

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 November 1998

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

KIRTON POINT SCHOOL

A petition signed by 269 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to approach the Port Lincoln City Council to reduce the speed limit in front of the Kirton Point School and Kindergarten to 25 km/h was presented by Ms Penfold.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, South Australian—Report, 1997-98

Planning Strategy for South Australia—Premier's Report on, 1997-98

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

Flinders Medical Centre—By Laws—General

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

Administrative and Information Services, Department for—Report, 1997-98

Industrial and Commercial Premises Corporation—Charter, 1998-99
Report, 1997-98

Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Report, 1997-98

Playford Centre—Report, 1997-98

Public Trustee—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training (Hon. M.R. Buckby)—

ETSA Corporation, Direction to—Relating to—

Installation of Metering Facilities

Issues (a) and (b)

Issues Numbered 1—10

Schedules 1 2 and 3

Police Superannuation Board—Report, 1997-98

SA Generation Corporation, Direction to—In respect of—

Issues (a) and (b)

Issues Numbered 1—9

Schedule 1

By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board—

Report, 1997-98

Torrens Catchment Water Management Board—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. M.K. Brindal)—

Local Government Act—Regulations—Superannuation

Board—Shares and other Securities

District Council—By-Laws—Tatiara

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Moveable Signs

No. 3—Council Land

No. 4—Bees

No. 5—Animals and Birds

No. 6—Caravans

No. 7—Taxis

No. 8—Dogs.

BEST KEPT SECRETS CAMPAIGN

The **Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J. HALL**: Creativity, quality and innovation are just some of the qualities that this Government seeks to develop and promote in our State. And these are just some of the qualities that are evident in our latest tourism marketing campaign, The Best Kept Secrets of South Australia. The Best Kept Secrets campaign—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Minister has leave.

The **Hon. J. HALL**: —was launched locally at the Piccadilly Cinema on 8 September and subsequently by the Premier in Sydney and at a trade and media launch in Melbourne. This is a campaign that aims to increase awareness of South Australia as a tourism destination—encouraging more people to come here, stay longer, see more, spend more and come back—again and again.

As a result of this campaign, the Tourism Commission aims to increase the number of interstate visitor nights spent in our State by 2 per cent per annum from our September 1997 base of 7 187 000. The Government expects that this will improve profits for tourism operators and encourage further investment in this vital growth industry.

As I said, this campaign is extremely innovative. It is based around a targeted direct mail distribution of *The Book of Best Kept Secrets*, or *The Book*, as it has now become widely known. This is the first major direct mail campaign by any tourism organisation in Australia. *The Book* is not designed to be a comprehensive touring guide to our State. Instead it aims to provide a taste and a flavour of the many unique attractions we have to offer and to spark an interest in people to look further and experience more. It includes maps, product packages, articles and messages by well-known South Australian personalities, including Greg Chappel and Gillian Rolton. One of my favourite comments comes from Maggie Beer and it simply says:

The scale of our city, the proximity of the countryside to our markets and the bounty of seafood from our clean, green waters. With so much to work with, we can't help being good!

The Book takes readers through an array of South Australian tourism experiences—encouraging them to 'drive' over and around our State; to 'feel' our natural environment; to 'taste' our fine food and wine; and to 'think' about the cultural festivals and special events on offer. Nearly 1.5 million copies of *The Book* have been distributed in total. *The Book* has targeted 674 000 households in Sydney; 80 076 in regional New South Wales and the ACT; 536 141 in Melbourne; 69 751 in regional Victoria; and nearly 100 000 homes in Adelaide.

Designed in South Australia, printed locally and supported by a local advertising agency, *The Book* is a demonstration of South Australian ingenuity and quality from front to back. A sum of \$6.2 million has been invested into this campaign, and it was considered vital that effective monitoring of responses to *The Book* and the associated advertising occurred. Respected independent research firm Roy Morgan Research was selected by tender to evaluate the effectiveness of the book in how it has branded our State, the information readers have remembered and its effectiveness in moving people from just considering a holiday here to actually taking one.

Four hundred benchmark telephone surveys were conducted in both the Melbourne and Sydney markets prior to the release of the book. That is now being followed by a further preliminary telephone survey of 400 in each market, focus group research and a final telephone survey around three months after the release of *The Book*. Although *The Book* has been released for only a short time, I am delighted to inform the House that the preliminary survey results from research in Melbourne have been outstanding. Around half of those surveyed recalled having received *The Book*—a phenomenal result for any piece of unsolicited mail. Of those, 77 per cent said they still had *The Book*, many up to a month after they had received it. Approximately 66 per cent reported that they intended to keep it for more than three months, while 51 per cent indicated that they intended to keep *The Book* for 12 months or longer.

As most members would appreciate, planning for a holiday tends to be a long-range activity. That is what makes these results so impressive and so important because it indicates that in more than 350 000 households *The Book* is likely to occupy a prime position in the kitchen or on a coffee table in those obvious and ordinary places where people tend to make their holiday plans. Of course, that was part of the plan of the 148-page, stylish, glossy book and its impressive black cover, and I am delighted to report that it appears to be working. Feedback is clearly indicating that people like *The Book*, with almost 90 per cent of people believing it is stylish and tasteful. Given that so many people indicated their intention to keep *The Book*, members will not be surprised to learn that around three quarters of the survey respondents described *The Book* as interesting and believed it increased their knowledge of South Australia as a holiday destination.

However, some of the best survey results to date relate specifically to tourism locations and individual operators. Awareness of a selection of tourism attractions found in *The Book* increased across the board, with would-be Victorian tourists showing a 150 per cent increase in their awareness of, for example, the Naracoorte caves. The South-East, a national tourism award winner, has already increased tourism-related visits by over 16 per cent in the past three years. With these results, tourism operators in the South-East region—and the members for MacKillop and Gordon, I dare say—should be looking forward to further gains in the future.

Outside the commissioned research results, we have also received particularly fantastic reports from two tourism operators who have advertised in *The Book*. Both reported receiving individual bookings worth more than \$10 000. Results like that so early in the campaign from a \$950 strip ad are definitely value for money. We will be using results like that and overall increases in visitor numbers to judge the value of this unique campaign. The early results that I have outlined are extremely encouraging to say the least, and I am delighted to tell the House that the best news of the surveys conducted is that almost 40 per cent of respondents indicated that, as a result of *The Book*, they are either planning a visit in the next 12 months or at some stage in the near future. That is the equivalent of a further 300 000 visitors to our State.

The outstanding results of *The Book* do not stop there either. Calls to our travel call centres have more than doubled during the first two weeks of distribution. Unprompted awareness of South Australian advertising has more than quadrupled to 19 per cent, making it more memorable than New South Wales and Victorian advertising, which runs at about 15 to 16 per cent awareness.

This innovative investment in our dynamic and growing tourism industry clearly looks like paying dividends, and I am told we should be confident of increasing visitor nights by our target of 2 per cent per annum, which will inject a further \$215 million into our State's economy over five years. I look forward to informing the House of our progress in meeting these targets and to receiving further survey results as they come in from the Best Kept Secrets campaign. Early planning for another edition of *The Book* is presently occurring, and it will be updated to take account of feedback from our target markets and further research. Naturally, it will include many new and unique secrets of South Australia.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Was the Premier telling the truth to Parliament in August this year when he repeated that 'no side deals' were given to Motorola, even though the former Premier gave approval in March 1996 for a Government agency to undertake negotiations with Motorola to finalise the terms under which Motorola would be the designated supplier of radio equipment for the Government radio network contract? In September this year, the Auditor-General told the Economic and Finance Committee that he believed a letter written by the former Premier on 9 July 1996 reignited legal obligations first put in place by then Minister Olsen to give Motorola the equipment supply contract for the Government radio network contract. However, in July this year, Treasurer Rob Lucas provided information to Parliament that on 20 March 1996—four months before the 9 July letter—the former Premier had already given approval for negotiations to be undertaken with Motorola over the Government radio contract, indicating that the obligations created by then Minister Olsen were already still alive.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Elder just does not want to see the facts as they are. The answer I gave to Parliament in 1994—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —is supported by no less than the Solicitor-General's advice.

HORIZONTAL FISCAL EQUALISATION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is directed to the Premier. What is the importance to us of the maintenance of horizontal fiscal equalisation under the Federal Government's tax reform package, given the comments over the weekend by New South Wales Premier Bob Carr?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —the honourable member for his question. The arguments for taxation reform in Australia are convincing. South Australia has borne the brunt of a recent High Court decision that took away the rights of States to collect revenue in tobacco, alcohol and fuel excises. That diminished substantially the revenue capacity of the States. This decision has compounded the effects of vertical fiscal imbalance, which is identified by many countries around the world—and certainly by many commentators in Australia—as something that needs to be corrected.

For those members opposite who are interjecting and who are on speaking terms with Premier Bob Carr, perhaps they could stress to him the importance of horizontal fiscal equalisation for Australia's benefit. As we all know and understand, horizontal fiscal equalisation is extremely important to the smaller States, and South Australia is no exception to that. In the absence of HFE, States which through which no fault of their own face higher costs because of the nature of their economy or have a low capacity to raise revenues would be unable to provide their communities with a level of public services offered by the more populated States. Those high costs would arise from sociodemographic factors such as the relatively high number of aged in South Australia, or it would be as a result of the need to provide greater welfare and health services because of the age profile of our population.

It could be because of the small size of the economy of South Australia, through diseconomies of scale. Not having the economies of scale of some States on the eastern seaboard does put us at a disadvantage. States such as South Australia had to meet greater costs *per capita* than larger States such as New South Wales and Victoria. These costs are not amortised over a larger base from which you can collect them. Smaller States, such as South Australia, are also disadvantaged by revenue raising capacity differences caused by such factors as resource differences, for example the existence of large mineral deposits in Western Australia or differences in economic structures, and I instance New South Wales' financial structure and the infrastructure that has been developed on the eastern seaboard of Australia over many centuries where, *pro rata*, the smaller States have not had the same support.

Under the principles of horizontal fiscal equalisation, each State is given funding sufficient to provide the average service level if an average revenue raising effort is made; that is, if our taxing effort is equal to that of the other States, there is an equalisation to ensure that we have the capacity to provide the same standard and level of education and health services as do the more populated States. Horizontal fiscal equalisation ensures that all Australians share equally in the resources of the nation: its absence would mean inequalities of services and taxes across the States. Greater centralisation would be the outcome of the abolition of HFE. You would get greater concentration in expenditure of Commonwealth funds and resources on the eastern seaboard of Australia, which I am sure that no member of this House would want.

The other point I want to make is that, as is pointed out to me, we are a Federation, part of that deal being that smaller States get a fair go. That is what HFE is all about. As for New South Wales Premier Bob Carr's \$1 million advertising campaign to attack the maintenance of horizontal fiscal equalisation under the Federal Coalition's tax reform package, it is nothing but blatant politicking. Premier Bob Carr is playing politics and political commentators around the country are acknowledging that, following the start of his advertising campaign on the weekend. It is pretty clear that there is a New South Wales State election coming up next year.

I can assure the House that we will be continuing to argue the case for maintenance of horizontal fiscal equalisation. Ironically, I have sat through Premiers' meetings at which Bob Carr has been an avid supporter of a fixed share of Commonwealth revenue for the States: he has been unstinting in that. He refrained from GST under a deal with Kim Beazley prior to the Federal election but, under the proposed

tax package, this is what Bob Carr will get: he will get out of the tax plan of the Commonwealth Government that for which he argued for the past two years in those Premiers' forums. Never since Federation have the States had the opportunity to access in the long term a growth tax that will come directly to the States.

It will not be a growth tax in the short term because, on the modelling undertaken by the Commonwealth, in years one to three there is no gain in revenues and, as I have advised the House previously, there is a commitment from the Prime Minister to ensure that no State is disadvantaged in the short term and start-up period. But in years four through 10, there will be an increase in the revenue from a GST that can be disbursed amongst the States and give us a growth factor, stopping the trend that we have seen in recent times where the revenue raising measures of the States are being evaporated by decisions of the High Court and of successive Commonwealth Governments. State Governments have to get back to having a guaranteed revenue flow to provide the basis of services that all of us in this House would want to provide to South Australians in the future.

South Australia has made it perfectly clear to the Prime Minister that we would support taxation reform on the premise that the GST revenues paid to the States would be distributed on a fiscal equalisation basis. That is the basis upon which we have had discussions with the Prime Minister. Premier Kennett in Victoria, as I have also previously advised the House, understands the importance of maintaining horizontal fiscal equalisation, so I cannot understand why Bob Carr, a few months before an election, takes this tack.

We have a position, supported by Victoria and the majority of the other States, with the exception of Bob Carr, where we will have maintenance of horizontal fiscal equalisation in the taxation plan. As we go forward with the opportunity to eliminate between eight and nine State taxes, as applying to the different jurisdictions, we will then get compensation by the revenue.

But, more importantly, the benefit will come from the tax reduction, the personal income tax cuts for ordinary Australians and South Australians, and greater disposable income for those people to spend on the goods and services that they think are important for their family and their communities, rather than Government taking it away. On the basis of the commitments of the Prime Minister, with the support of Premier Jeff Kennett in Victoria, I have no doubt that the tax plan will be endorsed with horizontal fiscal equalisation.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Did the Premier tell the truth to Parliament in August this year that no side deals were given to Motorola, in light of a series of documents leaked to the Opposition which plainly indicate that a side deal was made? The Opposition has a leaked copy of the Solicitor-General's advice to the Premier, dated 29 September this year, to which the Premier has alluded, which states that a letter written by the then Premier on 9 July 1996 referred to a meeting which took place in June 1996, that meeting held for the purpose of making Motorola designated supplier of radio equipment as contemplated by former Minister Olsen. The Opposition also has a copy of a leaked letter from the then CEO of Information Technology, Mr Ray Dundon—

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON:—no doubt he will have more to tell us and you can laugh at that—which refers to various letters sent to Motorola from the now Premier. Tell us the truth, John.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a point of order.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The member for Elder has imputed improper motive towards the Premier, which I understand is contrary to Standing Orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is in the Chamber and he could respond if he believed an improper motive was imputed. I would also caution the honourable member: when asking questions, there is no need to repeat the question at the end of the explanation.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You can tell when the Opposition does not have substance, because members opposite talk about—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Elder can just cool it a bit and wait for the answer. Whenever they get up and say they have a leaked document, they are trying to beat it up. Well, it is not a leaked document. The Solicitor-General's advice is what I distributed about four or five weeks ago to anybody who wanted it, including the media. So let us get rid of this nonsense about a leaked document. That is a statement that is not true. I distributed the Solicitor-General's advice, and what the Opposition does not like is the fact that the Solicitor-General's advice supports exactly the case that I have argued in this Parliament for some time.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): The Premier would be aware of the recently released economic indicators. Will the Premier inform the House of what these indicators show about the current state of South Australia's economy?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am certainly pleased to advise the House of a number of opportunities which are emerging and which we are now seeing where the economy in South Australia is starting to pick up and head in the right direction. Every member of the House would be mindful of the challenges presented to local industries by the economic crisis in the Asian region. In the light of this it is encouraging to note recent overseas export figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics which indicate that South Australian exporters are performing well, despite these challenges. In the three months to August 1998 South Australia's total overseas exports amounted to \$1.3 billion—up \$25 million or 2 per cent compared with the three months to August 1997.

The best performing commodity in that group was the aquaculture industry, which grew by 62 per cent, and wine was up some 37 per cent. The best performing industries were agriculture (up 45 per cent) and food, beverages, tobacco and manufacturing (up 18 per cent). It is encouraging to see sectors, which this Government has identified as presenting vital opportunities for employment in the State, such as aquaculture and wine, doing so well in the current climate. That was certainly underscored by the dinner held last Friday involving Food for the Future and our plan for tripling the exports of our food industry from \$5 billion to \$15 billion by 2010. Throughout regional and country areas of South

Australia the number of awards given to companies excelling in this area is a positive trend for the State.

We have often said that the financial crisis in Asia presents local exporters with opportunities to forge valuable relationships. To show that South Australian exporters are not just fair weather friends, we need to maintain our contacts in those markets. Loyalty in the markets, particularly in the Asia Pacific region, is a highly regarded attribute. By concentrating on developing strong trade links in these difficult times, local exporters are grabbing a very valuable opportunity—an opportunity which will result in jobs growth.

It is also encouraging to note some other economic indicators released yesterday. Building approvals in South Australia rose sharply in September, compared with a national rise of 1.9 per cent. Approvals in South Australia rose 18 per cent. Although building approval figures recently showed some volatility on a month by month basis, trend growth—the trend line, which is the important line—in approvals in South Australia remained strong, in direct contrast to the national situation. Between September 1997 and September 1998 the trend estimate of total dwelling approvals was up 27 per cent in this State. The next best performing State was Western Australia, with a rise of 14 per cent. Although both these indicators show that economic activity in South Australia is encouraging, we cannot accept that as being good enough. We need to get the economic fundamentals right in order to provide stable job growth and security for South Australians.

Export activity is important to the South Australian economy and increasingly positive export activity means creation of more jobs. The Government is looking to stimulate these areas. It has looked at industry sectors and put plans in place for their development. These are the strengths upon which we in South Australia must build. Our exporters and manufacturers have been doing it tough for too long, under the shackles of a crippling debt burden and taxation levels.

To reinforce the point, we have an opportunity, with legislation before this Parliament, to remove that debt and therefore have some easing of the taxes and charges in South Australia but, importantly, as with the tax plan, to remove the impost of wholesale sales tax that is a major disadvantage to our manufacturing base going into the export market. If we get rid of wholesale sales tax—an impost against our motor vehicle manufacturers going into the export market—and get rid of the debt through the passage of our legislation in relation to the sale of our power utilities, and get competitive marketplace and competitive import costs for places like General Motors, we will do more in those two measures than we have been able to do in the past two decades to position our manufacturing base and exporters to access the international marketplace.

If we are fair dinkum about jobs, that is the way in which we will reach a position of attracting new private sector capital investment and underpin jobs growth in this State; that is why we are pursuing those policies with vigour.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Why did the Premier fail to tell Parliament in August this year that the then CEO of Information Technology, Ray Dundon, wrote to Motorola in October 1994 following discussions with the Economic Development Authority and four months after the 23 June agreement of that year had been signed with Motorola reaffirming the Govern-

ment's undertaking to give Motorola the contract to become equipment supplier for the Government radio network? The Premier told Parliament on 27 August this year that no side deals were given to Motorola because clause 17 in the 23 June 1994 agreement wiped out any legal obligations to Motorola he might have created. The letter from Mr Dundon states:

It is my understanding that the South Australian Government is committed to the undertakings made in the various letters which have been sent to Motorola earlier this year by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, Mr John Olsen.

Leaked Crown Law advice of May 1995—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: You did not give us this, John: one of your mates did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: That advice states that the Ray Dundon letter amounts to a representation by the Government that Motorola will be appointed as a designated supplier of radio equipment for the radio project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will explain it simply, for the benefit of the member for Hart: read page 2 of the Solicitor-General's advice. Even the member for Hart, if he reads it slowly and carefully, will understand the advice, which underscores my answers to this Parliament consistently.

FOOD AND FABRIC AWARDS

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Deputy Premier advise the House on the success of the Premier's inaugural Food and Fabric Awards held last Friday night, and will he indicate the importance of this sector to the economy?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Colton for the question and acknowledge his past experience in the food industry. On Friday night—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I just ask the Opposition to listen, because this is actually a good news story, which is a little different than just trying to scare investors out of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On Friday night—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: That is right; some things never change.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. Last Friday night the Premier's Food and Fabric Awards were held at the Hilton Hotel. Over 400 people attended, many from regional South Australia; in fact, many more people displayed an interest in attending and, unfortunately, could not be accommodated. The awards celebrated South Australia's success within the food and fibre industries

and certainly highlighted the value of the innovation taking place within those very important industries. The initiative of the awards arose in conjunction with the Food for the Future plan which, as the Premier said, aims to increase the value of the food industry from \$5 billion to \$15 billion by 2010.

The Fibre and Fabric Plan is aimed at doubling the contribution of that sector from \$500 million to \$1 billion in the same time period. The standard of finalists was excellent. Many people in the industry are striving to achieve success and, as the Premier said, despite what is happening in Asia, South Australia's food industry is achieving great growth figures, and that is terrific to see. Not only was it good to see the winners honoured but it was also great to see those winners encourage other people to emulate their success and to lift their performance. One key to that success is the strong partnership between Government and industry. In addition, the partnership within and between industries is really helping the people concerned to achieve success.

The major award for the year was presented to Grant and Carol Paech of Beerenberg Pty Ltd, who are wonderful role models not only within the food industry but for any small-medium business in South Australia. Their undertaking is an outstanding example of best practice, market focus, innovation and getting a product to where it needs to go. Other winners include: horticulture, the Rose Company, Salisbury; dairy, Toni Robinson (former Mayor of Murray Bridge) of Island Pure, which is a sheep dairy on Kangaroo Island; field crops, Kevin Jaescke from Hart, along with Laucke Flour Mills; meat, Uncle Tom's poultry and the Oxford Hotel; seafood, Tony's Tuna and Grandax Crabs; and wool, the McBride family and R.M. Williams.

Certainly, the standard of entries was excellent and certainly reflects the talent, creativity and innovation that is driving ahead the South Australian food and fibre sectors. I thank very much the sponsors for their generosity in making the awards possible. I also thank not only the Premier for his support of the awards but also his Food Council, which is creating that partnership with industry. I also thank the member for Mawson in his role as convener of the Food for the Future group. Now that the honourable member has taken higher office, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer has replaced him, and I am sure that she will do a great job.

Overall it was a great night and an opportunity to celebrate what has been a very successful year for our food and fibre industries which, together with the wine industry, are creating many jobs in regional areas.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Given the Premier's continued denials to Parliament that there were no discussions 'formal or informal' with Motorola in 1994—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: I will start the question again.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member does not need to start the question again.

Mr FOLEY: Given the Premier's continued denials to Parliament that there were no discussions 'formal or informal' with Motorola in 1994 about other components of Government business, will the Premier explain why Motorola's Director, Roger Fordham, told Parliament's Industries Development Committee in August 1994 that Motorola had held business discussions 'with various parts

of the Government about other contracts between Motorola and the Government'?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What the member for Hart ought to do is quote all of what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a serious question before the Chair.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What the member for Hart ought to do is quote all of what Roger Fordham told the Industries Development Committee where he confirmed that there were no side deals.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Venning interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will also come to order.

Mr Foley: If you don't tell the truth, John, you'll get caught out.

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

HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage provide examples to this House of how South Australian heavy industry is committed to operating in what could be described as an environmentally friendly manner?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is an extremely important question and one in which I am sure the member for Giles would be interested. I know that the community is becoming increasingly aware that industry is responding positively and responsibly to regulatory requirements to reduce pollution and corporate pressures to increase efficiency, and I want to highlight one such instance. I draw the attention of the House to BHP and its very substantial operation at Whyalla. Statewide BHP employs approximately 2 000 very hard working Australians. BHP Integrated Steel published its five year environmental improvement plan in 1993. This plan contains some 35 projects of studies specifically targeting and striving for cleaner air, cleaner water and reduced noise levels.

I understand that BHP is continuously building on this document and, to date, has spent some \$82 million on environmental improvement initiatives. The Environment Protection Agency has worked cooperatively with BHP, providing guidance to the company. Throughout the environmental improvement program, the EPA has been used as a technical advice resource. In effect, the EPA has acted as a change agent and has worked with BHP in a process of continuous improvement through negotiation and assisted the company to manage environmental issues responsibly. Some of the major advances have included upgrading the existing fume collection equipment, which serves the basic oxygen steel furnace, and the addition of secondary fume controls at a cost of some \$9.5 million in an effort to capture the fugitive fumes escaping from the building.

