

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 February 1999

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Adelaide Festival Corporation,
Education (Government School Closures and Amalgamations) Amendment,
Guardianship and Administration (Extension of Sunset Clause and Validation of Orders) Amendment,
Passenger Transport (Service Contracts) Amendment,
Petroleum (Production Licences) Amendment,
Road Traffic (Road Events) Amendment,
Shop Trading Hours (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Summary Offences (Offensive and Other Weapons) Amendment,
TransAdelaide (Corporate Structure).

DUNSTAN, HON. D.A., DEATH

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. D.A. Dunstan QC, former Premier and member of the House, and places on record its appreciation for his long and meritorious service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I rise in this Chamber today to move this condolence motion for Don Dunstan AC, and I am sure that many Government members and Opposition members alike will take the opportunity to pay tribute to him and formally place their thoughts and recollections on the parliamentary record.

Don Dunstan was born to South Australian parents in the tropical South Pacific island of Fiji. Initially commencing his education in Suva, upon returning to South Australia Don Dunstan continued his education at St Peter's College, before commencing studies in law at the University of Adelaide. His life was marked with numerous milestones, many personal and many public, but it is mainly the public milestones that I will concentrate on today. Arguably, his first milestone was his graduation from law in 1948. Upon his graduation in 1948, he entered into legal practice, initially in his birthplace, Fiji, before returning to Adelaide to practise law.

Perhaps his first introduction to public life came with his successful bid to win the State seat of Norwood in 1953. He was elected as the Labor member for Norwood at a time when the Labor Party was in Opposition and Tom Playford was the first Minister of this State. When Labor Leader Frank Walsh led his Party to victory in the election of 1965, the well-respected but youthful Dunstan was appointed Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Social Justice. Incidentally, 1965 was the same year that he was appointed a QC.

Perhaps his ministerial appointments were an indication of the man himself, and by that I mean that his appointment as Attorney-General was appropriate because he had a love of the law. His appointment as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Social Justice was also telling as he carried with him a concern for the indigenous people of Australia until the

day he died. He was also a significantly strong advocate for social justice and therefore I believe that Don Dunstan's first ministerial posts were, in fact, indicative of the man.

He was always going to be destined for significant achievements. With a devotion for public life, Don Dunstan assumed the premiership in June 1967 upon the retirement of Frank Walsh. At this time Don Dunstan assumed the premiership, in addition to his other ministerial portfolios of Minister for Housing, Attorney-General and Treasurer. However, in 1968 another well-respected South Australian, Steele Hall, led the Liberal Country League to victory at that State election and, from the period 1968 to 1970, Don Dunstan was the Leader of the Opposition.

In 1970, under the reconstituted electoral boundaries in South Australia (put in place by the Hall Government), and on a wave of public popularity, Dunstan led the Labor Party to victory at the subsequent State election. The Labor Party occupied the Treasury benches and Don Dunstan was, of course, Premier and Treasurer at that time. It is at this point that I would like to talk about the premiership of Don Dunstan, commonly referred to as the Dunstan decade and the legislative achievements of his Administration.

Don was certainly not afraid of change, and legislative and social reforms were no exception. He initiated many reforms in the South Australian Parliament, not the least of which were in areas such as land rights for Aboriginals, consumer protection laws and anti-discrimination legislation and anti-racial discrimination legislation. With respect to land rights, he drafted the first of a series of reforms which were implemented by the subsequent Tonkin Liberal Government.

In addition to these areas, Don had a longstanding and profound interest in the arts and hence, during his premiership, directed many resources to the area. I have said previously, and I think it is worth repeating, that I do not think there has been a Premier before or since who has had such a close association and love of the arts. Don Dunstan regarded his Administration as a social democratic Government and, in turn, held the view that an expanded Public Service was a way forward. Many statutory authorities were established, such as the State Government Insurance Commission, the Film Corporation, the Development Corporation, the Craft Authority and involvement in the Festival Centre Trust, to name but some.

The initial site selection and planning of the Adelaide Festival Theatre undertaken by Steele Hall were picked up by Don Dunstan as Premier and his close association with the subsequent construction of the Adelaide Festival Theatre, Plaza and its environs live on today to serve this State and South Australians exceptionally well.

Each of these authorities has contributed in some way to the South Australia that we live in today, to the lifestyle of this State that is the envy of other States and the envy of many countries throughout the world. We take it for granted within South Australia but it is the reforms that have been put in place, the infrastructure that has been established, that today we are the beneficiaries of. Private sector regulation was increased substantially under the Dunstan Administration in the area of consumer affairs—overviewing, for example, transactions involving the sale of second-hand cars, door-to-door sales, pyramid selling, manufacturers' warranties, consumer credit and other similar steps, which were implemented by him.

Whilst advocating an expanded public sector, Dunstan approached social issues with a somewhat libertarian approach in areas such as reducing Government interference

in censorship, liquor licensing, gambling and the establishment of Maslin Beach. Many of these issues were at the time highly contentious but have since been readily accepted in the broader community, and they barely raise an eyebrow these days.

In 1979 Don fell victim to ill health and collapsed in this very Chamber. Within a week he announced his resignation as Premier and member for Norwood. A political career spanning some 26 years had come to an end. Don had been the member for Norwood throughout his entire political career and he left his mark on the Labor Party and this Parliament. He led the Labor Party to an unprecedented four election victories.

Upon retiring from politics, he still managed to have a direct impact on public life, championing many causes. From 1982 to 1987 he was the Chairman of the Victorian Tourism Commission and the national President of the Freedom from Hunger campaign. From 1992 to 1993 he was Chairman of the Community Aid Abroad organisation. From 1987 to 1993 he was Chairman of the Mandela Foundation. From 1990 to 1994 he was Chairman of the Jam Factory Craft and Design Centre. Even in retirement he led an exceptionally busy life, a life generally devoted to the wellbeing of others.

On behalf of the Government, I would like to formally place on the record our appreciation and thanks for his contribution to this Parliament and the South Australian community. If I can think of but one feature of the lifestyle of South Australia that is visible, that is a result of Dunstan's early endeavours, it is the alfresco cafe style that we see in South Australia these days. I can remember when he proposed outdoor cafes, with tables and chairs on the footpath, at which suggestion many people were aghast. If we look at Rundle Street East or the Bay, or at other locations throughout this city and State, we see that alfresco lifestyle, using to the advantage our Mediterranean climate, that we appreciate very much today. He was the person who suggested that we should incorporate that lifestyle thrust and approach within South Australia. We do so today and we do so enjoying it, every day. To me, that is an idea that he initiated which has flowed through subsequent decades to be a great part of the South Australian way of life.

On behalf of the Government, I express my sincere condolences to his children, family and close friends. In summation, Dunstan was well and truly a significant South Australian. He has left his mark on this Parliament and the South Australian community. We are better for his contribution.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I certainly second the motion moved by the Premier. In the early hours of Saturday morning, our State and our nation lost arguably its greatest reformer but not, of course, the reforms of a Leader who graced the premiership and this Parliament and, indeed, all our lives. It was an immense privilege to work for Don Dunstan during the last two years of his premiership. It was a difficult period, with the sacking of the Police Commissioner and the Salisbury Royal Commission, Don's controversial crusades for industrial democracy and Aboriginal lands rights, rows over uranium mining, debates about women's rights and, on the personal front, the tragic and untimely death of his wife Adele Koh, followed by his own illness and resignation from politics at Calvary Hospital, with those poignant images of dressing gown and cane.

That intense, sometimes frenetic, time on his staff was an experience that taught me many things. More than anything, Don Dunstan taught me that people in their public and private

lives must always challenge their own assumptions in the search for new ideas. But in seeking new solutions, Don was always underpinned by enduring Labor values of equal opportunity, fairness and democracy. Don showed us by example that the Labor Party must never flee its responsibilities to those who have been left out or left behind. He taught us that we must never turn away from injustice, prejudice or pain, or pretend that we do not see. He taught us that we must advance not by climbing over each other but by trying to bring along everyone who wants to come.

Throughout his career Don Dunstan showed us that he was prepared to put his neck on the line whenever he believed the principle of an issue was important enough. Instead of taking the easy path, for years Don had to battle for the most fundamental reforms that we now all take for granted. When we think of Don, the word 'courage' most sums up his life and his commitment, even to the very end.

He fought during the 1950s and 1960s to change the White Australia Policy that brought shame to our Party and nation. More than 30 years ago, as a young crusading Attorney-General, he battled wowsers and prejudice, he pioneered moves to acknowledge the rightful place of Aboriginal people in Australian law and culture, and in a completely different era he was often a lone male voice in the crusade for equal opportunity for women. Let us not forget that it was Don Dunstan who laid down the founding principles of multiculturalism, to disdain stereotypes, to outlaw discrimination and to make South Australia safe for diversity in culture, opinion, belief and lifestyle as well as cuisine.

Time and again I still meet people who say that they came to South Australia and even to Australia because of what Don Dunstan was doing in so many different ways in this small democracy of ours in South Australia. I was one of them. As Premier, Don Dunstan led South Australia out of a dull conservatism to make us a pacesetter in this nation and in some areas a leader in the world. He gave South Australia a national voice and standing far outweighing our size. That is an important legacy for us to reclaim, to have the confidence in ourselves and pride in the talents of our people to shake off any cringe and make our State lead and win again.

Don was the maestro of the possible. In health, education, planning and community welfare, Don Dunstan moved South Australia from rock bottom to Australian preeminence. In consumer protection, the Dunstan Government showed that ordinary people had redress for the 'rip-off'. He fought for equal justice under law and equal access to the law as well as for the end of capital punishment and for a range of civil liberties, and criminal and licensing law reforms.

In housing, Don Dunstan's administration proved that public sector homes need not be miserable and unimaginative, and our Housing Trust was held up internationally for its social engineering and innovative mix. In industrial relations the Dunstan State came closest to demonstrating that consensus and cooperation offered much greater all round rewards than conflict or division. In our education system Don's message was that the purpose of education was not only to discipline and instruct but, above all, to provide opportunities and liberate the mind, to free it from narrowness and from the groundless fears of prejudice and ignorance. Through a decent public education he wanted kids from working class suburbs and remote Aboriginal communities to get the chance to get ahead. In the arts Don Dunstan showed that not only could a small State become an international centre for culture but could take the best in arts to ordinary people—not just to the privileged. In developing an

Australian film industry it was Dunstan who led the way with films that were not just critically acclaimed but popular as well.

Of course, Don's commitment to democratic reforms can never be diminished or ignored. Let us never forget that it was years of campaigning by Don Dunstan that saw South Australia's Parliamentary system changed from the most blatantly gerrymandered in the nation to a system which was a model of democracy for all Australia. From the sham where one-third of South Australian voters elected two-thirds of the members of the Lower House, Don helped bring us one vote one value and fired the torch for real democracy nationally. In the Legislative Council Labor had four out of 20 members (even though it had 54 per cent of the popular vote) in a system where MLCs were elected on a property franchise, rigged boundaries and a disgraceful enrolment system. As we again debate the Government's move to sell South Australia's electricity assets, let us reflect that it was Don Dunstan's reforms that gave us an Upper House elected by all voters over 18 in one electorate—the entire State.

But winning these and a thousand other battles were never easy. Reform is always harder to sell than conservatism. It was my experience on his staff that Don always argued that the test of an idea was not whether it was popular or unpopular but whether it was right or wrong. In moving forward in often controversial areas, Don Dunstan knew that he could not leave his electorate too far behind. So, as a radical who valued results he took on the tougher, much more difficult task of explaining the need for change.

All of us who are committed to fundamental Labor principles know that it is easy to write policy. But Don knew that it was no use just being an architect of reform without being a salesman for reform as well. Don Dunstan was not content, as so many are, just to announce new policies, to grandstand, or, worse, to lament obstacles to reform. Don knew that vision by itself was not enough. He knew that compassion by itself was not enough. He knew that vision and compassion must be linked to action. So, Don took the difficult road of reform, first by winning respect and earning public acceptance of new ideas, then by implementing those reforms and going on to win election and re-election so that Labor could go on and achieve even more. One of Don's greatest lessons to all of us in this State and beyond was to demonstrate within the Australian Labor Party that winning elections and reformist zeal are not incompatible. He led a reforming Party but also made it a modern, professional force nationally.

Don's commitment and energies were not dissipated by the rigours of office. In 1976 in the Chifley Memorial Lecture Don said that the Labor Party had been the single constant source for reform in Australian politics this century. In that speech, in which he tackled the then recent Whitlam dismissal and the myths employed by our opponents against Labor, Don took an optimistic note. He said:

Yes, it is possible to bring about social and economic justice. Yes, it is possible to provide the people of Australia with security of employment, better community facilities and equality of opportunity. Yes, it is possible to give people the means to participate in the decision making processes which affect their lives. We have achieved much and we will go on to achieve much more. When we look back, let's not dwell on our disappointments; let's look to our successes and then plan the successes which are yet to come.

In his last year as Premier Don Dunstan pushed South Australia forward in recognising the future challenges needed before women could take an equal place in our society. Just

before he resigned, in a passionate lecture at Newcastle University he said that achievement of genuine equality of opportunity by women was probably the major challenge for social democracies during the coming decade. Again, I quote:

To treat women as lesser beings, in law, education or employment, is to diminish us as a society. Quite simply, we are wasting a huge proportion of Australia's most valuable resource, its people. If we are to develop our talents fully we must educate and employ women to the best of their ability. That is the challenge. The reality is, however, that Australian women are still discriminated against in most aspects of their lives. That discrimination may not be enshrined in law but is certainly entrenched in attitudes.

Don was delighted that in 1997 South Australian Labor elected a record number of women to Parliament—almost 45 per cent of our Lower House MPs.

Again, in that last year as Premier, he pioneered Australian efforts to democratise the workplace, because he believed that workers and not just shareholders have a major investment in industry and have a right to participate in decisions that affect their lives. In 1978, Don introduced historic legislation to recognise the inalienable rights of Pitjantjatjara tribal Aborigines to their land—15 years before Mabo. But let none of us forget that in 1965 Don introduced and passed Australia's first land rights legislation with the Aboriginal Lands Trust—decades ahead of other States.

So, when we look back on Don's career in politics we cannot be satisfied with just the warmest memories of former glories. Don's most enduring legacy should be his confident, insistent, challenging, invigorating summons for us to move forward. As Premier, Don was also rare in encouraging dissent. For him it was not enough simply to allow dissent. He was bigger than that. He demanded it. Don had his share of detractors. To many he was the most potent threat to the cold citadels of privilege and prejudice. Long after his retirement those who vilified Don continued to whip themselves into a frenzy whenever his name, legislation or legacy was raised. Their enduring enmity was a constant source of comfort to him. We can be confident that history will show how puny were the contributions of his opponents compared with the achievements of this great man.

How many remember that Don Dunstan co-founded Meals on Wheels, with his friend Doris Taylor, in his beloved Norwood back in the 1950s? How many people now remember that Don was the last non-Aboriginal national President of the Aboriginal Advancement League? How many remember that in 1957 Don Dunstan was in Cyprus negotiating for independence and for the release of Archbishop Makarios? Different causes; same commitment. Don was intensely political right up to the end. It would be absurd to pretend otherwise. In my last conversation with him he encouraged us to stick to our guns in fighting electricity privatisation.

But now we look at ways of honouring Don Dunstan. A university-based Dunstan Foundation deserves our strongest support, but we should do more. We should look at establishing the Dunstan Prize for leadership and innovation: in the arts, in social policy, in community affairs, design or technology. These awards—the 'Dons', I am sure they would be called—could be a signpost to courage and a recognition of those who enrich our lives by daring to be different. At Don's Festival Centre we could name the Dunstan Playhouse in his honour, and establish an international film festival and film week in alternate years to the Festival he loved. But even that, of course, is not enough.

My last words to Don Dunstan were a promise that, through the boldest reforms, in a new century, we would dedicate the first hundred days of our next Government—a reformist Labor Government—not to Don Dunstan's memory but to his enduring legacy.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): On Friday we will be celebrating the life of Don Dunstan and, like most South Australians, I found myself reflecting on that life many times since I learned of his death last Saturday morning. It is a privilege to live during and, in some cases, to share briefly the lifetime of a significant figure of history. While Premiers, like any political leaders, naturally become part of the history of their State and nation, only the exceptional go on to become required texts for students, to have their works critically analysed by historians and to be quoted long after their death. In my view, South Australia has had three: Sir Charles Cameron Kingston, Sir Thomas Playford and Don Dunstan. I have often acknowledged the enormous influence of Tom Playford upon my own political thinking. Don Dunstan I know was a great admirer of Sir Charles Cameron Kingston, and no doubt young Labor politicians of the future will pay tribute to Don Dunstan. The influences of all three will endure because of the vigorous and strong willed courage with which they pursued their visions for South Australia and the way they captured and nourished the spirit of the State, albeit in distinctly different ways.

Don Dunstan and I were not politically or personally close: I disagreed with him on many industrial issues. We had many spirited clashes on the topic of industrial democracy. However, I agreed entirely with his direction and vision in relation to the arts, his passionate defence of our heritage and his powerful advocacy on issues of social justice and racial equality. Don Dunstan opened our eyes to the value of our own architecture and artists; he opened our ears to the voices of writers and performers; and he opened our minds to cultural and social diversity. Like many achievers, including Sir Charles Cameron Kingston, Don Dunstan's life was marked with controversy, both political and personal—not that he was ever challenged to a duel in Victoria Square, as Kingston was. However, Don Dunstan did not flinch in the face of controversy nor step back from his beliefs and, while not always agreeing with him, I admired him very much for that quality.

Early in his career, TV political journalism was still in its infancy, but Don was an exceptional performer when it came to the value of the sound bite. His media management skills and sense of political occasion have been valuable lessons for those who followed him. I believe that Graham Gunn, David Wotton and I are the only remaining members of the Lower House to have sat in this Chamber with Don Dunstan. They will agree with me that you did not put a question to Don Dunstan without well and truly knowing your facts. However, all the preparation in the world could not guarantee that you would escape a vintage Dunstan oration.

I can recall how many a carefully prepared question was listened to with feigned indifference, perhaps while reading the *News*, before he rose slowly and nonchalantly to his feet to answer. He spoke quietly at first, seemingly bored, before building slowly from carefully measured comment to booming, blistering attack. Then he would resume his seat and assume the same expression of disdain, designed to wither the confidence of the Opposition. It was part of the

theatre of Parliament in which at times he appeared to be the writer, the producer, the director and the actor.

People have described Don Dunstan variously as a man before his time or of his time. Both, I believe, miss the important point. In my view, Don Dunstan was a man who understood the aspirations of the time. The 1960s and the 1970s were a time of change and liberation, and he responded to them. When Don Dunstan entered politics, South Australia was emerging from the constraints of post-war recovery of the 1950s and 1960s. There was a new optimism, a new social freedom and a generation known as the baby boomers. He gave inspiration and hope to the Labor Party and changed its policies throughout Australia.

To Mr Dunstan's family I send my sincere condolences. Together, we celebrate the life of a person passionate about South Australia.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Don Dunstan was a wonderful role model for those growing up in the Labor Party. He showed us what passion, commitment and idealism could achieve and that, I am sure, affected all of us who came under his influence and spell during the 1960s and 1970s. Both sides of my family were staunch Labor Party people, who would never have considered voting anything other than Labor. Sometimes Don Dunstan went a bit faster in social reform than they would have liked, and I can remember my grandmother, in particular, being very disturbed about some of the changes that were happening around her—and even my mother was a bit dubious about the possible effects of the extension of 6 o'clock closing. However, like so many of Don Dunstan's other reforms, it turned out well and was seen as a good reform, even within my family. Obviously, these marked changes caused much discussion and controversy within my family, and there were many discussions around the dinner table with the wider family.

Don Dunstan was appointed Attorney-General in 1965, when I was 10 years old and just beginning to take an interest in politics and society. I believe it was those discussions (and there was so much to discuss) that caused my interest in politics. I saw it as an exciting and interesting life, something which made a difference and which was worth while being a part of. That was an exciting and interesting time.

