort of approach we need. The latter organisation has excellent service and top quality food, but

we still have people in other establishments who feel resentful.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It is the Quandong Cafe—be careful how you say it. We still have a minority element who think it is an imposition to serve someone or to serve good food or to provide good service. If we are fair dinkum about tourism, we have to change that attitude and provide decent signage.

Recently, I went to the South-East in connection with the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee. When I went to pick up the hire car, a Japanese person was present. His English was not very good: he said that he wanted to go towards what appeared to be Victor Harbor. The next day, while travelling in the hire car in the South-East, I saw him in the Coorong. Heaven knows how he found his way around, but we need to address the issue of signage, mainly in English, but preferably for other people as well.

The pilchards disaster occurred recently, and members will realise that a pilchard is basically a sardine. It might seem the wrong time to be advocating this, but in Fremantle in Western Australia a company is making good use of sardines. It is selling them in Adelaide and around the world; it is canning them and selling them as marinated sardines. We in South Australia should be thinking about doing something along the same lines. It may not be the right time given the virus that is evident among the pilchard population, but in the years ahead the world will be looking for preserved foods and that is one which is highly nutritious and readily available.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It was a good outcome.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Members on this side would realise that I have been working away quietly on a compromise which, as it turned out, was very much like that adopted. The people in my electorate, particularly the women, will appreciate an extra hour's shopping in the supermarket during the week, and the extra few Sundays during the year for shopping in the regional centres will also be welcomed. I thought it was a great outcome. Given that I am, basically, a free trader, I had to make a compromise, as did others. I thought the debate and discussion among our colleagues was one of the best and most productive sessions that I have seen. It is a good outcome for South Australia and I am pleased that the Shop Distributive Union and members opposite are supportive.

Mr Clarke: We have not decided our policy yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith will have an opportunity in five minutes to make a contribution.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: With a bit of luck, we will have it in place by Christmas. I congratulate Minister Armitage for his efforts in that regard, and I am delighted to see that outcome.

I wish to raise another matter. I have discussed with the Ministers what I see as the farcical situation of a multipurpose sports facility, such as exists at Flagstaff Hill, being penalised under current funding arrangements. The peak sporting bodies get the money, but they do not want to support a multipurpose facility and thereby support other sporting activities. I have drawn the matter to the attention of the Minister for Human Services and, given that the Minister for Recreation and Sport is likely to inherit that part of Flagstaff Hill, I am sure he will be interested to hear my point of view on the matter. It does seem ludicrous. I understand that there are many of these facilities in other parts of South

Australia, but a group which caters for approximately 2 500 juniors a week should not be penalised simply because it is progressive enough to accommodate netball, tennis, football and many other sports. It is quite bizarre.

An issue that is again rearing its ugly head is voluntary student unionism. The word 'union' is a misnomer. I understand that the Federal Government still wants to go down the path of interfering in student union affairs. The Federal Government and local members need to understand that a student union at a university is not a trade union. It is similar to a local government providing a service for its constituents; it does not breach any individual right. The sooner people understand that guilds or unions at a university are not trade unions, the better off we will all be. If the Federal Government goes down that path, it is likely to end up with egg on its face. I trust that commonsense will prevail and that it will refrain from involving itself in that issue. Students at universities are adults. They should be able to look after their own affairs, and they do not need Federal or State politicians sticking their bib in and interfering in what they are doing.

Recently, we visited the South-East to look at the forests and the value adding of forest products, and that was a successful visit. I commend the members for MacKillop and Gordon for the excellent way they represent their areas and for the exciting activities taking place there, particularly involving forestry and the value adding of forestry products.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): When I thought about my address tonight, I decided I could approach it in one of two ways: first, I could give a thoughtful, incisive, erudite type speech such as that given by my colleague the member for Kaurana; or, secondly, I could adopt the more traditional role that I have adopted in the past, that is, of being less than reverent, getting stuck into the Liberal Party and being something of an intellectual pain. As you might have guessed, Mr Speaker, I have decided on the latter rather than the former, because I do not want to disappoint anyone after my having adopted this course for five years.

I want to deal with a number of issues. First, I refer to the Federal election. In particular, I pay tribute to a number of Labor Party candidates in what would be regarded as normally arch conservative, Liberal Party seats, such as Barker in the South-East of the State, Wakefield and so on. I want to deal briefly with Barker, a seat that I had something to do with in the lead-up to the Federal election. In particular, I pay tribute to David Detchon, the Labor Party candidate for that area. David is an independent lawn mowing contractor based in Goolwa. His employment is based largely on the work that he can get from, in the main, people who have retired to Goolwa and the surrounding area, most of whom would be Liberal Party supporters. He gave up much of his personal time to campaign in that large electorate, which stretches all the way down to the Victorian-South Australian border. That was not without some cost, both to him as an individual and to his business. Many people in the Labor Party who have contested traditional Liberal Party seats in country areas have been subjected to abuse from the local population, and they have experienced loss of employment and business opportunities because they have stood out for Labor Party policies.