Responding to what is a very difficult problem of trapping particulate matter from the Whyalla pellet plant has certainly required innovation. The individual particles, as members would realise, are less than one thousandth of a millimetre in

diameter. Despite these obvious difficulties, BHP is executing upgrades by using complex and cutting edge European technology to the value of approximately \$28 million. BHP has also focused on the marine environment, constructing a 2 hectare reed bed which will remove pollutants such as ammonia and zinc biologically—again at a cost of some \$4.5 million.

I am encouraged by the fact that the company will focus particularly on reducing further marine pollution in the future. I believe that this example illustrates the commitment with which this major South Australian industry is tackling the very difficult task of reducing environmental pollution responsibly within a very competitive corporate and global environment and, notwithstanding, it is important that all companies continue their efforts to improve their own environmental situation. The EPA, through assistance and regulation, has certainly a very important role to play in this regard. I should also mention to the House—and I am sure all members are aware of this—that the South Australian EPA is recognised nationally as the lead agency in all these types of reforms.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Does the Premier now acknowledge that the letter sent by him to Motorola in April 1994 offering Motorola the designated equipment supplier contract for the Government radio network was a 'side deal', unrelated to the incentive package that went before the Industries Development Committee and, if not, what would the Premier call it?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Far be it for the views of the member for Hart to be taken into account, I refer members to the Solicitor-General's advice and the Crown advice. In two determinations no less than the Crown Law officer and the Solicitor-General have put down that the contract I signed on 23 June 1994 (I think it was) expunged any component of references in previous correspondence. Therefore, my answer to the Parliament subsequent to that was accurate, and I will take the advice of the Solicitor-General and Crown Law well before the political misinterpretations of members opposite. Just let me put this to one side for the moment—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I do not give a damn—and why—because we have a company of international reputation and standing which has established itself in South Australia and which employs 200 people and which is now one of the most profitable, productive software development centres in the world for Motorola. Based on that, Motorola is now prepared to double the size of the investment employment base in South Australia. More than that, it is prepared to work with South Australian Government agencies to put in place training for high school kids or people who have lost a job to work as technicians and to work with software engineers because there is a dearth of software engineers around the world and in particular the Asia-Pacific region.

The fact is the honourable member's claims have been struck out by no less than the Crown Law officer and the Solicitor-General. The Solicitor-General has dismissed absolutely what the honourable member has had to say but, even if that were not the case, the fact is that we have an international company in this State, and I happen to be very proud of that fact.

HORSE RIDING

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the House what efforts are being made to develop a strategic direction for the recreational horse riding industry?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: On the weekend I had pleasure in opening a workshop for the recreational horse riding industry in relation to developing a strategic plan for the industry within the State. It is important to realise that there are about 93 000 registered horse riders within Australia. There is estimated to be another 90 000 who are not registered in formal clubs. In South Australia that amounts to between 9 000 and 20 000 registered horse owners. Over the years, they have had major problems with their industry in regard to local government, access to parks and trails development. Mr Speaker, you will recall opening the Tom Roberts trail when you were involved with the Ministry. This trail has been a big success for that industry.

The whole idea of the workshop was to bring recreational horse riding groups together to try to get them to establish an organisation so they could talk with one voice because, at the moment, a large number of different groups are all sending out different messages. The first point was to establish a group of representatives with which the Government could negotiate. Other issues for discussion included access to recreational parks; public access to private land (which is an issue not only in the recreational horse riding industry but also in the recreational walking area as well); how we go about developing trails, including which groups are involved and how we negotiate developing trails; and road safety and transport issues with regard to access to roads.

The whole idea was for Government to develop a partnership between the recreational horse riding industry, local government and State Government so that there is a clear strategy concerning how that industry is to develop. If any MPs have groups that might want to be involved in that process, they can either contact my office or the Department of Recreation and Sport and we will certainly put them in touch with the right group.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Does the Premier stand by his claim at a media conference on 4 September this year that all requirements under the State Supply Act were complied with and signed off on when Motorola was given the multimillion dollar contract to become equipment supplier for the Government radio network contract?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: My understanding is that that is the case. The Opposition in pursuing this is trying to fill in Question Time on Melbourne Cup Day, and it is an interesting way to try to fill in Question Time on Melbourne Cup Day. The simple—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I beg your pardon.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Deputy Leader was not prepared to repeat her interjection, and I thank her for that. Obviously, the honourable member was not prepared to repeat what was an exchange across the Chamber in the heat of the moment. Some journalists have put to me that they are confused by this issue. The Opposition is playing on that confusion—take an extract from a quote here, put it with

something over there, beat up a story and try to pump it up. Clearly that is what it is attempting to do.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Solicitor-General's advice came from me. It was not leaked. I put that out because on page 2 of the Solicitor-General's advice it clearly puts the whole background to this issue in context, and it clearly points out without qualification that the position I have put down persistently on this matter is accurate.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Elder to order again.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Members opposite do not like it.

BEST KEPT SECRETS CAMPAIGN

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Further to the Minister for Tourism's ministerial statement, will she provide information on the reaction of the interstate media to the Best Kept Secrets campaign?

The Hon. J. HALL: I thank the honourable member for his question because one of the most surprising and positive aspects of this campaign has been the extraordinary level of media support and coverage interstate. I have to say that, from a South Australian perspective, it has been a greatly valued additional element to the campaign. I would like to share with the House some of the amazing quotes that have been heard on radio interstate, because the interstate media coverage has been valued by the local advertising agency here, Killey Withy and Punshon, to be worth nearly \$200 000 in excess of what has been spent so far.

Those of us who know Ernie Sigley know that, when Ernie is enthusiastic about a topic, he waxes lyrical for some time. After the Crows win, which he supported at the time, he also had many things to say about the Secrets campaign, and one of them was this:

The other great beauty about Adelaide is that it is cheaper than a lot of other States, isn't it? Your accommodation is not as expensive and your cost of living is not as expensive.

He went on to say how proud he is to be an ambassador for South Australia and, after his years of living here, he describes it still as one of the best spots in the world and a great place to have a holiday.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. HALL: I know that Opposition members do not like to hear anything good being said about this State, but they will have to listen because some interstate people are very impressed with what is happening in this State. Lucy Broad on 2BL has described our city as busy and beautiful, but one of the best quotes—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Minister has the call.

The Hon. J. HALL: I urge all members to include this quote in some of their material because I think it is magnificent. It is from a *Sydney Morning Herald* writer, Bruce Elder, who wrote, after reading our Secrets book:

Where else in Australia, where else in the world, can you hire a car and experience the dry summer charm of rural Tuscany (the Adelaide Hills), little snippets of misplaced northern Germany (Hahndorf and Bethany), England village life (Stirling and Aldgate), the vineyards of Italy, Germany and France (the Barossa and Clare Valleys, as well as McLaren Vale), Australian wilderness (Kangaroo Island), and nocturnal life (Mylor)?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. HALL: Opposition members can laugh about these things but, when this sort of publicity is gained at no expense and in addition to a paid advertising campaign, I would have thought that they might be proud of it. It is important to start feeling good about our State and, unquestionably, this campaign is adding to that. In addition, one of the things that has happened in recent weeks is the number of national awards that South Australians have won. It is about time that, generally on this whole question of South Australia and the unique aspect of where we fit in our country, it ought to be acknowledged and we ought to feel really good about the achievements of this State.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 98. The Minister is clearly debating the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has resumed her seat. Before calling the member for Elizabeth, I announce that, in the recent horse race in Victoria, the winner was Jezabeel; second, Champagne; third, Persian Punch; and we think Taufan's Melody was fourth.

MENTAL HEALTH

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Given that the Minister for Human Services has never had a formal meeting with the Government's chief adviser in psychiatry, who did the Minister consult before making his decision to close Glenside Hospital—

An honourable member: Not you!

Ms STEVENS: Absolutely not me—and his subsequent decision to keep Glenside open? Why did the Minister not consult his chief adviser about these matters and the 18 recommendations made by the Coroner following six mental health related deaths in 1997? Following the release of the Coroner's report into three suicides and three homicides in 1997, the Minister ordered a review of mental health services. The review report was released on 6 May 1998 and on the same day the Minister announced that Glenside Hospital would close. A report in today's media says that the Minister's adviser in psychiatry, Professor Bob Goldney, resigned in protest at never having had a formal meeting with the Minister, saying that there were structural problems within the Health Commission, the committees set up to address mental health issues had overlapping roles and that nobody had an overriding sense of responsibility for mental health.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Everyone understands that mental health is an area undergoing enormous change and that there is a lot of diverse opinion in that area. Members understand that because it was a former Labor Government that took the decision to move away from institutions, and I recognise that that move was supported very strongly by the community, not only here in South Australia but throughout the rest of Australia and the world. That move has brought about enormous change. There are probably very few areas that have undergone more radical and fundamental change as people have been moved out of institutional care into long-term care in the community. Therefore, there is a lot of debate between clinicians and others in the mental health community over various points of view.

I point out that it was a former Labor Government that started this move, but I am sure that my predecessor would point out that, having started the move, the Labor Party did not put the promised \$11 million aside to provide facilities in the community. Minister Armitage arrived to find the

cupboard absolutely bare, even though the institutions, particularly at Hillcrest, were being shut down. Because of the diversity of views within the community, I initiated the mental health summit late last year. That summit brought together literally hundreds of people, written submissions and people involved in workshops, and we distilled the various ideas through that. In setting that up, I also indicated that I would set up a number of other groups, and Professor Goldney was a member of some of those groups.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out to the honourable member who interjects that the chief adviser's role is to give advice to the Minister and to the Health Commission and he has met on a regular basis with the Health Commission, including the CEO, who has met him on two occasions. Because of the recent debate, particularly about Glenside—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will come to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —Christine Charles, the Chief Executive Officer, last Friday talked to the clinicians, staff, the unions and others at Glenside, and they had a very good discussion for about two hours. There are a lot of different views. We have set up under Professor Brendan Kearney an implementation group, and a large number of people have been invited to join that group. Professor Goldney was invited to join it and accepted the invitation in writing in the past few weeks. We are trying to bring together all the different views and to allow all the different parties to express their views, including on the future of Glenside, what should happen to each group in Glenside and to make sure that it is systematically worked through.

We have also set up some broader reference groups including other people who have raised comments publicly, such as Dr Clayer, who has agreed to work in one of those broader reference groups. They will feed into this broad implementation group under the chairmanship of Professor Brendan Kearney.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Why won't you meet him?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that it is appropriate for people to have their input through the respective bodies that have been established. I will then be able to distil with the department exactly what information is required. I am particularly concerned to make sure that we have broad representation in the views put forward.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has had a fair go.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I hear on radio occasionally comments about the lack of resources in the community to deal with this move out into the community. The House should realise that since 1992 the number of staff involved in mental health in the community has increased threefold—from 139 full-time people to 397 full-time people. I give credit to the former Minister for what he initiated. I highlight to the House the enormous pressure in the community because the demand for mental health services is increasing dramatically.

I am the first to acknowledge that we are going through a period of change; we have a substantial increase in demand; we have put more resources into the community; and we are looking at what should be the future of Glenside. We have set up several reference groups and an implementation group to put that in place. I have also put in additional financial

resources. I have committed an extra new \$8 million, \$5 million of which was provided last year on a one-off basis. We have taken that and turned it into permanent funding. We have given another \$3 million on top of that.

I am the first to acknowledge that, with all these changes, there will still be a lot of concern amongst relatives, friends and carers for those with mental health needs. The honourable member attended the opening of Mental Health Week and she saw the recognition of and appreciation for what has been achieved in the area of mental health. I invite her to make a constructive input to the reference group and the implementation group for Glenside so that we can have her views and so that, after a decision is made, she cannot say that they did not speak to her or take into account her views.

RACING INDUSTRY

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the House how the racing industry will benefit from the strong performance of the South Australian TAB in 1997-98?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The good news for the racing industry on the back of the excellent result of the TAB in 1997-98 is that there has been an increase of some 9.4 per cent of the distribution over the previous year, and even the member for Hart would acknowledge that that is a good result and certainly good news for the racing industry. In actual fact, this brings about \$2.276 million extra money ahead of last year into the industry, and it can only be a positive thing to have that extra distribution. The member for Bragg would be interested to know that the distribution is broken up as follows: thoroughbreds, an extra approximately \$1.67 million; harness, roughly \$400 000; and greyhounds, around \$200 000. The authorities have been able to use this money for prize money, and they have broken it down in relation to the Thoroughbred Racing Authority allocating an extra \$900 000 for 1998-99; the Harness Racing Authority, \$108 000; and the Greyhound Racing Authority, some \$52 000.

That is certainly good news for the racing industry in general, and it is riding on the back of the excellent performance of the TAB. I will provide an example of how that benefits local racing. As from 1 November, prize money for the metropolitan thoroughbred race is about \$19 000, whereas as little as five years ago it was about \$12 000. There has been a significant improvement, and we should acknowledge the previous Minister's doing the hard yards in redeveloping the racing industry.

On Saturday night, the member for Bragg accompanied me to a function at Globe Derby where, as another improvement in racing, the Jubilee Room was opened. Globe Derby now has an excellent facility that will obviously increase both crowds and turnover. It is as a result of some \$260 000 of Government money going into the facility. It allows for eight bookmakers to take the bidding; it is air-conditioned; and it is an excellent facility in which people can watch the trots. There was a great crowd present on Saturday night, and it is good to see the harness racing club performing so well and upgrading its facilities. All in all, the racing industry, through the TAB and other capital works improvements, has seen some improvements over the past few years, and that is excellent.

SMOKE ALARMS

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Has the Government completed its investigation into how assistance with the cost and installation of smoke alarms can best be provided to the frail, aged and disabled in our community, and when will the funds be made available for this purpose? In March, when I originally asked the Minister a question about this issue, he was unsure what his Government would be doing to assist non-Housing Trust tenants who are frail, disabled and likely to be affected by changes to the Development Act making the installation of smoke alarms compulsory. However, the next day the Minister issued a press release announcing that \$100 000 was to be made available through local Home Assist Programs, local councils or the Disability Resource Centre to assist the aged and disabled. A month later, the Minister advised:

The Department of Human Services is currently undertaking an investigation into how assistance with the cost and installation of smoke alarms can best be provided to people with disabilities. The investigation report will include advice on likely costs to the Government, eligibility criteria and options for delivery and installation mechanisms. It is expected that the report will be available by the end of June 1998.

To date, however, it appears that none of the agencies that the Minister said would benefit from his announced \$100 000 initial grant has been advised of any funding allocation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This matter is being handled by the Minister for Disability Services; I will take it up with him to get a report.

POLICE SECURITY ADVICE UNIT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services inform the House why the relocation of the Police Security Advice Unit from the ground floor to the first floor of police headquarters in the city is a positive measure and not a negative one, as has been reported in the media of late?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I know that the member for Heysen is always interested in good security advice being given to all his constituents in Heysen. I have to report to the House today a good news story—a good news story like I see on a daily basis when it comes to what the South Australian Police Force is doing in protecting and enhancing security for all South Australians. Day in, day out there is rumour mongering, innuendo and scare tactics by members opposite, particularly from the member for Elder. He is happy, on the radio, to tell people that the Police Force is downgrading the importance of police security, which is an absolute false representation by him.

However, the good news story for South Australians is that the South Australian Police Force is increasing its resources to assist people when it comes to an issue such as security advice. In fact, the reason why it is relocating from the ground floor to the first floor is that the unit is being expanded. In expanding the unit by taking it from three officers to seven officers in the foreseeable future, the Police Force will get out amongst the community of South Australia to be able to give people the necessary information.

It is not for the Police Department to put in a shop front particular companies and their security systems; it is for the private sector to get out there and promote themselves to the public as private companies. The importance of police

security is that it should get out amongst the community and let people know what they can do to improve the security of their home and their possessions. I know, as I am sure a lot of other members would know, just how much work police security does, together with Neighbourhood Watch—a wonderful organisation which is strongly supported by about 5 000 volunteers throughout South Australia—in getting out to school fetes, fair days and agricultural shows to explain to people what they can do to improve the security of their homes and properties.

As I have said, the new proposed Police Security Advice Unit in the long-term will have a staff increase from the current three to seven. It will be an active part of the new crime reduction strategy section. This section has a responsibility to provide corporate crime reduction strategies and policy for local service areas across the State. These local service areas will again give a better focus to policing directions and support of the South Australian community. The South Australian Police Force and the Liberal Government are committed to ensuring that every possible opportunity is given to provide good safety and community wellbeing to South Australians.

It is a pity that the Opposition did not get on the phone to the responsible Minister. Indeed, I invite the Opposition spokesperson to telephone me if he has any concerns or interest in these matters; I will be happy to give him the truth, the facts and the continual good news stories as the South Australian Police Force, together with the State Government of South Australia, proceeds to ensure that modern police practice methods and crime prevention are put forward to enhance conditions for the elderly, the industrial areas, the commercial sectors and the general residences of all South Australians in this State.

It is time that people knew the facts and the good news stories that come across the desks of all Ministers and all members of Parliament on this side and also, I must say, on the other. Either members of the Opposition cannot read or they are not interested in telling the good news stories and the facts to all their constituents. Many of their constituents want to know how well this State is positioned to protect and enhance them and to support opportunities for them, and I suggest to Opposition members that it would be in their best interests in future to ensure that they give the right messages to all South Australians.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would suggest to the Minister that he was starting to debate the issue towards the end.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Today I read an article in the *Australian*, which I must say was quite graphic, regarding the leadership tensions in the Government and a looming split within the State Liberal Party. According to the article, in relation to the tensions ignited over the control of the Liberal parliamentary Party:

What they've done is lit a stick of dynamite and stuck it in the Party room's bum.

In my contribution in the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech, I outlined my major concern regarding the Government's poor track record in occupational health and safety in the workplace. I would like the Minister representing the Attorney-General to inform the House whether the official forms and notices that are an integral part of the Dangerous Substances Act 1979 have been printed and are ready for such emergencies. I have been informed by industry sources that they are not. If this is the case, should the event so graphically described in the *Australian* have happened, the issuing of a notice under the Dangerous Substances Act 1979 would not have been possible and the Act could not have been complied with in the interests of workplace safety.

Under part 6 of the Act, Notices and Emergencies, a number of subsections are quite clear with regard to securing the work environment and making it safe from dangerous substances. As an example, section 33(1) provides:

An authorised officer may issue a notice under this section for the purposes of—

(a) securing compliance with a requirement imposed by or under this Act (including a requirement imposed by a condition of an accreditation, licence or permit); or

(b) averting, eliminating or minimising danger to the health or safety of a person or to the safety of property or to the environment that has arisen from an activity involving a dangerous substance.

Under the Act, many other sections refer to the issuing of notices. If the information that I have been given is correct, I would like the Minister to inform this House exactly how long it has been since these notices have not been provided for the use of authorised officers. Occupational health and safety sources have labelled the Government as 'gone soft' on occupational health and safety issues, and I noted that in my Address in Reply contribution. If the information that I have been given is correct, it will show the community that the Government has not so much 'gone soft' on occupational health and safety matters but that it has absolutely no commitment at all. It is quite clear that the Government is so consumed with its own infighting that the issue of governing the State is, seemingly, a second priority, and my constituents and this State are a lot worse off for that.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Last Thursday in my Address in Reply contribution I focused upon the issue of unemployment and canvassed a range of issues. The problem we face is to deal with this desperate issue of unemployment, particularly for our young people. I asked the question: who cares about these young people, and who cares about these unemployed? I supported the proposition put forward by leading academics that the Federal Government consider freezing living wage rises and consider tax concessions to complement such a freeze as one way of reducing unemployment, possibly to as low as 5 per cent. One of many possibilities I explored in my address was to consider here in South Australia a wide range of options that might help us to reduce the unemployment level.

I suggested that we look at the costs of doing business in South Australia, particularly the cost to business and employment of job destroying taxes and future wage rises which, if they are greater in South Australia than in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria or elsewhere, threaten our viability to compete for job creating investments. Recognising that we are a small State in terms of population and are a long way from markets, Sir Thomas Playford, by keeping business and hiring costs among the most competitive in the country, was able at an earlier time to attract major job creating industries here such as Chrysler, Holden's, defence

industries, light manufacturing and others. We cannot turn back the clock, but we can explore past successes and ask whether they are still relevant today. There is no single answer or magic pudding for the problem of unemployment. I hope that we can engage in a wide ranging, sensible debate that explores all the options open to create a future for the unemployed of this State.

Having put this proposition, I was delighted to read the next day in the *Advertiser* a headline to the effect of 'MP says cut wages'. There is a big difference between suggesting that we look at containing future wage rises and suggesting that we cut existing wages, yet that is what the readers of the *Advertiser* were led to believe when they read that headline and that story. It is not surprising that, when the covering page had a headline 'Babies by postcode', my story was put onto the second page.

I was also interested to read in the article the response from the Opposition, through the member for Hart. The member for Hart had clearly believed word for word what he was told by whoever it was in the *Advertiser* who contacted him regarding what I had said. I draw the attention of members to *Hansard*, where they will find nothing that suggests cutting existing wages. I was particularly surprised by the suggestion that we look at child labour in factories as one alternative for solving unemployment. However, I compliment the member for Hart for later engaging in a sensible discussion on talkback radio about the issue.

We need to find some new answers: those we have been trying are not working on their own. It is not enough: we need more. The ALP and the unions could help by cooperating with the Government and employers to find new solutions. I make no apology for taking up the cause of the young unemployed.

As a member of Parliament, you can have opinions, and you can either put them forward or say and do nothing. I make no apology for offering new ideas to be considered by this House, and I hope that we give them serious consideration. As I visit schools and attend year 12 graduations in my electorate, and as I see the look on the faces of the young people going out into the world, I am reminded of the importance of this task.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): This afternoon I want to pay tribute to and commend to the House a wonderfully successful community event that occurs on an annual basis, and I refer to the annual Convoy for Kids. Held this year on 30 August, it was the biggest convoy of those that have been held so far. I will tell the House briefly the history of this event and explain what it is about.

Some years ago Mr Dave Gaudron in Queensland came up with the original concept of a Convoy for Kids as a way to treat his nephew, and other children with cerebral palsy, with a day out riding in a truck. In 1991 the first Convoy for Kids was staged in Queensland, involving just over 200 trucks. This was followed by a larger number in 1992.

Over six years ago, on 24 February 1993, Mr Colin Burford, now our convoy's patron, was a guest at the Lions Club of Elizabeth, and at that meeting he spoke about the Convoy for Kids in Queensland and suggested that we organise one here in South Australia. He asked the Elizabeth Lions Club to convene a committee, administer the funds involved and assist in the organisation of such an event. The Lions Club of Elizabeth thought it was a good idea and agreed to take it on. A committee was formed and meetings

were held, first in members' homes and then at the Elizabeth City Centre, to start that very first convoy.

Two beneficiaries were chosen for any proceeds from the day, the Crippled Children's Association and Camp Quality. Six years later, those two charities are still the beneficiaries. Representatives of these two groups are also committee members. The first convoy was held on Sunday 29 August 1993, and since then it has always been held every year on the last Sunday in August. When it left K Mart in Kurrulta Park in 1993 and headed north through Adelaide to Elizabeth City Centre, people were worried about just how many trucks would take part, but many did.

The first convoy in 1993 raised \$16 000 for those charities. In 1994, \$21 000 was raised; in 1995, \$31 000; in 1996, \$35 550; in 1997, \$42 000; and this year, \$53 850. The event has progressed to having major sponsors, including the Transport Workers Union, 5AD FM, Toys 'R' Us, and the Elizabeth City Centre. It was also supported this year by ROH Wheels, the Transport Workers Union Superannuation Fund, Joe's Poultry Processors, Diesel Exhaust, Ansett Airlines and the Ports Corporation.