Don Dunstan's family surely must now look back and be very proud of his achievements. Very few people can claim to have made a significant stamp on history with respect to the social development of their time, and Don Dunstan certainly is one of them. We in the Labor Party can look back and be proud that it was one of ours who did that and be proud that we were the people supporting him in his quest for change and for improved opportunity for all South Australians. I was one of those young people who benefited from much of the change and innovation that he introduced.

For Don Dunstan's family and friends it is obviously much more personal: they face the personal loss. I am sure that they are warmed by the memories but they have to live with the fact that they will not see him again. My sincere condolences go to his partner, Steven Cheng, and to his family, and all his friends and those in the Labor Party will miss him greatly.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): As a young adult I vividly recall my first encounter with Don Dunstan. I was late for a lecture at Adelaide University and, in turning the corner of a building, I almost

ran into him. That incident has never faded from my mind because, in seeing him for the first time in person, I realised that we were of similar stature. That was a real shock because, from his persona and his stature on the political stage, I had imagined him to be physically the size of Malcolm Fraser or Gough Whitlam. For me and for many South Australians he remained throughout his life, and in his death, larger than life. No matter how many were on the stage, he seemed to naturally attract the spotlight, and it is no wonder that the eulogies of the past days have included credit for matters that he himself never claimed.

On Saturday night, I read the words of the cover of Don's recording of *Desiderata*, which are as follows:

Don Dunstan has the dubious honour of being the very first professional leading man I worked with on radio. He played the lead and I had two small lines as a waiter. It is difficult to associate the young scholar-actor in that play with the quite remarkable public figure he has become. Don Dunstan would have enjoyed great success as an actor if he had chosen to do so. He didn't, fortunately for the theatre in South Australia, because the work he has done for it in his political capacity has been wonderful.

Those words were penned by Keith Michell. Like many on my side of the political spectrum, I would not laud equally all his accomplishments. However, in him I saw two attributes that I would hope every South Australian would acknowledge. He was in every sense the Renaissance man—intelligent, articulate, gardener, actor, chef, raconteur, man of letters. However, above all, he was a compassionate man, a man who never deviated from championing the cause of those whom he saw as victims of mainstream society. For that he was not universally loved. Indeed, he was at times despised, and not only by those who stood clearly as his political opponents. He knew the prejudice and the snide personal slights that some consider par for the course in public life. But he had the courage to stare such people in the eye and, in doing so, he always managed to rise above them. I, too, extend to his partner, and to those who loved him, my condolences. None of us, however, would ever deny that he always, as Kipling enjoined us, 'filled the unforgiving minute with 60 seconds worth of distance run'.

It would be pompous to claim that he leaves footsteps on the sands of time but, with his travelling partner, Sir Thomas Playford, he leaves an indelible mark on the sands and lands which fringe Gulf St Vincent. His final curtain call was characteristic of his life. Shakespeare wrote: 'We have a prescription to die when death is our physician.' He had such a prescription, and he took it with dignity and style. The State has changed through his contribution. History will judge him as surely as he has judged us. But I acknowledge the passing of a South Australian whose like we might not soon see again.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I wish to contribute to this condolence motion for the late Hon. Donald Allan Dunstan AC, QC. Don won the seat of Norwood from the Liberal Party at the general election held on 7 March 1953 and took his place as an Opposition backbencher in this place in the Thirty-Fourth Parliament. He went on to hold various shadow portfolios until Labor won office in 1965 in the Thirty-Eighth Parliament, when he was appointed Attorney-General, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister for Social Welfare. In the Third Session of that Thirty-Eighth Parliament in June 1967, upon the resignation of Frank Walsh, Don became Premier, Treasurer, Attorney-General and Minister for Housing. After a couple of years of a Liberal Government, the Labor Government again was elected to

office in 1970, at which time Don again become Premier and also assumed the important portfolios of Treasurer and Minister for Development and Mines. He remained Premier and Treasurer for the duration of the Forty-First and Forty-Second Parliaments, and then in the Forty-Third Parliament in 1977 he continued as Premier and Treasurer and took on the important and growing portfolio of immigration and ethnic affairs. Don held these portfolios until his sad resignation from Parliament on 15 February 1979 due to ill-health.

Don delivered his maiden speech during the Address in Reply debate in this place on 28 July 1953, I would like to mention a few of the points that Don made in that maiden speech. He spoke about prices and profits; he spoke about parliamentary democracy and the gerrymander that was operating in this State at that time; he spoke about the Housing Trust and the provision of homes for pensioners; and he spoke at some length about mental health. Although it was not a long speech, as a new member, and for someone as young as he was, he displayed a remarkable knowledge and understanding of these important issues.

Don served this Parliament and the people of South Australia in a remarkable way for almost 26 years, including 9½ years as Premier. He possessed a great love of people and a passion for fairness and social justice. During his premiership he engineered many great reforms in South Australia, both legislatively and through policy. He was like a breath of fresh air and brought South Australia into the twentieth century. South Australia was reformed from what was seen as a very conservative backward State to a State that attracted attention not only nation wide but even overseas. Don was seen as a leader and pacesetter in a range of areas, but particularly in creating a true democracy in consumer protection, multiculturalism, Aboriginal rights and the arts, and in fairness and equity for all people. Don's vision, courage and enormous energy were an inspirational force which earned him and his Government enormous respect not only from the majority of South Australians but also from people interstate and even overseas.

The last time I saw and spoke with Don was the day before Christmas Eve last year when I visited his home. Although his body was frail, his mind was very sharp and his attitude was absolutely wonderful for someone in his position. He had received many letters of support as well as cards and small gifts from people who were concerned about him and who loved him. Don was very caring. He was very touched by these messages and gifts, which proved what a caring and private person he was. I doubt whether I will see another political leader of his stature in my lifetime. I believe that, when he left this Parliament, Don Dunstan left the fabric of our State in far better shape than it was in when he entered it. I extend my heartfelt thanks for Don's life and my sincere condolences to Bronwen, Andrew, Paul and Steven.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I support the motion of condolence for Don Dunstan, who was the first politician I knew and someone who, on a number of occasions, crossed various paths in my life. He was a man who, I believe, was one of the great communicators of modern politics, as has been said by so many previous speakers. Whether it was at a Labor Party conference or at a public rally, in this Chamber of the Parliament, staring down the barrel of a television lens, on the stage, or sitting in the dirt with Aboriginals, Don Dunstan certainly knew how to get a message across.

He was someone whom I knew for about three decades in a number of different environments. He was a truly different person and politician. He was someone who impacted on my life on a number of occasions at varying times but predominantly in my time as a journalist. My first memories of Don Dunstan were in my early years in media during the late 1960s when talk-back radio was introduced in South Australia. The station was Radio 5AD. The on-air people included Bob Francis, Alec Macaskill and Andy Thorpe, to mention just a few. As a producer in those early days, I saw in Don Dunstan great radio material.

He was a most astute politician, as we have all heard and seen. He was then the Leader of the Opposition, and he and two of his key advisers instinctively knew that the introduction of talk-back radio would provide many opportunities, with a new form of communication, to him and his Party. Indeed, throughout the Dunstan years and after, Don was a great source of fascination to the media generally, as we know, and to the public; and with the increasing influence and importance of the electronic media in South Australia, he certainly knew how to use them best of all.

Don had the voice; he had the colour and charisma; and he promoted a lifestyle that was somewhat different from the norm. He was a superb chef, he was a very talented pianist, he wore different clothes, he had different hobbies and he was very definitely a different type of politician and Leader. He aroused great passion as a politician and a Leader of his time. As in relation to so many, there were rarely any shades of grey when it came to views on Don Dunstan. Everyone had an opinion on him. He was loved and loathed but he was generally respected.

Just as Don Dunstan was there during my early days in radio, he was certainly there in my media life when I started a new career at Channel 7 in January 1978. I had great delusions that I would settle into a new job over several weeks, learning how to put a television story to air. But, instead, two days after I started my new career in television, the then Premier, Don Dunstan, sacked the Police Commissioner, Harold Salisbury. Suffice to say that the next couple of days, weeks and months leading up to the establishment of the Mitchell royal commission were not exactly a period of settling in for a new State political reporter. They were, as many of us observed at the time, more like the proverbial deep end.

Just over a year later came the launch of a book on South Australian Liberal politics that I had co-authored with Dean Jaensch. The invitations had gone out to MPs, Liberal and Labor; media had been invited; and publicists were attending the launch. Laurie Oakes was coming over to do the launch and it was all scheduled for approximately 10 a.m. on 15 February 1979. Early that morning I received information that the then Premier, Don Dunstan, was going to resign later that day but, when I tried to convince my news editor to let me put a news flash to air, he would not believe me. So, Laurie Oakes, who was staying with my husband and me at the time, called into a Sydney radio station and announced the news there. Within four minutes my news editor had rung me back and told me that it must be true and suggested that I put a news flash on Adelaide television.

Anyway, we did launch our book. We satisfied the requirements of the publisher and the news editor and then dashed off to Calvary Hospital to cover one of the most dramatic and emotional speeches I have ever heard or reported in my life. Many stories abound about that day. They range from fact to pure fiction and fantasy, but there is no

doubt that it was full of high emotion, drama and disbelief, I might say, which again demonstrated to me and all who were there Don Dunstan's great communication skills. Most members of the media present were shocked or stunned. There were tears and, during the time when we were all in that room with the Premier, Don Dunstan, there was certainly no feeling of elation.

As an aside, several weeks later the newly elected Labor Premier, Des Corcoran, dropped me a personal note offering to relaunch the book because it had been somewhat overshadowed by the events of that amazing resignation day. As a working journalist then and for a large period of the Dunstan premiership, I certainly experienced the drama, flair and panache, anger, persuasive charms and outbursts that he embroiled on all of us. They always had an impact not just on the television screen but very definitely on the journalists as well.

We covered more than just the man but also his causes—his passionate advocacy on multiculturalism, his calls for social justice and some of the most articulate advocacy in favour of compulsory unionism and why it should be extended to sub-contractors. We heard him debate passionately the need for industrial democracy, and we heard him call for change in policy on issues of gender, the aged and the young, the need for Government intervention, urban planning, Aboriginal affairs and the arts.

There were also moments when the life of a professional journalist crossed over into the personal side, such as the tragic death of Don's second wife, Adele Koh, whom I knew well. I had the task of presenting a television obituary on Adele on Channel 7 when she died, which I aimed to put to air with care and professionalism. I was very touched a few weeks later when Don sent me a personal note saying 'Thank you.' Again, from a personal perspective, I found him to be a very kind and generous man with whom I shared a number of good mutual friends. He was probably the only Labor person to attend my father's funeral and he was there several weeks later to comfort me when a close friend of mine and a member of his personal staff died.

One of the last occasions I spent any time talking to Don Dunstan was when I sat between him and my husband at the unveiling of the bronze of Sir Thomas Playford at Norton Summit. It was freezing cold. Don was looking particularly frail and I think that many thought his time was near even then, and that was 2½ years ago. I suspect that it is no secret that Don did not care much for my choice of husband but, as we all know, he and Steele did not really have very much in common, either personally or politically, then or since. But, as the Labor Leader in his time, Don Dunstan lived, led and shaped this State's politics for a period in the 1960s and the 1970s. It was a time of reform, as has been said. It was a time of great personalities and a time of lively and vigorous debate in this very Chamber.

There was Dunstan, King, Hudson and Corcoran; on the Liberal side there was Hall and Millhouse, in particular; and between them all they created a unique and exciting era in our State's history. For those of us who saw it first-hand, it is often very difficult to understand that these events were two or three decades ago, but our State, our society and this Parliament have come a long way since then. It is important to remember that there can be no going back to those heady days. It is clearly obvious that Don Dunstan and I vehemently differed on many political issues and policies, but this is not the time or the place to deal with them. His memoirs, *Felicia*, listed a number of achievements of his Government, in

addition to the policy objectives he was unable to pursue due to his early retirement.

In the last few days it has been interesting to hear the many tributes to Don Dunstan and the many versions of what he has been credited with. While there is absolutely no doubt that he was one of Labor's leading social reformers, he was also someone who attempted to keep his achievements in perspective, and I believe we should do no less. Don Dunstan has an important place in our history and history does not need to be rewritten for him. He maintained his ideals, his outspokenness and his ideology until the end. He continued to forcefully articulate his strong loathing and disdain for the policies of economic rationalism, taking more than the odd swipe at our own Government.

As many members have commented, outside politics, family and friends, Don Dunstan dedicated his life to some of his other great passions. He was just as successful as a chef and author as he was as a politician. I also extend my sincere sympathy and thoughts to his family and friends, and especially to his children whom I knew very well, Bronwen, Andrew and Paul. It cannot be easy to grieve in the spotlight of a State, but his family can be proud of the manner in which they are conducting themselves.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): It is with considerable humility that I rise to pay a personal tribute to Don Dunstan. I speak with humility because the extent of his achievements is truly breathtaking, and we have all seen and heard that today and in recent days. I begin by passing on my personal condolences to Steven, to Andrew, Paul, Bronwen and their families, and to all those people who loved him.

What does one say about a man who has impacted so widely on so many aspects of our lives? Every one of us, particularly those who are poor, female, from a non-English speaking background or Aboriginal, can look to Don Dunstan and realise that he championed causes that impacted incredibly on our lives. People have mentioned many of those causes: individual freedom, democracy, the rights of all people to partake in the benefits of our society, the rights to inclusion of all people in the power structures of our society, consumer protection, education, health, social welfare, planning, and the list goes on. Many of these causes translated into legislative reforms and those legislative reforms heralded similar reforms across Australia and affected policy in all Australian States in those areas.

We need to acknowledge that Don Dunstan brought a particular style of governance to this State. First and foremost, I believe that he had an understanding that governance meant the need to balance social, economic and environmental considerations, to achieve a holistic rather than a fragmented, narrow focus in politics. He demonstrated that all the time, that he was much more than a one-dimensional figure. He understood the totality of human experience and that translated into the leadership and vision that he espoused.

He had an incredible clarity of vision for South Australia. There was no cringe mentality for Don Dunstan. He knew we could do it, he said we could do it, and we did it. He led us proudly, and every one of us felt that excitement, that pride, that we were South Australians, that we were leading the way, that we were doing it. Not only did he have a clear vision of what he wanted to achieve but he had a fierce determination to implement that vision. He knew how to act strategically to enable it to be achieved. As others have mentioned today, the things he fought for were not easy issues. They required steel will and determination, and the

force of that will to see that they came to pass, and Don Dunstan had that will.

He had an amazing ability to carry the argument. He was articulate, he was intelligent, he knew what he wanted to say and he said it well. He was able to persuade many groups of people to his point of view. He was able to do so in a Parliament where he was faced with a hostile Upper House. By the force of his argument he was able to carry the day. He also had the ability to draw extremely capable people to him so they would join him in his vision to implement the things on his agenda. We saw many highly talented people both in this House and around Don Dunstan in the South Australian community during that time.

As well, Don Dunstan was a human being with many, many sides. He was a man for all seasons, a man who related to people across a wide range of levels in our community. I remember first meeting him when I was in year 12 at Marion High School and he came to our school to talk to the year 12 students about his role as Attorney-General. I remember that he was the first politician that I had been in the same room with and that I was impressed with him. I also remember other aspects of Don Dunstan. I remember the cooking, which we have all referred to, the pink shorts and the safari suits. I remember him standing on the end of Glenelg jetty when the tidal wave was supposed to hit Adelaide, and of course it did not.

I admired the way that he continued to be part of the ongoing debate on the issues which concerned him passionately and which continued to concern so many people in our community, and people from all sections of society wanted to hear from Don Dunstan and he was prepared to do that. I recall in the early 1990s, when I was Principal of the Elizabeth West Re-entry School, that he came on invitation to speak to students at speech day, and even then he spoke about South Australia, our State, our future, his vision and our role in that vision.

Last night Elizabeth sub-branch members spoke for some time to a motion of condolence for Don Dunstan, reflecting on him and on what he meant for them as individuals and for our State. The branch asked me to put these comments on the record and I do so, proudly. They said that he was worthy of our highest esteem and respect. As I have done today, they mentioned the pride they felt in being South Australian when he was Premier of our State. They said that we were going places under Dunstan and that we felt that we were. One couple who settled in South Australia from Scotland said that Don Dunstan, as Premier, and the things that were happening in South Australia, made up part of their decision to come to South Australia. Someone said that he was a man for all seasons and all people. Everybody mourns his passing.

In conclusion, above all Don Dunstan was a man of remarkable intelligence, clarity of vision and determination, which he combined with a genuine love of people and a true humility. I noticed in the interview played last Friday that people referred to him as a man who was before his time. I saw that Don rejected that notion and actually said that the issues he confronted were there and needed to be confronted then and he did it. So, Don Dunstan was a man who seized the day and that is his legacy. The issues are before us, the challenges are there and we have to have the courage to seize the day.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): When I first entered this Parliament in 1970 it was the second occasion and the most notable time of Dunstan's premiership. I occupied the

seat now occupied by the member for Peake. I well recall in this Chamber in those early days the then Premier turning his scorn upon me and, in his characteristic way, quoted Shakespeare, with which I was not very familiar, having come from a somewhat different background. It was true to say that we had somewhat of a love-hate relationship because he called me a troglodyte and I was not quite sure what it meant. However, during the time we were in this together we had an interesting relationship because I had to go to him on many occasions on behalf of my constituents and it was normally a very pleasant meeting. He was polite and I was polite and we never had a cross word at those meetings and he always tried to be very helpful.

However, when we came into this Chamber it was an education to see him as one of the most polished political performers who have ever been in this place. He had the great ability to read his briefs very well and deliver some very strong counter-punches across the Chamber. We always knew when we had somewhat annoyed him because he used to go out through the lobby door and it would shut with a tremendous bang and we then knew that we may have had a measure of success. However, it was a most interesting time. Along with the Minister for Human Services and the member for Heysen, I was here on the last occasion when Don Dunstan was in this Chamber—on that day when he collapsed and did not return. I add my condolences to his family in supporting the motion.

In my time in this Chamber it was probably one of the most interesting periods. It was a time when this Parliament sat some very long hours and there were some very long conferences between both Houses.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: They were even longer than they are currently. I recall one famous occasion when I think we were meeting in one room and there was a conference between the two Chambers on succession duties. One member of the Legislative Council arrived and put his homburg hat on the hat peg, lit a large cigar and the proceedings commenced. We saw the sun go down and we saw the sun come up. One of the interesting things was that, during the whole time (and it was a most provocative occasion), Premier Dunstan never even raised his voice. At the end of the day he was giving away a fair bit, but it was interesting to watch the tactics because he achieved a large measure of what he wanted from the legislation. It was a real education and I remember those aspects of his premiership—and I do now know what it means to be called a troglodyte. He was one of the most colourful members in my time here, which is almost 30 years. I am pleased to also support this motion.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I am immensely proud that Don Dunstan launched my first campaign into this Parliament. I do not know that I ever actually told him I was proud, but I certainly thanked him. I carry that with pride. Many young people will never have the opportunity to meet this man, but will come to know the commitment that Don Dunstan made to this State of ours because many of Don's visions are still evolving today and when people talk of the changes that have occurred in this State over the past 30 years many or most of those changes will be credited to this remarkable man.

Don Dunstan had a vision. Even after some 20 years of being out of politics, if he ever was, this man could still play a role in our society and still pull a crowd, not because he was a legend but because what he had to share with our State—his

community—is still relevant today and because we need people with vision to lead us. A photo of Don has hung in my office almost from the day I moved in. I found it somewhere—it is in a tatty frame and hopefully one day I will replace it. However, it is not the frame that is the focus but the man. It has the eyes of understanding, compassion and care. The smile is supportive and encouraging. It does not surprise me, but I find it intriguing that people who come into my office, and who obviously did not wholly support his political position, still comment on what a great Premier he was. It is not uncommon for them to say that he had a vision for this State and, while they may not have wholeheartedly agreed with his vision, they believe he opened up opportunities for this State and gave us a future and a direction.

