

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 May 2000

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

PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 253 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House strengthen the law in relation to prostitution and ban prostitution related advertising, were presented by Ms Bedford, the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire, Mr Hamilton-Smith, Ms Key and Mr Scalzi.

Petitions received.

LIBRARY FUNDING

Petitions signed by 10 711 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure government funding of public libraries is maintained, were presented by the Hon. M.H. Armitage, Ms Bedford, the Hons G.M. Gunn and G.A. Ingerson, Ms Key, Mr Lewis, Ms Maywald, Mr McEwen and the Hons M.D. Rann, R.B. Such and D.C. Wotton.

Petitions received.

SPEED LIMIT

A petition signed by seven residents of South Australia, requesting that the House support legislation to increase the speed limit on sections of the Stuart, Eyre and Barrier Highways and Hawker to Lyndhurst Road to 130 kilometres per hour, was presented by the Hon. G.M. Gunn.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 44, 52, 94 and 95; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

OAK VALLEY SCHOOL

In reply to **Ms BREUER** (6 April).

The **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY**: A new school is planned at Oak Valley to replace existing facilities and provide a child-care and school service for up to 35 students.

The new school is planned to consolidate into one building teaching activities that are currently conducted in two separate buildings. The existing buildings serve different age levels of students, i.e., child parent centre, primary school, senior school teaching activities. Toilets are available. Although there is no running water to the caravan classrooms, drinking water is taken to the classroom areas on a daily basis.

It is estimated the child-care centre/school will cost \$1.2 million. This includes \$240 000 from the National Child-care Strategy to provide children's services as part of the school. Funding for the project was announced in the 1999-2000 DETE capital works program.

There has been an extensive process with the Oak Valley community concerning the design and development of the new school which has taken over 12 months. This time has been needed to:

- Ensure that existing utilities (i.e. power and water) are available in the community to support the new school building. This task has been responsible for much of the delay. The assessment has involved a number of specialists from different agencies visiting Oak Valley to confirm that existing utilities will be able to support the operations of the new facility.

- Confirm long-term stable enrolments (to ensure that the new facility will accommodate current and future enrolments).
- Consult with representatives of the community to ensure that the design is sympathetic to the landscape and is flexible to accommodate other community uses.
- Seek endorsement from representatives of the Oak Valley community for the final school design.

The design and documentation process has now been completed and the project is currently with the Development Assessment Commission for approval.

Construction time for the new facility will be dependent on local weather and conditions.

CROYDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr ATKINSON** (30 March).

The **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY**: During the transition process in 1997, parents of students from Croydon Primary School were requested to indicate where their children would enrol in 1998. This information was necessary to assist departmental officers and cluster principals in planning accommodation needs for students in their new schools in 1998. Principals of neighbouring schools surveyed all parents early in term 2, 1997. However, I am advised that many parents of students from Croydon Primary School did not return the surveys. Attempts to seek this vital information were made throughout terms 3 and 4 in 1997. From the limited information available to them at the time concerning likely enrolment increase at Allenby Gardens Primary School, departmental officers estimated that there would be limited accommodation pressures. The Building Land Asset Management System information indicated that there were no major issues concerning the condition of the Allenby Gardens site.

Many parents held the decision to enrol their children at Allenby Gardens Primary School until January 1998. I am advised that 56 students enrolled at Allenby Gardens Primary School at the start of the 1998 school year. I am also advised that 123 students enrolled at Challa Gardens Primary School and 35 students at Kilkenny Primary School following the closure of Croydon and Croydon Park Primary Schools.

As a result of the closure of Croydon and Croydon Park Primary Schools in 1997, substantial resources were allocated to local schools. These included \$2.1 million for the redevelopment of Croydon High School, \$503 000 for the upgrade of Kilkenny Primary School and \$746 000 for the upgrade of Challa Gardens Primary School.

Allenby Gardens Primary School successfully accommodated all of its new students. The school received \$14 000 as its per capita share resulting from the transfer of students from Croydon Primary School and received \$4000 for new furniture and was reimbursed \$6000 for funds expended during January 1998 on the upgrade of a classroom. In addition, the school has received a total of \$65 540 in Back to School grants since 1997 and the school's security system was upgraded in 1999 at a cost of \$19 900.