The Lions Club of Elizabeth is also a major sponsor with club members donating many hours of service every year to the event. Some 650 hours were donated this year alone. Other Lions Clubs took part and helped, including the Lions Clubs of Mallala and Port Adelaide-West Lakes. The Elizabeth Rotary Club and Salisbury Leos also assisted on the day. This year about 800 trucks travelled from Port Adelaide to Elizabeth carrying children with a disability, and it really was a wonderful occasion. Everybody involved—the truckies, the families and the helpers—could not help but be impressed with the joy that was so evident on the faces of those kids enjoying this annual event.

I pay tribute to the Elizabeth Lions Club. Megan Butler in particular has done a huge amount of work in organising the event from the Elizabeth end, but I also pay tribute to a whole range of people—ordinary people, including unionists and families—for putting on an event that is truly memorable. It is the biggest event of its kind in Australia. It is far bigger than that in Queensland. I am certain that it will have a long future and that we will be talking about, and enjoying Convoy for Kids in 10 years time.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): In this day and age, matters involving the environment and our heritage are very important and have become increasingly so over the last 10, 20 or perhaps even 30 years. So, it was a matter of extreme concern to me to receive a report last week about a lady who had telephoned my office and was very upset and irate that an item she regarded as part of the heritage of her house had been destroyed, and I refer to her certificate of title. According to her, it was a magnificent document that is irreplaceable. Her house was paid off, but when she and her husband decided to take out a loan for some extensions or similar work the bank asked for their certificate of title, which they gave the bank earlier this year.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Indeed, as the honourable member opposite interjects, it shows the history of the house as to who owned it. Imagine this lady's complete distress when, because a friend of hers said, 'I would be a little worried as to what has happened to your deed; if you've given it to the bank without any instructions, it may no longer exist', she contacted the bank and, sure enough, the bank indicated that it had been destroyed.

Mr Atkinson: Name them!

Mr MEIER: The bank was the Commonwealth Bank. The reason is that this State, as most members would be aware, went onto the computer system of land titles back in 1990 under the previous Government, and we will not hold that against the previous Government, because if we had been in office we would probably have done it earlier.

I recall taking up this matter some years ago on behalf of someone else. The problem is that it is still happening and people are losing their original title. On checking it out, it was made clear to me that the bank should have advised my constituent, Mrs Sharon Hannigan, that if she wanted to keep the title she needed to make that known, and that would have been duly recorded and the certificate of title given back to her—I assume with a ‘Cancelled’ note over it. As it was, it was sent to Adelaide and has been destroyed.

I am very concerned that this has happened. My constituent is extremely upset. In lieu of that title, she has received a photocopy which she says does not do it justice at all, compared to the intricate work of the original title and, as the honourable member opposite indicated, there is so much history of the house indicated on such a title, with a record of the various owners. It has been suggested to me by my constituent that the National Trust apparently is quite happy to accept titles now on computer and to actually have them on file. I intend to take this matter further to see that people who want their title deed maintained for posterity can have it put into a museum or have the National Trust look after it in some way, if that is what they would prefer, rather than keeping it themselves. I dare say that the majority of people would like to keep it themselves. I am suggesting that it be an automatic procedure that any title that comes to Adelaide is forwarded to the National Trust which can perhaps decide whether or not to keep it if its owners do not want it.

It is very important to preserve as much of our history as possible, and it is a great shame that so many deeds have been destroyed—something which can never be recovered but which is simple and inexpensive. I urge all banks to ensure that they let their clients know that if the deed goes to the Lands Titles Office they may never see it again, unless they make a specific request that they want it returned. On behalf of my constituent, I hope things will improve for future constituents.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): On Sunday more than 350 residents gathered to voice their concerns and to sign petitions about a proposed local development after the North-East Residents Action Group organised what they called the ‘rally for community friendly development’. I had the honour to be convenor at that rally. There are many concerns about the development that was the focus of the rally, and I welcome in his speech opening this session the Governor’s reference to the review of the Development Act, which I hope will incorporate examination of many of the concerns apparent at the rally on Sunday. It appears at the moment that a car has greater recognition than a social concern.

There were many speakers at the rally on Sunday and they highlighted the type of concerns the residents have. Dr Don Hopgood, the Moderator of the Uniting Church, spoke to the crowd and urged them to continue their fight, because one of the principle objections to this development is that 40 new gaming machines will be installed in the building. He felt that there was no good reason to increase the number of gaming machines in the community.

The second person who spoke was Professor Michael Lennon, the Chair and Executive Director of the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, who said that the additional 200 000 square metres of retail space created in Adelaide recently had come about without population growth. He highlighted that it came about rather because of the drive for the increased market share by big players—the big retailers. We will all be asked to consider this matter when we debate extended trading hours in the near future and the impact it will have on the community and businesses. He also said that, while councils could easily be involved in entrepreneurial activities, that involvement should not be for development simply to make money.

The third speaker on the day was the Hon. Nick Xenophon, a member of another place, who, of course, spoke about poker machines and how they are now the core business of many hotels rather than a part of their business which, after all, was social—serving food and providing social interaction for people in the community. He estimated that up to \$70 000 could be lost each week on gaming at this development alone. We also heard from Mr Max Baldock, who spoke in his role as President of the Small Retailers Association and said that retailers in the area could expect to lose between 6 and 15 per cent of their turnover if the project went ahead. He stated that a development like the one proposed could effectively give away food, so that food retailers would be particularly at risk. All up, the loss of money on pokies could employ 8 000 people. For every one job created in that sort of development six would be lost in small business. That is a fairly sobering fact and one that frightened most of the people at the rally.

It has become apparent to the residents of Modbury that their future is very much in their own hands. They have understood that the democratic process gives them the responsibility to be involved in the process rather than to wait for problems to arise. The depth of their commitment and of that shown by those who joined the residents action group has been impressive. They have met regularly to discuss how they can have a say in what is going on in their community and to look at things they fear will impact adversely on the way their community evolves. They have shown a great willingness to work hard to achieve the outcome that will be acceptable to everyone.

They do not believe that they have to have development for development’s sake. They want a development that will complement existing facilities and enhance the area—something that will add to the area and not create additional stresses to the regional centre. They do not want to hear why they have to have this particular development but, rather, they want to see their concerns addressed and find out ways to go about addressing them. They do not know how they can go about that matter without the help of those best able to advise them, and it has become an exercise of determination on their part to examine all the issues involved, sift through the recommendations of the various interested parties and emerge with the answers and a way to achieve the best possible outcome. They have undertaken this task for the betterment of the community, and their efforts are to be commended. We owe those people a great deal of thanks for highlighting this issue. Pokies will come up as something of great social concern in the near future. The amount of money we are taking from pokies will stand us in history as a society that has relied upon them for far too long.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I rise today to speak about a concern that every South Australian should have in respect of the River Murray. Recently a lot of concern has been expressed in the Riverland and throughout the entire length of the Murray Darling Basin Commission in South Australia in respect of the much lower than anticipated flows coming into South Australia. Some time ago it was expected that we would receive in excess of 80 000 megalitres per day as a high river flow this year. Unfortunately, the flow has been managed on the expectation of 80 000 megalitres a day coming into South Australia, but the peak has not achieved that level, the maximum flow being only 34 600 megalitres a day, and the river is now starting to drop.

This has extremely detrimental environmental impacts for South Australia as well as affecting the entire health of the river system and having irrigation impacts as well. The peak passed on 13 or 14 October, with the maximum pool level within the river rising at lock 3 to only four centimetres above pool level. This has resulted in the river not breaking its banks this year as was anticipated and, therefore, our flood plains not being inundated, with devastating effects on our wetlands. It also means that the anticipated flow of water we were to achieve has now passed the Riverland and gone out to sea. Whilst there have been some benefits with these additional flows over the past few months freshening the Coorong and flushing large volumes of sand from inside the Murray Mouth out to sea, it has had no environmental benefits further upstream.

One of the problems is that SA Water, which manages the flow of the river on advice given to it by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and the Bureau of Meteorology, has now had to start filling Lake Victoria at a much earlier date than anticipated and, therefore, the flows expected next year are cause for concern. It is anticipated that, with the reduction to both the peak flow and the total volume of water entering the State, we will still receive our minimum entitlement at least until mid-December. It means that salinity should remain relatively low for at least the next two months, but then there is a concern as to rest of the season. The filling of Lake Victoria at this time has reduced the flows into South Australia to about 20 000 megalitres a day.

The concern that needs to be raised here is: how on earth did the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and the Bureau of Meteorology get their advice so wrong? We had flows in excess of 100 000 megalitres a day released and passed over the Yarrowonga Weir in late September, at the same time as 50 000 megalitres a day was being released from Menindee Lakes, with only 20 000 megalitres a day arriving at Wentworth. The question has to be asked: what happened to all that water and why did we not get those excess flows into South Australia which would have created a flood environment that is badly needed in the region?

There are many concerns throughout the region that there needs to be a tri-State arrangement, agreement or integration regarding how the decisions are made on managing water so that South Australia is not the one left carrying the can all the time.

South Australia takes only 5 per cent of the water from the river, New South Wales takes about 50 per cent and Victoria takes a little less than that. That means that South Australia is the smallest user, yet it contributes to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission on an equal third basis. The three States contribute approximately \$14 million, yet South Australia takes far less water than the other States. I believe it is time that South Australia played a much stronger role in how these

flows are determined and how this water arrives, particularly with respect to environmental benefits to this State.

Ninety five per cent of South Australians rely on the Murray River for their water, so it should be a State issue and not only a local Riverland issue as it currently stands. Many people in the community have shown great concern and are raising this issue on a regular basis, but their concerns seem to be falling on deaf ears. We need a far more integrated approach, and we need Government to be pushing this issue forward on our behalf.

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 29 October. Page 119.)

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I am pleased to participate in this Address in Reply debate. I am not sure how many Address in Reply speeches I have given but it is many and I have enjoyed each one. I commence my comments by congratulating His Excellency, the Governor, for the manner in which he delivered his speech to open this session of Parliament. It is unfortunate that certain people have taken it upon themselves to make ill-informed and, in my view, improper comments in relation to his speech. Every member of this Parliament knows that the speech delivered by His Excellency, the Governor, is prepared by the Government of the day.

During my time in this House I have listened to some colourful comments made by previous Governors. It is the right of the Government of the day to outline its legislative program, or other matters, which it believes ought to be included in the speech. I believe it is unfortunate that any criticism or comments in that speech could, in any way, imply that the Governor supported, opposed or had any view on them.

One of the pleasant duties in which Presiding Officers are engaged on a regular basis is to meet with the Governor. I must say that, during the times I had the opportunity to do that, I found the Governor to be most interested in what was taking place in South Australia and particularly in respect of people in rural areas. I appreciate the Governor's interest and commend him for the manner in which he and his wife are carrying out their duties. In relation to the speech itself, the Government has clearly indicated that it has a vision for South Australia. The Government knows where it wants to take the people of South Australia.

The Government is attempting to make decisions which will be, in the long term, in the best interests of the people. It is fully aware that some of those decisions are controversial; they are perhaps not politically popular, but they are correct and they are in the best interests of all South Australians. We are all sent to this Parliament to govern in the best interests of the people of this State. That task is not easy. Members of Parliament should be prepared to make the right decisions and not just make decisions that are poll driven

because, unfortunately, we have seen Mr 70 per cent Bannon—

Mr Koutsantonis: Eighty five per cent, thank you.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That will reinforce the point I was about to make—Mr 85 per cent Bannon, and look where it led South Australia. He had the popularity. He was a nice enough gentleman who was always amenable to meeting members and discussing issues but, unfortunately, he did not exercise guidance in relation to the welfare of the people of South Australia. We have already seen, as I was reminded by the member for Peake, what happens when you are poll driven; when you do not understand the economics of the decisions you are making; or when you are not prepared to make the tough decisions.

Unfortunately, when this Government came to office it had nearly an impossible job: to turn around the State's financial situation; to get some development going; and to create opportunities. Over many years in South Australia the situation has been created where, as soon as any individual or group wants to do anything or build something, minority groups have been encouraged, promoted and, in some cases such as the Conservation Council, funded by the State to jump up and down to slow down, stop, change or alter and, in most cases, to make it impossible for projects to proceed.

Most members in this House, I hope, want to see orderly and responsible development take place, whether it be in the private or public sector. I know that in my own district some concerned citizens, supported by the community, wanted to build a boat ramp, but a few malcontents, who were opposed by over 95 per cent of the community, cost the Port Augusta council more than \$100 000. Surely this Parliament will not sit by any longer and allow this sort of nonsense to continue. In that instance a group of people organised themselves and got to work, with the support of the council and voluntary donations, to build a boat ramp.

If there is any place where people should be encouraged to go boating it is Port Augusta, which has an enclosed gulf and a good climate, but what happens? One or two, to put it mildly, odd bods and difficult people set out to use every trick in the trade. We had public hearings with judges. They had—

Mr Clarke: It is called democracy.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am all in favour of democracy but, at the end of the day, if you take a particular course of action you also must be prepared to take some responsibility. Unfortunately, those few individuals did not have to accept any responsibility: they cost the ratepayers and the Port Augusta council a large amount of money at virtually no cost to themselves. If we must have these third party appeals we must look very carefully at the whole process because, if it continues, the total community will suffer. I am one of those people who believes that we need to develop our resources and that we need to go forward to encourage mining and aquaculture. However, the sort of nonsense and time wasted in relation to aquaculture in South Australia is mind boggling.

Smoky Bay was previously part of my constituency. It is a very pleasant spot. The oyster growers in that area went through untold hassles to obtain leases. First, they were pushed into the wrong area where the oysters would not grow. We had a tremendous fight and, eventually, we got them positioned in the right area, and that industry has been an absolute boon to that community and has created many jobs. If members visit Smoky Bay they will see that some money is going into the area and people are getting jobs. There are some flow on effects. For example, a gentleman at

Ceduna is making aluminium barges to enable the leases to be serviced more effectively—all good for the community. However, I have to say that some people within the Department for Environment made it nearly impossible for those people to obtain their leases. I put it to this House that that sort of nonsense has to stop. I was appalled—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I told many people associated with that, in the plainest Australian language, what I think of the whole process and what should happen to the individuals responsible. The member for Ross Smith and I would both agree that we cannot afford to prevent those opportunities from responsibly going ahead. There is little or no other employment in that area, and I think we would all agree that an opportunity which provides jobs for young people and keeps them in the area should not be prevented from going ahead. However, I was appalled—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will talk about some of those in a moment. Perhaps a week or 10 days ago I was appalled to hear on the radio that the Environment Court (or whatever you like to call it) had knocked back a proposal for a boat ramp at Fitzgerald Bay, which is across the gulf from Port Augusta and down from Whyalla. That boat ramp will assist in encouraging the aquaculture industry in Upper Spencer Gulf, something which the overwhelming community supports. However, the Conservation Council in its wisdom objected to it on technical grounds. I put it to this House that the judge should have the power to say, 'Maybe you have a valid point on technical grounds, but this is in the public interest and you will slow down the whole project and stop people from investing the money.' It is a complete nonsense.

The difficulty is that, when you have this sort of red tape, bureaucracy and humbug taking place, you deter others, which is what concerns me. I believe that the work being carried out at the powerhouse at Port Augusta in conjunction with the snapper industry is very good for the area and it has great potential. We should be saying, 'Look, you have done a great job, and we want to encourage you. What can we do to responsibly assist you?' People running the powerhouse, the council and the community have been most supportive. I expect that the people from the Conservation Council live in Adelaide and their salaries are half funded by the taxpayer. They simply want to be spoilers. They want to stop things from proceeding without offering any good reason.

It is the same with the mining development at Yumbarra. Why do people who talk about job creation and opportunities want to prevent a few holes being drilled in an isolated set of sandhills consisting of stunted mallee, porcupine and a few sleepy lizards? If members visited this area on a hot day, they would not want to stay long. The other morning when I turned on the radio as I was driving along I was appalled to hear the Hon. Sandra Kanck going on *ad infinitum* about this. I was so annoyed about it that I contacted the ABC and put a contrary point of view. The town of Ceduna, which is now well represented by the member for Flinders, has a school built to accommodate nearly 1 000 children, but it has about 650 in attendance. It has problems with housing and chronic unemployment, both within the Aboriginal community and the general community. Hopefully the mine will be developed and all the people will be housed in Ceduna. In my view, no harm can be done to this area because there are tens of thousands of square kilometres of this country. If members have ever flown over it, they will know that it is not very attractive. The Hon. Sandra Kanck in her wisdom—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do not know whether the honourable member has been there, but I suggest that he visit the area. The amazing thing about the Hon. Sandra Kanck is that she said we should be encouraging ecotourism in this area. If we are to have ecotourism, we will have to build some roads through the area. Where will we house these people? There is no water. If any member is familiar with the Port Adelaide Football Club, the closest farm to it is the Borlaise farm where the immediate past captain of Port Adelaide was brought up, and that is on the inside of the dog fence.

I am amazed that the Hon. Sandra Kanck is promoting ecotourism in this area because, first, unless you knew where you were going you would get lost and, secondly, you would certainly get bogged in the sandhills. I am all in favour of ecotourism and I have no problem in putting some decent tracks through the area and providing some camping grounds. I have no trouble at all with allowing the community to go there, if it leads to employment creation.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Probably not. I have to say that I do not think I am one of the darlings of the environment movement. I am more interested in creating opportunities for people and responsible development and ensuring that Governments of the day have sufficient resources to provide—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Unfortunately, it is limited. There are plenty of wild camels, but they are a feral animal. However, I am not here to debate that issue. I want to highlight the urgent need to change the mentality and to streamline the operation to enable responsible economic development to take place. I cannot see what harm would result from drilling a couple of dozen holes at Yumbarra, finding out what is there and getting on with promoting it. How do people who continually stop tourist developments or agricultural developments think the Government will raise sufficient revenue to provide the basic services which are necessary in a modern society if they do not have people working? When I said that people such as the Hon. Sandra Kanck obviously want to live in tents and have candles, the interviewer suggested that perhaps I had gone slightly over the top. I was trying to make the point about how ridiculous are the propositions put forward by these people.

I sincerely hope that the exercise in which the Minister for Urban Planning is engaged currently will bring about a situation where we can limit these irresponsible third party appeals and that we can get on with some responsible development from which the community can benefit. If we do not, we will not attract investment capital or encourage people to further develop: they will be looking to greener pastures. I do not think they have this sort of trouble in Western Australia or in Queensland: they do not put up with this sort of nonsense. There is an urgent need to create opportunities, and the Public Service and the bureaucracy need to be pro-active. It has concerned me for a long time that one of the great problems Governments face is entrenched bureaucracy.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, I did not. I have been blamed for many things. However, I understand why people would come to that conclusion. My concern is that bureaucracy is a wonderful thing: it can stop most things by the creation of various tactics. The time has come to streamline

the process of development so that people throughout the State—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We have been in government for five years. I do not want to be provocative or hard to get on with: I am just a member of Parliament trying to do his duty. I realise from time to time that I have upset people on both sides of the House. I do not apologise for that because I was not sent here to make friends. I was sent here to do a job, and I have done it to the best of my ability. I have enjoyed it. I look forward to the future with a great deal of confidence.

I make no apology for having stuck up for the people I represent and for being pretty vigorous in the manner in which I have represented them. That is why we come here. When people live a long way from Adelaide, they often have great difficulty getting to the people they want to talk with, so that is when the role of a member of Parliament becomes very important. When people are a long way away, not only are they out of sight but they believe that they are out of the mind of those who make the decisions. This Government, with the limited time and the limited resources it has had, has certainly—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is interjecting from out of his seat.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —in relation to the people I represent, taken many steps to improve their welfare. One of the most important steps was the decision to seal all rural arterial roads by the year 2002, which has certainly seen a great increase in the expenditure on that program in South Australia. It is a very good program.

The amount of money that is being spent upgrading and improving rural health in South Australia has also been welcomed, as has been the decision to ensure that, when the sporting grants money is allocated, people in rural areas get a fair cut of the cake. For example, the \$160 000 that went to the yacht club at Port Augusta will result in a substantial redevelopment and the building of an excellent recreation facility, which will also be used by the Education Department. In addition, support was given to the Hawker community in relation to the development of a multipurpose recreational and sporting facility. They are all projects that have made life a little easier in country areas and I look forward to the continuation of those programs.

However, there is a need for all Governments to recognise that they should be very careful in proposing legislation, because nearly every time we pass an Act of Parliament we interfere with or take away the rights of people. It is very easy to say that we will put a levy on for this or a charge on for that. At the end of the day, it is just one more match that will break the camel's back, and we have to be very careful in the taxation system in this State that we do not go down the track of having too many levies. I am of the view that Governments should not try to be all things to all people. They should deal with the core issues of services and do them well: education, health and hospitals, roads and the provision of basic infrastructure, such as water.

In my constituency, not only are there problems with cost in small communities such as Marla and Marree but it is difficult to get sufficient resources to upgrade the facilities. They are the sorts of problems that people have when they take it upon themselves to become involved with small progress associations. They provide water and then tourists come through and steal it, and a local community of 15 or 16 people is left to pick up the account. There is a role for the

Government in the administration of utilities to be somewhat flexible when these unfortunate things take place. It is not the responsibility of such small communities to supply free water to hundreds of tourists.

I have no problem with the facilities being there so that tourists can fill up their caravans, but the Government needs to ensure that meters are provided so that they can put in 20¢ at a time. The case that has been brought to my attention at Lyndhurst has concerned me greatly, and I intend to pursue that issue, but that is just one of the small things that people in isolated communities have to put up with, and there are many other matters, as you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Last week I raised in Parliament my concern about the attacks that are made on elderly citizens in their homes and the vandalism of their property. Lo and behold, I picked up the paper on Friday morning to read that a 92 year old woman had a blanket put over her head when villains came in to her home and terrorised her. The time has come for all the social workers, do-gooders and hangers-on to look in the mirror. In my constituency, we now have more social workers, planners and schemers, but the problem is not improving.

Ms Rankine: What about the Government cutting money from the police budget?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Just let me finish. The honourable member will have her chance. I support a decent allocation of funds for the Police Department. I sometimes differ on how those funds are utilised. My own view is that too many resources are put into trifling traffic matters, and I do not know whether that is by direction or anything else. We could go into that and I may do so at a later date because I am going to introduce a Bill to Parliament to do something about these trifling matters. I do not believe that some of the tickets that have been issued are desirable or necessary. I am all in favour of the police being given the resources to patrol neighbourhoods, to respond quickly and to have the best equipment.

I remember the arguments that I had with the bureaucracy a few years ago in relation to getting satellite telephones at Marree and Oodnadatta. Other less important Government departments had GPSs and satellite phones. I remember one Sunday morning when I was in my office with other departmental people, and they had some new GPSs, which they did not know how to use. A couple of days later I spoke with the local constabulary in my constituency, and they told me that they did not have GPSs or satellite phones. I was appalled that those facilities were not available because, if a police officer is by himself or herself between Marree and Moomba and they come across a problem, they ought to have the ability to get in contact with their colleagues or they ought to be able to phone up and give the exact coordinates so, if a helicopter or an aeroplane has to be brought in, it can be done quickly and efficiently. The community is more mobile and a lot more four-wheel drives are in use.

I have been endeavouring to ensure that police homes are up to a decent standard, and they ought to be. If people are to be located in isolated areas away from their families, they should have the best facilities at minimal rental. I do not have a problem with that. I see no problem with the police having adequate resources, but I sometimes differ with those in charge on how they are utilised.