Don did give us a direction—one that allowed us to move into the new century in pace with the rest of this nation. We are lucky that fortune gave us a man with such vision. Vision is important if one is to lead people and, while Don will always be remembered for his contribution to the cultural dearth that this State experienced just 30 years ago, he will mostly be remembered for his commitment to improved living and working conditions and enhanced opportunities for citizens of this State. We will remember him for his commitment to fairness and equity for all people, and for that alone he will be forever loved and respected. His legacy to this State and nation is that he did really and genuinely care about all people, no matter their culture, religion or background. He had a vision and, sadly, these days there are far too few visionaries with the commitment of Don Dunstan. On behalf of my sub-branch and the many people who have rung my office I extend my condolences to Steven, Don's family and close friends.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I pay a brief tribute to the life and work of Donald Dunstan. I only met Donald Dunstan on a couple of occasions, but I was much impressed by his contribution to improving life in South Australia. It has been pointed out that not everyone agreed with all the things that he did, but as a democratic socialist there is, in respect of at least the human ideals, considerable overlap with elements of liberalism. Whilst mention has been made of his contribution in terms of reducing racism and promoting sexual equality and removing sexual discrimination, we should not kid ourselves that those evils have been removed from our society or come to the conclusion that the task of improving our society has ended: it has not.

The greatest epitaph one could accord to Don Dunstan is that not only did he love the people but he also served the people. For someone who contributed so much in a relatively short life—he only made it to the age of 72, which by today's standards is not a long life—he never showed signs of being carried away by a sense of his own importance; he was a humble man.

Mention has been made of Don's contribution in a whole range of areas, one of which the Premier touched on in relation to the cafe society. We should reflect on Don Dunstan's efforts, in conjunction with Graham Latham, in establishing the Regency Hotel School. We have seen the benefit of that contribution today not only in the hotel industry but throughout the restaurant catering industry as well. At the time Don Dunstan was promoting the concept of the hotel school I understand that someone asked a negative question in Parliament in respect of the expenditure of money on a crockery set for that hotel school. In this day and age I do not believe that anyone would be game enough to stand

up in Parliament and question the purchase of crockery or cutlery for the Regency Hotel School. I extend my condolences to his family and close friends. His legacy and contribution will continue on in South Australia. We can all say, 'Thank you, Don, for the contribution you made to making South Australia a better place.'

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I also rise to send my condolences to the family and partner of the Hon. Don Dunstan and to pay tribute to the man, that great South Australian, that great reformer, that great leader. However, in paying my tribute I do so from a perspective somewhat different from that of most members of this Chamber in that for the whole time Don Dunstan was elected to this Parliament I did not live in this State. Unlike many of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber it was not until many years after Don left Parliament that I in fact met him. I was living in Queensland during Don's reign—

An honourable member: Joh's country!

Ms WHITE: Yes. Don entered Parliament more than a decade before I was born. He was Attorney-General of this State while I was in nappies, and he left politics while I was in primary school. But, even though I was living in Queensland, I did know at that early age who Don Dunstan was. I knew a few leaders: I knew who the Premier of Queensland was, I knew who the Prime Minister was—and I had heard of Gough Whitlam, too. But I definitely knew who Don Dunstan was, not only because I had seen cooking segments hosted by him on Queensland television but because in a small school in Queensland several teachers had talked about Don Dunstan. I cannot remember my teachers talking about the Premier of Queensland, but they did talk about some of the social reforms—controversial at the time—in South Australia. Some of what they said was favourable, some of it was not, but it was talked about, and I knew what was happening in South Australia.

Don was a great advocate for South Australia in so many ways. I remember my early visits to Adelaide during the 1970s as a youngster, seeing the Festival Centre, walking through the Mall, getting a sense of the culture of the place, the attitude of the people and, yes, you could pick up the pride of South Australians in themselves, their State and the City of Adelaide. When I think about it—and I have been thinking about it for the last couple of days—what I experienced of South Australia is something which attracted me then and which has continued to attract me. I attribute this to the culture of the place that I experienced early. It drew me to South Australia in the first place and, many years later when I had the opportunity to choose where I would live in Australia—or anywhere in the world—it encouraged me to choose Adelaide.

Don Dunstan was a pacesetter. He set the pace for the nation, and the nation took note. He believed in giving every South Australian an equal opportunity. He will be remembered for that and for so many other things as well. I hope his legacy lives on.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I, too, express my condolences to Don Dunstan's family and close friends. I grew up in the Dunstan era. I first saw Don Dunstan through the eyes of a migrant. I must commend the Labor Party and, of course, its Leader at the time for embracing the migrant community. There is no question that Don Dunstan is and was well liked in the migrant community. I first met Don Dunstan while working as a drinks waiter at Hackney Hall during a Miss

Malta Quest function at which we provided drinks for him and Steele Hall. So, I soon knew what was his (and Steele Hall's) favourite drink. There is no doubt that migrants really appreciated the fact that Don Dunstan and the Labor Party had embraced them. Later, when I went to university, I saw him through the eyes of a university student in terms of his contribution to the Vietnam moratoriums and his push for electoral reform. In the last couple of years I saw him again as a member of Celebrating Cultural Diversity, of which I am also a member.

A lot has been said about Don Dunstan, and there is no doubt that he is a great South Australian who has contributed much to this State. I believe that as members of this place we all walk the same road, whether we are Liberal, Labor, Democrat, Independent or of a new Party, and that we all share the same human passion: the commitment to make society a better place. We just walk on different footpaths. Whether they be left or right, with time they merge into one road and one path. As a Liberal I value the commitment and the achievements of this great South Australian and his contribution in shaping the South Australia we all enjoy and love.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): On behalf of my family, my sub-branch and my electorate I extend my condolences to Gretel, Bronwen, Andrew, Paul and Steven. While here we mourn a leader, they are mourning today a father and a friend. Don was truly a great South Australian and a great leader. As some have said, he was a Renaissance man. He was a humanist, he was a visionary, he was also a man of the people. He was a man of ideas and he was a man of action. He had the best praxis of any political leader in Australia I have ever seen. Yet there is a debate going on in the moment in the papers—and Dean Brown mentioned it—about whether he was a man ahead of his time, a man of his time or a man for his time. I prefer to think of him as a man who made the time his. We call it the Dunstan decade. He defined South Australia in the 1970s for ourselves, for the rest of Australia and for the world.

I came to South Australia because of Don Dunstan, partly because of the excitement that he engendered here in South Australia, partly because of the opportunities he created, especially in my field of education, and partly because he made me aware of Adelaide and what it had to offer. Compared to the Sydney of the early 1970s where the Askin Government prevailed, this was truly a paradise. As many have said, Don had an impact in many fields: the arts, industrial relations, planning, food and wine, consumer protection, the law, social reforms and tourism. However, I want to refer to education in particular.

Before the Dunstan Government, education in South Australia was truly disastrous. Class sizes were huge, teachers were under-prepared and under-trained, the resources available to them were terrible, the number of kids who actually finished Year 12 was minuscule, and there were few programs to assist migrant children, Aboriginal children and people from working class backgrounds. In a very few years Dunstan, with Hugh Hudson the then Minister, absolutely changed the face of education. So, within a decade the public education system in South Australia became the best in Australia. We became the leaders in education in Australia, and for that I think Don deserves enormous credit.

As a Party official over a number of years I got to know Don reasonably well. Occasionally he would ring me to very articulately explain to me his position on some matter with

which he did not agree and on which he thought I should change the Party's position. I would try to explain to him that the Party was a more difficult kind of machine than it was when he was running the show. Despite the criticisms he made of the Labor Party from time to time, he always remained a very strong Party person. If you ever needed Don to come out for any purpose, he was ready to come, and that willingness stayed on right through his illness.

I know that over the last few years of his life I called on Don a number of times to help out the Party. After the disastrous 1993 election result for us we were short of funds, and I asked Don whether he would help establish a True Believers Fund so that we could get some of our core supporters back to give us money. Don very graciously agreed to be patron of that fund and signed letters that went out into the community. It was not the best time to say you were Labor and ask for money, but Don was prepared to do it. He also allowed us to run a testimonial dinner. A number of testimonial dinners had been given for Don over the years, but he was prepared to go along with it one more time, and we had a fabulous dinner at the Norwood Football Club in his honour. He was also pleased to attend a curry lunch for me as a candidate held in the O'Sullivan Beach Community Centre. I can imagine what he thought of those curries, given his taste, but he came down. He could hardly talk because of the cancer that affected his throat. He sipped water, but he gave a beautiful speech and everybody just loved seeing him.

I recall one occasion during 1992—I think it was the occasion of the referendum which imposed the fairness test into the Constitution affecting electoral boundaries. We decided it would be a good idea to get Don Dunstan to front some of the radio ads for the Labor Party because of his long history and association with electoral reform. I remember ringing Don and asking him whether he would create the ad for us. He readily agreed. I said, 'I will come to your house and pick you up. I will come a little early so I can tell you about the content and what we would like you to say.' So, I turned up at Don's house about 45 minutes early, thinking that would give us a chance to go through, rehearse and talk about it. He asked, 'What's it about?' and I spent five or 10 minutes explaining it. He listened, asked one or two questions and then sat there. I said, 'Do you need any more information?' He said 'No.' He just sat there and, for the 35 minutes until I had to take him, I tried to engage him in conversation. I said, 'The garden's looking good, Don', and I asked him what he thought about this or that, but he would not say anything. I could not get him to respond at all. I thought I had done something terrible to offend this man. I felt really awkward; I did not know what it was. I thought I would just go along with it.

I got into the car and took him to the radio studio. He walked into the studio; he had to give a minute long commercial. Without any notes or overt preparation, he did a take, and I think he went for 62 seconds. It was a word perfect, absolutely articulate argument; the whole thing was just beautiful. The journalist said, 'You were a bit long, Don; can you do it again?' So, he did it again, almost word perfect, exactly the same, but this time it was on 60 seconds and we had a take. It was done in about five or 10 minutes. Then Don became quite talkative and chatted to me and told me all sorts of stories about the good old days. I realised that what he had been doing for those 35 minutes was preparing and working through what he was going to do. He had a fantastic ability to concentrate on the issue and form the words without the need for notes.

I recall that one of the stories he told was about Frank Walsh, and I am sure that many on my side and in the Parliament have heard this story. He said that, when in 1953 Don told him he wanted to go into Parliament, Frank took him aside as the elder statesman and said, 'Don, you need to have a really good slogan.' Don looked at him eagerly and said, 'Yeah? What would you suggest?' Frank said, 'Well, I found what works for me is "Walsh for Goodwood."' I think Don realised then that the Labor Party certainly needed a few new tricks.

On one other occasion I was pleased to call on Don. He and Greg Crafter had cooked up this scheme where they wanted Vini Ciccarello to run as the Labor candidate for the seat of Norwood. The member for Norwood is not here at the moment, unfortunately. As the State Secretary I was invited to Don's house in Norwood for lunch along with Vini, Greg, Don and Don's son Andrew. Don had cooked a nice meal—I think it was a beef rendang—and a beautiful red wine was placed on the table. We sat down and Don explained to me quite patiently why we had to have Vini Ciccarello as the candidate. She was the only one who could win the seat and she was an ideal candidate. Vini was sitting there and I said, 'Vini, you will have to do this and that' and she looked at me. I said, 'Right, Don; if that's what you think, I'll try to fix it for you.' We went out and I said, 'Don Dunstan and Greg Crafter both think she can win it.' The rest of the Party was a little sceptical, because nobody really knew who Vini was except as the Mayor of Norwood, but we convinced the Party and, of course, Vini went on to win. I guess that shows that his political understanding was maintained pretty well right to the end.

Thinking about Don's house—and I imagine many members have been in his house—makes me think that it really summarised Don's world view. It was a house full of books and paintings, many of them paintings of himself done by famous Australian painters. There was one by Clifton Pugh, I think. Some of them are not very flattering but rather ugly paintings of Don, but they are all up there on display. There was a grand piano, the kitchen was right in the centre of the house and you could see the garden through the window. So, all his interests and all the things he was passionate about were there in that house. It was right in the centre of Norwood—in the centre of that urban, multicultural environment which he represented and cherished and which in many ways was the model for the rest of Adelaide.

Don certainly set the style in South Australia in the 1970s, and many of us have learnt a lot from Don, but one area in which I would be critical of Don is clothing. I think the Nehru suit was probably a fine idea, and I thought it was quite a good thing that he wore; I thought the pink shorts were acceptable; but I have to say the safari suit was going too far. The safari suit looked fine on Don, I must say, but, when other members of the front bench of the day, particularly the member for Lee's father, started wearing safari suits, it was not a pretty sight. It is wonderful to see some of the former Labor Cabinet members coming to have drinks in the bar occasionally, and some of them still wear those blasted safari suits. So, I think Don probably needs a little bit of criticism for introducing that style into South Australia.

One serious issue I would mention is the Salisbury affair. It is interesting that over the past few days since Don's death the press has talked about the Salisbury affair, and the editorials have suggested that Don made a mistake. It was certainly a difficult time for Don, but I do not for one moment believe it was a mistake. He made the absolutely right

decision. He realised that we could not have a Police Commissioner who was above the Government. He could not be telling lies to the Government and keeping files on the public which, as it turned out, were kept falsely and contained all sorts of bogus information. Don was absolutely correct. He certainly was vilified by the establishment once again for doing it but he was absolutely correct and made the right decision, and I commend him for it.

As a Parliament and a Labor Party, we have a lot to learn from Don. His leadership was bold, imaginative and positive. I am pleased that the Dunstan Foundation has been established and that his ideas and agenda will be pursued by that foundation. I am particularly pleased that it has been announced that the Government is putting funds into that body and I commend the Government for doing so, because that is a very good thing.

The last comment I would make relates to Don's being an actor and his ability to perform. Essential to all that was his sense of timing, and he revealed that right at the end of his life. His sense of timing was absolutely perfect—the last interview on Friday night and slipping away a few hours later with great dignity. So, once again I express to the family my sincere condolences.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): During the 1960s I was a young person growing up here in Adelaide, and I remember it as a fairly exciting time to be a South Australian. It was a time of incredible change, of questions and of expression. I remember moratorium demonstrations here in the city, at times quite violent, over the Vietnam War. It was an amazing period in which to be a South Australian. There was a new weight of sentiment in the arts. If the Playford years saw economic progress, Dunstan added to that momentum with progress of a different kind. I was then and remain proud to be South Australian. Don Dunstan contributed to that sense of pride, that sense of progress and that sense of change. He made us all feel that we were at the front of the pack. When I think of Don Dunstan, I particularly remember his achievement in the arts and wonder if only we could do more. He showed that for a relatively small investment we could reap immeasurable rewards.

I think of our quality of life and the cosmopolitan flavour that Don Dunstan brought to Adelaide, and I think of the ethnic and cultural diversity that he encouraged and promoted to us all. It was fun living in South Australia at that time. He helped us to take a new look at ourselves, and we liked what we saw. Few people have the privilege and honour of serving the people of South Australia as Premier: he served us well. Often controversial, he dared to be different, and he suffered at times for that. But he rose above it. He helped us to accept and he helped us to be tolerant. This is a great democracy. It is, in fact, a gift. Don Dunstan knew that. He made use of it. We can feel proud of Don Dunstan's contribution to our lives and to our quality of life.

Here was a great man, a member of this Parliament who, like so many elected representatives before and since, irrespective of personal or political affiliation, has given everything to South Australia. At the end of the day he has shown us all what good can be done in this place. How honoured we are to inherit the legacy of the great men and women who, like Don, have paved the way.

Ms KEY (Hanson): I add my support for this motion and also express my condolences from my family and from the Ashford ALP sub-branch to Don's partner Steven Cheng, to

Gretel, Paul, Bronwen and Andrew and also to grandson Tom, whom I know quite well. I actually met Don Dunstan in the same way as did the member for Hartley: I was a waitress—or table attendant, is the correct term now—at Pagana's restaurant, and Don Dunstan would come in there from time to time and speak in fluent Italian to John di Giglio, who owned the restaurant. I remember being very impressed by this man. I think he was in a safari suit, and I agree with the member for Kaurua that Don was probably the only one who could carry off the safari suit.

The safari suit caused some merriment in the Flinders University Labor Club, of which I was president: we were asked to a function at the Trades Hall and told that we needed to wear formal wear and that safari suits would be acceptable, so a number of women and I actually borrowed safari suits from different Labor members of the Caucus and turned up in them at this show, which caused great hilarity amongst the crowd. My real memory of Don as a political leader was when I was General Secretary of the Flinders University Students Association. I was asked to organise the Ralph Nader tour in South Australia. It was a national tour, as people will probably remember, and I was on the organising committee in South Australia.

Ralph Nader was asked before he came out here whether there were any particular people he wanted to meet, and he had a list of people in South Australia whom he admired. Don Dunstan was at the top of the list, and I remember having to talk to Don about whether he would, first, come to the lecture and, secondly, be available to speak to Ralph Nader. I can remember Mike Rann also being involved in getting these two great men together. The interesting part of their meeting was the very clear vision that they both had of rights not only for workers but also for citizens, and the issue that was then in its infancy, the issue of consumer rights. The discussion centred on some of the gains that had been made in the US by Ralph Nader, particularly on the issue of consumer rights, and the fact that consumers should have the right to know about the products they were buying and be able to redress the situation if, for some reason, that product or service was not up to par.

At our Labor Club meetings at Flinders University, Don Dunstan used to stare down at us from a painting on the wall. In that painting he was bursting out of a Superman outfit, and I remember that quite often, especially when we decided to have red wine at some of our meetings, we would toast Don Dunstan in that painting, thanking him for what we thought was a South Australia that was really going somewhere, a South Australia that had a philosophy and reforms that as students we all supported.

The last time I saw Don Dunstan was at the Whitlam series last year, which Vini Ciccarello and I were involved in organising with the ALP and the Trades and Labor Council. It was a very emotional night. I sat with Lea Stevens and my husband Kevin Purse, and we were on the brink of tears most of that night, because all of what Don Dunstan said was part of the vision that I certainly saw for South Australia. He talked about issues that in some ways are considered old hat but, judging from the 5 000-odd people who were there, those issues are still very important. I remember talking to Don very briefly afterwards and he said, 'Gee, it's really good that I could pull such a big crowd.' I think he was a bit surprised but also delighted that all these people had come to a political meeting to talk about issues of concern.

In particular, I was impressed by his ongoing campaigning for a strong public sector; that he actually understood and had

always advocated the role of the State; and that he talked about the issue of equity—how it is not just an ideology but has to be a reality. Don Dunstan stood for many other things that I support, and I am grateful that he would always call himself a democratic socialist, which is what I am. I am very proud to say that he is a mentor for many of us who have the same sort of politics.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I express my support for this motion. Don Dunstan was a great human being, a person of whom all Australians can be proud. He was a man of enormous intellect and of great courage, and he had an understanding of the complexities of society and a vision for the future. Don was a great leader who took people with him. He had an unquenchable thirst for reform and a great compassion for his fellow human beings. Don Dunstan was a very loyal human being and a giant in the political world.

Don Dunstan will be remembered for many things. He was a great reformer. Many of his reforms have been mentioned, but I will go over just a few again. They include: Aboriginal land rights, equality for Aborigines, female equality, multiculturalism, rights for minority groups, the arts, the various social causes, industrial democracy, electoral reform, consumer protection, and the list goes on and on. Don was first elected to the seat of Norwood in 1953. We must remember that Labor was barely in existence at that time, and from 1953 to 1965 it was Don Dunstan who was the driving force for electoral reform in South Australia. For him, one vote, one value was the only way we could achieve good government. For Don Dunstan, the proper delivery of Government services could come only after electoral reform was achieved.

I first remember Don Dunstan when he came to Port Augusta in 1966. If you think that Don was before his time in Adelaide, imagine what people in Port Augusta might have thought of him when he first went there. I remember my father, when he was an organiser for the Australian Workers Union, taking Don Dunstan to the Commonwealth railways to meet with local government blue collar workers—out to the shearing sheds. At first it was a bit of a shock, but it was not long before Dunstan's great oratory and communication skills would draw people to him. I remember my father very quickly forming the opinion that Don Dunstan had to become the next leader of the Australian Labor Party, in South Australia.