Allenby Gardens Primary School then received \$40 000 funding under the 1999-2000 Minor Works Program to establish a computer room adjacent to the school library. Departmental officers have discussed with the Principal the provision of a primary school activity hall under the Capital Works Assistance Scheme.

The total funds allocated to the redevelopment/upgrade of local schools including Allenby Gardens Primary School is in excess of \$3.5 million.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Development Act—Regulations—Significant Trees

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

Institution of Surveyors, Australia, South Australia
Division Incorporated—Report, 1999

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act—
Regulations—Self Managed Employer—Additional
Information

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

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—
Report, 1999

By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Judges of the Supreme Court of South Australia—Report,
1999

Rules of Court—

Court of Disputed Returns—Local Government (Elec-
tions) Act—Application of Proceedings
District Court—District Court Act—Status Hearings

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

South Australian Harness Racing Club—Report, 1998-99

By the Minister for Employment and Training (Hon. M.K. Brindal)—

Vocational Education, Employment and Training Board—
Report, 1999.

WOOMERA DETAINEES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Last Friday at an Immigration Ministerial Council in Wellington, New Zealand, the South Australian government raised some serious concerns about the impending release of detainees from the Woomera Immigration Detention Centre. Up to 90 per cent of the 1 300 illegal immigrants currently being detained at Woomera will be granted temporary protection visas, allowing them to stay in Australia for three years. The state government has also been advised that, once the visas have been granted, the detainees are offered transport to only three destinations: Perth, Brisbane or Adelaide.

The South Australian government understands that detainees will receive a commonwealth funded assistance package of approximately \$500. They will not be eligible for any of the normal humanitarian settlement services funded by the commonwealth. They will not be eligible for up to three months accommodation. They will not be eligible for fully-funded English language classes. They will not have access to job network services. They will not have access to settlement services, including counselling, assistance to access to schools, and family support services. In fact, after taking these people to the Centrelink office in their preferred destination, the commonwealth's involvement with the group will cease.

Given the location of Woomera, it is reasonable to expect that a significant number of those offered temporary visas will come to Adelaide. On top of that, preparations are under way to allow for a possible increase to 3 000 people in Woomera. To add to South Australia's concerns, there are also currently almost 30 unattached or unaccompanied minors aged between 14 and 17 years detained at Woomera who have specific guardianship and placement issues. This gives rise to significant cost implications for public housing, emergency accommodation, health and community services, not only for state government agencies but also, just as importantly, for our non-government welfare organisations and charities. That is who is left to pick up the tab—South Australian taxpayers and our welfare groups and charities!

There is a sense of urgency for South Australia with the first of the Woomera detainees expected to be released this

month. In Wellington, every state and territory passed a motion calling on the commonwealth immediately to suspend temporary protection visas until a review of costs to the states could be undertaken. That motion was flatly rejected by the federal immigration minister on the ground that there was no additional cost to the states. Furthermore, the commonwealth reiterated that it was committed to a policy of providing reduced services as a means of deterring further illegal boat people. The commonwealth is effectively asking South Australians—asking our welfare and charity groups—to turn these people away. What an incredible policy position—asking welfare groups and charities to turn people away.

The policy is wrong. If the commonwealth thinks reduced services will stop the influx of illegal people boat people, it is wrong. If the commonwealth thinks there is no cost to the states, it is wrong. We have had 41 temporary visa holders arrive in Adelaide over the past six weeks. The minimum direct cost to the South Australian taxpayer has been approximately \$2 000 per person. That jumps to \$5 000 per person if English language services are provided. Up to 95 per cent of detainees at Woomera do not speak English.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will move around to the left.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Wesley United Mission has written to me in the past few days. It has advised me that, over the past fortnight, the mission's welfare program has assisted 38 Afghan temporary visa holders. Eleven of those turned up as the mission was closing its doors on Easter Thursday. They would not and could not turn them away. They have a moral obligation to help these people. These people the commonwealth—and I stress the commonwealth—has determined should be allowed to stay in this country for a minimum of three years.