Let me get back to the point. I believe that the time is well and truly past when we should put up with these louts who have no regard for elderly people or others. On Sunday when I walked through one of the supermarkets in Port Augusta I was inundated with constituents who said to me, 'We cannot

even park our cars at the restaurant at the motel without our vehicles being vandalised. What is going on?'

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright will have an opportunity to speak in the debate.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would be happy to discuss the matter with the honourable member. I am most concerned about this activity—villains getting on the roof, in the backyard and breaking into homes. When I read the police reports in the local newspaper each week, I am appalled, and I think that, where they use physical violence against elderly people, they ought to get their own medicine back. As for the cost of putting them in gaol, in my view we could spend the money in far better ways.

During the break, I had the opportunity to briefly visit the United States and Canada, and I was privileged to visit three legislatures. I visited the Legislature of Washington State in Olympia, which is one of the few State assemblies in the United States that has a bicameral system. I was privileged to meet a number of legislators there and the people involved in the Administration. I am pleased to say that, even though it was most enjoyable, I think our system is better. I also had the opportunity to visit briefly the province of Saskatchewan, go to the capital Regina and meet a number of members of Parliament. I also went to Lincoln in Nebraska. One of the interesting things I found out in Saskatchewan is that there is no bar in the Parliament building. There never has been one there, and it is unlikely that there ever will be one.

Mr Clarke: No what?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No alcohol in the building. I also had the opportunity to visit one of the most recently constructed secondary schools, which I found interesting. I also looked at the changes in the technology used in agriculture. In particular, I looked at the process of using disk drilling machines instead of tines for stubble retention, particularly in those areas that are subject to wind erosion. The crops are directly drilled into the previous year's stubble without knocking it down or without the need to burn it, as is done in many cases. It is an updated version of what was involved many years ago. It was most interesting. It is one of those things I sincerely hope the Department of Primary Industries in this State continues to research and evaluate. I do not think any of us wants to see dust storms. The concept that has been developed by those companies—and also to a limited degree in Australia—needs further research, development and encouragement, because it is in the long-term interests of agriculture.

What is good for agriculture is good for the people of South Australia and, if we can encourage people to improve their farming techniques and to upgrade their machinery—and hopefully people can manufacture some of that machinery in South Australia—all will go well for the future. In this State we have had a history of being innovative, of having some of the finest machinery manufacturers in the world. I was pleased to have that opportunity. I saw electronic voting, which I do not agree with. I was interested in the television coverage in Olympia, where they virtually conduct their own television and sell the footage.

I am most pleased to participate in this Address in Reply debate. I support the motion and commend His Excellency the Governor and his wife for the manner in which they carry out their duties. The majority of the legislation that is before the Parliament is in the interests of the people of South Australia, and every honourable member should give their best endeavour to see it implemented as soon as possible so

as to free up resources to improve the facilities that the public reasonably expects.

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

Ms RANKINE (Wright): A little over 12 months ago, the people of Wright showed their confidence in me by electing me as their representative in this place. I was and remain extremely humbled by the trust they have put in me, and it is a responsibility I take seriously. In my inaugural address to this House, I spoke of the hopes and aspirations of the people of my electorate. These are good and hard working people who want nothing more than a fair go for themselves and for their families. They want the ability to plan for their families' futures, and that means security in their jobs and jobs for their children.

Too often young people and those not fortunate enough to have a job are derided and marginalised. Too often we hear lines such as, 'There are jobs for those who want them,' or, 'The problem is they don't want to work.' Too often we see stories in the media of some firm or other complaining that they cannot fill a position. All those misconceptions were well and truly shot to pieces in recent weeks when we saw about 2 300 young men and women lined up for hours in the hope of securing one of 65 jobs on offer at the new Salisbury cinema complex. These were not high paying prestigious jobs but jobs serving popcorn and showing people to their seats in the theatre. We saw the same thing happening again a little over a week ago with hundreds of jobless lining up, hoping to pick up a job at the new McDonald's outlet.

The Government can rattle on as much as it likes but there is little doubt that it has let down the people of South Australia, and members opposite know this to be a fact. To begin with, this Government has presided over the greatest ever decimation of our Public Service. About 14 000 full-time positions in our Public Service have been cut since it took office. Again last year the Government paid out another \$35 million in separation packages: that represents another 885 people with skills, experience and expertise lost to our Public Service. What this Government does not seem to understand is that, in order to have a healthy private sector, you need a healthy public sector. If you do not believe me, go out and ask those operators of small business who have never had it so hard. Listen to them talk about how they have been hit, how they have been left behind and neglected by this Government.

What the Government seems to have lost sight of is that public servants are people with families. They contribute enormously to local economies, the same as anyone else. I challenge members to go into the country regions and ask local business people about the effect of cuts in the Public Service and how it has hit them, and to ask retailers in the City of Adelaide how it has hit them. This Premier has reigned over the loss of an average of 2 000 jobs per month. While trends in other States have seen unemployment reduce, in South Australia we are averaging an unemployment rate of about 10.2 per cent. It could be argued that this is the Government of the average standard: it has wanted average standards in a whole range of Government services. However, this is an average it has not been able to meet; it has not been able to meet the national average of unemployment, and in the northern suburbs we continue to have the highest level of unemployment, particularly for young people.

We constantly hear announcements from the Government about prospective jobs, about likely developments, but what

happens? They all seem to fall in that big black hole of which this Government seems so fond. Quite simply, we will not attract business or investment to this State and no-one will show confidence in our State if we cannot show confidence in ourselves. The other day, I heard the member for Waite on the radio talking about the *Advertiser* article which suggested reducing wages. He was explaining that that was not what he said, that he was talking about capping wages. He was also challenged about politicians' wages, and he mentioned that he would be happy not to be paid for the job he does. I do not believe that that is a concern of South Australians. They are prepared and happy to pay for their politicians: they just want value for money.

There is no doubt that our Premier is working to preserve some jobs, but the average South Australian could be forgiven for having the impression that the job the Premier most wants to save is his own. How shameful, after the Liberal love-in in Port Pirie, to have our daily paper report that in the reshuffle the Premier had managed to shore up his support and now he might be able to move to concentrate on the running of this State. Rather than heads rolling, as is the usual case, they all came away from Port Pirie happy; every player had won a prize.

Under this Government, restructuring has not meant providing a better, more efficient service: it has meant driving our services into the ground. It has meant reducing them to the bare bones in every sector of government—in education, health and police, and I would like to touch on that area briefly. First, let me offer my congratulations to the member for Mawson on his promotion to the ministry. Last week, we heard an eloquent presentation from the member for Ross Smith as to the reasons for his promotion, and I am not about to go into them again. Suffice to say I sincerely hope we will have, in the member for Mawson, a Minister who has some real commitment to those vital services he is administering, a Minister who has some idea of what is going on and who does not at every opportunity pass the buck to his CEO.

I hope we will now have a Minister who is prepared, with an open mind, to look at the crisis that is besetting our Police Force in particular. The previous Minister was well on the way to achieving an approval rating amongst police officers that would have challenged that of the member for Bright, something to which I am sure very few would aspire. The South Australian public, quite rightly, have a great deal of pride in the members of our Police Force. They are highly respected and greatly valued. However, increasingly they are required to do their job with one hand tied behind their back. What has this Government done to support the South Australian Police Force? This year, it has cut \$4 million from its budget. However, it was not any use asking the previous Minister a question relating to the effects of these cuts. He did not want to know. He certainly never took any responsibility for that.

Members thought it was amusing when I raised the issue of police bicycle patrols. I asked the then Minister whether they were to be increased this year, as they are recognised as an effective crime deterrent and, if so, whether the Government would be prepared to pay for the bikes. It is not funny! Last year the Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully councils were forced to buy the bikes for police officers to use if they wanted this service introduced into their areas. I have raised concerns about the withdrawal of police vehicles from a range of areas within the Police Force. Make no mistake: this is a direct result of the budget cuts. But did the Minister know anything about it? He did not seem to at the time. I gave the

example of officers having to catch a bus to a special operation. In his written response the Minister said:

The members were encouraged to use public transport whenever possible to monitor the behaviour on buses and trains with assistance to and consistent with the objectives of Transit Division. The operation was performed in plain clothes with the outcome being to reassure TransAdelaide staff that SAPOL is actively working towards reducing the incidents of behavioural offences on the transport system as well as the shopping centre.

Quite simply, a car was not available: that is why they were encouraged to catch the bus. I raised the issue of feed for our beloved police greys, the budget for which has been cut by nearly half. Our hard working police dogs will no longer be fed meat. What was the then Minister's response? He was hoping that the price of hay would drop! He does not have to worry about that any more: that is the new Minister's problem. What a mean-spirited and penny-pinching act that was.

I hope that the new Minister will view with an open mind the disastrous Focus 21, which is supposed to be the Government's vision of policing into the twenty-first century. Under Focus 21, this great vision for the future, in my electorate we have seen the Tea Tree Gully police station turned into a shopfront; the Tea Tree Gully patrol base relocated out of the area it services; and the Para Hills and Salisbury patrol bases amalgamated into the Salisbury division and into one location, with the loss of something like 17 senior police officers. Focus 21 was supposed to deliver a new police station and patrol base for the Tea Tree Gully area. It seems that this vision into the twenty-first century did not include where and when this new police station patrol base would be provided.

I urge the new Minister for Police to address this issue as a matter of urgency. Golden Grove is the fastest growing area in our State. This new facility is urgently required and it makes sense to put it where the people are. Here we have a Government that has consistently reduced police numbers and police resources. What has been the result? We have seen the number of breaking and enterings increased; theft and illegal use of motor vehicles has increased; serious and minor assaults have increased; robberies have increased; and robberies with a firearm have increased by a whopping 58.4 per cent. It is time that this Government realised that reducing police resources is no way to address community crime issues.

In his speech opening this session of Parliament the Governor noted that this Government had been responsible for appointing the country's first ever Minister for Disabilities. This is an area of grave concern, and another area that needs urgent attention. Recently, a visit to my office was made by a group of parents of adults with multiple disabilities who are located in community-based accommodation. They expressed extreme concern about the lack of provision of essential equipment for their children. I was advised that as of 1 September this year the IDSC waiting list for equipment included 125 people, one-third of whom are categorised as urgent (that is, very critical), with the remainder listed as priority 1, which is defined as follows:

The person is dependent upon the provision of equipment to support essential life activities.

The person has a significant disability and their health is at immediate risk without equipment support.

The family carer's/support worker's safety or health is at significant risk, or they are unable to continue to support the person without equipment support.

Priority 2 is defined as follows:

The provision of equipment will facilitate effective personal support by either enabling essential support activities to occur or reducing the cost of support hours.

The person is dependent upon the equipment to participate in routine daily activities.

The family carer is at significant risk of having to give up paid employment without the support of equipment.

The piece of equipment is required for attaining or maintaining function.

It is important to understand what this really means to people. The parents concerned gave me examples of three people urgently requiring equipment. One person was a large man whose new wheelchair, which he had waited years to receive, had provided him with much improved comfort. The new wheelchair was large and bulky, and staff, family and friends were unable to move it without a great deal of strain. This has resulted in his being isolated within the community. Basically, he had a new wheelchair that he could not use: all he could do was sit in it. Electrics for ease of movement of the wheelchair had been requested as a result. The person's situation is not seen as urgent as he has comfortable seating and, as a result, the wait is likely to be over three years. That means a period of over three years before this person can become mobile.

Another person's family was told that they would have to wait three years for a commode toilet chair. This person has severe multiple disabilities and has had a great deal of difficulty with bowel movement and with a bowel blockage. The commode chair would greatly assist the person with bowel management, as they would be correctly seated to aid evacuation. Earlier this year, a person required a new headrest for her wheelchair, as her head was falling back and her tongue obstructing her airway. This occurred because that person's health had deteriorated and she no longer had the head and tongue control she previously had. Despite the life threatening nature of the issue, that person and her family were told that the wait was likely to be approximately one year, possibly longer.

That person's family asked if she could pay for the headrest herself, as they would rather she be alive and broke. The cost of the headrest was over \$1 100, and the expense wiped out this person's savings. Her only income is the disability support pension, and she had saved for many years for the \$1 100.

I also had come to see me a constituent who was an amputee, reliant on a wheelchair for the majority of his mobility needs. He also suffered heart problems, which have restricted his ability to lift heavy objects. He was provided with a wheelchair through Domiciliary Care. However, it was not suitable and did not meet his needs. Through Options he was informed that he would have a three year wait for a chair of any kind, so they encouraged him to take the chair that was offered by Domiciliary Care. The chair weighs in the vicinity of 24 kg, which is far too heavy for him to lift, and he is reliant on his wife to push him. She is also having difficulty managing the chair. This man is quite large so, in order for him to get around, he is forced to push himself backwards with his one existing foot. This is an absolute disgrace, and it is something that needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: It is something that is not being addressed. Another of my constituents is 48 years of age and is totally dependent. Four years ago, she was encouraged to move out of the Julia Farr Centre under the Future Directions program. She has the support of a loving and caring family

and she has moved into her own home. Her young daughter can come and stay with her and she has her pets around her. The only thing over which she has control is her home. The Government is now telling her that it is too expensive for her to stay in her home, and it wants to move her back into a shared facility. Her mother was told that, if they did not take up this option, the only other alternative was a nursing home.

I have contacted the Minister about this matter on a number of occasions, and the latest reasoning put forward was that this woman moved out on the understanding that it was on a temporary basis. No-one would move out and buy their own home on a temporary basis, and there is no documentation that I can find that indicates in any way, shape or form that this was on a temporary basis. The department must have known that this woman's multiple sclerosis had progressed so rapidly that it was not about to get better, so commonsense dictates that her dependence and care levels would increase. And instead of making a commitment to that person to continue her care, as I said, the Government is threatening her with a nursing home.

I pledge to do everything that I can to protect this woman's rights, and I invite the Minister to visit her—he knows who I am speaking of—and tell her face to face that she cannot remain in her home, that she has to forgo the right to have her daughter come and stay with her and that she has to give up her pets. I want the Minister for Disability Services to be the one to go and tell her that he will deny her these very basic human rights and that he will be the one who will take away her remaining fragment of independence and dignity. I will not give up until I know that this woman is left in peace and is guaranteed the quality of life that she deserves.

I am told that the cost of her care is in the vicinity of \$160 000 per year and, quite clearly, that is expensive for one person. The funding needed to provide all the urgent priority 1 and priority 2 equipment for those on the IDSC list is around \$316 000—again, a lot of money. But it does not seem quite so much when compared with the cost of the suite of offices for the Minister for Disability Services and his staff, which was estimated at around \$354 000. When I put this question to the Minister in this House, the Premier told us that \$43 000 only was to be spent on Minister Lawson's office. We could only accept what the Premier said. However, during Estimates, when I asked the Minister for Administrative Services how much of the estimated cost of the Minister's suite was being scrapped to meet this budget figure, he said that I was assuming that some components of the construction work had been scrapped. He did not confirm or deny which areas had been withdrawn.

The construction work alone was over \$100 000. But what was really scandalous in all this was the fact that \$80 500 was allocated for engineering services; \$89 680 for furniture, fittings and equipment; \$26 000 for on costs; and \$61 950 for additional costs—and it was not specified what they were: we can only assume that maybe they were pot plants and paintings.

After the last State election, this Government gave a commitment to the people to listen. The message is loud and clear. The people of the electorate want jobs and job security. The people of this State and the people of Wright want quality public services. They want a Government that values people and puts more than a dollar value on basic human dignity. They do not want a Government of closed doors, closed minds and closed hearts. I support the motion.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): In replying to His Excellency's address, I would like to speak on some developments since the House last adjourned. First, on behalf of my constituents and the many small businesses in the electorate of Playford, I would congratulate the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning for not allowing the rezoning of Walkley Heights. I explained to the House during a grievance debate earlier this year that an application had been made to allow for the construction of a bulky goods warehouse on a site at the corner of Walkleys and Grand Junction Roads in my electorate. I am pleased to report back to the House that the Minister did respond to the many hundreds of objections to the proposed rezoning and rejected the application.

I would especially thank Councillor John Cotton of Salisbury Council who is a tireless worker for the local residents and businesses he represents. I am sure that, had it not been for his efforts, the bulky goods warehouse would have been a *fait accompli* long ago. Many other groups have also worked hard, including Mayor Tony Zappia and the Salisbury Council, and Michael Hall and the Valley View Neighbourhood Watch. Their work has protected the amenity of our neighbourhood and the viability of many small businesses threatened by the proposal.

Having attended many of the home games and all the finals games of the Para Hills Soccer Club, of which I am proud to be a patron, I was delighted to watch them make the grand final of the State league. Unfortunately, we went down to a very good Modbury Jets side by a single goal. Nonetheless, we have been promoted to the Premier league of the State's soccer competition. Promotion will be a significant boost to the club. Playing in the Premier league will create greater interest in the Para Hills Knights in the local area and doubtless the club will attract bigger crowds. My congratulations to President Keith Puyenbroek, Secretary Charlie Kelly and Coach 'Bud' Hilton on the club's 1998 success.

As seven matches of the Olympic soccer tournament will be held in Adelaide, the Para Hills club is working for an opportunity to provide training facilities for one of the competing teams at its Paddocks ground on Bridge Road. The club has excellent facilities and its pitch is recognised as one of the best in South Australia. It would be an excellent venue. The only obstacle at this stage is lighting. Negotiations are currently under way with Salisbury Council, but any assistance this State Government may be able to provide will be welcome.

I also congratulate Miss Jansia Panagaris who has been working in my electorate office on a traineeship since early this year. Jansia was an asset to my office. She is a tremendous worker going well beyond what would normally be expected to make sure a job was done properly. She easily gained full-time employment towards the end of her placement with my office in an area in which she had been studying. Indeed, potential employers were so impressed with Jansia that the job offers kept coming well after she had accepted the job in which she is now working. On behalf of my assistant Clare and myself, I would thank Jansia for her dedication over the last 10 months and wish her well in her new job. I am sure she will be valued as much by her new employer as she was in my office.

The traineeship placements with electorate offices have been a great success and I encourage the Government to continue with them. As well as providing some much-needed assistance in the electorate offices of State MPs they have provided many young people with the experience that will be valuable in any career.

Finally, during the recess I had the opportunity to travel to Italy where I attended a conference on the provision of health care and met with experts in the field of bioethics. Details of my trip will be covered in my report, but I will briefly cover an area I investigated which I believe requires the urgent attention of this Parliament.

Genetic technology is moving ahead in leaps and bounds, evidenced by the birth of the lamb Dolly, cloned and reported early last year. Much of the media speculation has been ill-informed and many commentators were predicting that cloning of humans was imminent. Fortunately, this has proved to be not so. Researchers have been unable to repeat the Dolly experiment, and there has been speculation that, in the original experiment, there may have still been some of the maternal genetic material in the ovum that was used to clone Dolly.

I suspect, therefore, that we are a long way from the cloning of humans. Nevertheless, South Australia has had the foresight to ban the practice of human cloning. I believe this to be a good thing. The Parliament must resist the mood prevailing in some scientific circles that any limits placed on scientific research are a humiliation and an impediment to scientific inquiry.

However, there are other developments that are perhaps more urgent where we legislators risk being overtaken by events. Until six months ago I had never heard of the human genome project. Most people still have never heard of it, but the ramifications on us all of the human genome project will be profound. Essentially, it is a worldwide cooperative effort to map the human genome, that is, to discover which genes determine which characteristics: which genes determine height, eye colour or a person's relative risk of developing heart disease, diabetes or cystic fibrosis.

This project is enormous in scope. It has been said that unlocking the power of the gene will be more profound than unlocking the power of the atom or the discovery of electricity. The project involves millions if not billions of dollars investment. The benefits of this knowledge will be enormous but the dangers will be great. For example, it may become possible through somatic gene therapy to cure conditions previously thought to be incurable. Young people afflicted with cystic fibrosis may be able to have defective lung cells genetically altered by administering a special virus. It will be possible for us to know whether we are at risk of developing heart disease or some other genetically linked disease and to take the steps necessary to reduce that risk.

To eliminate a disease is quite different from eliminating those who are afflicted with a disease. The danger is that knowledge gained from the human genome project will be used for genetic screening not only of the unborn but of us all. Such information would be invaluable to insurance companies and potential employers. Could it be that those of us with a relatively higher risk of developing heart disease will be refused health insurance or deemed not worth employing and training? The danger is that this knowledge could ultimately result in an underclass deemed genetically uninsurable and unemployable.

Hence, the responsibility of this Parliament is to closely examine these issues now whilst there is still time. Given the response in this place by the Minister for Human Services to my question on the provision of IVF services in this State, these seem to be issues that he would much rather avoid. He said:

I do not believe that it should be up to the politicians to set medical ethics: it should be up to the profession itself to do so.

I do not believe that I have seen a more gross dereliction of responsibility from a Minister of the Crown. Surely we have been elected to this place to make the very decisions the Minister suggests we should avoid. On issues other than medical ethics we do so all the time. Certainly, we take the advice of experts and specialists, but the buck always stops here. Ultimately, it is our responsibility to either accept or reject advice.

The implications of the human genome project and other developments in genetics must be dealt with by this Parliament. Whilst we must not ignore the advice of the various experts, we must not neglect our responsibility as elected representatives to address and arbitrate on these profound questions.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion of the member for Gordon in respect of this year's Address in Reply. The Governor's opening speech was probably the most political that I have heard in my 13 years in this place. There is no doubt that the speech read by the Governor was prepared by the Government. Whilst I understand that the Governor has some prerogative to change the speech, I doubt whether, because of the type of person he is, he would have exercised that prerogative. Therefore, he was left with this political speech to read. It was very unfair to place this on Sir Eric Neal and give him a political speech. I certainly sympathise with him. It was quite disgraceful. Sir Eric Neal continues to do an outstanding job as the Governor of South Australia with his good lady, and they set a marvellous example to other people, which follows on from the marvellous job done by the preceding Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell.

It is now 12 months since the last election. It is interesting to see how new members have settled into this place. Some settled into the cut and thrust of this place quickly while others are taking longer. This is understandable because it happens in all walks of life as each individual is different. It took me about two years to settle into this place. I wish all new members well. I am sure that they will acquit themselves well in this place once they have settled in and will make a positive contribution not only to the Parliament but also to the State of South Australia and its people.

I was interested to read through the Governor's opening speech and will refer to some aspects of it during my contribution today. The second sentence of the speech was quite inaccurate as it states:

This is a term of Government which has kept to its promised path.

This statement is far from true. In October last year at the State election the Premier gave an unequivocal assurance that ETSA would never be sold, yet four months later he announced that ETSA would be broken up and sold. No wonder people in general are cynical about politicians and their promises.

We also saw a similar backflip by the Prime Minister John Howard in relation to a GST. The Prime Minister said after the election before last that he would never introduce a GST—never, ever—and yet at the last Federal election it was the main plank of the Liberal Coalition, so he broke that promise. Even now he is saying that he has a mandate to implement a GST, even though he secured only about 48 per cent of the vote, so he has no mandate. However, he intends to push on with it, and it will be interesting to see what happens at the Federal level in the Senate and whether the

Coalition Government can implement a GST. It has a rocky road ahead of it over the next couple of years.

Only when promises made by politicians and political Parties are kept will people once again trust politicians, Governments and the institution of Parliament. It was a sorry day when that trust and respect disappeared. I do not know exactly when it happened, but it was certainly some years ago, ably aided and abetted by the media. The main problem is that the media keep dishing up information that is not always factual and give us all a bad name. However, it is up to us as individuals and collectively as members of this place and other Parliaments to earn the respect of people and get back on track so that we can regain the respect of the general public at large.