Don Dunstan was the moderniser of the Australian Labor Party. He became Premier in 1967—and let us not forget that this was 5½ years before Gough Whitlam came to power, nine years before Neville Wran became Premier, 16 years before John Cain became Premier and 22 years before Wayne Goss became Premier in Queensland. All those people, I believe, have been defined as reformers for the Labor Party—and justifiably so. But Don Dunstan is the great moderniser of the Australian Labor Party. In 1968, Don Dunstan's Labor Party received 52 per cent of the primary vote and could not form government. In those times, under the gerrymander that existed, Eyre had about 2 500 voters, Gumeracha had 4 000 voters and the Labor area of Enfield had 56 000 voters.

In politics, Don Dunstan was a winner. In 1970, Don Dunstan's Labor Party received 51.6 per cent of the primary vote. In 1973, Labor received 51.5 per cent of the primary vote. In 1975 (and although Gough would not agree, perhaps Federal Labor drew us back a little) we went down to 46.3 per cent of the primary vote but we were still ahead of the

Liberal Party, and in 1977 we returned to 51.6 per cent of the primary vote. Dunstan took Labor to the election on five occasions, and on four of those occasions he was victorious and received more than 50 per cent of the primary vote.

Dunstan's influence went way beyond South Australia. In terms of national recognition, he is the most significant leader South Australia has ever had. In the 1970s all around Australia Dunstan was invited to talk about where South Australia was going, how South Australia was doing it, what reforms were on the agenda and how these were being achieved. He was both electorally popular and committed to change for reform. He believed in the political process: he believed it was useful.

In recent years, one can well remember Don (when he was no longer a fit and healthy man) still having a lot of involvement in public debates. I well remember when he went to The Parks Community Centre in 1996 and spoke very passionately about the closure of The Parks High School. Others have talked about how he could draw 5 000 paying people to the Entertainment Centre to speak about such a passionate issue as Government and public enterprise. Like the member for Kaurana, as a candidate, I also recall Don Dunstan's support. He was very generous with his time and was always happy to go to fundraising functions. Nothing was too much trouble for Don Dunstan. On behalf of the Lee sub-branch, I extend our sympathies to Don's family and to Steven, and I wish them all the best during these very difficult times.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Don Dunstan—what a great man. His achievements have been well recorded here today, and they were not just matters of social reform. He gave Adelaide a great reputation nationally, and Adelaide was an exciting and vibrant place under his Government. I am conscious of the immense sadness that his family and those close to him must be feeling now and must have felt over the past few days, but I trust that that sadness is tempered by the pride that they can take in their loved one, Don Dunstan, for his achievements, his decency and his integrity as a man.

Don was kind enough to assist in the Mitchell campaign, which brought me into this place. On Australia Day 1997 he travelled to Mitchell Park and, despite some frailty, he treated us—the local Labor Party members and supporters—to an eloquent rebuttal of every argument for Australia's retention of a monarchy—very appropriately, on Australia Day. He inspired and set in place so much by way of reform, which many take for granted today, especially those who enjoy the rights and the benefits that flow from his reforms. He inspired and set in place so much that is under threat in these times, which leaves us with a challenge to retain, recapture and build upon so much in the way of his achievements—a challenge which must compare with what he faced at the end of the 1960s. May he rest in peace.

Ms BREUER (Giles): Many speakers today have mentioned Don Dunstan's many accomplishments. Don Dunstan certainly changed this State—and, indeed, I believe this country: there is no question about that. South Australia led this country in many social issues, and Australia followed its lead. Today there has been much mention of putting Adelaide on the map. However, my contribution is on behalf of all those people who live in country and remote regions of South Australia—people whom I have met during my campaign, in my electorate duties and as an MP travelling to much of rural South Australia. So many people have said to me over the past three years, 'I remember when Don Dunstan

came here on 15 April 1975,' or whenever it was. Everywhere I went—communities from the north to the south of South Australia—people always said similar things to me. There were people who remembered him for his greatness, but also for his ability to be able to relate to them and to their lives.

It is so easy when one thinks about Don to talk about the changes to city life—and the cafe scene has been mentioned a number of times—but people in the country felt and knew Don cared about them also. These are working and middle class people, ordinary people who live away from the city, and they all have stories about Don, wherever one goes in this State. This week I have had numerous phone calls at my office from people who did not know Don personally, but who just wanted to ring up to say how sorry they were and how much they valued Don in that part of the State. Last Saturday night I watched the last interview that was recorded by Don with George Negus. It was made much more poignant knowing that he was now gone.

I had the pleasure of knowing Don only for the past three years, unlike many people here today, who have known him for many years. Of course, like most people in the Labor Party, I regarded him as an icon, but I only met him about three years ago when I asked him to come and help with my election campaign. He came to Whyalla—it was a hot day—and I collected him from the plane. We went to a local cafe and sat inside—we do not have the joy of sitting outside in Whyalla.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BREUER: No, it hasn't reached there yet, but we're working on it. I sat there with Rod Sutherland (the brother of our Party's former secretary, Kaye Sutherland, a wonderful woman, who passed away last year) and listened to Don talk about the white Australia policy. He dropped names such as 'Arthur'—'and I said to Arthur,' and I thought, Arthur Calwell! It was the most incredible experience for me, having known of Don Dunstan for all those years, to meet the man in person and to listen to stories. Afterwards Rod rang me and said, 'Wasn't that incredible? It was like a history book of the Labor Party and of Australia.' It was a very moving experience for me. I met Don a number of times after that, and he was always very special. He always had that ability to make people feel as though they counted: even though you were a nobody, you still counted and you were important to the Labor Party and to the people of South Australia.

I mention the interview with George Negus because two images emerged which really struck me and which, I think, will stay with me forever. The first image was of Don sitting in the sand talking to the men of the Pitjantjatjara lands. When I have visited those lands the people still talk about Don Dunstan and when he came to their land. They still remember with respect and much appreciation the work that he did for those communities and for all Aboriginal communities not only in South Australia but throughout Australia.

I will never forget the second image. I remember thinking, 'I must watch this tape at least once a year every year for the rest of my political life.' Don was asked why he was there and what motivated him during all those years and, indeed, until his death. Don replied that it was his causes—the same causes that are so dear to so many of us here. I believe that it would be so easy for us to lose that perspective as we move through our political careers. Don said that it was also his love of people—people kept him going and that was his strength. I hope that, one day, my epitaph will read 'love of people'. The causes also keep me going. I thank Don Dunstan

for the inspiration that he has given me and so many of us. I also thank him on behalf of the many men and women in rural South Australia who I know feel as I do today.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Don Dunstan enabled ordinary South Australians to think that things were possible when they would not previously have thought them even probable. I benefited from this by being elected to the position of Secretary of the Administrative and Clerical Officers' Association in 1975. An 83 per cent male membership decided to place their trust, confidence and hopes in a young female when previously all the officers of the union had been middle-aged men. I considered then and I do now that they were only brave enough to do this because Don Dunstan had set the climate that said, 'We must look again at the way we have viewed people in the past; we must look again at what we think they are able to do; and we must look to the future rather than constantly at the past in attempting to solve some of the issues that we face as individuals and as communities.'

I want to illustrate another way in which Don Dunstan showed a depth and complexity of understanding that was beyond that of many at the time. The story demonstrates my ignorance at the time and that of three others, so they will remain nameless. Shortly after my election to the secretaryship of ACOA I was contacted by a member of Don's staff and asked to sit on a committee to look at issues relating to women and superannuation. The other nameless members included a senior member of his staff, a senior Treasury bureaucrat and a now quite senior economics lecturer.

Our combined wisdom was not anything like that of Don Dunstan. We met several times, went through a number of superannuation schemes and the relevant legislation and looked at what might be the barriers to women gaining access to superannuation. We identified a number of issues which I now know are called 'direct discrimination'. They included provisions such as that preventing women's partners—indeed, it had to be their legal spouse or, on very rare occasions, their *de facto* spouse of seven years' standing in those times—from gaining automatic access to any pension or residual lump sum benefit.

The spouses of men never had to prove any dependency: the spouses of women did. We could recognise that aspect as being discrimination. We reported and met Mr Dunstan in the Premier's suite. He was very polite but nothing happened. I inquired several times about what had happened to the report and I was eventually told words to the effect that it was not what the Premier wanted. This bamboozled me given the energies and efforts we had put into the report. As not many months and certainly not many years went by I came to understand that the major barrier to women gaining access to superannuation was their varied participation in the work place, and I became very embarrassed that my name had ever been attached to a report which stated that the problems for women gaining access to superannuation were those relating only to direct discrimination. I know now, as Don obviously knew then, that the issue is far more complex than that and that, as a committee, we probably needed to look at it a lot longer.

Many of today's contributions and those in the press have talked about his actions in the area of Aboriginal affairs and land rights. It is a sadness for me that there is not yet any Aboriginal person in this place who is able to record directly the attitude of their community to Don's contribution in this area. So, I want to be so bold as to speak for an Aboriginal

leader who was excellently equipped to be the first of her people in this place, and that is the late Ruby Hammond. Ruby's eyes lit up with delight and her face bubbled with joy whenever she talked about Don Dunstan. She had the utmost admiration for Don and the way he made things possible. I believe that she would join with me in saying that he made things possible for her that might not otherwise have been. He supported and encouraged her and removed some of the barriers that were preventing her and her community from taking their rightful place in the whole community.

Her public thanks to Don Dunstan will go unrecorded, but mine will not, fortunately, nor will those of the Reynell sub-branch. On behalf of the Reynell sub-branch I wish to express our condolences to his partner and family, including his grandchildren, and our thanks for what he did for us and our State.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I rise today to lament the passing of a most wonderful man and a truly great South Australian, Donald Allan Dunstan. He burst upon us like a comet. Some knew that he was coming; we were aware of his presence when he arrived. We may not see anything like his brilliance again and people will talk about him for a long time. I express my condolences and those of my sub-branch and electorate to his family and loved ones, his myriad of close friends, the South Australian public and the political process—all will miss Don greatly. He was generous, kind, caring and humble, a man of great intelligence, character and style.

He was interested in everything and everybody. Don's image is captured brilliantly by Grant Nowell's photograph of him on his seventieth birthday. It showed strength and resolve; it is how I will remember him. Don used the democratic process to alter the social, political and cultural life of this State very significantly. He was the first great Labor visionary since Chifley and one of Australia's greatest social visionaries. He became our light on the hill. In paying tribute to Don we must, I think, begin by frankly acknowledging his achievements for which many will stand as his enduring monument, the breadth of the vision which he held and the unstinting energy he expended in seeing that vision fulfilled.

Don built on the strength of a free and dissident society and his progressive legislation was recognised and adopted throughout Australia and the world. He created an environment where acceptance and diversity became a hallmark in South Australia long before it was recognised as the way forward in other States. It was an exciting time and we were all happy to take part in it. He was a leader. The pace was frantic and, with no thought for his own health, he gave continually during his time in office and afterwards when he perhaps may have expected others to be championing the causes which he held so dear.

What made Don more remarkable than most was his unwavering hope for a better society in which everyone had an opportunity. He believed in community and that communities count. He believed in sharing, that the standard of living enjoyed by some should be the standard of living shared by all. He showed us that solidarity in the fight for the common good could deliver a better society. That he was considered special by so many was never more clearly illustrated than by the public demand for tickets for the 1998 Whitlam Lecture. The size of the hall required grew and changed several times until the Entertainment Centre was clearly the most suitable venue. That so many people paid to hear Don's view of things

showed that he advocated the ideals to which we now look to see us turn things around. It was not a night of nostalgia. With his usual courage and as much strength as he could muster, he prepared and delivered the following inspirational speech, which he titled 'We intervene or we sink':

In charting a course for the labour movement, it is vital to do two things: to analyse and understand the dynamics of the national and global economies; and to do so with a proper appreciation of our history of dealing with the problems of a market economy. Labor in this country never accepted the utopianism of the Marxist philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, which held as doctrine that if all privately owned means of production, distribution and exchange were expropriated to the State, all cause of exploitation, all existence of classes in society would end—that the State would in fact wither away and there would be left merely an 'administration'—a process owned and controlled by the whole people and that in Engel's lyrical phrases towards the end of his pamphlet *Socialism Utopian and Scientific*, 'Men at last masters of their own mode of socialisation become thereby masters of nature, masters of themselves, free.'

Marx and Engels were severely limited by their training in the Hegelian philosophy and so were led to reject the minor proposals for utopian experiments—spewing out the utopian minnows and swallowing a utopian whale. As we have seen, the systems founded upon their ideas have spectacularly collapsed after periods not of freedom but of bitter repression, of the inhumanity and cruelty of regimes from Stalin to Ceaucescu, of the emergence of institutionalised privilege within the system, and the failure to provide to citizens either the services, the goods or the environment which as human beings they were entitled to demand.

But the great misfortune which has occurred on the collapse of the system is that Soviet citizens, denied under their controlled education system of adequate knowledge of economic history, have tended in sweeping away a centrally planned system to leave the market and the growth of a capitalist economy largely uncontrolled, resulting in the very problems which gave rise to the whole communist theory in the first place.

The conditions of uncontrolled capitalism were for the working people of England and western Europe and, later, in America some of the worst conditions known in modern history. It is quite clear that the treatment of working people by those who saw the only virtue in economic activity as being motivated by greed came to be widely condemned. Marx's chapter on the working day and industrial capital in *Das Kapital* were vivid and accurate, but taken from official records which set out the pitiful conditions workers, including women and children, laboured under under uncontrolled capitalist development. The chaotic conditions now developing and providing misery for millions in former Soviet countries and where a class of happy and often crooked exploiters of that chaos is emerging was utterly predictable.

Labor in this country and social democrats everywhere have always accepted that we had to maintain the discipline of the marketplace as the only basically effective general method of indicating the needs and wants of the people, and that we would maintain a rentier society in which development occurred and capital for development raised by borrowing money and paying interest or dividends on it. But in those circumstances we have also rightly believed that the State must intervene to ensure that market forces and the requirements of capital investment result in the social needs of the community being met. Labor has been clear in what those social needs are.

May I reiterate what in my political memoirs I stated were my reasons for entering political activity in Australia and working through the Australian Labor Party as the great reform Party of this country:

I believed then, as now, that it is possible to build a society in which individual citizens have security of food, shelter, work and services, which will celebrate their worth as individuals, and that people have made their many differences their strength, where all citizens have an equal and effective say in their own governance and an opportunity to participate in and to influence decisions affecting their lives. It is possible to build a social democracy, a dynamic society in which there would be equal opportunity to act creatively within a social context.

It has been Labor's proud accomplishment that great progress has been made in Australia towards the goal of that kind of society. These accomplishments are now all under severe threat.

Now we are faced with political opponents who have adopted a policy which is very largely that of advocating unrestricted capitalism and of constantly advancing it. We have schools of economics where the history of economic thought is but little taught and universities where history studies are regarded as economically unimportant. The return to the advocacy of simplistic *laissez-faire* policies in economics belies the experience of history. Rational economic analysis has been superseded by the economic teaching of the Chicago school, calling itself, oxymoronically, 'economic rationalism'.

Their thesis, as put forward by their political disciples, is that faced with a globalised economy what we must do is to reduce government provision of services to the barest minimum, ensure that services so far as they are provided to the community, whether in the area of what have been called public utilities or social services are only provided through organisations operating in the interests of private profit, that competition and the operations of the unregulated market can produce the optimum pattern of production and development of our resources, and that in the interests of incentive and international competition, the public sector must eschew raising money by way of loan for long-term infrastructure development, that redistributive taxes must disappear as a means of providing social justice, and that we must totally deny ourselves in all circumstances of the fiscal flexibility to run a deficit budget.

To examine and expose the absurdity as well as the enormity of these proposals to turn us back to a kind of social Darwinism, mere survival of the fittest (or most cunning and rapacious) and 'each for himself and god for us all, as the elephant said when dancing among the chickens', I need to revisit history a little, not to advocate the policies of nostalgia, but to show that there have been proven ways to deal with the wrongs, the social injustices, the failures of the private sector to produce needed results in the past, that we have established institutions which continue to serve the purpose of serving the community and avoiding previous lack of both service and social justice, and that the institutions and policies of the past can be adapted and built upon to make sensible policy to deal with current challenges. It is vital to learn the lessons of history. If we don't know where we have come from, we cannot make intelligent judgments about where we are going to.

Firstly, there are considerable limitations to relying on the unregulated marketplace alone to produce optimal results socially and economically. Keynes exposed the baselessness of *laissez-faire* theories in his lectures in 1924 and 1926, 'The End of *Laissez Faire*'. As he said then:

The world is not so governed from above that private and social interest always coincide. It is not so managed here below that in practice they coincide. It is not a correct deduction from the principles of economics that enlightened self-interest always operates in the public interest. Nor is it true that self-interest generally is enlightened; more often individuals acting separately to promote their own ends are too ignorant or too weak to attain even these. Experience does not show that individuals when they make up a social unit are always less clear-sighted than when they act separately.

Historically, Labor (and at times as I shall now show, non-Labor) Governments have proved it necessary to intervene in various ways in the marketplace to ensure socially desirable results.

Sometimes the traditionally termed left-right divide in these interventions has been characterised as a fight between public and private ownership. That is quite an inadequate analysis. Labor has not held a view that there is any particular virtue as between the public or private holding of the indicia of title by a public body raising its money from bondholders or a private company raising its money from shareholders as long as the needs of the public are adequately served and in the case of basic services that they are delivered on the basis of social justice.

Intervention may be found to take place not only by nationalising assets or undertakings—it may be also by setting up a publicly owned enterprise where the private sector will not, in order to meet the community's needs, or where a Government enterprise may itself force better service by competition with the private sector. It may be by licensing or regulation. It may be by providing assistance to the average citizen to place him or her on a footing of equality with wealthier interests. The forms of intervention are necessarily empirically chosen, but as I shall show by the example of South Australia it has been vital to produce a productive, fair and just society.

South Australia at its founding in 1836 had poorer natural timber resources than any other State. Much of such woodland as then

existed was quickly cleared in the province's first 40 years. Timber was used for fuel, fencing, in the mines, or was often wasted. In 1875 a Forest Act was passed and a board appointed. They established a number of nurseries and tried out many species of tree. Outstanding results were obtained from *pinus radiata*, which appeared to grow more rapidly here than in its native environment. In 1883 the board was replaced by the first Government Woods and Forests Department in the British Empire, and in 1902 the first State sawmill set up. Australia's first course in forestry was set up in 1910 and became a degree course at Adelaide University, where it remained until its transfer to Canberra in 1925.

Problems with dieback in *pinus radiata* were solved by the use of zinc sulphate and bipartisan political support led to the establishment of a large State-owned forestry industry. While thinnings provided a considerable resource by 1930, calls at that time for the private sector to set up to make use of it drew no response. It was only much later that private sector operations began to be involved, but the State sector has remained throughout the driving force in providing a timber resource to this State and proving a use of non-indigenous timber already of considerable benefit to communities elsewhere in Australia.

By 1975 the departmental forests in South Australia covered 73 000-odd hectares, the private sector forests 16 500 hectares, and the department had created 6 000 jobs and paid \$19.9 million to State revenue. The whole enterprise had provided a cheap timber resource, which has been a factor in keeping housing costs down, of which more later. The State forestry enterprise is on the Olsen Government's privatisation list. The whole pine forestry enterprise and the pine resource of this nation would not exist if the matter had been left to the enterprise of the private sector or initiative called forth by the operation of the market. Indeed, we would not have developed *pinus radiata* as a resource in this country at all.

In the depression years of the 1930s this State—a largely agricultural area with a declining mining sector and small production in motor body building—was hardest hit of all mainland States. Adult male unemployment stood at 33 per cent and farmers were walking off farms in droves. Playford, who presided over the tough administration of the Lands Department, was determined to see that the economy diversified and we undertake industrial development. That would not happen on its own. The necessary infrastructure support must be created. At that time the electricity supply was provided by the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, incorporated by statute but wholly privately owned and financed and which in its early years had regularly paid a dividend of 12 per cent, and though this fell to 7 per cent for a while was restored to 10 per cent by the time Playford was embarking on his industrialisation program. Electricity production here was also subject to uncertainty from problems in coal supply from the eastern States, but the company refused to be involved in a costly exercise of the exploitation of the soft brown coal deposits within this State, where supplies would be assured. Nor would they do special deals to assist the establishment of the industry here. Playford appointed a royal commission, among whose findings were these:

11. It is essential that the company should endeavour to fix its charges for industrial purposes at a rate sufficiently low to meet competition for industry by other States.
18. Over the period of the last 24 years the company has paid in dividends and interest nearly £2 million more than if the Treasury rates had been paid. Future capital costs at Treasury rates would result in reduced capital costs and so lower charges.
19. An adequate supply of electricity at reasonable charges is of the utmost importance to the community, particularly for the development of the industry. The interests of the public in this regard have so far been largely at the discretion of the directors of the company. Its claim that the public interest has been and will continue to be studied tends to conflict with the directors' duty to shareholders.
20. The company supplies a large area of the more densely populated portion of the State. If it is to expand its area of supply or refuse supply entirely in accordance with its own decisions founded to a large extent on its own interests, the development and coordination on sound lines of electricity supplies throughout the State will be very difficult.