As I said recently at a Labor Party State Conference, it is all very well for Labor Party members in metropolitan Adelaide to run for Liberal seats in metropolitan Adelaide, but they are largely anonymous. Their employment oppor-

tunities and their socialisation within the local community are not necessarily affected. If they are a small business person, their business is largely unaffected by the fact that they have stood for the Labor Party. That is not the case for a Labor Party person standing for office on the Labor Party ticket in a seat such as Barker. In the seat of Barker we recorded more than a 7 per cent two-Party preferred swing. A large measure of that is attributable to the fact that Dave Detchon exhibited the guts and determination to go down into what was hitherto regarded as tiger territory to wave the Labor Party standard and give up a lot of his time and personal money—the income he otherwise would have received from his business—to campaign for the Labor Party in those areas. Indeed, in the State seat of Gordon, which is wholly within the Federal seat of Barker, on the Federal results, the Labor two-Party preferred vote is over 46 per cent—well within reach of the Labor Party at the next State election.

So, I offer my commendation to the work of people such as David Detchon and others who ran for seats in areas such as the Federal seats of Wakefield, Mayo and Grey, where people such as Jeff Buckland, the Labor candidate for Grey and AWU Secretary in Whyalla, put an enormous amount of effort into trying to win those seats, despite the fact that they received little, if any, financial support from the Labor Party centrally and had to rely in the main on grassroots support, their own work and a few of their own supporters who were prepared to get out on doorknocking campaigns for them in those areas.

Indeed, together with the former Labor Party candidate for Stuart, Ben Browne, and our Senate candidate, Bill Hender, I was fortunate enough to campaign in the Mid North of South Australia in support of our candidate for Grey. I may say that it is an experience to campaign in towns such as Jamestown, where it would be absolutely false to believe that there is such a thing as a secret ballot, because the three Labor Party voters in Jamestown are well known to everybody else in the town. They are martyrs to the cause and it is a tribute that we still get that number of votes in such conservative areas as Jamestown, Clare and others.

Wherever I visited there was a considerable swing towards the Labor Party. I might say that after my spending only a day and a night in Clare itself there was a 3 per cent swing towards the Labor Party in that town. Indeed, the Labor Party candidate for Grey said to me that, if only he had had another two days with me in that area, there would have been a 9 per cent swing towards the Labor Party. I was heartened by the response I had from rural and regional constituents in South Australia, because they understood only too well how they had been abandoned by the Liberal Party at both the State and Federal levels. They were crying out for leadership.

When I was in Peterborough and other places in the State seat of Stuart they would say to me, 'Good on you for coming along here with Ben Browne. Even though Ben Browne is no longer the Labor Party candidate for Stuart, he is still coming out here campaigning for the Labor Party, meeting people in these areas, bringing Labor Party members of Parliament to our region, listening to and understanding our concerns.' If only we could get the State local member to take the same sort of interest in those areas as you, Mr Clarke, have exhibited. Even though you live in Adelaide, you have come out to the bush and you understand our concerns.'

Ben Browne, from Spalding, no longer a candidate for that area, was out there with us wanting to understand even more about the concerns of the people of Stuart. They wanted to know where their State member was. I said, 'I don't know.

He could be in London. He could be shopping. He could be Mr Invisible once again, but Ben Browne is there. He is with you on the ground at Peterborough, wanting to listen and understand the views of the local people.'

Wherever I went, I understood the feelings of the people in that area, because they were telling me in no uncertain terms that Stuart is a winner for the Labor Party at the next State election if the current member for Stuart is going to be the Liberal Party standard bearer in the year 2001. I promised them that they would not have to be inflicted for a further four years after the year 2001 with that representation. Indeed, we would free them of the yoke that has been strung around their neck by their present member. That is a promise that I made to the people of Peterborough and elsewhere within the seat of Stuart encompassed, of course, within the seat of Grey, and I intend to fulfil my promise in that area. During the Federal election we also saw the reshuffle of the Ministry at a State level.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Did someone rattle his chain or has the bear just awoken? What I am interested in is this: when the member for Unley was made the Minister for Local Government, I said that that was the worst appointment since Caligula appointed his horse consul for Rome. Well, I was wrong, because the member for Unley turned out to be not too bad a Minister for Local Government, since basically most of the work had been done for him. When he wanted to sell out the City of Adelaide, he cooperated with us so that we could do over the residents of North Adelaide, because he wanted to get back at Lord Armitage—I mean the member for Adelaide—who wanted to protect the fiefdom that he had within North Adelaide—

Mr Koutsantonis: And the king's deer.