There was a call in the Governor's Speech for responsibility for a just and bipartisan approach, an approach of goodwill and willing negotiation and compromise for all 69 MPs in this State. This is a commendable and desirable goal that I fully support, but the Premier and this Government will not back it up with actions. A typical example is the ongoing suggestion of a jobs summit by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader has repeatedly made the offer to the Premier and the Government over the past 15 or 18 months about his willingness and in fact the willingness of the entire Opposition to be involved in a jobs summit so that we can get everything out on the table to do what we can collectively in a bipartisan way to overcome the awful problem of high unemployment rates in the State. It needs the full support of all members. It needs an all-inclusive approach to try to overcome this awful situation of high unemployment in South Australia. However, there has been silence and absolute resistance by the Premier to take up the Leader's offer.

Recently, some light was shed on the matter by the new Minister for Employment (Hon. Mark Brindal), who suggested that this was a good idea; but, alas, things have gone quiet again. I feel that the hapless Minister has been nobbled by the Premier and possibly by the Cabinet to back away from the interest he showed as a new Minister. It is a great pity, because unemployment is such a massive and serious problem in South Australia that anything and everything should be tried in a major bipartisan way to find solutions to this awful problem.

The Leader of the Opposition will continue to be a very willing participant in a jobs summit. On behalf of the thousands of unemployed people in our electorates I appeal to the Premier and to the Government to take up the offer for a jobs summit. Let us get on with the job in a bipartisan way to find ways of reducing the awful level of unemployment in our State. I agree with the member for Chaffey's comment in her Address in Reply contribution that politicians and Governments do not create jobs. Industry and business create jobs, and they should be heavily involved in job creation. The honourable member is dead right in that respect. Politicians and Governments take a lot of the blame, unfairly, for the high rate of unemployment.

Governments can employ only a certain percentage of people in the work force. Of course, the vast majority of employment opportunities are offered in the private sector. That has always been the case and probably always will be. So, it is unfair to hit governments with that responsibility entirely. Of course, government policies do dictate and influence the private sector in respect of job creation but, nevertheless, it is primarily a private sector area. Besides a bipartisan approach by all Parties in this place in both Houses of Parliament, the member for Chaffey's suggestion that

industry and business should be heavily involved in any sort of jobs summit or job creation discussions is quite valid, and I support her fully in that aspect. In his speech, the Governor also said:

Through its legislative program it intends to continue to present to South Australians a framework for recovery. . . a population which enjoys harmony in the workplace and feels safe at home and in the street.

First, I take up the point about harmony in the workplace. I point to the Government's hypocrisy in this speech in terms of harmony in the workplace when we have just seen one of the most disgraceful disputes in the nation's history, namely, the attack on the Maritime Union of Australia which raged on Australian wharves for most of this year and which was caused by the Federal Government, in particular Minister Reith, ably assisted by Patrick's (with Corrigan from Patrick's up to his ears in this conspiracy) and the National Farmers Federation.

This conspiracy will go down as one of the most aggressive and confrontationist attacks on the trade union movement in Australia's industrial history. The first two rounds in the court have been won comprehensively by the Maritime Union of Australia. Of course that is not the end of the problem, but the first two rounds have gone to the unions and the workers and against the Government and Patrick's. So, we will see what happens in the future in respect of this situation.

Court cases and other hearings are pending which will last for some time. As I say, the first two rounds have been comprehensively won by the union, which was a great victory against this very outrageous conspiracy. Where were the Premier and the State Liberal Government during this long running dispute? They were nowhere to be seen and no effort was made to try to broker a resolution to the confrontation. There was just silence on behalf of the Premier, in particular, the Minister and the Government. The one chance Government members had to participate in this debate in the Parliament was to respond to a private member's motion moved by the member for Ross Smith.

Government members resisted speaking to the honourable member's motion week after week. They kept adjourning the item and, eventually, when a vote had to be taken, all they did was to move a pathetic amendment and used their numbers, supported by the Independents I might add, to oppose the quite accurate motion of the member for Ross Smith.

With respect to the second part of the Governor's speech, I do not know how the Government intends to make people feel safe in their home or in the street when it has continually cut the police budget. Fewer police are now in the field than when Labor left office in December 1993. There has been a good two year lack of recruitment for the police force. The police academy at Largs Bay was virtually closed for a couple of years. I know that the Government and, in particular, the new Minister are making efforts to solve this problem but it will take a long time to overcome that back log caused by lack of recruitment over quite a few months. The morale of most members of the police force is at an all time low as a result of budget cuts, the declining number of police in the field, loss of career paths and the legislative attack on police officers which we saw in the last session of parliament.

All these factors weigh heavily against the effectiveness of the police force in combating crime in this State. I am glad that the new Minister for Police is present in the Chamber because I want to mention one example of the lack of resources and, perhaps, systems in the police force at the moment. I do not want to make a political issue out of this but

I believe I should raise it as a matter of concern. As I say, it is good that the Minister is present in the Chamber because he is new to the portfolio and it would be helpful to him.

A very community minded woman in my electorate, an area coordinator for Neighbourhood Watch, contacted me in relation to a real problem with police coordination caused, I believe, by budget cuts and lack of resources in the State's police force. This area coordinator has regularly and consistently advised her Neighbourhood Watch colleagues to telephone 11444 if requiring police assistance or to report crimes, etc. On three separate occasions when Neighbourhood Watch representatives have witnessed acts of violence and vandalism they have telephoned the police on that number and, despite waiting and then re-ringing at regular intervals, have been greeted by only music. No-one is available to answer and respond to urgent calls when people have been seen with baseball bats, and those sorts of objects, smashing up people's properties. The police could attend, apprehend and arrest offenders to get some sort of justice.

On at least one occasion, in desperation, because people were still smashing up premises and after receiving this continual barrage of music on 11444, a person rang the police on 000. But all they received was a rebuke from the officers who said that the problem was not serious enough because lives were not at risk. I can sympathise with the police in that regard because 000 is an emergency number which is for high priority at risk and life threatening situations. I do not have any problem with that, except to say that it highlighted a problem with the number of people telephoning 11444.

This woman is extremely upset. As I say, she is the area coordinator of Neighbourhood Watch and she has spent valuable time over a long period talking to other community people and enticing them to join and to become involved as representatives with Neighbourhood Watch. She has told local people that it is a great concept—which it is; it is a marvellous concept. She has encouraged people to join up, become involved and, in fact, take the extra step if they witness a crime being committed to ring police on 11444. They took her in good faith but she feels she has let them down by the fact that when they telephone this number all they get is music.

I do not blame the Minister or the police: I know the resources are stretched. However, I bring the matter to the Minister's attention because it is quite serious. I know how I would feel if I witnessed a crime and the offenders were there on the spot, but I was not able to get the police to even answer the telephone. During his speech, His Excellency the Governor said:

Importantly, my Government has drawn together health, housing, community services, ageing and disability services to ensure that all these services are focused on the needs of families and individuals and not institutions.

I applaud the Government for this very positive move. I think that bringing together health, housing and community services is a very good concept that deserves success.

One issue I would take up, while on the area of housing in particular, is The Parks Urban Renewal Project (PURP) about which I have spoken several times in this House. PURP was announced by this Government over four years ago. Four Ministers have been responsible for the housing portfolio in that time, so it has been a bit disjointed. Nevertheless, the project was announced nearly five years ago, yet still we have no action. A little piecemeal stuff is being done around the area of The Parks, which is in my electorate, but nothing substantial.

In fact, I understand that the project still has not been granted Cabinet approval. All it has done is frighten people. Many people who live in the area have been long time residents of Ferryden Park, in particular, and Woodville Gardens. These areas were occupied in post war years by people who previously lived at Port Adelaide. After the war these areas were opened up to the Housing Trust and people shifted to the area and have lived there all their lives. Some people have been there for 30, 35 and 40 years and they do not want to shift from the area. They are comfortable; they have raised their families; most are quite elderly. Some widows are living on their own, yet they feel safe and secure in an area which is familiar to them and with neighbours who are familiar to them. It is important when one gets older to feel that sort of security.

Nevertheless, that feeling of security has disappeared. Countless public meetings have been called over this issue since the Government announced the urban renewal project. I know the Government has had some problems; at least two developers who were entering into a joint enterprise with the Housing Trust or the Government have pulled out, gone bust or whatever. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, it still has not been given the go ahead, unless Cabinet has approved it in recent times. People are still fearful that they will be turfed out of their homes after living in them all their lives. Their homes are filled with all their memories of their married life and their families, and they are fearful they will be shifted out and sent to some area on the other side of town or whatever. I know that under the project people were to be looked after, but nevertheless people fear the worst when their future is unknown.

I have been to almost all the public meetings and I know that these people are afraid that they will lose all that is near and dear to them. It is disgraceful. The Government should have worked out the nuts and bolts of this program, budgeted for it and then announced it rather than announcing it and then, over the next five years, scrambling around trying to make it work. It is very disheartening for the people involved. I do not know when it will be approved, if it is to be approved. All it has done is upset people and made them fearful.

I congratulate the Government in that the smoke-free dining legislation will come into effect on 4 January 1999. This is great news; it is about time it happened. It has been slow in coming, but nevertheless it has come. I welcome that initiative. The only thing about which I am a bit disappointed is that it does not cater for the staff and those who work behind the bars in hotels and clubs. It is great to protect non-smokers who want to dine without the rotten smoke, but it is perhaps even more important to protect non-smoking people working in these places. They are there all the time compared with diners who come in perhaps once a week or once a month. It is great that diners are now to be protected from inhaling smoke as passive smokers, but the people who work in those places seven days a week should be given very high priority. The measure should be expanded to include protection for them.

I hope that that will happen and I will be talking to the Minister about the possibility of introducing legislation. I know that smoking bans in hotel bars will be unpopular, especially with my own supporters, working class people, but we have to respect the rights of other people, especially the workers: we need to do something for their protection. I know a couple of people who work in bars and they continually have colds and asthma type problems. It is not asthma but it

is brought about by their working conditions—breathing in smoke all day and all night. It has to be stopped.

I refer now to the continued work being done by the Government with Aboriginal communities and the fact that the Government will continue to provide a coordinated approach to Aboriginal affairs within the State. Without making a political point, I know there are some problems with Aboriginal people, particularly in my electorate of Price. A task force was set up last year in response to some of those problems and I am a member of it. It includes police officers and people from all sorts of Government agencies, in particular Aboriginal Affairs, Aboriginal health and Aboriginal education, and Aboriginal social workers. As I said, it highlights a problem brought about mainly by both State and Federal Governments cutting budgets and withdrawing funding to send medical teams to the tribal lands.

Previously, teams would go to Ceduna and the tribal lands to deal with health problems, but that has been cut out. Now these Aboriginal people are put on a train, bus or plane and sent to Adelaide. There is no backup or coordination between the departments and, when these people arrive, say, at Adelaide Airport and they get off the plane, they are totally confused. They have never been to the big smoke before, they do not know where to go, they have no money and no-one is there to meet them, so they drift around and find their own way into town.

They meet up with some of the streetwise, urban Aborigines who lead them astray, and they finish up getting into trouble with alcohol and drugs, and they get involved in crimes such as housebreaking. One cannot blame them when they find themselves in a big city with no backup support, no-one to meet them and nowhere to stay. It is a very big problem that this task force is trying to deal with and must deal with for the sake of Aboriginal people, in particular.

The answer is to get coordination between the agencies and to set up a place where those people can stay while they are in Adelaide for treatment. The should be met at the airport, bus depot or station, they should be taken to where they are to stay, and they should be looked after and taken to the hospital or health service where they are to be treated or checked out. Another alternative is for Governments to put their hands in their pockets and return to the situation where teams of doctors and other medical people were sent to treat these people on their own tribal lands. That is probably the best way to do it, and it is something that the Government needs to look at urgently.

Another matter that I would like to touch on is the \$1 million fund that has been made available by this Government to assist child-care services experiencing problems following changes to Commonwealth funding arrangements. This is a very real concern to me, and I applaud the State Liberal Government for putting this money aside. It is not very much—\$1 million—but it has made the effort to put it aside, and it is a well-meaning initiative. However, it does not address the real problem. As a result of the Federal Government's massive cuts to child care, a lot of child-care centres have closed down: two have closed in my electorate.

The State Government has made \$1 million available in a very well-meaning way to assist some child-care centres get over a hump if they are having temporary financial problems. It is a one-off injection of funds to get them over that hump, but it only helps them to get over a temporary problem. If the ongoing problem is the non-viability of a centre with respect to the number of enrolments of children, that one-off assistance is of no value. That was the case with the Penning-

ton Child Care Centre in my electorate, which was forced to close down because, although the Minister offered financial assistance on a one-off basis, that was not enough. The centre was not viable because of falling enrolment numbers, and that was brought about directly because of the massive funding cuts by the Federal Liberal Government.

It has meant that ordinary working people, and, indeed, some fairly well-off people, cannot afford to send their children to a child-care centre, because it costs something like \$180 to \$185 a week. Who can afford that? Some people would be working for nothing other than to pay the fee. A second child-care centre closed in my electorate a few months ago. A possible solution is for the Government to look at the amalgamation of preschools or kindergartens with child-care centres. They do much the same thing, they run on different budgets, they complement one another and they duplicate some services, and this might be a good way of getting value for the community from a very bad situation. If those two agencies could get together, pool their resources and come up with an expanded scheme to look after young children and give them preschool education, it would be a great thing.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I welcome the opportunity to support the address by our Governor, Sir Eric Neal. I thank His Excellency for delivering his opening speech, which outlined the intentions of our Government for the session ahead and the Government's desire to achieve certain goals.

I congratulate Sir Eric and Lady Neal on the job they are doing as South Australia's No.1 couple, that is, as our Governor and his wife. They have been very welcome all over the State, especially in our country regions. Their itineraries have been extensive and exhausting, but they follow them with great ease and aplomb. I thank Sir Eric and Lady Neal for their efforts and I look forward to their fine stewardship in the years ahead. I wish them both good health and satisfaction in the important job that they do for us all. It is always pleasing to meet them and talk to them personally.

The session ahead will be very important for us all, and one could say that it is a watershed for the State. Debt reduction and job creation are the two most important issues. A multitude of problems can be solved if we address these two issues, which are intrinsically linked. We must reduce debt in order to free up moneys that are wasted on interest payments. We must spend it on capital works that create jobs as well as life-long community assets, and this in turn improves our standard of living. Confidence will return and, as we all know, confidence breeds competence, and vice versa.

We are currently suffering excess pessimism in South Australia, as was mentioned in this House today and last week. Much of it begins here in this very House. The carping criticisms of politicians and the decision making process, individual people and companies are all pilloried in this place and reported in the worst possible light by the media. Our leaders must have the flexibility and confidentiality to be able to deal with corporations and companies as well as individuals, without having all the details of contracts and expectations made public by select committees, parliamentary committees or, indeed, via Question Time in this House, as we saw today with the member for Hart. We need to get out into the real world.

Some of the people with whom we deal come from other countries, with different cultures from ours. If all the details involved are aired in public it can be very embarrassing for

these people, with terrible results; with breaches of confidentiality, no wonder there is hesitation to deal with the Government.

Companies will take big risks and there will always be downsides, but the added embarrassment of being associated with so-called 'shabby political deals' is now a huge deterrent. We must assist and encourage our risk takers. It is difficult in the world of business out there—we all know that. It is high time that this House realised it and took more responsible actions, for the usual risks involved, and with downsides that we know of, do not add the extra problems.

Today in this House, the member for Elder got stuck into Motorola and the Premier yet again. Despite all this negative comment, Motorola is to be commended for choosing to invest further in South Australia. Also today, the member for Hart broke many confidences as well as incurring the contempt of the Parliament by using information to which he is no longer privy to load the questions he asked the Premier. Does the honourable member want Motorola to go? Does he welcome the investment from Motorola? I wonder. I know that the member for Hart has young children.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Because you are no longer a member of the committee from which you got the information. I know the honourable member has young children. Does he want them to get a job here in South Australia, or does he want them to leave home and go interstate? These games we play might be very smart, but when South Australia—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I shall check the record.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It's not. Okay, then I will check that, but the member for Hart would realise that the games we play in this place are very damaging. South Australia is a small place, and we need everything running for us, but the way it is now it is difficult enough.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I do not want to indulge in a political game. I do not leak information to the Opposition, and I do not expect that many of my colleagues do either. A lot of it is fictitious. I am a realist, I know it happens. We know how Sir Thomas Playford operated in the old days. He did deals all over the place with Holdens, Actil, ETSA, BHP and the list goes on.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: No, he did not. The State's early success was due largely to his ability to negotiate directly and to overcome any stumbling blocks by saying, 'My Government will fix that today.' He would be getting similar treatment today if he were Premier right now, and so would his Ministers. We all know that it worked well for South Australia, and Sir Thomas, as the member for Peake just said, was a man who was totally above any dishonest act, a man of total integrity. There has never been any doubt about that; it was never questioned. I am sure that, if Sir Thomas was dealing today, he would suffer the same pillorying from the Opposition and the same carping from the media.

The Opposition's attitude needs to be questioned here. Does it want the State to get up and going again, given that when it was in government it brought it to its knees? We can put all this behind us and we can—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: —be more positive and hope for better

things. Every time we look upon a positive the Opposition finds a negative, and it harps, carps, hammers and drives. The other day I was extremely pleased to hear the member for Spence actually agree with something that the Government did in relation to shopping hours. It was a refreshing change to see someone over there agree, because not everything we on this side of the House do is bad. Every time members opposite harp and carp on the matter it creates further doubt and mistrust out there.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: No doubt! If there is a problem for the Opposition, if there has been an obvious breach, I am quite happy to hear about it in this place. However, where there is continued harping about a deal or a negotiation with a company, I do not want to know about it in here; I just want to see the results. We are failing in our duty to the public of South Australia. We play too much politics in here, and it is damaging everyone. People do not trust us; they do not trust the institution of Parliament. They suffer great insecurity.

I do not think the Parliament *per se* has been held in a lower light in the history of South Australia. I am not proud to say that as a member of Parliament, and I think any member of the Opposition could say the same. I do not think this Parliament has ever been held in lower esteem than that in which it is held now. We are all part of this; we are all politicians and we all draw salaries; and it is our responsibility. I am prepared to do my part. I know that most members opposite are well intentioned and honourable and that they try hard. However, half a dozen wish to destroy and create mischief. I wish that they would see it—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Just listen to Question Time, to yourself, the honourable member behind you and the Leader. Do I need to go any further? Take that lot out and we will almost be back to the way things should be. It should never be this way in this great country, because it is still the best country in the world in which to live. One needs to travel overseas and to come back to appreciate that. It concerns me. I have three children, and luckily they are all employed. I know how difficult it is for the younger ones coming through the system now: for them the future looks bleak here in South Australia.

Duly elected Governments must have the capacity to make decisions and to implement them. I have not made public comment about the future of the Upper House for some time. However, my views are well known, and I have not changed my mind. In fact, it has strengthened my resolve. We must change the system, as quite obviously the system is not working today in South Australia. Today requires Parliaments—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: If you wait a while, you might hear something you want to hear—to make quick and often unpopular decisions. It cannot happen in this place, and we are falling further and further behind. I cannot understand the Labor Opposition, because if it was prepared to stick by the normal line we would not have this problem in the Upper House.

It annoyed me greatly that at the last State election the Labor candidate standing against me ran absolutely stone motherless dead—we did not even see a placard—so much so that the Labor vote was decimated. The people of Schubert are best served by having a strong Liberal Party and a strong Labor Party candidate.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I can hear what the member for Peake says. You paid the price and it cost the Labor Party a member in the Upper House. The Labor Party might think it was a smart trick but it cost the Labor Party a member in the Upper House. The Labor Party should think the matter through again. I am only a basic thinker around this place but the silly games the Labor Party played cost it. Because the Labor Party did not get another member in the other place it is now costing the Parliament, with the hassle of having to deal with too many minority Parties.

Mr Koutsantonis: Is it our fault?

Mr VENNING: I am asking the Labor Party to examine itself and to consider running its best candidates in all seats in the State to maximise its Upper House representation. I offer that advice to the Opposition. In a spirit of cooperation I am prepared to be conciliatory in my stance on the Upper House. We have several choices available to us before we have to determine—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I said 'we', not 'I'. My first choice is to change the operation of the Upper House to make it a true House of Review, as it was in the old days, a true committee House where all legislation is scrutinised, recommendations are made but, in the end, with the majority vote in the Lower House always prevailing. The second option is to change the franchise of the Legislative Council back to what it was, the same as in most other States, especially Victoria, with Upper House members having individual constituencies across the State, linked—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: This is one vote one value still—if you listen—linked to multiples of House of Assembly seats. If House of Assembly seats are based on one vote one value, so should these. They could be linked to two or three Lower House seats and that would lock in the constituency. Thirdly, reduce the size of the Legislative Council, which will give a successful Government a better chance of getting legislation through.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The crunch line is coming, if you listen. This would also save the Government money in terms of administration. The fourth option remains the unmentionable, and members will know what that is. The Senate works well: smaller States are protected by having equal numbers and are not swamped by larger States. We heard the Premier today speaking strongly on that matter. We rely on the Senate to protect us, because the stronger States are trying to take away finance from the smaller States. Years ago the situation involving our Council used to be the same as that for the Senate, and our country regions were protected by an obvious weighting which was called many things, including a 'playmander' or 'gerrymander' but, with the decline in regional and rural South Australia which is now very obvious and well advanced, the fortunes can be directly linked to the time when all this changed and the Dunstan Government changed the franchise so that we now have a totally city-based Parliament.

I now wish to change tack and talk about the harvest, which as at 3 November—today—is well under way in South Australia. Harvest prospects have been looking good indeed, but this will not be known until the header is in the paddock. The gathering of the grain is revealing disappointments, mainly because of the downgrading of our barley sample, particularly because of excessive amounts of screenings, that is, small grains. Levels of 70 per cent are common and,

therefore, malting barley is downgraded to feed barley. This results in a huge loss of price and, therefore, income to a free on board (FOB) price of about \$68 per tonne, which is less than half the malting barley price. This is a huge reduction in income and is knocking huge holes in farm budgets, because that price hardly meets the cost of production.

The fact that the yields are very good somewhat offsets the disappointing samples. As the year progresses, we hope to find that the samples will improve, because the crops that are being reaped now are the early crops, and they did suffer during that heatwave some six to eight weeks ago. Hopefully, in two or three weeks time we will see crops coming in with true malting barley qualities.

I now turn to another vital issue that affects our State, the Yumbarra National Park. I note that the member for Mawson is here: he and I served on the select committee, as did the member for Torrens. She is not here, but I hope that she will hear my remarks and may wish to come into the Chamber. I am very concerned at the refusal to allow exploration in the Yumbarra National Park to determine what if anything exists in the region. Because of the geomagnetic surveys we know that there is quite a strong mineral anomaly there, and it is totally beyond belief that we do not at least go and look at it and work out whether we are talking about something or nothing. The full consultation period is now over, and I believe it is time to act.

As I said, I was on the select committee, which handed down its findings 19 months ago, on 17 March 1997. I went to the park twice, and the evidence we took was overwhelmingly in support of allowing exploration. The member for Torrens was also there, and I hope that she can hear this speech. We went there on 16 May and again on 18 April 1996. The Hon. Sandra Kanck's comments in recent days show that the negative virus is alive and well in South Australia. All the hype about pristine wilderness and valuable wildlife, as the member for Mawson will know, just does not jell. The Hon. Sandra Kanck obviously has not been there: she cannot be talking about the same place we saw. A visit reveals something quite different.