Accordingly they recommended that the assets of the company be acquired and that from then on electricity supplies be the responsibility of a statutory trust owned by the State. Playford, with

the support of the Labor Party, pushed the legislation through the Parliament and the Electricity Trust became a vital factor in this State's economy, owning and running its own soft brown coal mine at Leigh Creek, financing its operations through semi-governmental loans, providing good deals for industry and ensuring not only reasonable costs to consumers generally but also ensuring delivery to the poor and the remote on the basis of social justice.

The royal commission had pinpointed the fact that there is real conflict between the aims required of directors of companies in the private sector—their primary concern must be to maximise return to their shareholders, while the board members of a publicly-owned trust must endeavour to operate efficiently and economically with the best return possible to Government, subject to the objective of providing the service that the community needs on a just and reasonable basis.

That very conflict is highlighted at this time between the maintenance of Telstra in majority public control and operation, with an agenda to see that services are provided to all and that profitable areas of return subsidise the cost to the remote and disadvantaged, who cannot pay the full user cost of telephone service and in contrast its sale to wholly private interests, whose only duty under company law is to maximise the benefit to shareholders.

The Electricity Trust is a Government undertaking, which has been wholly funded by its clients—the consumers of electricity. It has not cost the Treasury anything. It has, as was proposed by the royal commission, raised capital for its plant and development by loans approved at semi-Governmental rates, which are well below the cost of dividends sought by investors in share capital. Those loans have been largely repaid, so the users have already paid the capital cost of the undertaking. ETSA has not only paid the Government the normal State taxes and charges and a notional amount equal to Commonwealth company tax but also amounts as dividends. In the last four financial years the Government has received, through extra charges of this sort on the Trust, some \$1.3 billion. \$700 million was taken last year, part of it by a piece of creative accounting by the Trust borrowing \$450 million from the State Government for the so-called capital restructuring and using it to pay a similar amount back to the Treasury as dividend. The result was to increase the Trust loan liability from a low \$400 million on assets and business worth an estimated \$6 billion up to \$850 million.

Mr Olsen at the last election solemnly promised the people that there would be no sale of ETSA. After the elections he became aware, he says, that the Auditor-General has warned (in a warning communicated to the Premier's Department in the middle of last year—a warning Mr Olsen was, he assures us with a straight face, 'unaware of' months later at election time) that there are certain identifiable risks to the State's finances through South Australia being involved in a national electricity grid and complying with a national competition policy in that:

1. ETSA has been making (apart from the so-called loan arrangement last year) a payment to State Treasury annually of about \$212 million, which it may not be able to do if complying with competition requirements.
2. The risk that competition in supply of electricity may lead to a reduction in ETSA's market.
3. The risks of penalties in non-compliance with the competition policy through the non-payment to the State of 'competition payments' of about \$332 million and a potential reduction in the Commonwealth payment of financial assistance to the State amounting to \$690 million.

Mr Olsen has now claimed that that means that the electricity undertaking must be sold. If it is sold, that does not mean that South Australia has conformed to national competition policy. Mr Olsen has said that we are facing a loss of over \$1 billion. How? The Auditor-General has said no more than that the risks known in the negotiations for South Australia entering the national grid must be properly managed.

Mr Olsen is now proceeding with legislation to sell ETSA alleging that that is necessary to relieve the State of the risk, and will help to carry us to his goal of having the Treasury 'debt free'. This is the most transparent attempt at selling the people the old thimble and pea trick that it has been my misfortune to come across in a lifetime in politics. If ETSA is sold and the money paid into the Treasury for general debt reduction it will not mean that the people of the State have less debt and costs but more.

The electricity undertaking will still be subject to the requirements of national competition policy and subject to competition in the operation of the national grid. Non-compliance will affect South

Australia's payments whether the undertaking is privately or publicly owned. Privatising is not a condition of national competition policy—so the question of compliance with that policy and the effect of non-compliance still faces us. The national competition agreement principles signed by Dean Brown and other Premiers states:

This agreement is neutral with respect to the nature and form of ownership of business enterprises. It is not intended to promote public or private ownership.

What is more, what is the great risk that Mr Olsen talks about? Compliance with the policy has been on track for some time. All the Auditor-General is warning is that non-compliance will carry costs.

In addition, the raising of share capital for the electricity undertaking will mean that dividends to shareholders will have to be paid—by the consumers. For shares to be sold they must have the promise of dividends at a higher level than semi-government bond interest payments. As the royal commission pointed out, electricity charges would be much lower if governmental loan rates are payable for capital development rather than dividends on shares. We have the current spectacle of a well known public figure in large newspaper advertisements urging people to improve their income by investing in a balanced share portfolio rather than have it sitting in Government guaranteed loan. That improved income if a bondholder opts to transfer his money to shares to get a dividend higher than interest on his bonds must be met by the consumers of electricity. And they will be paying for dividends on the whole cost of the purchase of ETSA—some \$4-\$6 billion, or whatever price they sell it for—instead of semi-governmental loan interest and capital repayment on \$850 million.

So all Mr Olsen is doing with his ploy is to make the Treasury books look better—with a one-off addition of money from the sale—but increase heavily rather than decrease the effective burden on South Australian taxpayers. The taxpayers and the consumers of electricity are the same people—virtually every South Australian is a consumer of electricity. The only reason that this course is being pursued contrary to the experience in South Australia leading to the setting up of our publicly-owned electricity undertaking is the ideological position that the community and Governments should run nothing in the way of service undertaking, and that social needs will inevitably be met if everything has as its sole object the making of private profit.

The results of that belief are only too vividly demonstrated for us in New Zealand. There the Government undertaking for electricity supply in Auckland was transferred to a corporation where four of the nine member board were elected by the consumers but the control was in the hands of the five member majority whose task it was to prepare the undertaking for a share float where those five would thereafter be elected by the subscribing shareholders. This was the course to effective privatisation under which the Government had no control and the consumers merely token and minority input. The regime of management which then operated to reduce costs of the undertaking saw capital investment in upgrading the existing works put on hold, the staff reduced and maintenance reduced in order to make the share float attractive. Disastrously the whole cable system went into burn-out, causing massive losses to business and private individuals, dire discomfort to Auckland residents and chaos in the city. The case makes a sick joke of the adage that private management is always more efficient than public management. And that is the kind of future we can expect. The demand that the community should not intervene in the economy by running needed community services has been amply demonstrated here in South Australia already.

South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent on earth. Providing water here has always been a matter of crucial public importance. It was one of the great successes of the Playford regime that we did it so effectively. While other States have from time to time had to have water restrictions on use by the public, that has not occurred in South Australia since 1957. The Engineering and Water Supply Department of South Australia took over the whole water and waste water management of the State—not operating on a series of local water boards but operating under central management and using governmental loan money to build efficient catchments to store and supply natural rainfall and to hold waters pumped from the Murray River. Pipelines were built across the State and water was made available to the poor and the remote at prices they could afford. The rating system provided that the more valuable properties subsidised the poor and the average householder. Adelaide was effectively sewered ahead of any other Australian capital. The only criticism that could be made of the water supply was that it was alkaline and its taste was unattractive.

When Michael Flanders and Donald Swan appeared at a theatre in Adelaide, Flanders—sitting in his wheelchair mid stage—was brought a glass of water. He took a sip, screwed a face and said ‘Adelaide water!’ Another sip—‘Chap must have his own billabong.’ A third sip—‘And somebody’s camped by it!’

When Gough Whitlam commenced his program to induce improvement to the quality of life in the poorer suburbs of metropolitan areas by offering money to the States under section 96 grants to undertake sewerage of their unsewered urban areas, he said we in South Australia did not qualify for these grants because we were already fully sewered in Adelaide. I agreed that we were but that we were under another disability—our water needed filtration and after one of those arguments he and I seemed to have with considerable regularity it was agreed that we could get money to commence the filtration of the metropolitan water supply. The department operated efficiently but was subjected to repeated scrutiny as to its operations, and its structure and management went through revision from time to time to ensure that that efficiency was maintained.

Enter Mr Olsen. No mention was made at the 1993 elections of any move to privatise the water supply. Mr Olsen, however, embarked upon a program which he said would deliver great results to South Australia. The plant and equipment of water supply would still continue to be owned by SA Water—the department downsized and ‘corporatised’—but the management of water and waste water would be sold to a consortium which would bring international expertise to South Australia, centre its research operations for the whole of South-East Asia and the Pacific here, tender for projects for water and waste water in that region and provide employment for South Australians and be required to draw on South Australian suppliers of equipment in those international operations, thus creating a great water industry for South Australia. There was also to be a provision that within 12 months the company formed by the successful consortium become at least 60 per cent Australian owned.

The successful consortium was formed by Thames Water (one of Mrs. Thatcher’s privatisation beneficiaries), CGT (a French corporation also running a privatised water operation) with a tiny share holding by Kinhill, a local engineering company well known in Australia. The contract with the consortium was not revealed publicly on the grounds of ‘commercial confidentiality’. That excuse in relation to State assets and money is entirely without justification. When the State made an agreement with BHP to set up an iron ore smelter and, later, a steelworks and shipyard at Whyalla, it was done under indenture properly scrutinised by Parliament. However, in due season the agreement was leaked. It did not contain the assurances and enforceable guarantees Mr Olsen had claimed for it. The company ‘United Water’ has not only made no attempt to involve Australian ownership, but the Kinhill interest has been sold to another international company.

The management of our water supply is now entirely in foreign hands, and hands which are concerned only with the provision of returns to their . . . shareholders and the payment of much larger salaries to their executives than are ever paid in the public sector. Water is not cheaper—its price has gone up by more than inflation . . . So far from the principal companies working through their local subsidiary here for contracts in developing countries in our region they are in competition with that company for contracts. The research facilities of the principal companies have not been transferred from France or England. The great water industry is a mirage.

The objectives of the Engineering and Water Supply Department were not to make money for the Government (though at the time of the privatisation of the management it was providing revenue above its costs). . .

I have been passed a note which says that I have to wind up. I now refer to Don Dunstan’s having had strong convictions, which those who had the privilege to hear the speech would know about. He had strong convictions and he had the courage of those convictions. His convictions and ideals have been recognised with the establishment of the Don Dunstan Foundation at the University of Adelaide. The foundation has been established with a view to perpetuating the memory of the founder and reflecting his life’s work through the fostering of research and education on a broad range of issues concerning social development based on social and economic equity; the appropriate use of Government intervention to secure socially just outcomes; the ability of individuals

substantially to control their own lives; democratic and inclusive forms of governance; cultural and ethnic diversity; toleration and respect for fundamental human rights; respect for and protection of the rights of indigenous people; and remediation of global maldistribution of wealth and income.

The objects and functions of the foundation will be to endow a Chair of Social Inquiry at the university to be called the Don Dunstan Chair of Social Inquiry; to award scholarships, trusts, donations, endowments or gifts with the object of funding and encouraging study and research in any of the relevant areas, whether at the university or any other post-secondary educational institution in Australia; to commission, promote and subsidise academic research projects to any of the relevant areas; to publish or subsidise the publication of the results of academic research projects; to disseminate or subsidise the dissemination of educational materials relating to any of the relevant areas by means of scholarships, grants, sponsorships and prizes or other financial assistance to support students or intending students of the university in the pursuit of their studies into any of the relevant areas; to commission, promote or subsidise academic studies or research into the influences on the social development and history of Australia achieved by the founder through his life and work, and to publish or subsidise the publication of the results of such studies; to convene, organise and conduct seminars, lectures, classes, courses of study, presentations or public forums with the intention of furthering the objects of the foundation; to solicit and accept gifts, donations, trusts, endowments, bequests, subsidies, sponsorships or grants from any individual, organisation, association, estate or government body to assist the foundation in carrying out its functions, and to raise funds for all or any of the foundation’s objects; to advertise and promote the activities of the foundation by any means or medium; and to do all such other acts, matters or things as are or appear to the trustees to be incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objectives.

The proposed projects of the foundation will cover urban issues and planning; law reform; equity and access to equity; education; the arts economy; government support for industry; job creation and labour intensive industries; housing; and health services.

Don identified these issues through his many years of speaking with people. His great love of people saw him well equipped to understand and work for people from all walks of life. He was a fiercely proud South Australian. My first recollection of Don was when I met him handing out brochures with Molly Byrne as they campaigned for her newly created seat of Tea Tree Gully in the 1970 election. They were at Tea Tree Plaza, the hub of the electorate of Florey, for Don had a strong association with the people of the north-eastern suburbs as well as his beloved Norwood. He was instrumental in the development of the north-east. Recently, when it was under threat, he came to defend the Modbury Hospital and he was generous with his time in relation to matters that affected our area. He was so active in his own time and at his own expense following the 1997 election that people saw him as the leading voice for commonsense and rational thought rather than economic rationalisation.

Don’s gift to us is an example of what good government is all about. He took us from a country town and made us a city that captured the imagination and admiration of every State in Australia. The news of what we were doing made world headlines. Don has shown us what South Australia can

do. It is time for each and every South Australian to demand that things change. We have done it before; Don's vision has laid the groundwork. We do not need to go back to the old times when Don was doing his great things. We need to use his example to move forward. We, especially in this place, must have Don's courage and use our power and influence as he did. Let us make history repeat itself.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): As the member for Norwood, it is with deep feelings of grief and regret that I stand here and bid farewell to my great friend Don Dunstan. I have already expressed my condolences to his family, partner and friends on behalf of the people of Norwood. As most people are aware, Don has been a part of my life since I was in primary school, I cannot begin to describe the desolation and emptiness that I have felt since his death on Saturday morning. He was my friend, confidante, mentor, and inspiration and I cannot imagine Norwood without him. On Saturday morning as I walked around The Parade just a few hours after his death, it was very difficult to speak to the people of Norwood who were expressing their grief and disbelief. Most people knew what had happened; only a few had not heard the news services were not aware of his passing and that we had lost one of our great national treasures, the likes of whom we may never see again. He was the man who had helped to transform not only this State but also Australia, as has been said by many speakers today, and we will be indebted to him for a very long time.

By a strange quirk of fate, last night we had our sub-branch meeting in Norwood. The meeting would normally have been held on the previous Monday—the first Monday of the month—so it must have been a bit of serendipity that it was held last night and we were able to express our appreciation of Don and everything he had done for Norwood and South Australia. Mike Rann was there and spoke emotionally about Don and how he had had a wonderful experience working for him. Bob Ellis was very sorry that he would not be able to record the documentary programs he had intended to do with Don. Chris Schacht, who is the Senator for the area and duty Senator, spoke about the first time he had heard Don Dunstan speak at the local church hall and said how Don had inspired him.

A former member for Norwood, Greg Crafter, who as many of you know is very sardonic and often tells bad jokes, recounted many of the experiences he had had with Don. He worked for Don from the early 1970s and some of the stories he recounts would make us feel good if as members we had some of these positive experiences. Evidently Don was so popular—and I know how popular he was in the area—that, when people knew that Don would be doorknocking in their street, they took the day off work so they could be home and talk to Don. If only that might happen to us! He also visited a nursing home, where an elderly lady—I think she was in her nineties—lifted up the corner of her mattress and showed Greg a poster of a very handsome Don Dunstan. She said, 'I have to hide it in case my husband sees it.' She was very concerned he would be jealous.

When Greg became the member for Norwood he also went out door knocking. There was always a lot to do; Greg was always in a hurry and people would invite him inside for a cup of tea. He would say, 'Oh, I really haven't got time.' He was quickly told, 'Well, Don used to come in and Don always stayed for a cup of tea.' So Greg got into the habit of understanding how important that was, no matter how long

it took, and that he needed to carry on the same practices of Don Dunstan.

I will not speak today about what Don has done; I think many people today have spoken amply about what he achieved for South Australia, the policies he introduced and what he did in his beloved Norwood. Whilst I was Mayor, Don Dunstan was setting up his new restaurant, and I think it was a measure of the man and an example of the wonderful human being he was that he would come into the Norwood Town Hall and stand at the planning counter with his plans and ideas about his restaurant. He did not mind waiting. I would try to get him to the head of the queue and he would always say, 'No, I'll wait my turn.' He did not expect any favours. In the past couple of months he has been very sick; we all know that, and we have seen his declining health. An overwhelming number of people have come into my office with messages and notes for him, which I used to take to him. I again express the admiration people had for him when they contacted me to say, 'Vini, we just wanted to say to Don, "Godspeed; we love you and we thank you for what you have done."' We didn't expect him to ring us or write a note.'

He thought that every individual was very important: nothing was too much trouble for Don. I had the privilege of having a meal with him on Thursday, just the day before he died. I had taken the correspondence in to him and exactly the same thing happened. Don insisted on opening every single letter, and he was very frustrated because he wanted to respond but he did not have the energy at that time. That is the man that I will remember: a man who in the past six months, in particular, has shown great dignity and also much courage in trying to ensure that what he has done for South Australia in his caring for the community will be continued. He did not want anything special for himself.

My colleagues and I have often had discussions about Norwood, referring to it as the trendy, yuppy area, unlike the western side of town. I can assure members that Norwood in the early days was not like that, and the very young Don Dunstan did an enormous amount for the people of non-English speaking backgrounds, the many migrants who arrived in South Australia. They had come with their hopes, their ideas, their dreams, their skills and their experiences, and Don recognised all the good qualities in them. A Polish friend of mine told me of the time she went into her kitchen in Kent Town, where her two elderly parents were sitting talking to Don. They did not speak any English and he did not speak any Polish, but they were communicating. That was the essence of the man.

We now talk about multiculturalism and all the wonderful policies that have developed. Norwood is an example of Don and multiculturalism because it is a wonderful microcosm. Not all the credit belongs to Norwood but many of the things that developed in Norwood thanks to Don Dunstan became policies. Don helped many people, and not only in his office. In fact, in his early days local members did not have offices, and we can all thank him for ensuring that all members of Parliament now have offices. He had a stream of people wanting to speak to him, and I remember very distinctly because my father used to take a stream of them to Don's house, as did many others. They were people with problems, and Don was always there, always ready to spend time with them. They will always remember him fondly and continue to share the memories of a great time.

I would like to put on the public record my thanks to the Premier, the Cabinet and the JPSC for having taken up the suggestion of putting a bust of Don Dunstan in Parliament

House. I felt that it was very important for someone so significant to our State to be honoured in the place where he had effected all the legislative reforms. I know that Don was very thrilled when he got the message that it had been approved. I only wish that the Premier had had the opportunity of speaking to him personally about it. I think that Don would have been delighted to have spoken to you, John. But it will be a wonderful testament to him, as will the \$250 000 which the Government has given to the Dunstan Foundation. As he said, people were his driving force, and now, with the Foundation, his legacy will live on.

I feel very humble to be the member for Norwood. As I said last night to my branch members, I do not pretend to have the same intellect as Don; I only wish I had the same public speaking abilities that he had, with that wonderful resonant voice, but I hope that I can carry on his legacy. I used to chase him up the Parade. I used to sneak up behind him and pinch his bottom. Don would always laugh that wonderful laugh of his. When I was Mayor he would turn around and say, 'Oh, it's the Mayor', or more recently he would say, 'It's the local member.' I was trying to express my concern for him because he was so thin, and latterly I would say to him in Italian, 'Don, non hai culo,' which literally translates as, 'You've got no bum.' It was too small; I did not have anything to grab hold of!