I am today writing to the federal minister, Mr Ruddock, asking again for the commonwealth to reconsider its position. I will also be writing to non-government charity and welfare organisations in this state asking them what impact the commonwealth policy is likely to have on their services. Because, at the end of the day, no South Australian should be disadvantaged by this policy by the commonwealth, and I intend to ensure that they are not.

The commonwealth argues that the majority of these temporary visa holders will be self-sufficient. And the reality is that, once their three years has expired, the majority, if not all, will be granted permanent residency. If that is to be the case (and it appears likely to be), and if the commonwealth remains intransigent (and it also appears likely that it will), I now offer a compromise to the federal government, and I hope that the commonwealth will listen to the unanimous view of the states and territories.

I will also write to the commonwealth and ask it to consider requiring those refugees who do become self-sufficient to repay the cost of the services provided to them similar to the current tertiary education scheme. If it is good enough for our tertiary students to bear the cost of their education once they enter the work force, I argue that it is good enough for those people who seek to become part of our society also to bear some of the cost once they find sustainable employment. If the federal government is after a deterrent, I argue that this measure would be a greater disincentive than reduced services. Certainly, the South Australian community would not suffer as a result.

South Australia strongly supports considered and coordinated responses to refugees rather than the piecemeal and crisis driven approach that will inevitably result from the

present arrangements. It is widely recognised that refugees require appropriate, early, coordinated intervention, and that the sooner they recover and settle the better for them and the whole community. This should be about fairness and being serious about our responsibilities; it should not be a cost shifting exercise. Remember, it is the commonwealth which has chosen to grant these people temporary protection, not the state. By granting these visas, the commonwealth is effectively acknowledging these people as refugees, and as such it has a responsibility and a duty of care. South Australia simply asks the commonwealth to accept that responsibility.

QUESTION TIME

AUSTRALIAN CAR INDUSTRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the recent announcement by Mitsubishi that it will reduce its work force by 600 following the earlier loss of 300 jobs, does the Premier now believe it is vital to hold a comprehensive review of the Australian car industry and the impact of tariff cuts so far before any further cuts to our tariffs are made in 2005, and does he believe that further meetings with Daimler Chrysler are now urgently required in order to gauge that company's intentions regarding the Tonsley and Lonsdale plants and to lobby for additional assembly and components work?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): As indicated by Mitsubishi in January, restructuring was to be put in place. During my discussions in Tokyo on, I think, two occasions and also here with the managing director in Adelaide on a number of occasions, the South Australian Government's support for Mitsubishi was based on two important points: first, that there would be longevity in manufacturing operations; and, secondly, that any such restructuring would be put at a minimum. Mitsubishi has honoured those commitments publicly, and as recently as last week it again confirmed to me in writing those commitments.

Regarding the current tariff regime, I note that one of the candidates in the current ballot for the union movement has today publicly called for a further freeze on tariffs. We had that debate two years ago and we fought, and won, that debate to put a pause in place and that pause is in place through to 2005. It is based on the current policy that Mitsubishi has been prepared to commit to hundreds of millions of dollars, first, in two facelifts. The first one will start on the production line in about July this year and there will be a further facelift possibly before a new platform and vehicle is built in 2004-2005, taking manufacturing out to 2010-2012. It is based on the current policy with the pause included. It is why we fought so hard in 1997 to win that.

At the time we won that tariff pause, the federal government made it perfectly clear that that was the last occasion on which it would further err in terms of tariff reductions. That is the reality of the circumstances: we won the day, we got the pause and it was clearly indicated that no further reduction would be entertained by the commonwealth. Based on that policy, Mitsubishi has committed and is continuing to maintain that commitment to expand its manufacturing operations. It is interesting to note that during the course of 1999 (when there was speculation about manufacturing operations) market share of the company dropped.