It is in fact just low mallee scrub with sandhills—and thousands of hectares of it. The Hon. Ms Kanck has commented on the habitat of the rare native fowl. The previous member for Playford, (now Senator) John Quirke, and I scoured the region, and all we found was one nest of the native fowl, and that had not been used for years. The member for Mawson will remember this one nest. This nest, which is actually on Goog's Track, is the same nest that we see in literature purporting to save the species. We found one flower, and the former member for Playford and I knelt down and had our photographs taken with this one flower. The member for Mawson witnessed this. I have a photograph of this two or three inch high single flower.

This area of land is known as the Yellabinna Mallee, and includes the Yumbarra Conservation Park and the regional reserve; the Pureba Conservation Park; and the Nunnya Conservation Reserve. They all lie in this area and cover thousands of hectares. It lies within the geological and tectonic feature we all know as the Gawler Craton. The particular area containing the anomaly, which was found by the South Australian exploration initiative, as I said, just happens to be the restricted area: a small area in the middle of thousands of hectares. When we got there I was amazed to find that there had been a fire through half of it in November 1994, and there was nothing left.

We talk about degradation that may be caused by people or by vehicles coming and going, but this fire took all—it levelled everything. Nothing was left, and the regeneration was just starting to occur. So, I find it amazing to be talking about disturbing pristine wilderness, when there has been a natural fire that has obliterated half of it. I do not exaggerate—the member for Torrens can come in here and listen to my speech, because she was there and she saw it with her own eyes. This area was totally devoid of vegetation and native animals: not a living thing was visible.

The proclamation under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, which established the central portion of the Yumbarra Conservation Park, contains no provision for exploration and mining. That is the problem. The park covers an approximate area of 327 589 hectares, which is 3 276 square kilometres, or 8 per cent of 4 million hectares of sand dune mallee, which forms the Yellabinna association. Exploration licence application number 142/93 covers an area of 37 900 hectares, of which 26 650 hectares lies within the Yumbarra National Park. Item 17 of the findings of the select committee states:

a biological survey of Yumbarra Conservation Park has established a practical baseline database and found that, while this park is a significant part of the State's mallee ecosystems and environmental heritage, and is located centrally on both north-south and east-west biogeographical transitions in the Yellabinna mallee, there are unlikely to be elements of the ecosystems in the central area of the park that are not also represented elsewhere in the park;

So, quite clearly, the elements that we are talking about will appear outside, in the hectares around. So, to pick out that part and say that it is unique is not true. That is quite clear in the report. Item 27 states:

recognising the conflicting imperatives relating to economic developments and jobs versus absolute non-interference in parks and reserves, the South Australian community has a right at least to know what, if any, economic benefits would be forgone should the existing constraints prevail;

So, in other words, at least we should have a look and know what we are talking about. We do not know if there is anything there. Let us find out and, if so, let us then have the debate, and not now.

The locals in the area have been consulted. They gave evidence in both Adelaide and Ceduna. The local Aboriginal groups have been consulted. They gave evidence (including the Wirangu tribe) through their elder Mr B. Ware. The local farmers and the local land care groups were also consulted, and they gave evidence. I am sure that everyone on the select committee, including John Quirke (now Senator Quirke) and, to some degree, even the member for Torrens, was expecting the go ahead to allow exploration only. The member for Torrens was looking to agree; she would agree to a compromise, if one could be arranged, so that other lands could be earmarked to swap for the area taken. I am sure that we could have compromised and undertaken some negotiation in relation to this area. But what happened then, after months of work, made a mockery of the whole process. Mr Quirke came to the meeting on the last day—

Mr Clarke: Who's he?

Mr VENNING: Mr John Quirke—whom the member for Ross Smith would know well, and his fate. He had been rolled in Caucus. He was told that he could not support the line we were obviously about to take and that there was no room for any discussion and no room for movement. After the hours that we had spent on this, the Caucus room (with the knowledge that only Caucus has) says, 'No, you will not go down that track,' and that was the position. The Govern-

ment had the numbers to crunch the decision, but after the Chairman (Stephen Baker) obtained advice—and I did not agree with him—we changed the last two recommendations, which meant that we would back off and have a further prolonged consultation period, which is now 19 months on.

Items 28 and 29 in the report, which were added after that final negative, state:

28. It is not appropriate to commit the Government to approve mining in Yumbarra without any capacity to judge the significance of the development and its impacts, and

29. The Parliament has a right to seek further information on management and access issues, including procedures and measures to minimise impact on the environment, Aboriginal interests and exploration work program, prior to considering a motion for reclamation.

So, after all the work in what was a very interesting select committee, we were rolled. The emphasis of the committee was on cooperation. I do not think the members disagreed once on the total deliberations, and the member for Mawson would agree with me there. I think I had more trouble with the member for Mawson than I did with members of the Labor Party. He was parliamentary secretary for environment and resources, but now he is born again and realises the folly of his ways.

It is amazing that, after all that process, we were rolled like that. How suspect this institution is. The evidence was totally overwhelming, yet it does not happen. Even the Aborigines were prepared to negotiate, but it was stopped. That was 19 months ago. Hopefully we will shortly have the opportunity to reconsider the Parliament's position. We can never make up for the lost time, but we now have to allow the area to at least be explored, so we can then make a further decision whether or not to allow mining.

If this type of mentality, this negativity virus, was as rampant 25 years ago as it is today, this State would not have much of its enterprise, and it would have no opportunities, no jobs and no royalties. We all need to reflect on the effect of our decisions. I said earlier that most members in here have children, and they do want them to be able to find a meaningful job here in South Australia. They do not want that job to be interstate, because if the children move interstate, they would see them once or twice a year. That is not much of a compromise. The answer is a resounding 'Yes.' It is time that all of us did something to assist in that outcome: that is, promoting jobs in South Australia.

As the member for Spence has just walked in, I would commend him on his agreement to the shopping hours proposal. With respect to the speech by His Excellency, I refer to page 11 where he said:

My Government also intends to introduce legislation to remove the penalty for failing to vote at a State election.

I think this is a magnificent proposal. I have always had a strong conviction against compulsory voting. I have always been in favour of voluntary voting. As a member who represents a strong blue ribbon seat, it would make it harder for me to predict my outcome, and is that not the best for the Parliament? I could almost guess to the 't' what my vote will be, because people have to vote. If it is made voluntary, my seat would not be assured, and it could cost me my seat, purely by people not attending at the polling booth to vote. I welcome that. By leaving the compulsory aspect to voting, but taking away the fine is a very good move, and I am very happy with that.

Also, I was very pleased to hear the Governor say:

My Government will also be introducing legislation to expand the stamp duty exemptions provided for intergenerational farm transfers to include—

and this is new—

nephews and nieces.

There is no discrimination there. Further:

It will also expand to include farm and plant equipment transferred.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I know that the member for Ross Smith has a friend, a Mr Browne from Spalding, whom I know very well, and I think he would applaud that, because we have now made it easier for assets to be transferred. We know that many farmers are very well off with respect to assets but very poor in terms of real cash. When it comes to transferring these assets to their children, it has cost a fortune in the past and in many instances has caused the break up of the farm. Now we have a total picture, with the land, plant and equipment able to be transferred not only to sons and daughters but also to nephews and nieces. I think the primary producers will be very pleased with the Government.

I also thank the Opposition for its support on this matter. We have delivered there what we said we would deliver five years ago, although I had my tongue in my cheek as to whether we could include the plant and equipment. But it has now been done, and I am very pleased. I commend the Governor's speech to the House and have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Ms KEY (Hanson): In my remarks on the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech, I would like to cover a number of matters, one of which involves issues that have become prominent in the electorate of Hanson, which I represent. First, it is a great honour to represent the constituents of Hanson, and I will continue to do as much as I can to make sure that their interests are represented in this Parliament.

At the outset, I would also like to congratulate the Speaker—I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you were involved in this matter—and the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee for installing a women's toilet for House of Assembly members. Although members may laugh at my complimenting the JPSC on that matter, it is something that women members of Parliament and their female guests appreciate.

It is an honour to follow the member for Schubert. As members know, he is the Presiding Member of the Environment Resources and Development Committee of which I am a member. I am pleased to say that that committee not only takes up a lot of time but from my point of view as a member it is very important. The inquiries in which the committee has been involved so far in the areas of aquaculture, inland fishing (which is ongoing) and rural road safety are important. As a member I have learnt a considerable amount about those matters, and I welcome the opportunity to participate on that committee. Despite the fact that different Parties are represented on the committee, we seem to work well with the staff, and that is a positive thing. I look forward to doing further work on that committee.

I enjoy being a member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, but my first disappointment as a member of Parliament involved the battle that was fought and lost regarding the West Beach groyne. I will be interested to see in the future how successful and necessary this boat

harbor is for the community and whether the sand and the marine and foreshore plants will be protected as promised or whether it becomes the environmental disaster that I suspect it will. I have been trying to find out how much sand replenishment for the West Beach boat harbour will cost the area, but at this stage I have no clear idea about that.

I also have the privilege of being a member of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation. Unfortunately, unlike the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, that committee has met once. The Chairman, Minister Armitage, held the first meeting a couple of months ago. We responded to correspondence dated August 1997 from a number of people about their concerns regarding the WorkCover Corporation and their individual case. Later in my Address in Reply, I would like to talk about some of the issues that have been raised with me as the shadow Industrial Affairs spokesperson.

A number of constituent concerns have been highlighted during the past year. I refer, first, to the issue of the privatisation of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. My office has received 200 calls on this issue. Unlike the member for Peake, I did not put out a survey; people rang me because they were concerned about the reports in the *Advertiser* and otherwise in the media. Unlike the direct survey that was conducted by some of my colleagues, people contacted me because they were upset about the Electricity Trust being privatised.

I am sure that I share my concern with a number of members in this House, but I have received quite a few hundred Housing Trust inquiries involving people transferring from one dwelling to another, priority housing and problems with disruptive neighbours. Unfortunately the disruptive neighbours issue is something we all have complaints about, and it needs to be addressed.

In Hanson some issues raised by constituents I put into the category of 'residents living next door to industry'. A number of members of this place would encounter such problems, but in Hanson issues have been raised with regard to noise pollution, smell and vapour pollution and dust from neighbouring industries. Despite my best efforts and the efforts of a number of local residents, we have not had very much satisfaction from the Environment Protection Agency. Although I am sure that people in the agency listen to the complaints or problems we have raised, even if they had the resources to do something about our complaints the legislation has serious omissions which prevents them from being able to take action.

With our shadow environment spokesperson, John Hill, I would be keen to see the Environment Protection Agency overhauled along with the legislation to ensure that an opportunity exists for people living next to industry or people with environmental concerns generally to take up the issues and ensure that not only are they heard but also that there is a responsibility on the relevant agencies to return calls and give feedback to the complainants.

As a result of the lack of action by the State Government within the environment area, we have set up a western suburbs environment group. A number of people who have never been involved in any action or lobbying before are very concerned about what is happening in their local environment, particularly in Plympton, which is next to industry in many parts, and in the Camden Park and Netley areas. These people have never been involved in lobbying of any type before and some have never been in an organised group

before, but they feel so strongly that they believe they need a forum for action.

I have been very much supported by the Federal Labor candidate for Hindmarsh (Steve Georganas) and, interestingly, by the member for Hindmarsh (Chris Gallus), along with local government people. With support from the three levels of Government we may be able to bring pressure to bear to ensure that, first, at least the public have access to information about the hazards and environmental issues that surround them and, secondly, to see whether we can take realistic preventative action when someone lives next door to industry. None of these people are saying that the industry should go away, but a number of them lived there before the industry settled around them, and they are saying that some means should exist whereby it is possible to work out a solution.

The other strong group in Hanson is the Airport Action Group. Because the airport is slap-bang in the middle of the electorate, a number of people in my electorate and in the electorate of Peake are bothered by the airport flight path, as are North Adelaide residents, some of whom have come to a couple of meetings because of their concern about the flight path. We have been successful in ensuring that pressure is put on the Federal member (Chris Gallus) to ensure that the proper curfew is observed and to look at other environmental issues involved in living in areas with planes going over regularly.

The residents associations within Hanson have also been busy. In some ways they have been revived, perhaps due to the local government elections, followed by the State election, followed by the Federal election. We have had a good round of these organisations being revived and becoming active about local issues. I will briefly discuss some other constituent concerns. Many people who contact my office do not necessarily live in my electorate, but they have raised concerns.

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

JUDGES' PENSIONS (PRESERVED PENSIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

Ms KEY: As I was saying before the break, there are a number of issues that have been raised over the past year with me as the member for Hanson, and one of the final ones I wanted to discuss in general terms relates to the Equal Opportunity Commission. A number of unions and constituents have come to my office with concerns in regard to various EO matters. Interestingly, they believe that they have been discriminated against on the basis of age, gender, sexuality, race or ethnic origin, culture and religion. Although South Australia did lead Australia with its equal opportunity legislation, unfortunately that EO legislation is no longer at the cutting edge and has taken its place down at the bottom of equal opportunity provisions in Australia.

Of course, the problem associated with that is the lack of resources that have been extended to the national body, the Human Rights Commission, and to the EO Commission itself. On the basis of the number of inquiries and complaints

I had received, I endeavoured during this year to follow up on issues with regard to the Equal Opportunity Commission. I am advised by advocates who work in this area that, in fact, it now takes much longer for an equal opportunity matter to be dealt with, that it is not just a matter of listing a grievance to see whether your grievance has some substance within the Act itself, and that it might take anywhere from six to 18 months to find out whether the Commissioner or the Commission believes you have a legitimate grievance.

Having been an equal opportunity practitioner before entering this place, I view that situation with some concern. I am sad to say that a number of claimants with whom I dealt when employed by the Transport Workers Union some 18 months ago are yet to receive a response in terms of whether or not they have grounds for a legitimate complaint under the EO Act. So, together with the complaints I have received, I have some personal experience of this. I see this as a major area which needs to be considered and which also needs a review in regard to the operation of the Act.

As I am the shadow Minister for Industrial Affairs, a number of people not necessarily from the seat of Hanson but from all around South Australia have raised with me issues in relation to industrial affairs. Unfortunately, most of those issues lie within the occupational health and safety and workers compensation area. When you look at the statistics, at least 20 people in South Australia die from work related injuries. Up to another 100 die as a consequence of industrial cancers and other work related diseases.

In addition, when one looks at the 1996-97 statistics one sees that 54 000 workers were injured as a result of a work related incident, which averages out at approximately 15 injured workers a day. Also, in the course of a year approximately one in every 11 South Australian workers is injured as a result of their work. Those sorts of statistics are very sobering and we should be looking at the question of prevention. Following an injury people must consider the next step and what sort of support is available to them and their families.

To date more than 120 employees on WorkCover have informed me about their concerns in relation to their WorkCover case and the way in which it has been handled. A number of people have contacted my office through the Internet process. I have also received complaints by letter, telephone and fax. As I said, at this stage more than 120 people in this area are looking for some assistance from the Opposition. I view this situation with some concern because, in many cases, I believe that what they really need is proper advocacy and support—not a politician sticking his or her nose in their case, trying to give them some assistance through the political process.

I will mention a couple of examples because I believe they reflect people's concerns. One particular worker from the electorate of Elizabeth has been writing to me since I was elected in October last year. With the support of the member for Elizabeth (Lea Stevens) she has given me an outline of her experience since being injured in 1995 when she needed to have an operation. It is now 3½ years down the track and Ms E.R.'s letter states:

I injured myself in 1995, necessitating an operation. I have not recovered from this injury and some 3½ years down the track I find myself bogged in a system which has absolutely no empathy for my situation physically, mentally and personally. This has taken a heavy toll on both me and my family.

Under the current system my salary was maintained for one year and then reduced to 20 per cent for a further year. Under the current legislation an employer's obligation to an injured worker expires

after two years and the company [which I will not name] exercised their option and terminated my seventeen year career. At the beginning of the year MMI [the insurance company] decided that based on their medical advice, my wages were to be reduced by 25 hours per week, despite the fact that the operating surgeon had stated that I was totally incapacitated, and may be unable to return to work in the future. Since then I have attended several arbitration hearings, countless specialists and numerous legal appointments. On one occasion in March 1997 MMI issued a notice to reduce my salary on the basis of being cleared for full-time clerical work. MMI persisted with this notice and did not withdraw that notice until several days before the hearing. The insurance company subsequently issued a further notice based on 25 hours and withdrew this notice. I have attended several more of these conferences to no avail. To date I have expended nearly \$11 000 simply to maintain a portion of the salary I was earning prior to my injury. On principle I was prepared to do so but. . .

Ms E.R. was told that this would not keep her out of court and her letter indicates that, at this stage, she is unable to afford legal costs. Her letter continues:

. . . any payments I was likely to be awarded would be used up by the system. I am seriously considering, despite legal advice to the contrary, opting out. Apparently there is no provision in the Act to allow for a final determination of my case. In other words, even if I successfully defend my situation WorkCover continues to appeal on slightly different grounds *ad infinitum*. I feel that the current system is totally unfair to a legitimately injured worker. My main concerns are—

and I think it is very interesting that this worker is able to summarise her terrible situation so clearly—

1. Termination of employment after two years of incapacity.
 2. The \$50 000 ceiling for redemption of claims is inadequate.
 3. The legal costs of maintaining one's salary should not be borne by the worker.
 4. The adversarial attitude of MMI acting on behalf of WorkCover.
- This is a brief outline of the situation.

Then she goes on to say that she would like to discuss the matter with me in more detail, which she has done. Ms ER, as I call her, is one example of the many tragic stories that have reached my office and, certainly, my colleagues' offices with regard to WorkCover claims.

Another case I would like to cite briefly is Ms JK from the District of Bragg. This person has seen her local member, the Hon. Mr Ingerson, a number of times with regard to her very difficult situation as a traveller. She has talked about not only the difficulties of being in an area that is not adequately covered by an award or enterprise agreement but also concerns about what happens to workers if they are injured in such a situation.

As a result of the changes to the work force that we are now seeing whereby more and more people are being employed on contracts, in casual work and, in some cases, on commission, I am finding that many of the cases referred to me concern people's work relationship as an employee, or whether there is, in fact, a contract of employment involving an employer-employee situation, and they are becoming more and more difficult to understand. The constituent of Bragg in her letter writes:

I also believe that this matter and others re [the company] need to be brought up in Parliament, the contract made illegal, the workers put on an award and [the employer, whom I will not name] made to be accountable. I also wish to add that the *Advertiser* reported that Graham Ingerson had free legal help re his work predicament and I think that that was wrong since he earned, and still earns, a decent wage. [I am not in that position.] Thank you for considering this information and thank you for doing something about it. It is much appreciated.

My concern is that I cannot do much about her situation. She has not had any satisfaction from her local member; she was not a member of a trade union; she has no money; and she

cannot pursue any legal avenues. Unfortunately, there would be a huge debate about her status as an employee or whether, in fact, she is an employee. Her payment is on commission. She has done very well and is obviously a very capable member of staff, but she has had the misfortune of being injured at work and now finds that she has no assistance whatsoever and has to rely very much on relatives to get her through this difficult situation.

I said earlier in my Address in Reply speech that I had some real concerns that, although I had the honour of being on the parliamentary committee on occupational safety, rehabilitation and compensation, we had met only once and that we were still dealing with issues raised under former Minister Brown from August last year. Unfortunately, a number of names and letters written to that committee reflect the views of some of the people who contact me as the shadow industrial affairs spokesperson with regard to the way they are being treated under the WorkCover system.

I have also had the opportunity to talk to some of the union advocates about their view of what is happening with regard to WorkCover cases. They wish me to raise in this place a number of changes regarding the administration of the workers compensation Act. Along with other colleagues on this side of the House, I have made approaches to the WorkCover Corporation, particularly the Chief Executive Officer, Keith Brown, to see whether we can look at some of these very serious cases and work out a process that may assist people while they are going through the WorkCover system as it stands. Although the Chief Executive Officer has given a lot of support, I am still waiting to hear from WorkCover about what suggestions or process issues they can come up with. Admittedly, we did have a meeting two months ago but, in the meantime, I have been absolutely hounded by people who have been injured on the job and who are waiting to find out where they can go to get support.

My other concern is that a number of people, if they take on the tactic of some of the workers compensation support groups or injured workers' groups of sending faxes to every member in both Houses to lobby regarding their WorkCover claim, are written off as being crazy or not warranting any attention. My view is different. I have been saying to the people who have turned up in my office, e-mailed me, faxed me or written to me that perhaps they should, first, target their complaints about the WorkCover system to the Minister responsible and, secondly, let their local member of Parliament know what is happening. If they want to give me as the shadow Minister a copy of their complaint, I would be more than happy to follow up on their complaint or grievance.

As I said, a number of people have been written off as being crazy or, if they are seen to be associated with any support group, their case is seen to be wanting or it is assumed that they have a dubious reason for taking on this method. I am not saying that I have been successful—in fact, I have probably been stunningly unsuccessful in talking to different members of the WorkCover support groups and injured workers' associations—but we as members of Parliament need to recognise that, in the main, these people are genuine cases. They are people who have been injured on the job or have problems associated with their work, and no-one is listening to them. We have a serious problem on our hands. Whether it be through the parliamentary committee on occupational safety, rehabilitation and compensation or whether it be through the direct action of the people concerned, I hope that we on both sides of this House regard

workers compensation issues as serious issues and take them on as a priority.

As a result of inaction generally in the WorkCover area, I am also sad to report that a number of people are now acting as advocates who, in my experience—and I have been a WorkCover advocate for a number of years—are not completely up-to-date with some of the decisions and some of the issues that would be helpful to WorkCover claimants. That is the first issue. The second issue is that many people are saying, ‘The legal system costs too much; I will start representing myself’, not understanding some of the intricacies of what is necessary when you take up a WorkCover case even on a very basic level. The other problem is that people get very upset when the decisions do not favour the fact that they have been a legitimate injured worker trying to seek some sort of redress for themselves and their family.

As a result of this, a number of the advocates, who are quite often not trained—some of them are brilliant, some of them are terrible—are finding that more and more WorkCover people are coming to them and bypassing the usual areas of support, whether it be legal support, the employee advocate unit or their union. As I said earlier, some really difficult decisions have come out of that system. A number of people have reported to me that some people have tried to take their own life because they have not been able to cope with the situation—the protracted negotiations, the tribunal hearings and the review hearings in which they have been involved. It was reported to me that this year, just in 1998, nine people have committed suicide as a result of their WorkCover claim and that the spouses of two people who have been on the WorkCover list have also committed suicide. That can be attributed to the very bad WorkCover system that is currently in place.

There have been a number of highlights in being member for Hanson over the last year, but I am really concerned about and I bring to Parliament’s attention the WorkCover system. Regardless of which side of the House they sit on, a number of other members will appreciate what I am saying and know that this is a serious issue that we must address.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): As I reply to the Governor’s speech to this packed Chamber, I would like to concentrate on the nature of the program outlined in the Governor’s speech rather than the nature of the controversy that ensued from it about whether it was political or otherwise and what the role of the Governor should be in making such speeches.

What is clear about the legislative agenda for this session outlined by the Governor on behalf of the Liberal Government is that it is pretty thin. It is lucky for the Government that a debate is ensuing on ETSA because, if there were not, I do not know how we would fill in our time, given the legislative program outlined by the Government. It is very thin indeed.

There is one thing that I would like to say about the role of the Governor, not as it relates to making the speeches opening Parliament but as a public figure and representative of this State. During the last session I got to know the Governor quite a bit better than I had previously, and something that greatly impressed me about His Excellency was his interest in young people, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds. He takes a keen interest in the activities of these young people and he is keen to participate and play a role in areas such as Salisbury and Elizabeth, which I represent. I welcome that and commend him for it. I hope that His Excellency will continue to have that interest.