I would have loved to be able to fatten him up and keep him with us for another 10 years, and I will always regret that after he resigned as Premier we did not give him the opportunity of contributing more fully to this State, that he had to go interstate to get a job. The platitudes are coming thick and fast now, and I think the sorrow people are expressing is genuine: people are sorry that he has gone, but if only in the last 20 years we had had more of Don Dunstan in South Australia I think South Australia and Australia would have been in a much better state.

The SPEAKER: I would like to thank honourable members who have contributed to the debate this afternoon and I will ensure that a copy of the proceedings as recorded in the *Hansard* is passed on to the family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 4.51 to 5.20 p.m.]

ETSA TRUCK DEPOT

A petition signed by 621 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to direct ETSA not to establish a truck depot at 59 Barnes Road, Glynde was presented by Mr Scalzi.

Petition received.

MIDWIFERY REGISTER

A petition signed by 690 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to oppose the deletion of the Midwifery Register from the Nurses Act was presented by Ms Stevens.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 20, 25, 30, 32, 35, 37, 38, 40 to 42, 44, 45, 47

to 50, 52, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62 to 67, 69, 71 and 74; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SPORTS FUNDING

In reply to **Ms KEY (Hanson)** 18 November 1998.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Office of Recreation and Sport has been advised as follows:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics, in its 1997-1998 publication, *Participation in Sport and Physical Activities*, estimated that 47.8 per cent of persons aged 18 years and over participated in sport or physical activity. Males had a higher participation rate (52.6 per cent) than females (43 per cent). These estimates include combined data for non-organised and organised participation.

An earlier survey had been undertaken for South Australia by the Australian Bureau of Statistics published in October, 1995 titled 'Participation in Sporting and Physical Recreational Activities', commissioned by the Office for Recreation and Sport.

This survey, however, sampled persons aged 15 years and over, which provided a higher participation rate of 59.3 per cent. Similarly to the above mentioned national survey, males had a higher participation rate (61.1 per cent) than females (57.6 per cent).

Unfortunately, accurate data of the type produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, is unavailable regarding the gender participation rates for recreational activities specifically.

In relation to women's participation in specific sports it is the government's position that the sports themselves must decide how best to encourage women's participation.

However, the government provides funds to assist recreation and sport associations develop programs relevant to their needs, and to encourage participation in physical activities by all South Australians.

Through the Active Club Grants Program and the Statewide Development Grant Scheme, administered by the Office for Recreation and Sport, state recreation and sport associations are able to apply for funds which are essentially based on access and equity principles. Among the wide range of needs for development grants the area of women's sport development receives considerable funding.

For sport participation generally the Active Club Grants Program, during its 1998 funding round provided \$23 500 to recreation and sport associations specifically for the purposes of catering for women in sport or recreation.

Further financial assistance has been provided to groups for a range of projects aimed at women, such as the establishment of women's football teams and the conducting of women's netball development camps.

Many non-gender specific organisations have also received funding for projects assisting women in sport.

The Statewide Development Grant Scheme provided funds to the following organisations for the purposes of women's sport development:

Womensport and Recreation SA Inc	\$25 000
YWCA	\$16 000
Women's Golf	\$10 000
Guides SA	\$10 000
Women's Cricket	\$10 000
Lacrosse SA	\$10 000
Netball SA	\$17 500
Softball SA	\$9 000

The Office for Recreation and Sport also administers the Wendy Ey memorial Scholarship, which provides a total of \$10 000 to assist women coaches achieve level 2 or 3 accreditation.

The Office, through its Policy and Social Development Unit, is presently implementing a Mentoring scheme for young women aimed at increasing the number of women in positions of decision making in sport and recreation.

Finally, in relation to high performance sport, the Office, through the South Australian Sports Institute, provides 48 per cent of its funds for elite athlete scholarships to women and 52 per cent to men.

TAXATION REFORM

In reply to **Mr WRIGHT (Lee)** 18 November 1998.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have been advised as follows:

The respective research reports referred to in the question were commissioned by the Department of Industry and Trade to assist with its understanding of key tax reform issues, with a particular emphasis upon the business and industry perspective. As information documents they helped Government to develop its policy position as distinct from being representative of Government policy in their own right. Both reports were finalised prior to the Commonwealth's announcement of their tax reform proposals on 13 August 1998.

The first study, undertaken by Allen Consulting and led by Dr Vince Fitzgerald, was completed in late December 1997 at a total cost of \$72 910. It provided a comprehensive review of the Australian taxation system and its international competitiveness. It concluded that while Australia was not a high tax country overall, the current taxation system adversely affected business because of high rates on business taxes, excessive compliance costs and numerous distortions, that it discouraged investment in Australia and limited the internationalisation of Australian business. It suggested that a number of changes were required, including:

- The abolition of wholesale sales tax;
- A GST at a rate of around 10 per cent with minimal exemptions;
- Replacement of a range of State taxes utilising revenue collected via the GST;
- A considerably simplified fringe benefits tax regime and some relief from payroll tax;
- Revisions to the capital gains tax regime; and
- Moderate cuts to personal income tax.

The second study, undertaken by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies (SACES), was designed to model the economic impacts of possible tax reform options upon South Australia and the nation as a whole, drawing upon the work undertaken by Allen Consulting. The final report was presented in June 1998, at a total cost of \$56 000.

While the report did not make recommendations, the results of the modelling suggested that:

- The abolition of wholesale sales tax and its replacement with a GST would be of particular benefit to South Australia, in both employment and economic growth terms, particularly for the wine and motor industries;
- The abolition of existing State stamp duties and financial institutions taxes, would also boost national GDP and employment, but the abolition of payroll tax would be less likely to produce economic benefits

With respect to this work of the SACES it should be noted that there were a number of difficulties associated with the modelling exercise given its complexity particularly in respect of the State taxes. As a result the modelling outputs were revised on several occasions before the final report was produced. In particular, the model was unable to take account of any changes to compliance and collection costs associated with the various options.

UNITED WATER

In reply to **Mr WRIGHT (Lee)** 18 November 98.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have been advised as follows:

The payments represent reimbursement of funds paid by United Water to a consultant, predominantly Ethos Consulting for development of the Water Industry Cluster process. It was considered desirable for this work to be conducted by an independent expert which was outside the scope of United Water's obligations.

The Cluster process and the need for consulting support was agreed by a representative industry/Government group and United Water, SA Water and South Australian Centre for Manufacturing, agreed to contribute a third each toward the cost of the consultant. The two-thirds Government contribution was funded out of the Water Industry Best Practice Program.

In 1997-98, a total of \$55 447.49 was reimbursed to United Water, based on proof of total payment by United Water of the entire account, including their third share.

Of this amount, \$4 954 was the Government's two-thirds contribution toward the cost of a license fee for intellectual property in the cluster development process from Collaborative Economics of the US. This process is identical to that used by Vision 2010 operated through the South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I am advised that Ethos used other subcontractors such as the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, but acted as the main contractor.

The consultancy was selected by a representative industry group led by United Water. I am advised that 3 consultants were reviewed with Mark Douglas of Ethos finally selected due to his background as consultant in the Irrigation Industry Strategic Plan.

The outcome of the process has been the formalisation of the Water Industry Alliance as a not for profit Association established to promote commercial collaboration between the partners. While various interim reports were provided, for the most part the role of the consultant was to facilitate a process of bringing together companies in manufacturing and services from diverse backgrounds to act as 'an industry' in the interests of growing the water industry in South Australia into national and international markets.

SHIP BREAKING INDUSTRY

In reply to **Mr FOLEY (Hart)** 18 November.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have been advised as follows:

1. No, the project has not yet reached a stage where discussions of financial commitment could be undertaken.

2. No, I am advised that my department has had a consultancy undertaken in order that it may assess claims made for the viability of the project by the proponent. This material has not been provided to the proponent.

I am further advised that the accommodation expenses for two consultants, were met by my Department in order that they could provide advice to Departmental officers regarding technical aspects of the proposal. This advice has not been provided to the proponent.

The total cost of these expenditures is just under \$23 000.

POLICE, HORSES AND DOGS

In reply to **Ms KEY (Hanson)** 26 November 1998.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am advised by the South Australia Police that the information the member has received is not accurate.

I am further advised that the budget and actual expenditure for dog and horse food for the last three financial years is as follows:

	Budget	Expenditure
1995-96	\$30 000	\$33 000
1996-97	\$33 000	\$49 000
1997-98	\$40 000	\$72 500

The above figures indicate that expenditure for dog and horse food has exceeded the budget by \$16 000 in 1996-97 and \$32 500 in 1997-98. This excess expenditure has been caused by fluctuations in feed prices which are determined by the availability of stock and level of purchasing.

The budget for horse and dog feed for 1998-99 is \$44 000 which represents an increase of \$4 000. As of 1-12-98 this budget is being met without the welfare of the animals being jeopardised. Efficient buying and management practices and stable feed prices have resulted in this budget line being controlled.

The quality of both horse and dog feed is of premium quality and has not been compromised. Dogs are fed a premium quality dry feed which on manufacturers' recommendations does not require to be supplemented by meat. RSPCA has used the same feed and consider it to meet full dietary requirements.

Horse feed is also high quality and care is taken to ensure high standards are maintained.

The process of reviewing the budgets and expenditure for horse and dog feed is a part of SAPOL's process of monitoring budgets in line with best practices.

ROAD SAFETY

In reply to **Ms KEY (Hanson)** 26 November 1998.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by South Australia Police that Road Safety Audits were conducted by police members as part of a SAPOL initiative. In no way was it prompted by Transport SA.

The initiative was in response to matters contained in the Rural Road Safety Action Plan. The focus was on maximising deterrence strategies and allocation of SAPOL resources to best enhance country road safety. The project was intelligence based.

Experienced State Highway Task Force members attached to the Traffic Services Division conducted the safety audits, not country police members.

The members took the view of experienced road enforcement operators who are thoroughly conversant with all aspects of rural arterial networks, rather than that of a trained traffic engineer.

At this time the project is nearing completion. Twelve major arterials have been audited and the results documented. Although there will be consultation with Transport SA, the information gained will be used by country police managers.

No funding was sought or provided outside SAPOL.

SPEED CAMERAS

In reply to **Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith)** 26 November 1998.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been provided the following information by the Police—

Assistant Commissioner Jim Litster is a member of the Road Signage Committee, chaired by the Hon. Graham Ingerson. In the interim, Police have investigated the issue of general speed camera signage in depth and surveyed the situation in other states and New Zealand.

In relation to crash statistics on nominated roads, the following statistics, taken from the police database for the period 1-1-95 to 31-8-98 (latest available) are provided:

Road	Total Crashes	Casualty Crashes	Fatalities
Park Tce			
(Port Rd—Torrens Rd)	289	30	1
Montefiore Rd			
(North Tce—Jeffcott St)	102	19	0
Main North Rd			
(Regency Rd—Grand Junction Rd)	728	90	2
Tapleys Hill Rd			
(Burbridge Rd—Warren Ave)	187	31	0

TEA TREE GULLY POLICE

In reply to **Ms RANKINE (Wright)** 25 November 1998.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been provided with the following information from the Police that indicates SAPOL's clear intention is to ensure that the implementation of the Local Service Area concept will provide the public of Tea Tree Gully with the most effective policing service possible.

The decision to proceed with the construction of a new police base will then be based on the impact of the Local Service Area approach, which will take into account the way in which services will be provided in the area as well as the location and scope of police facilities.

In this respect, SAPOL has continued to consult with Tea Tree Gully Council officers to identify possible sites for any new facility, which would contribute to service delivery objectives.

However, at this point, the matter of a new facility is still under consideration relative to the impact of the Local Services Area. A decision will be made in early 1999.

HAMMOND, Dr L.

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 19 November 1998.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Termination arrangements were negotiated with the former Chief Executive of the MFP by the Commissioner for Public Employment at the request of the then Chairman of the MFP Sir Llew Edwards.

Dr Hammond's termination payment was authorised by the Minister for Government Enterprises following advice from the Commissioner for Public Employment regarding the agreement negotiated with Dr Hammond.

PARA HILLS POLICE STATION

In reply to **Mr SNELLING (Playford)** 18 November 1998.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by South Australia Police that on 4 December 1997, the Salisbury and Para Hills Sub-Divisions were amalgamated as a part of Focus 21 initiatives to form the Salisbury Division. Para Hills patrol personnel were re-deployed to Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury Divisions.

Tea Tree Gully patrols have been temporarily accommodated at the current Para Hills Police Station/Patrol Base. Accommodation at Para Hills is considered to be temporary, as it is intended that a patrol base will be established at an appropriate location within the Tea Tree Gully patrol area.

It is intended that the current Para Hills Police Station/Patrol Base will become redundant once Tea Tree Gully patrols are relocated. Appropriate accommodation will be found for Para Hills Police Station in the very near vicinity to its present location.

There is and never has been any suggestion that a police station facility will not be provided at Para Hills.

COBBLER CREEK

In reply to **Ms RANKINE (Wright)** 19 November 1998.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Vodafone was able to erect a telecommunications tower in the Cobbler Creek Recreation Park because the Keating Labor Government, under the Telecommunications Act 1991, exempted telecommunications carriers from State, Territory and local government planning and environmental laws and took away the right of State Governments and local people to stop the building of the tower.

At the time of the construction of the telecommunications tower in the Cobbler Creek Recreation Park, Vodafone provided no advice to the Government on when the site would be operational.

Vodafone have since advised that the site will be operational by January 1999.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth).**

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

1. As I indicated to the honourable member on 5 November 1998, the Chief Executive of the Department of Human Services has referred the question of a conflict of duty to the Crown Solicitor for advice and is awaiting a response.

2. The public health sector is under pressure but it continues to treat thousands of people every day in a professional and competent manner. Staff are working well in spite of the increased pressure. This issue has consistently been raised in Medicare discussions with the Commonwealth Minister for Health.

3. Staffing arrangements are the domain of the Chief Executive. Senior officials have not been removed. A review of mental health services is being undertaken. During this time, the Director of the Mental Health Unit continues to work in the Statewide Division but in a more general role than previously. The contract of the Director of Community Services had been completed. There has never been a Chief Executive of Health Export Development in the portfolio.

There are a number of staff changes arising from the streamlining of the Central Office of the Department of Human Services.

FORWOOD PRODUCTS

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 18 November 1998.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The documents related to the sale of the South Australian Government sawmills to Carter Holt Harvey included clauses which provide for logging costs to be held constant for the first five years, and a rebate paid on logs delivered to Mount Burr Mill in the first two years.

These concessions resulted in the estimated reduction in revenue to ForestrySA of \$1 million. It was agreed by the Department of Treasury and Finance that \$1 million would be set aside from the sale proceeds to compensate ForestrySA for this loss of revenue.

ForestrySA has drawn on this fund as costs have been incurred and the balance at 31 October 1998 stood at \$298 000.

It is expected that the fund will be depleted by the end of 2000.

WIRRINA

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 18 November 1998.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Premier has advised that: The Government allocated \$14.85 million towards infrastructure provision for the development of the Wirrina Paradise Resort.

MBfI Resorts Pty Ltd to date have invested over \$40 million in the Resort including contribution to infrastructure.

The infrastructure projects contributed to by Government include:

- the Wirrina Marina
- the public road from Main South Road to the Marina
- a water treatment plant
- a waste water treatment plant
- works to increase the local reservoir capacity

Both the Resort developer and the Government contributed to the cost of each of these projects which were reviewed also by the Public Works Committee.

The two treatment plants and the reservoir works are located on the Resort and form part of its assets. However, the water treatment plant is capable of being sold separately and is subject to a written agreement with the Government which ensures that Government will receive half the proceeds of sale if the plant is sold within twenty (20) years of its construction.

The major contribution to infrastructure consisted of the Government's contribution to the construction of the Marina and associated public road. In addition to the public road, the Marina basin, breakwater structures and boat ramp are owned by the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning and leased and managed by the Resort developer. Thus this infrastructure is secured due to Crown ownership.

MBfl Resorts Pty Ltd has informed Government that since provision of the infrastructure, their accommodation numbers have increased by 40 per cent.

Further, MBfl Resorts Pty Ltd has undertaken to collate the information of the numbers of boats using the public ramp facilities and will provide it in the near future.

HOUSING TRUST, BRUKUNGA

In reply to Ms BEDFORD (Florey).

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

1. Since October 1996 the South Australian Housing Trust has not housed any new tenants in Brukung.
2. Not applicable.

STANDING ORDERS

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has approved the changes to the Standing Orders adopted by the House on 26 November. These changes are now in effect, and the Standing Orders book has been reprinted. I draw to members' attention a number of clerical corrections found during the republishing process which, with members' concurrence, I have made. They are as follows:

Standing Order 46: 'two minutes' should have read 'three minutes'.

Standing Order 81A: in the last line the words 'will not be' are better expressed as 'is not'.

Standing Order 82(3): while all references to 'printed' were to be changed to 'published', this one creates an anomaly and I have left it as 'printed'.

Standing Order 262: the word 'published' has been deleted, as the Chairman will be still working with a printed copy for the foreseeable future.

Standing Order 349: the phrase 'the weekly supplement of' was deleted from Standing Order 348 but not from this Standing Order, creating an anomaly.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the eighty-eighth report of the Public Works Committee, on the Sensational Adelaide 500 Capital Works, which has been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

- Australian Financial Institutions Commission—Report, 1996-97
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report Addendum, 1997-98

Seventh Australian Masters Games Corporation—Charter, 1998-99

By the Minister for Primary Industries, Resources and Regional Development (Hon. R.G. Kerin)—

Citrus Board of South Australia—Report for Year Ended 30 April 1998

Soil Conservation Boards—Report, 1997-98

Regulations under the following Acts—

Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Exemptions

Meat Hygiene—Fees and Codes

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

Development Act—

Report on the Interim Operation of the Waste Disposal

(Land-Fill) Development Plan Amendment by the

Minister for Transport and Urban Planning

Report on the Interim Operation of the City of Charles

Sturt—Hindmarsh and Woodville (City) and Henley

and Grange (City) Development Plans—Local

Heritage Plan Amendment

Statutory Authorities Review Committee Report—

Timeliness of Annual Reporting by Statutory

Authorities—Response to

Regulations under the following Acts—

Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving)—Log

Book Fee

Controlled Substances—Tetrahydrocannabinols

Harbors and Navigation—Jet Skis

Speed Zones—Fisherman Bay—Nildottie

Road Traffic—Road Events—Fees

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

Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report, 1997-98

Freedom of Information Act—Report, 1997-98

National Crime Authority—Report, 1997-98

Regulations under the following Acts—

Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Warrants to Seize Goods or Land

Legal Practitioners—General

Liquor Licensing—

Cases where Licence not required

Dry Areas—Long Term—

Naracoorte

Port Adelaide

Dry Areas—Short Term—Various

Unclaimed Goods—Variations of Values

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—

Scale of Charges—Medical Practitioners

Scale of Medical and Other Charges

Rules of Court—

District Court—District Court Act—

Amendment No. 21

Victim Impact Statements

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act—

Admission of Practitioners

Victim Impact Statements

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

Department of Education, Training and Employment—

Children's Services—Report, 1997-98

ETSA Contributory and Non-Contributory Superannuation

Schemes—Report, 1997-98

Regulations under the following Acts—

Public Corporations—Adelaide Entertainments Corporation

Southern State Superannuation—Lyell McEwin

Employees

Superannuation—Lyell McEwin Employees

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

Arid Areas Water Resources Planning Committee—Report, 1997-98

Coast Protection Board—Report, 1997-98

Dog and Cat Management Board—Report, 1997-98
 Environment Protection Authority—Report, 1997-98
 Eyre Region Water Resources Planning Committee—
 Report, 1997-98
 Murray-Darling Basin Commission—Report, 1997-98
 State Water Plan 1995, South Australia's Progress in
 Implementing the—Our Water, Our Future- Report,
 September 1998
 Water Well Drilling Committee—Report, 1997-98
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Environment Protection—Prescribed National Scheme
 Laws
 Water Resources—
 Prescribed Area and Periods
 Upper Willunga Catchment

By the Minister for Industry and Trade (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Local Government Finance Authority Act—Regulations—
 Prescribed Bodies

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Racing Industry Development Authority—Report,
 1997-98

Rules of Racing—
 Racing Act—Harness Racing—Partnerships

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

Local Government Act—Rules—Southern Region Waste
 Resource Authority—Constitution and Rules

By-Laws—Corporations—

City of Mitcham—

By-Law No 7—Cats

City of Holdfast Bay—

By-Law No. 1—Permits and Penalties

By-Law No. 2—Moveable Signs

By-Law No. 3—Council Land

By-Law No. 4—Waste Management

By-Law No. 5—Caravans and Camping

By-Law No. 6—Lodging Houses

By-Law No. 7—Fire Prevention

By-Law No. 8—Creatures.