Mr CLARKE: —and the king's deer, as the member for Peake points out. They are roaming free throughout the parklands of Adelaide. So, the member for Unley has actually turned out to be not too bad a Minister for Local Government. But then they made the member for Unley the Minister for Employment. Well, compared to the previous State Minister for Employment, his immediate predecessor, that was a bit like appointing Nelson Mandela: that is the equivalent. We heard today the member for Unley give very feisty answers to questions in Question Time. It is a bit of a pity he spoiled it because he had to read from his briefing notes, but it almost looked *extempore*. In fact, he ought to go *extempore* more often in terms of his delivery. He is much better at that than reading from a prepared sheet.

I thought it was a bit strange that he was Minister for Youth. That is really drawing a long bow. It is a bit like saying that at 47 years of age I would still be eligible to be President of the Young Labor Association.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: As the member for Peake says, I will try if it gets me a vote, but it is drawing quite a long bow. Anyway, the member for Unley in his capacity as the Minister for Employment, Minister for Youth (no matter how much you stretch your imagination), and Minister for Local Government will do a reasonable job in trying to protect the Government's backside in those areas. We will find him out, such as his rather rash promise to resign if certain conditions were not met, as he said today. He will be reminded of that *ad nauseam* over the next three years.

We then deal with the Minister for Tourism. Other than getting up at 7 a.m. for breakfast and getting to the office by quarter to nine and finishing by 12 o'clock the same after-

noon, what has the Minister for Tourism got to do for the rest of the week? Here we have one Minister solely dedicated to tourism. I do not underrate tourism as an economic driving force for South Australia, but I ask you, Mr Speaker, when you have roughly 100 or 120 employees, a Chief Executive Officer, a Deputy Chief Executive Officer, a General Manager of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre and an outstandingly successful Convention Centre with a full-time General Manager, what is there for the Minister for Tourism to do other than swan around to a few cocktail parties and toast people during the day or evening?

What does a South Australian State Minister for Tourism do after 12 midday on a Monday? She must sit in her office waiting for the next phone call, begging some member of the community from a phone booth to pick up the phone and phone her ministerial office directly with a question, because there is nothing for her to do. The reality is that it is not that tourism is unimportant; it is just that the position the Premier has created in this area is a 'make work' program—the very type of program the Liberal Party both at a Federal and State level criticised the Labor Party so much for with respect to Working Nation. We were told that we were creating 'make work' programs, not real jobs; we were painting rocks with white paint. In terms of the workload of the current Minister for Tourism, the person who goes out and paints rocks white is doing a more productive job and it actually lasts them five days of the week for eight hours of the day, unlike the Minister for Tourism, who is employed at a considerable extra cost.

We have to put this down to the fact that the Minister for Tourism could not cut the mustard as the Minister for Employment. We all remember the Minister for Employment on the first day she took her seat in this place as the Minister for Employment and was asked questions by a number of people, including myself, on employment matters and it was basically a tongue out of the mouth saying, 'Yah, yah, yah—I don't want to know you; I don't want to answer the question.' We all remember the Estimates Committee, where we saw an absolutely appalling performance with respect to the knowledge of labour market programs and the responsibilities of the State Government in this area.

The Premier has given the now Minister for Tourism something to do—a letterhead. To my knowledge there is not one State Minister for Tourism in this Commonwealth now or ever before who has only ever been the Minister for Tourism. Not even in Queensland or New South Wales do you find one individual so overburdened in terms of their responsibilities that they are just solely the Minister for Tourism. They have a number of other portfolio responsibilities as well.

Indeed, at a Federal level, the Federal Minister for Tourism, whether it has been under a Liberal or a Labor Government has had sport, recreation, racing or any number of other portfolio responsibilities. Clearly, what the Premier has said in that reshuffle is that he does not have faith in the current Minister for Tourism to operate employment or youth affairs but, because he needs the current Minister for Tourism's vote and the votes of a dwindling band of supporters to maintain his position as Premier, he will give her a make work position as a junior Minister.

I now seek to deal with the new Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services. I congratulate the member for Mawson on his appointment. For five years the member for Mawson has been assiduous in crawling and grovelling to the Premier of the day. There has been no rock

so low that he could not crawl underneath it to ingratiate himself with the Premier of the day in seeking some sort of preferment—and he won it. He won it as Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services. Good luck to him. Five years of gravel rash, no matter what the pain, paid off for him.

Unfortunately for the member for Schubert, no matter how well intentioned, he did not have the same success. True, the member for Schubert is the only member in this House to whom I defer on matters of agriculture: he knows more about agriculture than I do. I am the first person in this House to admit that the member for Schubert is far more knowledgeable about matters agricultural than I am, but he is the only member to whom I defer on that matter and, despite his loyalty to the Premier, he was bypassed absolutely for a ministry he richly deserves because his loyalty was unswerving.