However, since January and the company's announcement that it was here for the long haul, its market share has returned, and it has gone up again since January this year. With the facelift, which will start in production about July-August, the company anticipates, in about October, increasing the production run at the Mitsubishi plant to 205 units a day; such has been the acceptance of Mitsubishi, the quality of the product and the assurance of the company in terms of longevity. The government will continue to work—and I know we have support in this—with Mitsubishi to ensure that its operational costs are addressed—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, I will get to that—and to ensure that it is internationally competitive. I emphasise, for example, that on 1 July this year some \$50 million will be reduced in workers' compensation payments by South Australian business and, if we continue to have a fully funded scheme (in line with policies this Government has put in place over the past six or seven years), we will see a further \$50 million reduction in workers' compensation premiums on 1 July next year. That is in stark contrast to what we are seeing at the moment in New South Wales, where the unfunded workers' compensation scheme is blowing out by hundreds of millions of dollars and heading towards, as I understand it, \$1 billion. Therefore, we will continue to work with the company to ensure reduced operating costs. In relation to the position of—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, the automotive components and outsourcing companies are not. They are part of it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has asked his question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The leader by his interjection indicates a little bit of ignorance. These companies buy in a whole range of goods and services for small and medium business. Let me move on to the component in the question about Daimler Chrysler. As I have indicated publicly, last year I had discussions with Daimler Chrysler in Detroit and also in Europe. In both instances, we spoke to them about its involvement in the Asia-Pacific region, given that Daimler Chrysler anticipates spending hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new capital investment in the next three to five year period in the automotive industry world wide. That substantial investment is something that we have identified as an opportunity for South Australia. To build on that and the meetings I had last year with Daimler Chrysler both in Europe and in the United States, last week we announced the appointment of Mr Graham Spurling to head up an automotive industry task force.

Graham Spurling, of course, is well known to South Australians as the former Managing Director of Mitsubishi. Mr Spurling was successful in the introduction of the new model Mitsubishi that we understand today and, in addition, he has had some five years experience in the United States as the Chief Executive Officer of GNB Technologies. Mr Spurling is therefore well known in the automotive industry within Australia and internationally.

Mr Spurling's task, on a consultancy of approximately three days per week over the next three months (together with a small, dedicated task force of four people from the Centre for Manufacturing and the Department of Industry and Trade who are working full-time on this issue), will be to consult and discuss with Daimler Chrysler and Mitsubishi in terms of attracting a raft of overseas automotive component supply

firms in respect of establishing their base in South Australia and to build here in the future.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Daimler Chrysler will indicate that its right-hand drive jeep production in Austria was not one of its smartest past decisions. However, be that as it may, we have also had discussions with General Motors in relation to its \$1 billion investment in the automotive industry which is anticipated to be committed over the course of the next year. We have had discussions with a range of companies, whether it be foundry, tooling and other feeder industries to the automotive industry and, in particular, those companies which are based overseas and which supply products to General Motors for attachment to its vehicles and which then go to the domestic and international markets.

The discussions with the raft of automotive supply companies are continuing. We have indicated publicly that we are committed to the development of Supplier Park which will be collocated with General Motors at Salisbury/Elizabeth. We have an anchor tenant in the Dana Corporation to assist with the development of that Supplier Park. I therefore indicate to the Leader that every conceivable step is being taken and will be taken to ensure the maintenance of our manufacturing industry, the capacity for it to be internationally global competitive and to attract further associated automotive component supply firms to underpin that international competitiveness.

Only recently trade figures were released by the federal minister in the federal parliament on Trade Outlook, I think it was called. Interestingly, the automotive industry exports from Australia had increased by either 56 per cent or 65 per cent (it was one or the other), which is a massive increase in exports of built motor vehicles and automotive component supply firms out of South Australia to the international marketplace. That success story is something on which we want to build. I indicate to the leader that we will vigorously pursue the automotive industry, the manufacturing components and the feeder industries as being important industries to South Australia, and I would welcome any support in that respect.