CRAMOND REPORT

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I hereby table the independent report by Mr Cramond into allegations that I misled Parliament over a 1994 contract between the South Australian Government and Motorola. Mr Cramond finds that the so-called side deal alleged by the Opposition never happened. I was accused of conspiracy: there was none. I was accused of a cover up: there was none. Mr Cramond also finds that none of my statements as Premier to this House have been wrong. However—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: However, everyone who reads the report will find in it salutary lessons for both major parties. Government is found deficient in not ensuring that some of its political and departmental processes were well organised and well managed as it moved into Government after the 1993 State election, while the Opposition is revealed as having conducted a baseless witch-hunt which has wasted valuable time, effort and money, especially over the past year—and worse, a witch-hunt which has used this Parliament as a media circus to create mayhem over a five year old accusation with no foundation—rather than to deliver

constructive opposition on behalf of the people of South Australia and their future well being.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Where's the Leader of the Opposition?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well one might ask! In his report, Mr Cramond does not give credence to one single allegation that the Opposition has made about me or about any side deal with Motorola. Mr Cramond finds, in fact, that what I have been saying for five years is absolutely correct: there was no side deal, there was no secret deal and there was no hiding of any deal.

This report lays to rest any suggestion that my Government has been in any way corrupt in its negotiations with Motorola. I always had complete faith that this would be the result of Mr Cramond's investigation. I would like to take this opportunity to say to the Opposition, 'Watch my lips.' There was no side deal put in place for the Government radio network contract to be awarded to Motorola to entice the company to set up a software centre in Adelaide.

I would also like to remind the Opposition, the media and the people of South Australia that the completely above board and honourable contract that was signed with Motorola for its software centre has been very positive for South Australia. It has delivered to date 230 jobs and \$173 million into Gross State Product. What would the Opposition have us do—send them home? Undo the jobs and the contribution to Gross State Product? I remain very proud of that contract and of my part, with my colleagues, in delivering it to South Australia. Page 30 of Mr Cramond's report shows that I have every reason to be so.

Mr Cramond also finds that the legal advice provided to a Cabinet subcommittee on 17 May 1995 was incorrect. This May 1995 advice from Crown Law conveyed that a letter I had sent to Motorola on 14 April 1994 did constitute a legally binding offer of the radio network contract over and above the incentive package that was signed with Motorola two months later in June 1994. This is the so-called side deal that the Opposition has been pursuing. However, on page 31 of his report, Mr Cramond is quite explicit that the officer who provided the legal advice should have taken the contract that the State Government signed with Motorola in June 1994 into consideration when reaching his conclusion (that was the same person who prepared the contract) because, if he had, he would have found that my assessment was accurate—that is, there was no radio contract side deal, for precisely the reason I have maintained consistently and publicly: clause 17 of the June 1994 contract specifically supersedes all that had gone before.

In other words, Mr Cramond agrees that the June 1994 contract rendered the contents of my April 1994 letter null and void. Mr Cramond's report also includes comment from the Auditor-General, Mr Ken MacPherson. It is a very important comment. It indicates that he would not have written about the Motorola contract negotiations and contract in the very critical way he did in his annual report if he, too, had had access to the June 1994 contract with its clause 17. He was not made aware of this clause. He should have been. This conclusion is to be found on pages 28 and 29. Interestingly, Mr Cramond's research leads him, on page 46, to the conclusion that Motorola would always have won the South Australian Government's radio network contract because it has the best and most suitable technology. On page 29 he makes a statement which finally lays to rest all the Opposition

accusations that the radio network contract with Motorola was at odds with the State Supply Act.

Mr Cramond sets out that, whoever had won the radio network contract, State Supply would have found itself in exactly the same situation with regard to the contract. That said, and having once and for all dealt with the wrong allegations of a secret side deal, I do not seek in any way to hide from the fact that Mr Cramond does not find me, nor my officers, nor my Government, blameless in his deliberations. All of us made errors during the Motorola process and Mr Cramond's report highlights them. My department, the Economic Development Authority, should have kept the then Office of Information Technology aware of the progress of the Motorola contract.

It should especially have made it aware that the contract Motorola signed in June 1994 was a full and final offer of incentives and superseded everything that had gone before. As Mr Cramond's report indicates, had the EDA kept the Office of Information Technology informed, its CEO, Mr Dundon, would not have sent a letter to Motorola in October 1994 which, to all intents and purposes, unfortunately reactivated the April 1994 letter. The Office of Information Technology should have been provided with a copy of the June 1994 contract. It did not have one, and Mr Cramond makes mention on page 23 that when it asked for one it was denied for so-called security reasons. That was unacceptable.

In turn, I should have been far more acute in my awareness of the discussions my officers were having with Motorola and the time frame of those discussions. Mr Cramond has found that I made an error in part of my background to a question from Mr Rann in September 1994 with regard to this area. By the specific terms of reference of this investigation, Mr Cramond was required to find answers that were wrong either false or misleading. All my answers to Mr Rann's actual question have been found to be correct. It was my background knowledge which I added to my answer which has been found to be wrong.

The error I made was by way of comment that there had been no informal or formal discussions about the radio contract with Motorola. Mr Cramond says—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:—there were informal discussions at officer level and I should have known this from my regular departmental briefings. I wrongly stated that to my knowledge there had not been. I continue to maintain I did not know of any such informal negotiations within the time frame of the question Mr Rann asked of me—while the time frame I talked about was post the 23 June contract as the question had a preamble about rumours which I took to be present. Mr Rann has conceded in his correspondence with Mr Cramond that his question was clumsy.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I address my remarks to the Leader of the Opposition. Interjections are out of order. We had a disgraceful performance on the part of many members last year. This House will not degenerate this year into the sorts of performances we had last year. If members are to continue to interject across the Chamber after I have called them to order, I will be moving earlier this year than I ever have. Members have had ample warning. I was tolerant last year. The tolerance was abused.

I want to put on the record very clearly that this year the tolerance will not be given to members as it was last year.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I repeat: Mr Rann conceded in his correspondence with Mr Cramond that his question was clumsy. I have conceded that my answer was equally muddled and Mr Cramond makes mention of this. I would like to stress to the Parliament that, while my comment has been found to be wrong in fact, it was not intentionally wrong. By way of stressing this point, it can be noted from Mr Cramond's report that at no time during the September 1994 Estimates Committee was I ever made aware by any of my officers in attendance and at the table at that time that the answer was incorrect. And at no time following did any officer ever correct my version of events or, as is the norm if a Minister makes an error, suggest a written correction. In other words, at all times my officers appear to have agreed with my assessment of the time frame of events. I do not seek to argue with Mr Cramond's assessment. He has found that I gave wrong information to the Parliament. I accept that. As there never was a side deal, I stress that my error had no effect on any aspect of the parliamentary process which has followed since 1994. All I can do is apologise for making an explanatory comment which, in the five years since I made it, I have never been advised was wrong.

I would hope the Parliament will understand that it beggars belief that any Minister would take the serious step of deliberately misleading Parliament about an informal discussion on a deal that never happened. That said, I repeat my apology to this House for this unintentional error. I go back to the point I made at the beginning of this statement, that is, there are valuable lessons for both the Government and the Opposition in Mr Cramond's report. My Government shall certainly heed them because we are committed to good and accountable government.

I most certainly hope that the Opposition, too, will learn and be embarrassed by its abuse of the parliamentary process in this witch-hunt. But the most important result is that the contract between the South Australian Government and Motorola has been found to be as honest and worthy as we have always maintained it is, and that is to the benefit of every South Australian.

MOTOROLA

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

PRINTING COMMITTEE

Mr VENNING (Schubert): As Chairman, I bring up the first report of the committee 1998-99 and move:

That it be received and adopted.

Motion carried.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Is the \$50 million to \$100 million blow-out in the cost of the Government radio network associated in any way with the coat-tailing arrangements made with the New South Wales Government contract that it signed with Motorola for its radio equipment? Last week it was revealed that the Government radio network contract, which was forecast to cost between \$150 million and \$200 million, would now cost nearly \$248 million. The South Australian Government did not call tenders for the Motorola contract and instead coat-tailed its tender arrangements with the New South Wales contract with Motorola.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will refer that to the Minister in the other place. The important feature of the Government radio network contract is that it follows from the Coroner's report into the Ash Wednesday fires, and the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hart, as a senior adviser to the then Labor Government, sat around for years and ignored the fact that the Coroner had identified that, without such a contract, the people of South Australia were not safe. It is a simple fact that the Labor Government sat on its hands for over a decade and did nothing to ensure the safety of South Australians. That is what is important in relation to this contract, and I will refer the question to the responsible Minister.

ELECTRICITY, LEASE

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier inform the House of the practical benefits to South Australia of an ETSA lease?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to respond to the honourable member's question. The Government's proposals for the lease of this State's power assets are not the product of ideological zealotry. Instead, they represent a practical way of reducing our \$2 million-a-day debt bill. If we lease ETSA, we can slash our debt, cut our interest bill and use the money for South Australians. We can create the long-term momentum that will lead to jobs and prosperity, and we have seen through the National Australia Bank and the Econtech report that economic activity in South Australia is picking up, and substantially so, and that the economy is in the best position it has been in for some considerable time—years.

It is the result of five or six years of diligent policy direction and hard work of a Liberal Government that we are positioned in that way. We want to build on that momentum. Debt retirement remains the first priority of this Government—debt swallowing up the money that could otherwise be spent on South Australians and meeting the social infrastructure needs of South Australians. That is why we proposed bringing forward part of the electricity dividend in the ETSA reinvestment fund: to demonstrate the tangible benefits that people and their families will receive if that money is invested in this State.

I stress 'bringing forward' part of the dividend. The financial media has suggested that a lease of ETSA could generate between \$4 billion to \$6 billion. Even taking the lower figure, after the allocation of \$1 billion for the ETSA reinvestment fund, we would still be putting 75 per cent of

the proceeds into retiring debt—enough to almost slash it by half and certainly enough to wipe out that component of the State Bank debt.

The ETSA reinvestment fund focuses on practical measures: job creation; renewal of social infrastructure; renewal and protection of our environment; and support for families in need. That is where the \$1 billion of reinvestment is targeted. Do members opposite and in the other place oppose spending \$50 million to put computers into classrooms and into providing \$38 million to upgrade schools around the State? Do they oppose putting \$50 million into regional development? Do they oppose the second belt of parklands and keeping septic tank overflows out of our water catchment areas? Do they oppose spending more than \$60 million on upgrades and new work at the Queen Elizabeth, Royal Adelaide, Lyell McEwin and Noarlunga Hospitals and the Flinders Medical Centre?

This Government does not intend to deny South Australians a better future. Leasing ETSA cuts the debt, cuts our interest payments and gives us the money we need to do that. The ETSA reinvestment fund lets South Australians see where that money will go and how they will benefit, not to mention getting rid of the risk of trading in a national market.

It has been interesting to see that since the fund was announced the New South Wales shadow Treasurer, Mr Phillips, has spoken of the importance of demonstrating direct and tangible benefits of an electricity sale in that State and providing an up-front dividend for the community, to quote him. The editorial in yesterday's *Financial Review* described doing so as a valid proposal that might overcome road blocks. We still have time to realise the full value of our electricity assets and wipe out a large proportion of the debt, while freeing up funds for Government services. South Australians want and need the projects we are proposing through this reinvestment fund. It is now up to those in the other place and across this Chamber who oppose this policy to show whether or not they believe that South Australians deserve these projects.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises advise whether the South Australian Government determined the unit price for the console equipment and radio handsets for its whole of Government radio network based on the New South Wales Government radio network contract with Motorola, and is that the same contract which is now subject to three inquiries in New South Wales, including an investigation by the Independent Commission Against Corruption.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Is the Carr Government corrupt?

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

Mr FOLEY: It was reported in the weekend *Sydney Morning Herald* that the process used in letting a contract for console equipment for the New South Wales police radio network had been referred to the Independent Commission Against Corruption, the Police Integrity Commission and the Ombudsman. New South Wales Police Superintendent Stanton, in a press release last week, said that Motorola was part of a Government contract to supply equipment for its radio network. He said:

The police service as a Government agency is obliged to purchase from the agreed contract supplier.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As I indicated in response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, I will refer that question to the responsible Minister. I reiterate that this Government has had on its agenda the addressing of the simple fact that the previous Labor Government for a decade sat on its hands and allowed the recommendations of the Coroner's report into the Ash Wednesday bushfires to gather dust. The simple fact is that there was a decade during which the previous Labor Government could have addressed the matters of how emergency service communication actually occurred, but it chose not to do that.

Frankly, I am surprised because it is an extraordinarily important feature of any communications response, namely, the ability of the various emergency services to liaise and provide the most appropriate services. But for whatever reason, the previous Labor Government chose to ignore the Coroner's report for that decade. This Government did not. We have been looking at addressing this issue for a long time and the Government radio network contract is a cogent response to an identified need, which a previous Government ignored.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage explain to the House the significant ramifications for South Australia if New South Wales were to proceed with the abandoning of the River Murray water allocation cap? Having been involved in the negotiations that led to the introduction of the River Murray cap, I am certainly aware of the strong support for this initiative on the part of the vast majority of South Australians.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I certainly thank the honourable member for his question and recognise the very important part he did play in helping to negotiate the cap for South Australia. I am sure all members in this place are well aware of the plight of the River Murray: declining water quality, increasing stream salinity, algal blooms, collapse of native fish populations and the near closure of the mouth. The Murray Darling Basin Ministerial Council in July 1995 showed great vision and foresight when it agreed to one of the most important policy decisions since the initial River Murray Waters Agreement was signed in 1914. Make no mistake, the Murray Darling Basin initiative is the most forward thinking plan devised by visionary and just principle.

The council recognised that a balance needed to be struck between consumptive use and instream water requirements in order to secure our future. Importantly, it recognised that the time to act was now. There were worrying signs of overuse of the basin's water resources, particularly in New South Wales. I remind the House that the council is represented by Ministers of the States from Queensland, New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, Victoria and South Australia. The council unanimously agreed to immediately establish a cap on further diversions from the basin's rivers and streams, and the fundamental importance of this decision I suggest cannot be overstated.

It is therefore extremely alarming for all of us to hear the comments emanating from New South Wales in the past few days that we should abandon the cap. How much more evidence do we need to show that the Murray/Darling Basin has serious problems? We already extract some 80 per cent of the river's annual flow. That would appear to be reasonably sufficient. I am also advised by the scientific community that, in the long-term, even this level of extraction may not

necessarily be sustainable. We should also not forget that the blue-green algal bloom, along some 1 000 kilometres of the Darling River in 1991 was the largest bloom ever recorded throughout the world. It effectively placed the river out of bounds for stock or domestic use for some considerable period of time.

This event, perhaps more than any other, did in fact focus the collective minds of the nation on the serious consequences of poor catchment and river management. South Australia has long recognised the need to manage water extraction from the basin carefully. Effectively, we instituted our own cap in the late 1960s. South Australia was instrumental in encouraging other States to adopt the principles of the cap in 1995.

The leaders and the policy makers in New South Wales must be encouraged strenuously to reconsider their intended direction, because it is with greater efficiencies and new technologies that the resource will be protected and economic benefits delivered. Greater diversions, whether by building more farm dams or by increasing water allocations instead of prudent and determined management, will create immeasurable hazards—unacceptable to downstream users, unacceptable to South Australians and certainly unacceptable to the South Australian Government. When you live in a catchment as important to the Australian economy and our sense of identity, there is no room for these go it alone attitudes from New South Wales. The issue is greater than a State's rights to do what it likes. To abandon the cap would, indeed, be an irresponsible blow to necessary water reform measures, and it would certainly look to threaten current flow regimes that ensure the health of this great river system. This is the message that is now being sent to all the leaders and decision makers in New South Wales.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is again directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises, the senior Cabinet Minister responsible for the Government radio communications system. Given the concerns expressed in New South Wales about the proprietary Motorola system locking out competitors from providing future service or equipment for the Government radio network, will the Minister now explain whether this same proprietary system has similarly locked out competitors here in South Australia?

Mr Richard Mann, Communications Division General Manager of Plessey Australia, a rival communication company to Motorola, was reported as saying that Motorola would import all its equipment for the New South Wales radio network contract, that no spare parts would be kept in Australia and that anything that broke down would be repaired in America. Mr Mann added:

The Motorola system would effectively lock out any competitor from providing any future service or equipment for the police for at least 10 years because they would be incompatible.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Before I actually provide the answer I indicate to the member for Hart that his information that I am the senior Minister responsible for the contract is not correct. I am happy to go through the whole of Question Time taking every single question in relation to the GRNC, and I am very happy to provide the same response to every question because that is the appropriate thing to do. I shall refer this question to the Minister in another place with responsibility for the contract, but in so doing I reiterate: it was a decade where the need of South Australians to have an

emergency services communications network which worked and which prepared appropriate responses in an emergency was ignored by a Labor Government. This Government has not done so.

FIREFIGHTERS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Emergency Services respond to claims made by the United Firefighters Union during the current industrial dispute?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I thank the member for Fisher for his question and note his interest throughout his electorate in community safety issues. This is an important question, and members opposite might be interested in listening to this so that they can give the true facts to their community rather than supporting the furphies run out by the United Firefighters Union. It does not really surprise me when I see and listen to some of the information being peddled by the United Firefighters Union, but it is important to get matters on the public record correct. I appreciate the opportunity in the Chamber tonight to do this.

First, the offer that has been put to the UFU is not, as the UFU is claiming, 6 per cent over three years; in fact, the offer is 6 per cent over two years. I suggest that, when it gets back to the actual dollars we put in the firefighters' pockets, that is a vast difference. I hope that the firefighters will realise that it is 6 per cent over two years and not what the UFU has said, namely, 6 per cent over three years. Also, I point out to the House that the UFU claims that the police received 13.5 per cent as part of their EB agreement. Again, that is a furphy. The fact is that, indeed, the police received 9.5 per cent.

The other points I highlight include claims that the fire service is shrinking and that we are out there slashing and burning the fire service. In fact, not one dollar is being cut from the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service budget, and there is no slashing and burning whatsoever. That is an absolutely incorrect statement being put out by the UFU. In fact, I am delighted to report that soon to arrive in Adelaide will be \$5.6 million of brand new pumpers—16 in total. My advice is that that will put the South Australia Metropolitan Fire Service up there with the best, if not above the best, when it comes to the equipment, plant and so on that our Government continually pours into the fire service to ensure that the South Australia community is protected.

The other point I want to highlight to the House is that there are no hidden agendas, as claimed by the union. In fact, the only smokescreens are the agendas that the UFU wants to run out and about in the community. The CEO of the MFS, Mr Darbyshire, has advised the union today of this fact: the Government has a duty of care obligation—and I have that as the Minister—to ensure that when we develop new technology and opportunities for South Australians we first and foremost look at community safety, life and property throughout this State. If, with a new direction, capitalising on information technology, we have an opportunity to introduce a common computer aided dispatch system to tie in with the GRN—something that the previous Labor Government did not have the fortitude to take hold of even though it had 10 years after the Ash Wednesday Coroner's report to address it—we will do so and get on with the job. If my advice is that I need to consider a number of risk opportunities and, importantly, consider all benefits in the interests of the South Australian community, I will take that duty of care on board every time.

Therefore, we have advised the UFU today that we will be further developing the business case and looking at a range of potential options which include Mount Barker and other areas but which do not rule out the Wakefield Street site. I have also indicated to the UFU that I am very happy to consult with it through the negotiation team down the track as we develop the business case and to invite its comment. So, there are no hidden agendas; everything is above board and on the table.