The Minister for Youth Affairs enters the Chamber in a dinner suit and I ask you, Sir, would you get that on 5MMM or SAFM? I can see why the Minister is the Minister for Youth Affairs: he captures the imagination of all those under the age of 18 years just by his sheer magnetism and personal presence. I will not repeat my comments about the member for Unley because it would only bore the other members of the Chamber.

However, one of the things I noticed during the past 12 months was the cosiness between the member for Unley and the member for Coles. They are great allies and I well recall an interjection I made, I think, in 1996 when it was preselection time in the Liberal Party. I think it was the Wednesday just after the preselection for the Liberal seat of Unley which had been held on the Monday night. The member for Coles, as she was then, asked a question of the then Premier. Just before she asked the question my interjection was: 'How did we miss out on Unley?' I remember only too well that at that time the member for Unley was under great attack internally from the Liberal Party.

It intended to knock off his preselection, and the member for Coles was leading the charge. She had actually captured the field. She had got them all. She had got all the soldiers, the infantrymen, the cavalrymen and the artillerymen. She had held the high ground and was just about to crucify the member for Unley. That was in about June or May of 1996, and the honourable member would well understand it because he had a Dagwood type face for most of 1996 as he contemplated his fate at preselection. But he was saved by the intervention of none other than the current Minister for Human Services, the then Premier. The then Premier prevailed upon the State Executive members of the Liberal Party to shore up his vote.

The member for Coles had the numbers and the local preselection ballot and he was a gone goose. It was bye, bye, Mark. He was saved barely five months later, and the member for Unley showed his gratitude to his Leader, to the man who saved his preselection, to the man who ultimately elevated him to the ministry, by shoving the knife right up to the hilt, right through the breastplate into the heart of the then Premier. That was the gratitude of the member for Unley towards his saviour, and the funny part about it is this: his ally in joining forces in putting hands on the same sword that went straight through the breast of the then Premier was none other than the member for Coles.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe it is contrary to Standing Orders to ascribe improper motives to any member of this Chamber, and I

believe the honourable member is doing so to me. I am sure that the member for Coles can speak for herself.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. It may disturb some members if debate goes down that track, but the Chair only has power to ensure that it conforms to an Address in Reply debate.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Sir, I have never assaulted anyone in my life, and the honourable member accused me of assault with a weapon.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not believe that the member for Ross Smith was implying that: he was using it as a figure of speech in debate.

Mr CLARKE: I certainly do not believe that the member for Unley would assault someone with a deadly weapon in the sense of a physical attack but, mind you, there are many ways of dealing with your opponents, and the member for Unley is very practised at that. However, he is only an apprentice compared to the member for Coles. If knitting needles are to be working while the guillotine is being sharpened, the member for Coles is a past master at that particular exercise. Indeed, I refuse to believe that in her ministerial office there is a grindstone where she sharpens knives and axes.

I do not believe that for one instance. I have spoken to many members of the Liberal Party and they tell me that, but I refuse to believe that the member for Coles would engage in that type of behaviour. I tell them, 'Take off those ironclad back vests that you wear. Just because Joan is following you, don't worry about it.' Just to give members another example of the Liberal Party faction fighting, on the day, unfortunately, that the Liberal Party won the election in the Federal seat of Adelaide I, regretfully, had to listen to the turgid speeches by members of the Liberal Party at the declaration of the poll.

Mr Koutsantonis: Was Mark Brindal there?

Mr CLARKE: Mark Brindal was not there. No, he is not in the right faction. As we were going down in the lift, I was surrounded by Liberals: Jim Bonner, the director, the assistant director, Graham—and I forget his last name, but he is a very nice person—and Vicki Chapman was standing right behind me. Mr Bonner said to me, 'Don't you feel a bit uncomfortable in this company going down in this lift?' I said, 'I feel safer than John Olsen does standing in front of Vicki Chapman.' Vicki Chapman replied, 'John would not even step into the same lift as me.' That shows the depth of political enmity within the Liberal Party that some of its members cannot even share the same lift. I can do that with my Labor Party colleagues; whether I get out is another thing, but I can step into the same lift with my Labor Party colleagues. The fact that I may suddenly disappear through a trapdoor is neither here nor there. We do not carry grudges in the Labor Party.

Mr Koutsantonis: Hear, hear!

Mr CLARKE: As the member for Peake can testify, I do not carry a grudge. I just have a very long memory.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: No, he is not and I should not be smiling. I have only a minute left and I could probably wax lyrical for a while, but I am gone already.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 29 October at 10.30 a.m.