We are now in a new parliamentary session, we have come to the close of the fifth year of the Liberal Government and we have entered the sixth year, marching to the middle point of the second term of the State Liberal Government. This session began just after a Federal election in which all of us as State members, after an extended State parliamentary session, found ourselves campaigning straightaway in a Federal election. Soon after that finished we were back in Parliament for the next session.

I extend my congratulations to the successful Labor candidate in Kingston, David Cox, my friend and colleague, on his impressive win in that seat. I would also like to extend my appreciation and congratulations to all Labor candidates who stood as representatives of the Labor Party at this Federal election, because I appreciate the effort and the great number of hours that they necessarily must put in. They put their lives on hold, and it is an enormous task to represent a Party, particularly in a marginal seat. I give all candidates great credit and thank them publicly for their efforts.

Along with my colleagues the members for Kaurua and Lee, I have been a losing candidate; I ran in that very hard State election for Labor, the 1993 State Bank election, as indeed they did. We are now here but, although running very good and hard campaigns for two years leading up to that election, each of us lost and know the heartbreak of losing candidates. So, I do have a lot of empathy with candidates who put in the effort for our Party and do not get there.

One of the things that I find very useful in my role in campaigning in Federal elections is that, while doorknocking is not really my idea of a good time, once I am out there I enjoy it, and I do so because it is particularly useful. I use doorknocking in my own electorate as a very useful tool for picking up exactly how people are feeling about the issues that are current at that time. When doorknocking for candidates in other areas at election time, I also like the opportunity to run that crosscheck with constituents of other areas, particularly for my portfolio purposes.

One of the things that was most interesting about the Federal election and the reaction of electors, particularly in marginal seats, was their general agreement over their disappointment with not only the Federal Liberal Government but also more particularly the State Liberal Government in its five years in office in this State. The overwhelming message that came through to me at the doorstep in the past couple of months particularly was that, despite all the pain that has been inflicted—the cuts in services inflicted by this Government on the electorate of South Australia—and despite all the tax increases that have been announced in this last State budget progressively over the term of the Government—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms WHITE: Plus the unannounced ones, as my colleague indicates—jobs are not being created or sustained in this State. That seemed to be the major disappointment of nearly everyone to whom I spoke at the doorstep. This State has been the worst performer in mainland Australia on the issue of jobs creation since this Liberal Government took office. It was interesting to listen to a Government member of this House give us his ideas on how to fix the jobs problem. His suggestion was to lower wages.

Mr Conlon: Is that Martin Hamilton-Smith?

Ms WHITE: A member of the Government espousing Government philosophy, perhaps. ‘Lower wages!’ was his response. It is interesting to note that that is still the response in this day and age, in a State where in many areas our wages lag behind those of the rest of the nation. For that honourable

member, creation of more jobs came down to lowering wages. The Employers Chamber came out immediately and said, 'No, that's the wrong approach; in fact, what you should be doing is aiming for higher wage jobs.' It is interesting when the Employers Chamber, which usually takes a more conservative approach, comes out straight away to criticise such a silly idea.

During the campaign, one thing became particularly evident to me. I have in my electorate office one staff member, who was a candidate in the Federal election campaign. That meant that I had a relief person in for much of that time, and obviously after the campaign that involved a bit of a workload build-up, which I have been working through. My office is at present understaffed. I do not have a trainee, as most other members have in their offices. I have not had one for four or five months, because the Government has not given me a trainee, despite repeated requests by me.

I know that my colleagues the Deputy Leader and the member for Wright have also been without trainees. That decreases our ability to service well our electorates. It is a fact that our three offices would have to be some of the busiest offices in the State but we have the least staff of members' offices. That is quite a problem. When I raised this important matter with a number of my Liberal colleagues, they sneered at me and said, 'It is only people in the Salisbury/Elizabeth area.' That is typical of this Government's attitude to the huge need that offices in our areas have to meet in order to service properly our constituents.

I would also like to have a gripe about the fact that I have asked the Government that I be able to shift my office into my electorate. My office is not located in my electorate; with the latest boundaries redistribution, it is not even near the new electorate. In fact, it is more than five kilometres from the closest boundary of the Taylor electorate. The Government, through its Treasurer, has come back to me and said that it will not move my office into my electorate. That also affects my ability to service my constituents, who—perhaps more than any other constituents in the Adelaide area—do not have ready access to transport and who find it difficult to travel to my electorate office. So, yet again this Government is showing its contempt for at least certain constituents in South Australia.

This treatment is compounded by the treatment that these constituents have been getting in other areas from this Government. The Auditor-General found tax increases and a decrease in services significant enough to comment on. According to the Auditor-General's Report, by 2001-2 we will see a 26 per cent increase in taxation, compared to 1993-94, when this Government came to power. What are we seeing for that?

According to the Auditor-General's Report, we have seen an increase at this time of \$400 million in the underlying debt. So, we have increasing taxes, decreasing services, no remedying of the underlying debt and, worst of all, failing on the job creation measure. Also worthy of note as we start this session are the Auditor-General's comments concerning the direction the Government is taking in contracting out. The Auditor-General talks about the ETSA privatisation and he also talks in more general terms about some of the problems and dangers he sees in the path the Government is hoeing in terms of accountability and standards of Government services to constituents.

The Auditor-General warns this Government specifically that, because accountability is becoming more complex as the Government steps back from direct provision of services to

South Australians, that cannot be a reason for this Government, as it has been doing in recent years, to avoid addressing the issues raised by the Auditor-General in terms of accountability and duty of care obligations to service South Australians.

Also, the Auditor-General talks about the importance of this Government's ensuring that public confidence is maintained in the procedures and accountability of Government and the public institutions with which it is involved. We had a pretty good example of one aspect of what the Auditor-General is getting at when today in Question Time a couple of my colleagues asked questions of the Premier about the Motorola deal, public confidence in the way the Government handled it and the openness and accountability of the Government as well. The Auditor-General refers to the dangers of not proceeding cautiously in the contracting out of Government services. He mentions Modbury Hospital and the EDS contracts specifically and makes a couple of important points that we should keep in mind as we begin this session. First, he says that confidentiality clauses are no excuse for not being open with the public of South Australia, and that is an important matter that we need to keep in mind.

The other important point raised by the Auditor-General which we should keep in mind is his statement that duty of care responsibilities of a Government are 'non-delegable' (I think the Auditor-General made up that word)—should not be delegated to contractors but remain the responsibility of the Government. Obviously, we will discuss that point further when we debate the report.

One of the big increases in taxes at Federal level in the next couple of years will be the GST, and one of the issues which came out of the campaign and which is with us now that we have a Federal Liberal Government and the GST is on the agenda is what will be included in this tax and what will not. In my portfolio area of education there are many questions about what will be taxed. A particular matter which came up during the campaign and which is of concern to many parents around Australia is the GST on public school fees. When this was put to the State Minister in Parliament during the campaign and to the Federal Government, the answer was 'Yes,' potentially public school fees in South Australia would be taxed whereas private tuition fees in non-government schools would not be taxed under the 10 per cent GST, but that we would have to wait for the report of the consultative committee on taxation set up by the Government.

Of course, we have only 17 days to consult on this very complex matter affecting education and a whole raft of other areas, and it does not even look as though the Government has had much interest in submissions to that committee. One would have to ask: where is the Education Minister, specifically, and where is the Government on these very important matters that will affect the hip pockets of many South Australians? The answer, of course, is that they are not taking any direction at all, but sitting back and letting it happen. That seems to be a bit of a pattern with the Education Minister, as we have seen now that he is in dispute with the teachers over their enterprise agreement and pay claim. The really disappointing thing about that is that, even though the education budget was brought down in May and the Minister knew that he would enter into negotiations in July for an enterprise agreement to take effect after December, he has left it until 15 October to begin those negotiations.

The impact of that has been that schools and kindergartens all round the State, which have to plan their resources for next year, have been unable to do so. As a result, programs look

as though they will be lost. A week ago the Australian Education Union gave me the results of a faxback that they had had from schools. At that stage, they had had faxbacks from approximately 200 schools that had nominated programs they were about to lose because they were not able to reappoint teachers they had previously appointed under the \$28 million flexible resourcing and special education funding that is at risk in this dispute, according to the Minister. I will list some of the programs that these schools have nominated as not being able to continue if the funding, which has already been allocated in the budget, is not released very shortly.

Of 200 responses, 42 schools said that small group support and special education support programs would go. Fifty schools said that literacy support and early intervention programs could not continue next year. Eighteen would not be able to continue with primary music and performing arts courses. Twenty-one schools said that they would not be able to support computer integration, an apparent priority of the Government. Twenty-five schools said that they would not be able to support training and development. Fifty-six schools said that they would not have administration support (SSOs), that they would lose that. Twenty-seven preschools said that they would lose their speech and language early intervention support. Twenty-two schools said that they would lose their at risk early intervention programs for those preschoolers not eligible for special education classes.

I have a whole raft of other programs here and, quite obviously, the impact will be stark. These schools will have to operate with reduced staffing levels at the start of next year. They are not able to offer their current staff those positions—and this will impact particularly cruelly on country schools, which find it very difficult to attract those staff, in any case. Subject options will decrease. Many schools will have to displace those teachers. This will cause major disruption to educational programs, and dislocation of staff is unavoidable unless the Minister releases that money now.

When I asked the Minister in Parliament whether that money was guaranteed to those schools or whether it was, in fact, a bargaining chip in his enterprise agreement negotiations, he said that it was, indeed, a bargaining chip and that, until there was agreement to the budget cuts for the next three years, he would not release the money. So, the money has been budgeted—it is there—but the Minister is refusing to release it because he wants to use that as a bargaining chip. He is bargaining with our children's future. And that is the focus of this Minister. Also, he is not telling us whether the country incentives, which are very necessary to attract teachers to country areas, will be in place in time for next year. That is still being bargained away.

Of the cuts that have already been levelled at our schools, perhaps one of the cruellest has been the cuts to adult re-entry programs—a \$1 million cut to nine re-entry schools. At a time of high unemployment in this State, when the Government has said that it will do all it can to enhance employment opportunities, it is targeting nine schools that take the most long-term unemployed people and provide them with the education skills that help them to enter the work force and cutting the funding to those schools, on top of the cuts that are being imposed on every school.

Quite clearly, the focus and vision of this Government is wrong. The focus is on budget cuts rather than educational services and health services—services to South Australia. To summarise, one must ask the question: how can the Government sprout the rhetoric of South Australia becoming the

smart State, the education State, when the biggest cuts are going to education? It is clear that the priorities of the Government are wrong, and that they are not what it says they are. The Government's priorities are not job creation, education and health services, because they are the ones that, above all else, are taking it in the neck.

Mr CONLON (Elder): In speaking to the Governor's address, and some of the things that have been said about it, I will do something that I consider is very wise for a junior shadow Minister, and that is to congratulate Mike Rann on his performance over the past year. As we all know, Mike cleaned up the Premier in an almost graphically violent way in the great debate, and sent him limping out of the place. He limped all the way to election day, fell over the line with a bare majority, relying on the fiercely Independent members for Gordon and McKillop, and plainly was referred to as the loser of the century, although I would not repeat such a terrible comment. Since then, Mike Rann has gone from strength to strength and is plainly building the team for the next Government, a Government that this State so desperately needs and one of which, with Mike's support, I hope to be a very important part.

Before passing onto the main subject matter that I would like to address, I will speak on the two recent elections in Australia. The first was the Tasmanian election where of course I would congratulate the new Premier, Premier Bacon. I would also say a kind word for the former Premier of Tasmania, Mr Rundle, who went to the election with a brave and what turned out to be an unpopular policy to sell his State's electricity supply. It was unpopular, but at least Mr Rundle had the courage to put it before his electorate. He paid the price because his electorate had the good sense to reject such a scheme, but Mr Rundle is to be congratulated for his honesty and candour, an example from which this Government might well have learned.

The other election of course was the Federal election. There has been much talk about that. The only part I want to touch on is the one great deep personal satisfaction I had from the result, and that was the loss of Ms Pauline Hanson's seat in the Federal Parliament. She was one of the most repulsive and divisive influences I have seen in my life in Australian politics. Before going on to talk about the standards in this place, which is a thing I do want to talk about, I congratulate this Parliament for having never engaged in the sort of vile politics that we saw at Federal level.

I would say that Pauline Hanson plainly had a big kick along by the choice of the Federal Conservative Parties to dance with the devil, to give her prominence and legitimacy. I can say in all honesty that no-one on either side of this House has ever done such a thing. I remember Steve Condous (the member for Colton) speaking against Pauline Hanson. Before I go onto my usual technique of bagging the living daylights out of members opposite, I want at least to give you credit for that. It is important to remember that there are dangerous, repulsive elements in our society that ignorance and fearmongering can encourage.

Recently, people would have seen National Action out in full force, if that is something you can say, protesting at some recent gay and lesbian event. When I look at National Action on television or in person, I am reminded that there used to be a theory that nature compensated you for any shortcoming. For instance, if you were short, like me, it made you smart or a good talker; if you were not very good looking, you were athletic; or if your ears did not work, you had better eyesight.

However, when I look at the National Action people, I think that theory could not be right. These people were short-changed in their genetic cast to the die. They came up empty. They stood at the table when the genetic die was cast and they came up fairly empty, and it seems that they want to blame everyone in the world for it except themselves.

When I see them in their repulsive displays of intolerance, I do wish sometimes that the churches would say more about National Action than they do about the gay and lesbian lifestyle. I am not frightened of any gays or lesbians, but those National Action people gathering around singing the 'Horst Wessel' song do put a shiver up my spine.

I now move on to my main subject of parliamentary standards. In his address, the Governor referred to some changes to be made to parliamentary procedures which apparently will raise standards. One of those changes deals with the right of people who are defamed in the Parliament to respond. I have no difficulty with that. However, I think that self-regulation is the best answer to defamation. Members of this House should be mindful of the great privileges they have been given. In the short time I have been here I have been very robust during debates, but I have always been careful to pick on those who have the right to answer me in the same vein and to not go outside that. I think that is the best mode of control.

The other matter relates to a sin bin. I am told that there are some unruly members of this place who engage in debate in far too energetic and robust a fashion. Of course, I am not one of those, but I support the idea of a sin bin. However, I do not think that the problems with the standards in this place relate to the fact that, at times, debates get a bit robust and heated. I do not have a difficulty with that. I think that it is not only healthy but, let us face it, it is what the media expect and what they will report, and we have to live in this world.

I think there are other standards in this place that we should address, because they drag down members on both sides of the Chamber. I refer to two matters: the standards that we have set in this House for credibility in the time I have been here, which I think are appalling, and the standard of Government decision making. I think both those standards have been low. I want to refer briefly to the role that I think journalists and the media should play in this. I believe that journalists give us far too easy a time. Their expectations in respect of the standards in this place are far too low, and that is what they get.

To digress for a moment: journalism used to be a far more noble profession than it is today. For example, there was a time when membership of the bar in England was limited to a select class of people, usually the sons of princes or earls, etc. One way in which they maintained their exclusivity was by making the entrance requirement to the bar in England not simply the requirement that you should know something about the law—that would be far too simple—but that you spent eight years of enforced indolence taking dinner with members of the bar. That was the requirement, and you were not allowed to work during that period.

It strikes me as strange that the common law which we all revere was formed in its nascent stages by a group of people who thought that it was a special skill to learn what most people know you do to keep body and soul together: that is, to eat dinner. The only profession that was noble enough to take part in this activity during that time was journalism. Apparently, any other paid occupation was too low. So, apparently there was a time when journalists were respected members of the community.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: When I was young.

Mr CONLON: When Mike Rann was very young. In a more serious vein, journalism is one of the most important professions in society. It is no accident that the free press together with trade unions are always the first—

Mr Koutsantonis: And the church.

Mr CONLON: Only if the church does not cooperate—functions to go in any impressive regime. To illustrate my point, I will relate a small joke. There was a time when Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar and Napoleon were on a balcony in Red Square watching the May Day march. Alexander the Great said, 'Look at the size of this army. With an army of this size I wouldn't have stopped at India, I would have conquered the entire world.' Julius Caesar said, 'Never mind that. Look at these weapons of mass destruction. With weapons like these I would have got beyond Hadrian's Wall and conquered the entire globe.' In the meantime, Napoleon was in a corner reading *Pravda*. They said, 'Napoleon, aren't you interested in this fantastic army and these fantastic machines?' He said, 'Never mind that army and those machines; with a newspaper like this no-one would have known about Waterloo.' That is just an illustration of the importance of the media and journalism.

It is my humble opinion, from the short time I have been in the House, that the standards that are accepted by the media are too low. I do not blame them individually for that as it is a culture which has grown up and in which my predecessors and I may have had a role. In my experience in this place a frank and forthright answer to a question is a rare exception. I would compare it to playing fish. They will not tell you what they have got, only what they have not got. You really have to nail them down: 'Have you got any 2s?' 'No; fish!' Frankness, forthrightness and honesty in this place are sadly absent and it drags down the opinion of us in the eyes of the community.

I have been a worker on the wharves, a trade unionist, an industrial officer, a lawyer and all sorts of things. I have always been able to walk into any place and, when people ask me what I do, I tell them and can be proud of it. But, it is not that easy to say, 'Well, I'm a politician' and then tell them why you are proud of it. We get a bad rap, but we are not setting high enough standards and the media is compliant in that it does not expect high enough standards of us. In this place it seems that, unless a Minister is caught red-handed by eye witnesses telling a deliberate lie and unless these eye witnesses have some supporting documentary evidence, the answer is good enough. That has been my experience in this place in the past year. I do not know whether former Labor Governments have contributed to the adoption of such a culture, but the standards are low. I suspect we did not because I do not think we have ever done anything wrong. The standards are extremely low.

To give two examples of the standards I have seen since I have been here, first, the Minister for Employment prior to this one, in the first week she was asked questions on comments she had made the previous day about unemployment figures—questions not about the figures but about the comments she made about them—and she was unable to give an answer. In reply to every question asked of her she said she would take it away and bring back an answer—on comments she had made the previous day! That is not saying that it makes her unfit, but it went for a week without mention in the media: that a Minister of the Crown was not capable of answering questions.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr CONLON: She went missing—she disappeared. I turn to the most egregious example of all. I refer to the former Minister, Graham Ingerson. Someone said in this place that to describe the former Minister as accident prone is like saying the *Titanic* took a bit of water after hitting the iceberg. This is a bloke whose credibility seemed to be on the line for almost the entire 12 months I was in this Parliament on one issue after another. It seemed to be accepted that, well, that is Graham, until he eventually sank under the sheer weight of all the questions over his credibility. I am not here to bag the member for Bragg *per se*, but we accept incredibly low standards in that regard. It makes for bad and easy Government and hard Opposition. I do not mind Opposition being made hard as it is good training for when we get those lovely seats over there, but it is not good for the State.

I turn to my second point: the standards of Government decisions. It is simply unacceptable and the people of South Australia would not accept Government members excusing all of their shortcomings by saying, 'Well, look at the State Bank.' Labor was unfortunate enough to be in Government when the State Bank disaster occurred and it is clear that we paid our price. We were reduced to 10 and then 11 members on the front bench and it has been a long, hard haul, led by the redoubtable Mike Rann, back from that position. We paid our price for being in Government when the State Bank disaster occurred.

The Government got the benefit, being elected with a massive majority. But the benefit does not extend so far as to excuse every unacceptable decision, every lapse in standard and every absence of fiscal rectitude that you have shown; however, it seems to be that that is the standard you would like to set. The media has accepted from you an appalling set of standards in relation to the EDS building, Australis, the letting of the water contract, the recent Motorola controversy and Hindmarsh Stadium—the list is almost too long. It seems to me that it has come to be accepted that these are the sorts of things this State Government does and that as long as it contains the losses somewhere below \$100 million at a time we should not complain too much. It is an appalling standard of government, and it has not had sufficient or rigorous examination.

Let me turn to the final point I will make about the standards of this Government, namely, the decision by John Olsen to go to the last election and to tell people he would never sell ETSA. It was the most blatant, insulting and egregious deception of a constituency that I have ever seen. It was the plain embrace of a belief that you can do or say anything before an election and change your mind afterwards so long as you get elected. I will never be part of such a deception of the people of South Australia.

I was saddened by the fact that, 48 hours after expressing some outrage about such a blatant deception of the people of South Australia, the media hopped in behind the Government. What happened? They spent a year bagging Mike Rann. What for? For keeping his word; for doing what he said we would do at the State election. If that is an acceptable standard, I am yet to be convinced. It was that enormous lack of any candour and honesty with the people of South Australia—and this is what outrages me the most—that was sheeted home not simply to members opposite who told the lie but to us. The constituency believed that this is the sort of thing politicians do, but it is not the sort of things politicians do. It is a rarity for members of a political Party to go to an election and to commit a massive, blatant, egregious deception upon the

constituency with no intention ever of keeping their word, and I do not want to—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Perhaps we should have a truth commission in South Australia.

Mr CONLON: A truth commission! There wouldn't be one of them left in the place. I actually have some sympathy for some of their backbenchers. For example, Martin Homer-Smith—sorry, is that Martin Hamilton-Simpson? I will get it in a minute—

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

Mr CONLON: I think he has difficulty dissembling, much to the pain of John Olsen in recent—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will remember that he must refer to members by their electorates and not by their names.

Mr CONLON:—much to the pain of the Premier—my apologies—given the member for Waite's unexpected candour in the Economic and Finance Committee. In fact, now that it is out in the media it is no secret that the Auditor-General will again appear before the Economic and Finance Committee to clear up some of his evidence on the Motorola deal, because apparently he was not supplied with the right information about a certain New South Wales tendering arrangement. That information is very damaging for the Government. The reason he is coming back is that at the end of the evidence he was asked by Martin Hamilton-Smith to go and check—

The SPEAKER: Order! We are talking about standards in this Chamber. Let us address the Standing Order correctly. Members will refer to members by their electorates.

Mr CONLON: I apologise. The member for Waite insisted that the Auditor-General check the information he had—and he did, and he checked it, and he came back and corrected it. I can at least thank one member of the Liberal Government for candour, honesty and for scoring hits that we might not have been able to do ourselves. I conclude by saying—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: No, you do not want to bore every one. The standard of decision making by this Government in terms of economic and fiscal rectitude has been appalling but it is not a matter for humour. The fact is that, in my honest opinion, South Australia finds itself at a very difficult and dangerous point in its history. It is not my wish to be a member of the State Parliament at a time when the State of South Australia becomes a permanent mendicant at the Premiers' Conference. I want us to have a future—a strong economic and social future in our own right and of our own making.

If we are to achieve that, everyone will have to do their job well and every sector will have to perform well. Whether it be local government, education or hospitals, everything will have to perform to the highest standards. If South Australia is to have a future, we will have to do our job in opposition and shortly in government; members opposite will have to do their job well when those of them who are left are in opposition; and the journalists will have to do their job well.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My Address in Reply contribution will be brief. I am seriously concerned about the process we are observing. I shudder to think how much this Address in Reply debate, for the four days we have tied up the Parliament, has cost the taxpayers of South Australia. I wonder that we cannot find a more efficient and economical

way for people to speak out on behalf of their electorates. Perhaps if we have things to say and speeches to make they can be inserted in *Hansard* without our necessarily presenting them.

I extend to you, Mr Speaker, my thanks for your assistance in my learning the procedures of the House and for your activities in progressing the work of the Parliament. It has been a great privilege to be the member for Norwood over the past 13 months. Having served the community and local government for many years, I find it an even greater honour to be the MP for the community I love so much. Norwood is a vibrant, multicultural community; it is diverse and colourful. As everyone would know, many people in Norwood came from the Campania region of Italy, as I did. In fact, people from all over the globe have settled in Norwood. In many cases they had to battle against enormous adversity. They worked hard and overcame the odds to make a better life. They had to be very practical and down to earth.