The point I really want to highlight is that South Australian firefighters are amongst the highest paid firefighters in Australia. I encourage the union to get on with the job for its firefighters in completing the negotiation and round table conference with our team, to accept the 6 per cent over two years and to consult with us as we develop the business case for the computer aided dispatch centre.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is again directed to the senior Cabinet Minister for Information Economy and administrative services and, therefore, the Government radio network contract.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, I hope somebody in Cabinet has carriage of this. Why did the South Australian Government agree in 1996 to coat-tail its tender arrangements for the purchase of equipment for the whole of Government radio network based on arrangements in New South Wales which had not then been finalised and some of which were not tendered out until last year? Last year, the New South Wales Government called for tenders for a contract to supply communication consoles for the police radio service that was subsequently awarded to Motorola. According to media reports, the police awarded the contract to Motorola in October last year, even though its bid was at a higher price than a rival bid, because Motorola had offered a discount on another contract to supply two-way radios. The New South Wales contract has since been referred to the Independent Commission Against Corruption for investigation.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: At the risk of boring the House I reiterate that I am not the Minister responsible for the Government radio network contract. I will refer the honourable member's question to the responsible Minister in another place.

SMOKING BAN

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Human Services inform the House of the level of success of the new smoke-free dining laws which came into effect on 4 January 1999?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Earlier this afternoon we paid tribute to a reformer on behalf of South Australians. I think it is fair to say that the smoke-free dining legislation that this Parliament passed when my colleague the Minister for Government Enterprises was the Minister for Health was reforming legislation in a significant way. It has created a precedent where other States of Australia are now looking at what South Australia has done. It means that in more than 6 000 eating facilities throughout this State people will now be able to have a meal without having to put up with cigarette smoke. There is no doubt that the introduction of the legislation and its operation from 4 January has had an

enormous impact in giving people pleasure in eating and an assurance they will not have to put up with cigarette smoke.

It has been overwhelmingly accepted. There have been a number of applications for exemption but the number of applications is very small indeed given that more than 6 000 premises are involved under this legislation. I point out the overwhelming support it has received from organisations throughout the State, including the Heart Foundation, the Anti-Cancer Foundation, the Quit campaign, the Australian Medical Association, the Asthma Foundation, the Tobacco Control Council, Drug and Alcohol Services Council, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners and the Public and Environmental Health Service. All those bodies have come out supporting the legislation and the ban. I also pay tribute to the advertising and media campaign that has been undertaken. Most importantly, I am delighted that we are able to stand high in this Parliament and say that, now we have made sure that dining out in South Australia is smoke free, you can enjoy the food much more than you could previously.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I direct my question to the Premier. Given that the Minister for Government Enterprises refuses to answer questions concerning the Government radio contract—

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I rise on a point of order, Sir: I have not actually refused to answer any question. I have referred them all to the appropriate Minister in another place—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There is no point of order.

Mr FOLEY: Given that the Minister for Government Enterprises refuses to answer the questions put by the Opposition concerning the Government radio contract, and given that the contract is worth in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars and that there is ongoing controversy surrounding its implementation, will the Premier advise the Opposition which Cabinet Minister has responsibility for this contract?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: With major policy decisions of this nature Cabinet collectively makes final policy decisions for implementation. The implementation of the contract is with the Minister for Administrative Services, the Hon. Robert Lawson, in another place. This is a complicated contract. As the Minister has said, we have come to grips with an issue that the former Labor Government knew about, had a Coroner's report upon and did absolutely nothing to address. That is the point, and well might the member for Hart go silent on it.

Mr FOLEY: I asked the Premier which senior Cabinet Minister has responsibility. The Premier should answer that question and no other.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has already answered that part of the question.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House of any major new urban developments and detail the likely benefits of such developments for South Australia?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Colton for an extraordinarily important question regarding

urban development in South Australia, because it is my view that urban development done appropriately is likely to be the thing which differentiates Adelaide from other capital cities over the next 20 years. The Government has encouraged many new urban developments, and one such development is the Lipson Wharf development which is occurring as part of the regeneration and redevelopment of the Port Adelaide precinct. I am pleased to advise the House that last Wednesday, 3 February, I attended an official event to launch the beginning of the construction for the Lipson Wharf project.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Yes; as the member for Hart says, it is a good development. This \$20 million development will line the south-eastern side of the Port Adelaide wharves on the site of former rusting dockside sheds adjacent to the landmark lighthouse and the Port Adelaide historic precinct. The Lipson Wharf project comprises three super lots with paved pedestrian spaces linking those super lots, and complementing the project is the \$1 million promenade along the wharf, previously constructed by the Government. Development of these three super lots will see the establishment of a most creative and exciting mix of cafes, shops, offices and, very importantly, dockside dwellings overlooking the Port River. This mixed use concept enables a flexible approach to the development. It certainly reflects current trends and suits the historic character of the port area where, in years past (and as everyone would know who has visited the Port Adelaide area it is many years past) the owners lived above their businesses and accordingly there was a very vibrant after business hours street life.

This Lipson Wharf area and development combines with the earlier Harborside Quay residential development to bring back new life to the extraordinarily historic Port Adelaide precinct which will be of great benefit to all South Australians.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the member for Heysen says, it was the first designated heritage precinct in South Australia. Everyone who has visited the port area recently would know that over the past 30 years the economic tide has been going out in Port Adelaide. Fewer than 100 people live in the historic heart of the port at the moment. The Lipson Wharf development shows quite clearly that successful development can take place in Port Adelaide and that there is very strong public demand for good residential accommodation. I understand that the 23 individual two and three level residential allotments associated with one of the earlier super lots have already been sold or are under contract. So, that quite clearly identifies that if you put the best possible urban regeneration into areas such as Port Adelaide people will go there.

The Lipson Wharf and Harborside Quay developments demonstrate this Government's commitment to urban regeneration projects. They certainly identify this Government's ability to work with private sector developers to make optimal use of existing community resources and services. The Government has acted in this arena to remediate serious contamination problems with the sites involved and then package and market them in a manner which attracts and secures professional private development to everyone's gain. So, the Government is concerned to bring about good, progressive urban development because, as I said, that is what will differentiate Adelaide from its competitors in the capital city market. Port Adelaide is such a great opportunity because

it is Australia's last major dockland development opportunity, and the Government is working assiduously to make sure that it is the best.

HAMMOND, Dr L.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises, and I might have one here to which he can give an answer. Will the Minister provide us with the accurate and complete details of the total payout received by former MFP boss Dr Laurie Hammond and, if not, why not, given that the Government began investigating this matter at least three months ago? On 18 November last year the Minister revealed that a Government investigation was already under way into the exact amount that Dr Hammond had received as a payout. The Minister further admitted that he may have misled Parliament when, on the prompting of the Premier, he told the House in December 1997 that Dr Hammond had received a \$198 500 payout. The Auditor-General has reported Dr Hammond as receiving payments of between \$470 000 and \$480 000 for the six months to the abolition of the MFP.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: A number of members of the House have suggested that the member for Hart might like to contemplate the payout to Mr Bruce Guerin, which the public of South Australia is still paying. But in answer to the question—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Because everyone realises that it is an extraordinarily significant amount that we are paying Mr Guerin. The answer to the question is that the Government is aware of the total amount of money. What the Government is completing at the moment is further work on the authorisations and the private documents and records of phone calls of people who are no longer even in South Australia and certainly no longer members of the MFP board. In addressing the House I have taken very seriously the requirement to have the complete information available. That is coming to fruition, and no-one is looking forward to providing that information to the House more than I. I believe that it will be no later than next week but, as I say, information is being collated as to private notes. The amount is known, and I will identify to the House all the facts in relation to those sums of money when all the information is correct, as I know that the member for Hart would not wish me to provide incomplete information.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Minister for Year 2000 compliance. Following the establishment of the Ministry for Year 2000 compliance in October last year, I think it was, what changes in public awareness of the problem have occurred, if any? Has any assessment been made of the level of work of the Y2K bug rectification programs that have been undertaken and, if so, what has been the result of such assessment?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Members of this Chamber would be aware of the member for Hammond's keen interest in matters involving technology. He is well aware of the implications of this problem, particularly as we have only 11 months left to redress it. In December of last year the Australian Bureau of Statistics released its first in-depth

report into its analysis of the awareness within business of the year 2000 problem. The bureau surveyed some 6 500 Australian businesses and provided figures for the whole of Australia, State by State. On a positive note, the survey found that South Australia was effectively one of the nation's areas of highest awareness, with 93 per cent of businesses being year 2000 date problem aware. However, we are only too well aware that just because businesses are aware of a problem does not necessarily mean that they have an in-depth understanding, nor does it necessarily mean that they have rectified or are intending to rectify the problem.

So, the bureau also surveyed the business view on rectification and found that only 63 per cent of the South Australian businesses surveyed that were aware of the problem indicated that they were going to do anything about it. That indicated to the team the Government set in place that its task is not simply one of making businesses aware that a problem exists but also of providing business with the knowledge that it needs to understand the problem and to act upon it. To that end, the staff charged with the responsibility of advising business have set in place a number of mechanisms to broaden knowledge. One of those mechanisms is being felt through the entire community, that is, utilising Government services and utilities and their mail-out systems to make businesses and householders aware of the problem.

Members of this Chamber themselves would have noted that included with motor vehicle registration, electricity and water accounts are inserts that, amongst other things, include details of the year 2000 date problem and provide the Government hotline number encouraging people to find out more about the problem. That hotline number is easy to remember. It is a free number, therefore it is an 1800 number and, appropriately, 11 2000. I am pleased to say that, as a result of those mail-outs and other awareness programs, the hotline in South Australia received 222 calls in December and in January that number increased to 417 calls and keeps increasing. Indeed, relative to other States, the hotline calls in South Australia are now higher than in other States in Australia, and we take some satisfaction from the fact that we are now motivating South Australians to find out about the problem and to begin redressing it.

We are also particularly concerned that in rural South Australia the awareness rate is lower and the activity rate to rectify the problem is lower, so to this end we have engaged the services of three people who are rural based, drawn from rural South Australia, who will be actively speaking with local government, with community and with business people to ensure that they understand the problem and what it could do to their business and that they act upon it. Very quickly, South Australians are now starting to realise that, if they run a business, the year 2000 date problem is not simply a computer problem, is not simply a technology problem but, indeed, is a serious business management problem. They realise that if they do not act upon this problem to rectify it their business could well experience difficulties at the turn of the century.

In order to ensure that we keep well aware of the rate of progress in South Australia, regular surveys will be conducted of our business community and consumers to ensure that we have the most up-to-date information. On future occasions, I will apprise the House of progress on this most important matter.

PROJECTS DELIVERY TASK FORCE

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier tell the House which projects will now not go ahead as a result of the decision to end the Projects Delivery Task Force headed by Mr Roger Cook, and is Mr Cook still on the Government payroll? A media report today states that the task force was undermined by senior bureaucrats and that developers are disappointed by the decision. When he announced the task force in November 1997, the Premier stated:

We need a dedicated team of people to ensure these developments proceed without the delays we have seen in the past. . . This State is open for business and I intend to ensure developers hear that message loud and clear.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Indeed the task force has delivered for South Australians. We have the \$180 million Glenelg-West Beach development by Baulderstone Hornibrook. We have had a breakthrough in the Barossa Valley. Ten years ago then Premier Bannon announced that the Barossa Valley would be fixed with tourism infrastructure. Nothing happened under Labor, but under a Liberal Government and with this task force construction is now taking place in the Barossa Valley for that new tourism infrastructure.

Those are just two projects of many that Roger Cook and his group have been able to broker and work through. That is why we have had an unprecedented increase in the percentage of private sector new capital investment in South Australia. If my memory serves me correctly, it is about a 24 per cent increase, compared with the national average of 5 per cent. So, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her Dorothy Dix question because the fact is that through the brokering and work of Roger Cook and his group we have moved these projects from dreams to reality. We are delivering.

Regarding the 20 or 30 projects that were given to the task force—they do not all come to mind at the moment—its initial task for the year was to work on those projects and have them delivered. Roger Cook has done an outstanding job in delivering those projects.

The next phase is that Roger Cook will continue in his role, but the task force will be slightly different. We will bring in these private sector people who have been involved on a case-by-case basis as a project arises. Someone with commercial and professional expertise will be brought in to help the Government with the negotiations for these projects. Roger Cook is on the payroll and, whilst he keeps producing the results that he does, he will continue to be on the payroll in South Australia.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police will come to order.

CAPE BARREN GEESSE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage advise what steps are being taken to assist farmers on Lower Eyre Peninsula with the problems encountered with Cape Barren geese? The goose population has exploded in recent years, creating a situation of plague proportions which is causing economic hardship to some farmers on Lower Eyre Peninsula.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: At least they're not albatross. I thank the honourable member for her question, which

obviously relates to an extremely disturbing problem for farmers in her electorate resulting from an influx of Cape Barren geese on their properties.

To address this issue, the Government initiated a trial to look at the means to successfully manage and control the impact of the geese. This trial, which was conducted some months ago, found that the population of Cape Barren geese in South Australia has risen from fewer than 3 000 birds in 1980 to an estimated 9 000 to 10 000 birds in 1998. Obviously, there has been a remarkable recovery in that population.

It was also discovered that during summer on Eyre Peninsula 5 000 to 6 000 Cape Barren geese graze on farming properties. This represents a 200 per cent increase in the goose population in that region since 1980. Obviously, such a population growth has had a substantial impact on the farming properties in the region.

However, I think members should also be aware that we are not alone in facing such issues. Across Australia and around the world a number of regions are experiencing significant native bird pest problems. Each region certainly has its own unique combination of bird species and management issues, all of which have been extremely difficult to deal with.

The final stage of the project that was set in place will provide a set of management recommendations to address these problems. Officers of my department have advised me that they are working on these issues as I speak. I expect to receive their recommendations before the end of the week. I assure the honourable member that the moment I have seen the report I will immediately make sure that those recommendations are available to her and the farming communities that are so beset by these problems.

EMERGENCY WORKERS, ROAD SAFETY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services, representing the Minister for Transport. When will action be taken to restrict the speed limit of vehicles passing emergency vehicles with crews working on the roadside? Members of the CFS have expressed to me their concern at the risk posed by vehicles travelling at high speeds past areas where they are working. These volunteers consider that they and other emergency workers are exposed to similar risks as road workers and need similar protection. They understand that legislation on the matter has been prepared for some time, and were hoping for a decision before this summer's wildfires and other incidents.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will take up this matter with the Minister for Transport in another place, but I am told by the Minister for Emergency Services that talks have been under way between the respective Ministers on this issue. So, I am sure that those two Ministers (the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Emergency Services) will resolve the issue very quickly to protect those people involved in making sure that they are providing emergency services on the roadside.

RURAL EDUCATION AND CHILD-CARE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training provide members with specific details of changes made by his department for the better delivery of education and child-care

services in rural South Australia since he set up a directorate of country services late last year?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Country schools and children's services have for too long had a Cinderella complex. As I have visited country schools over the past 15 months, one of the things that I have found fairly common therein is the fact that there are many situations where they find that metropolitan solutions for education and children's services do not necessarily work very well in the country.

Following the announcement and appointment of a Director for Country Services for education, I want to concentrate on country schools and ensure that their problems are addressed promptly. The Director for Country Services is this month commencing a consultation process throughout country areas. My instruction to him has been to go out and listen to country people in order to ascertain where they see problems in the delivery of the service. We will then look at how we can address those issues in terms of providing unique solutions to schools in country locations.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I happened to go to a country school. I went to Wasleys Primary School—and enjoyed it, might I say. And let me tell the honourable member that a number of schools are in that situation. This initiative has been welcomed by country people: it is one that they have seen as being required for quite some time. There are planned meetings for some 28 country sites. A number of people—school counsellors—have telephoned, offering to hold meetings with the Director, and communities will have their chance to have a direct input in the forming of policy. It is not only the school councils and those communities but also teachers in country schools who see better options and solutions than those which are currently undertaken by the department.

I encourage all country members from both sides of the House to become involved in this consultation process. It is important that we address the problems that exist in the country. It is important that country MPs have a say and listen to their communities as to how we can better deliver this service. Consultations are being conducted throughout the first term. Following those consultations, in due course I will be pleased to inform the House as to what changes will be made in the delivery of our education and children's services into country locations.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Ms RANKINE (Wright): What plans, if any, are in place for the Salisbury East Campus of the University of South Australia, and will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training guarantee that this once valuable local resource will again be put to productive educational use? Despite strong student and community opposition, the Salisbury East Campus of the University of South Australia had its academic courses progressively withdrawn from 1994, with its ultimate closure at the end of 1996.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: You.

Members interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: It started in 1994. Since that time, the buildings and facilities at this campus have remained empty and unused. They are becoming run down and vandalised, and that is an issue of great frustration and concern to both the Salisbury council and the community generally.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the honourable member has indicated, the site has been vacant for a couple of years. The University of South Australia has sole control over that land, and it has placed the Salisbury campus on the market. Indeed, it has been on the market for some two years. I am advised that at this time it is undertaking negotiations with a buyer for the campus. I am not able to advise the House as to how those negotiations are going, but I am aware that negotiations are in progress for the purchase of the campus.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Year 2000 Compliance advise the House of the costs to Government to date of rectifying the year 2000 compliance problem?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Hartley—indeed, like all members of the Government—is concerned not only about the year 2000 date problem but also about the fact that the community will notice no difference when we spend the money on rectifying the problem and whether we do the job properly, which is our intent. By that, I mean that we are expending money simply to ensure the Government systems that are operating this year will continue to operate next year without any problem.

I advised the House previously that responsibility for rectification of systems and of any item that has an embedded chip rests with the chief executives of the 10 Government portfolio agencies. Cabinet set three firm deadlines. The first of those deadlines has just passed, and that was 31 December last year, by which time all systems had to be identified, assessed and problems corrected. The second deadline is 30 June this year, by which time testing of all corrected systems must be completed, and obviously the last of those deadlines is 31 December this year. With that background in mind, in May last year, in my then role as Minister for Information Services—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: —I advised the House that an allocation of \$78 million would be necessary for the Government to cover the cost of this. The member for Peake interjected. I know I should not respond to interjections, Mr Speaker, but he raised an important point when he asked why it was taking so long. Many parts of industry have been working on this problem for years. The member for Peake may be interested to know that the industries most advanced in rectifying this problem have been working on it since 1995. It is absolutely vital that this problem is solved to ensure that business continues to operate, just as it is important that the Government continues to resolve the problem.

With the advance of time from May last year, at which time I publicly advised that there was every chance that the expenditure needed would increase to the vicinity of \$100 million, I can now advise the Parliament that at present the cost of rectification of the year 2000 date problem for the State Government is \$104.2 million.

As I indicated, that is not money that we particularly enjoy spending because it delivers no immediately visible benefit. However, that benefit will certainly be visible from early January next year when members see what happens in other jurisdictions, hopefully not in Australia but certainly in other parts of the world, where they have not focused on this problem and have literally thrown caution to the wind. I also advise the Parliament that we have against that a 10 per cent contingency factor. So, while it is \$104.2 million now—and

it has been stable for two months at that rate—there is always the chance of an expansion as we complete the work in rectifying systems.

I advise the House that the major ingredients of that cost are as follows: Human Services, \$32.7 million; Government business enterprises, \$18.9 million; the electricity sector, \$15 million; the Department of Education, Training and Employment, \$11.7 million; the Department of Justice, \$6.5 million; and the departments of Transport, Planning and the Arts, \$6.3 million. They are significant amounts of money, but that expenditure is necessary to ensure that the systems continue.

As an example of the types of areas that have been identified for rectification, Adelaide's traffic system would have problems if the date problem were not rectified and

when waiting on component parts. Similarly, the Crouzet ticketing system on our buses, trains and trams and the portable units held by officers are also candidates for rectification. Indeed, the rectification of that system will cost approximately \$1 million. The areas for rectification are extensive and wide ranging and, on a future occasion, I look forward to reporting to the House on the progress on this matter.

The SPEAKER: Due to the lateness of the hour, it is not the intention of the Chair to put the question that the House note grievances.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 February at 2 p.m.