When I talk to the practical people of Norwood about the parliamentary process, they struggle to understand some of what goes on in this place. Let me be quite clear: I respect all the democratic processes of this Parliament but I believe it needs to move with the times. I have considered the time spent in this place on some matters that, frankly, did not warrant the attention they received, and I have sat in this place while the issues of real moment to the State were rushed through to avoid scrutiny. One only has to think about the haze under which most of the legislation dealing with the future of our electricity utilities has been treated to understand what I mean.

We had the farce of the member for Schubert moving a motion in, I think, October 1997 congratulating the Crows for winning the Grand Final but its not being debated until October this year—almost 12 months after that event and just before the Crows won their second Grand Final. We also had the farcical situation of the member for Torrens introducing a very good Bill to protect our young people when selling lollies but its not being debated because we did not have the time. Every day that this House sits, the South Australian public is treated to the unedifying spectacle of the Premier and senior Ministers failing to answer questions to which South Australians deserve answers.

People in Norwood would like to know whether the Premier supports the Howard Government's push to tax food. Do we not have a right to know what our Premier and our State Government have been pushing for behind closed doors? Do we not have a right to know whether the Premier has told the Prime Minister that a 10 per cent tax on top of school fees or another 10 per cent on power bills is acceptable? But, as usual, this Government will not provide the answers. My strong view is that the rules of the House relating to the relevance of answers to questions need to be enforced more rigorously. We need just consider the prepared, self-serving answers that the Parliament gets to questions asked of Ministers, with the evasion and bad faith shown by John Olsen's Ministers in answering Opposition questions.

What happened to the promise of open government? What happened to the promise of being accountable to the Parliament? The Governments of both Dean Brown and John Olsen have been very secretive Governments—secret contracts to outsource our water supply, to outsource Modbury Hospital and to outsource Government computing, and secret plans to sell ETSA.

We have seen contracts entered into without the prior scrutiny of the Parliament and then withheld from the public on the grounds of commercial confidentiality. What nonsense! If corporations want to run our essential services and be paid with taxpayers' money, they should be willing to accept full public disclosure. If those corporations will not accept full public disclosure, their alternative is obvious.

This year another problem emerged for members of Parliament with the changeover to accrual accounting. No longer is Government expenditure detailed by program in a way that previously allowed members to scrutinise Government expenditure by reference to budget papers; no longer can members quickly pick up expenditure on new priorities or changes in existing programs; no longer can members look at the budget papers and see how much is directed towards children's services and how this is broken down into occasional care, long care, pre-school education or respite care, or how much is being directed towards multicultural educational services for Aboriginal children; and no longer can members look at the budget papers and see how much is directed towards metropolitan hospitals, country health services, mental health or public and environmental health.

So little information is available that the new budget format has seriously affected the ability of the Estimates Committees to carry out their work in scrutinising the budget. I would ask members to consider how many resources are expended by the bureaucrats in preparing answers to possible questions to be asked during Estimates Committees and members then having only approximately half an hour, in many cases, to ask questions in many portfolios. Further, there is the spectre of the Ministers and many of the senior bureaucrats sitting in Parliament all day waiting for questions to be asked. Again, perhaps there could be a more efficient way of scrutinising what the Government is doing.

The new accrual accounting system is designed for accountants and its introduction has been seized upon by this Government to become even more secretive. Here is a Government that told the public that the 1998 budget was a responsible and fair budget. The Government said that it would spend more on health care, education and people who need it most. Because of accrual accounting, these statements could not be checked. They could not be challenged and they could not be verified. They turned out to be a hoax.

Documents were leaked that reveal the real story on budget cuts in education and human services: \$108 million to be cut from human services over three years, including a \$10 million cut each year to hospital growth funds; and \$69 million to be cut from education over three years, including a freeze on school operating grants, the introduction of a shorter school year and massive cuts to further education. In my electorate, the budget of Marden Senior College was massively cut by more than \$150 000.

More generally, I strongly support Mike Rann's call for further reform of Parliament, and perhaps we need to consider a reduction of the number of parliamentarians if we cannot work more effectively. I support his call for a right of reply for citizens unfairly attacked in Parliament and under parliamentary privilege, and I strongly agree with his call for a code of conduct for all MPs.

My former council of Kensington and Norwood introduced a code of conduct some years ago, and it is about time we had one in Parliament. As I stated earlier, people in Norwood do not like and do not understand all the time wasting and all the name calling in this place. They think—as I do—that politicians are here to do a job and to extend a

helping hand to those in need, but too much of the time they see us as self-serving and immured in the archaic traditions of the past. We must do more to bring the Parliament into the twenty-first century.

A week ago an article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* written by Mr Craig Clarke, who used statistics to measure the parliamentary performance of members. I had the distinction of being singled out as the person who had made the smallest number of contributions in Parliament, having made just two speeches and asked only one question. The article states:

The formerly outspoken Mayor of Kensington and Norwood was quieter than a church mouse.

That has been a source of great mirth to all those who know me. To my great satisfaction, this article has evoked a very positive reaction from most people to whom I have spoken because they are pleased that I am not wasting the Parliament's time and repeating *ad nauseam* what 46 other members have often already said.

The other day, even the former Deputy Premier, the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy, with whom I served on a committee for several years, said he was proud of me when he read the article. I think Mr Clarke is either very naive or does not understand the parliamentary process. If he spent some of his time here during Question Time, he would hear the dorothea dixers and see the sport played by the Government at times when a Government Minister is asked a dorothea dixer and then there are interjections from his or her own side asking them to spin out the answer for at least 13 minutes or 15 minutes so that the Opposition does not get an opportunity to ask questions. I think Mr Clarke would understand that the Opposition of necessity often has to follow a particular line of questioning to extract information from the Government. He should also understand as a political journalist that there are pecking orders in all Oppositions as to who gets preference, starting with the Leader, followed by shadow Ministers which effectively leaves little opportunity for backbenchers.

I have been debating policy for many years and I have always been very vocal in speaking out for my community. If I have something to add to a debate, a point to make which has not already been raised, I will do so, but I will not speak for the sole purpose of being recorded in *Hansard* and thereby improving my statistics. I am interested in outcomes, and the Premier and his Ministers can attest to the fact that I have often cornered them in the Chamber, in corridors and even in the lift when I want to lobby them for something on behalf of my constituents. I am then prepared to give them some time to find a solution.

On this point I therefore put on the public record my thanks to the Minister for Education (Hon. Malcolm Buckby) for having renewed for another two years the funding for the Margaret Ives Children's Centre in my electorate. However, two matters are outstanding and the Hon. Malcolm Buckby knows that I will continue to pressure him until we have exhausted all other avenues.

On 3 October a majority of the Australian people voted against the GST. Everywhere I go around my electorate people are worried about the impact that a GST will have on them. The many elderly people of Norwood are asking themselves, 'How much more will I have to pay for my medicines if the GST comes in?' The many parents of school-aged children in Norwood feel that they will not be able to afford to pay another 10 per cent on top of the burgeoning school fees that they are already forced to pay. Many people in Norwood who are in receipt of Government benefits in

Housing Trust accommodation are worried about their rents increasing the very minute that they are supposedly compensated for the impact of the GST. Every pensioner and self-funded retiree with whom I speak wants to know how they will afford meat, fresh fruit and vegetables under a GST when they are having enough difficulty making ends meet already.

Nearly every restaurant and cafe owner asks me how they will afford the extra time and money that would have to go into administration and being John Howard's tax collector. As was highlighted during the last Federal election, this is a tax from the cradle to the grave. All baby foods will be taxed. When the child goes to school his or her parents will have to pay the GST on school uniforms, bus trips to get to school, lunches bought from the tuck shop and trips to movies. When the child grows up and buys a home everything from which it is made and everything in it will be taxed. Every time the person turns on a light and every time they use a local government service they will be taxed and, when they depart this mortal coil, the cost of their funeral will go up by 10 per cent. The GST will add to the cost of cremation, to the cost of a memorial, to the cost of burial fees and to the cost of hiring the chapel.

When all this comes to pass I will be telling the people of Norwood the truth, that is, that this Government supported it all. It could have stood up for the battlers but decided instead to tax the necessities of their lives while giving tax breaks to the well off. It could have stood up for the rights of South Australia, but it did not. People in Norwood know what it is like to lose essential services through cutbacks by Governments with the wrong priorities, but I will not go through them at this stage.

At this point I would like to pay a special tribute to the Hon. Don Dunstan, former Premier and member for Norwood. It is a testimony to his significance in our community when, earlier this year, approximately 5 000 people were prepared to pay for the privilege of listening to Don speak about social policies in South Australia. I am sure all members would want to wish Don a speedy recovery from his illness. Several months ago I approached the Premier privately to suggest that a bust of Don Dunstan be placed in Parliament House in recognition of his contribution to South Australia as the second longest serving Premier of this State. The Premier agreed to consider the suggestion, and I hope that he and this Parliament will agree to it, and that this should in no way override what the Lord Mayor more recently has suggested, namely, to have a statue of Don in a more public place.

There is a precedent for having two representations of former Premiers, as Sir Thomas Playford is represented both in this place and in his beloved Adelaide Hills. I was on PLEC (Powerline Environment Committee) which approved a sum of money to the East Torrens Council to remove powerlines so that the statue of Sir Thomas Playford would not be obliterated by the stobie poles and the powerlines.

I conclude by extending an enormous amount of thanks to my staff, Effy Kleanthi, my personal assistant, and our trainee, Tania Kouts—no relation to Tom—everyone in the Norwood sub-branch for having continued to support me and also to my long suffering colleagues for their support and their understanding of my political incorrectness at times. I hope that in the next session of this Parliament we can all continue to work together in a more efficient way for the benefit of South Australia.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I have great pleasure in responding to the address by His Excellency the Governor to the Forty-Ninth Parliament. I was very impressed with the way in which His Excellency presented the speech and also with the content of the speech. I have a lot of time for Sir Eric Neal as Governor, and I was delighted that he had the opportunity to visit Yorke Peninsula on Friday 18 September—not that long ago. He was invited to officially launch the fundraising for Heartbeat Incorporated at Wallaroo on that day. As a result of requests from the area, His Excellency agreed to a full-day visit and extended his observations to Kadina, Moonta and Wallaroo. It was a real pleasure to be with Sir Eric for most of that day and to appreciate that he shows a very real interest in so much of South Australia, and certainly in the part that I represent, namely, northern Yorke Peninsula. I sincerely thank His Excellency.

A few very interesting points were brought out in His Excellency's speech, one of which is that there is a crisis in Asia and that some degree of economic turmoil is besetting most of our trading partners. It is a positive reflection on South Australia and Australia that we are handling the Asian economic crisis better than any other country in the region, and that is a credit to the Government at the Federal and State levels for building our economy up to such a condition that we can weather major crises such as those which Asia is experiencing.

I hate to think what the situation would have been if the Labor Party had been in government at the Federal level. Thank goodness it has not been, and thank goodness it was not elected at the recent election because we would have gone from a situation of great economic stability to a classic case of overspending with the resultant effects of high interest rates and increased taxation. We are in a period of relative economic stability and it was wonderful that the Federal Government was recently returned to office.

In his speech, His Excellency identified a few key issues. He said:

... all 69 parliamentarians have the future quality of life and the self-esteem of South Australia very much in their hands.

How right His Excellency is. He said:

It is an onerous responsibility, one which calls for a just and bipartisan approach, an approach of goodwill—and of willing negotiation and compromise—to get to where this State needs to be.

I simply say, 'Hear, hear!' The responsibility is there and the need for a bipartisan approach is so important. I hark back to just over a year ago during the State election campaign, when the Leader of the Opposition, who is still Leader of the Opposition, made very clear that he was happy to extend the bipartisan hand to the Government and that he was happy to work hand-in-glove with the Government and not to seek to obstruct the course of action to be undertaken by it.

Unfortunately, we have not seen too much of that bipartisanship. In fact, it has amazed me how it has been a knock, knock Opposition for the last 12 months. One would think that they had never seen anything about bipartisanship. The way in which they did a complete 180° turn in a matter of weeks from the commitment they gave earlier was quite incredible.

Unfortunately, many of the new members have not been able to exercise their influence on their Leader. Maybe it is simply because they do not have the numbers or perhaps, out of respect for their Leader, they are prepared to go along, but I can see from the look on their faces that they would much

rather see a spirit of cooperation between the Opposition and the Government. I know some members who are seeking to interject now would agree with me 100 per cent, and I thank them for that. It is a pity that they cannot make their views known within their Party, but hopefully within the next 12 months the time will come when they can make sure that the Leader of the Opposition and his shadow team will start to show real cooperation and bipartisanship. We are looking forward to that day: may it come sooner than later.

His Excellency then went on to deal with many other aspects. He emphasised again that we are still in very serious debt, having to pay some \$2 million a day in interest rates alone, and that continues to be a great worry. Obviously the solution is very clear: we must seek to sell ETSA and Optima so that we can reduce our debt to such a level that our daily interest payments become relatively insignificant. I am sure that this Parliament will consider that further and, hopefully, a suitable arrangement will be made. His Excellency went on to identify many of the matters that this Government will consider in the coming session. I do believe that this Government has a very fine, strong record. It has made a great number of achievements over the past five years and particularly in the past 12 months. I have mentioned the aspect of seeking to sell ETSA and Optima. Members would be aware of the restructuring that has occurred in that respect, and let us hope that that may proceed.

Many key achievements have been made. The employment initiatives package involves the expenditure of \$100 million, which will result in 4 500 jobs over the next two years, including the expansion of the State Government traineeship program with 2 400 additional traineeships; the expansion of the small business employer incentives scheme, which will fund an additional 1 500 trainees; the expansion of the graduate recruitment program to recruit an additional 600 graduates to the public sector; and the expansion of the Community at Work scheme to fund eight to 12 projects in regional South Australia.

These are all very fine, worthwhile undertakings, and it is a pity that the Opposition does not give credit where credit is due. Again, if you think back to when the current Leader of the Opposition was the Minister in charge of what they called 'employment' (we called it 'unemployment'), you will recall that in excess of 30 000 jobs were lost while he was Minister. That was an absolute tragedy for this State: over 30 000 jobs were lost whilst Mike Rann was the Minister in charge of employment—or, again, should I say, 'unemployment'? Thankfully, that situation has been turned around and this Government has made more progress in this area than has ever occurred before.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Didn't you listen to all the figures I just read out? I will not transgress Standing Orders by repeating them, because members should listen in the first instance and hopefully they would learn something as a result. I will continue. In the 1998-99 financial year we have a broadly balanced budget, despite pressures on public sector wage costs, the increasingly urgent imperative to take further steps to tackle continuing high and unacceptable levels of unemployment, continuing reductions in the level of Commonwealth funding to States and the High Court's decision to rule out business franchise fees.

The difficulty in getting a balanced budget does not have to be highlighted, particularly at a time when we have had significant wage pushes by a variety of sectors. I suggest to all members that this Government has shown a very respon-

sible attitude towards its wage negotiations, and we are close to settling most of the enterprise bargaining matters before us. Of course, in its day the Opposition never worried about the financial implications. It could not care less if the budget simply blew out. It would say, 'What's the answer? Increase taxes.' That is the only thing the Opposition was interested in when it was in government.

The farmed seafood initiative is putting \$5.2 million over four years into developing the aquaculture industry. We heard the Premier say today that there has been a 60 per cent increase in exports from the aquaculture industry in South Australia. The way the aquaculture industry is taking off is absolutely magnificent. Most members here would not recall the time when I had the pleasure of being the shadow Minister for Agriculture. During that period I took the opportunity to investigate agriculture and fishing in the United States. I looked at the aquaculture industry to a large extent, and I remember looking at catfish farming areas there. I came back to this Parliament and said, 'We need to follow the lead that America is taking in such areas as catfish and marron farming', and so on. The then Minister for Fisheries, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, absolutely ridiculed me. He said that I must have fallen out of the tree in advocating these aquaculture projects. He belittled me in this Parliament, saying, 'These aquaculture projects—what a joke! Catfish farming, and the like—what an absolute joke!' His adviser now sits in this Parliament! He probably gives the Leader advice.

All I can suggest to the Leader of the Opposition is, 'Be wary of advice that you might get from the member for Hart', because he gave advice to the then Minister for Fisheries, who belittled the ideas and the concepts that I brought back from America which have now shown themselves to be one of the key economic development areas in this State. Many of my constituents in the electorate of Goyder are beginning to benefit from aquaculture, and there will be continued expansion in this area. When I look back, I have to smile at some of the ill founded and uneducated suggestions that floated around after I had publicly said, 'We must go more into the aquaculture area and promote it in South Australia.' It is coming to fruition in a very big way.

I will also highlight a few other aspects of the way South Australia is progressing. On the most recent figures, South Australia has had the highest growth among the States in new car sales over the past year, with sales running at the highest level since the early 1980s; the second highest growth rate in retail sales for the year and now some 21 consecutive months of increasing retail turnover trends; and the second highest growth in the level of building approvals, up 24 per cent on the previous year. That figure of 24 per cent has now increased, according to figures released in the past few hours. They are positive figures, and it shows that this Government has this State on a positive footing.

I am pleased that the results are starting to show. Also business investment levels are at historical highs, showing the second highest growth rate among the States in 1997-98, and certainly this is led by some key projects such as the Roxby Downs expansion, Holden's investment in the new Vectra production line, and other infrastructure projects such as the Adelaide Airport upgrade, which is already starting to help generate exports and create more jobs. Recently I had the privilege of looking through the GMH production line and I was most impressed.

Mr Clarke: Have you discovered cars?

Mr MEIER: No, I went through General Motors when I was about 16 years old. That was the last time, but I can tell

you that production has changed significantly over that time. I will not delve in detail into the fact that I have owned more Holdens than any other car, but I was delighted to see the way that cars are put together. It is great that General Motors has had the confidence in South Australia to bring the Vectra line into production. True, there are a few aspects that this State Parliament has to address, because we are competing with other States and countries. I will not identify those issues now because more information is being sought but, if we do not address the areas about which GMH has concerns, we cannot take it for granted that it will continue to expand and build in South Australia.

South Australia's exports are up. Despite the Asian situation to which I alluded yesterday, they are 2.2 per cent higher in the recent three months than in the corresponding period a year ago. That is a real credit to South Australia, to see that our export levels are up despite the Asian crisis. What other countries or States can say that? This is a real credit to South Australia. Where would we be if Labor was still in power and we still had the massive debt? Our exports would have dipped enormously and unemployment would have gone off the chart. We have actually had a population growth of some .5 of 1 per cent in the past 12 months.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Although that may not be a lot, members will recall that during the previous Labor Administration our population declined most of the time in the last few years. We, too, suffered from it when we came into Government, because we were trying to stop the escalating debt, and now we have put a brake on population decline. The population loss from South Australia has been halted. It takes a long time to slow these things up and then reverse them but we are well on the way in that respect. Job advertisements were up 15 per cent in the 12 months to September and, again, they are running at the highest level since July 1990.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Members would know, particularly the member for Ross Smith who has a little knowledge in this area, that if job advertisements have increased, then the jobs are out there and that is a very positive sign. I know that the member for Ross Smith would like to extend the hand of bipartisanship. He recognises what we have done for this State, but of course he is constrained by the rest of his Party and by his Leader and I sympathise with the member for Ross Smith in that respect. His situation is fully acknowledged. The employment estimates are bouncing back strongly: 8 100 jobs were created in the State in September and 7 600 in August—led by full-time jobs. Again, our unemployment rate is under 10 per cent. It is far too high.

Mr Clarke: It's the highest in mainland Australia.

Mr MEIER: I cannot disagree with that. We have a lot of improvement still to make, but thankfully the trend is in the right direction. As I said earlier, if Labor were in power unemployment would have really gone through the roof. Certainly, I highlight a few other achievements, especially as the Minister for Human Services is in the House. We have increased spending in the recent budget, as members would be aware, in key portfolio areas delivering better services to the South Australian public, despite the budgetary pressures created by the Labor Government.

Health has had an increase of \$51 million, up 9 per cent in real terms on Labor's last budget. So I do not want to hear criticisms from members opposite when they say that more money is needed in health. In fact, the way that he has managed to get that extra spending in health is a credit to the

Minister for Human Services, as is what he has done for health in this State, and not only in South Australia as a whole but in my electorate in particular. I take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Human Services for his personal keen interest in health areas in my electorate and for his personal visits to my electorate. It is very much appreciated.

Further, in education, spending is up \$50 million, which is also a 9 per cent increase in real terms on Labor's last budget. In public order and safety, spending is up \$3 million, a 5 per cent increase in real terms on Labor's last budget. Capital works spending is up 8 per cent on the 1997-98 figures. So, many positives are showing forth and have shown forth under our Government and they will continue to show forth because of strong economic management. I think that His Excellency's speech clearly shows the direction in which we are heading and I hope that there will be a greater offer of bipartisanship in the coming session.

Earlier today I highlighted an area of great concern to me, and I referred to the fact that some housing deeds are being destroyed, deeds that go back 100 years or more. The deeds that people hand in for a loan or simply to purchase a house are taken by the bank, and those deeds are being destroyed. I indicated in the grievance debate earlier that this was recently very upsetting for a constituent of mine, Mrs Sharon Hannigan, who brought this matter to my attention. Whilst the offer was there for a duplicate of her original housing deed, which goes back many, many years, the duplicate is a very poor imitation of the original.

It needs to be highlighted that many of the details contained in these original deeds help to trace an aspect of history. It would perhaps not be appropriate for me to read out the names of the various owners of this particular property that Sharon Hannigan and her husband now own, but I will refer to some of the occupations that are referred to. In fact, in Mrs Hannigan's situation this was the second deed that had been provided and only went back to 1946 even though her house goes back the better part of 100 years. Since 1946 the occupiers have included: a quantity surveyor, together with his wife; a machine operator; a Telecom employee, together with his wife; a fuel station proprietor; more recently, an electrician and a pantryhand; and an earlier one simply said that the lady was a spinster. This sort of information should not be destroyed without every attempt being made to preserve these documents. I suggested earlier

that I believe that these documents could automatically be offered to the National Trust, if they are to go on to a computer type record, so that the National Trust has the opportunity to at least keep these records.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I am a little surprised that the member for Ross Smith seems to trivialise this—because my constituent was absolutely furious. She was livid at what had happened to her title deed. It was quite old, yet it was simply destroyed. It was a beautiful work of art, and she had hoped to have it framed. I do not see this as trivial—in fact, I see it as very serious. I am trying to get across to this Parliament and to all members the fact that we need to address the issue of people having the opportunity to have those deeds preserved.

The number one priority should be that they have it returned to them. But in this case the bank (and, as I mentioned earlier, it was the Commonwealth Bank) failed to notify my constituent that if it took the deed it would be sent to Adelaide and would be destroyed once it had been put on computer. And that is exactly what happened. They should have alerted her: that is the first thing. But I believe that if that fails there should be an automatic condition for deeds—perhaps deeds over a certain age, rather than very modern ones—to be offered to the National Trust and, if the owner makes no claim to the deed, the National Trust can decide whether or not it wants to keep the document for historical significance.

So much of our history has disappeared, and this is a very simple, yet very important, part of our history—a title deed to a property where, in so many cases, many people have lived over the years. And it is great to trace back just who has been in the house that you or someone else has been living in. So, I highlight that also, and I trust that we will be able to take further action to ensure that this accidental destruction of deeds does not occur again.

As I said at the beginning, I thank His Excellency for the presentation of his speech to the opening of this Parliament and I, too, look forward to a very rewarding forty-ninth parliamentary session.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 4 November at 2 p.m.