RIVERS SUMMIT

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Premier advise the House whether he believes there is merit in holding a summit on the future of South Australian rivers?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I did notice during the parliamentary break that the leader again said (and it is becoming a sort of standard policy line), 'Let's have another summit.' I think that the leader's comments appeared in the *Advertiser* on Easter Saturday. As I was having a bit of a break on the river, I thought, 'Here we go again.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As my colleague the Minister for Water Resources has indicated, there are more summits in the Leader of the Opposition than there are in the Flinders Ranges, and I think the minister's response is in part right, if not wholly right. The Leader of the Opposition has called for no fewer than nine summits—nine! We have had a call for a job summit and a mini-jobs summit. He wanted a summit on privatisation, a summit on the Housing Trust, a summit on the Adelaide to Darwin rail link, and the classic of them all is a recovery summit. I am not sure whether the recovery summit would be the 'morning after the night before' or after the ALP state preselection convention. I could understand how

we could hold a recovery summit; we could have the Murray recovery summit and Ralph's recovery summit. We still have the Murray River summit to come. This from the leader who three years ago called on the state government to reject the recommendations of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission to cap South Australia's urban water supplies.

The leader's reasoning at that time was that water capping would act as an enormous disincentive for big industries to establish themselves in South Australia. I should have thought that if there were any disincentive to big industries it would be the ALP, given claims such as the one about red guards and cash registers ringing in London and New York. Yet now we are supposed to go to Stuttgart in a bipartisan way to attract Daimler Chrysler and some international money. We cannot be selective and say that French or Japanese money is no good but German and US money is. International investment from large companies is important to this state in building manufacturing operations.

Fortunately, in answer to the leader's claim that we should not endorse the cap, the member for Heysen as environment minister set the record straight by explaining to the leader that it was the Labor government at the time that put the cap on the agenda. He did not even go back to check the records. Furthermore, imagine what credibility South Australia would have today in the light of the Murray River issue if we had followed the advice of the leader and said to New South Wales and Victoria, 'You must abide by the cap, but we won't.' This government has taken the issue of the Murray River far beyond the local summit level and for the first time we have a Prime Minister of Australia to commit to ensure that listed on COAG is this question of South Australia's interests and the environmental flow from the Snowy corporatisation scheme. I acknowledge the Prime Minister's and Senator Robert Hill's involvement in that and thank them for it.

We are under some threat. I notice that the independent member in Victoria who has championed this 28 per cent of Snowy corporatisation is now talking about challenging with a High Court action, and is talking about enormous costs. We have taken up this issue because, following the change of government in Victoria, the certainty, surety and support we had from Premier Kennett went, and we find that an independent is calling the tune to the Bracks government.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: When the member for Hart settles down from trying to distract the debate I will continue. We will pursue the issue at the COAG meeting to be held later this year. The Prime Minister has acknowledged in writing recently that this issue will be high on the agenda. COAG officials who met a week or a fortnight ago have also worked through the issue as it relates to South Australia's interest—and be assured that we will pursue that interest vigorously.

PORT STANVAC OIL REFINERY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Premier been briefed on, and is he aware of, reports of impending redundancies and the temporary shut-down of the Mobil refinery at Port Stanvac; and what assurances has the government received from the company about the security of jobs at Port Stanvac?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: A television media report of last Friday states that the refinery will soon close for at least 12 days for maintenance. The report went on to state that the work force fears that the closure could precede substantial redundancies at the refinery. Workers believe that a temporary closure could occur later this week or next week and that for some weeks the company has been stockpiling petrol at various locations to prevent the need for petrol rationing.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): It disappoints me to have to answer that question in this House, because yet again we have the Leader of the Opposition endeavouring to create mischief—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—around yet another South Australian company.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Well may he laugh. I am sure that the workers from the Mobil refinery would be interested to see the way in which the leader conducts himself in this place while negotiations proceed in relation to the refinery. The leader asked if a briefing had been provided to the Premier. A briefing was provided to government on 20 April. It was provided by the refinery manager to me in my role as Minister for Minerals and Energy, and in that role I have a responsibility to ensure security of supply. It was done by Mobil in good faith to demonstrate that South Australians have nothing whatsoever to fear from the negotiations it is undertaking with the unions involved in representing workers at the refinery. Those negotiations are a matter for Mobil, but it has emphasised to government, by opening up its books to government, that supply of petroleum for South Australia is secure and no problem at all will be presented from its maintenance close down for as long a period as that will be.

The fact that Mobil is able to close down its refinery for extended maintenance periods or for extended periods in itself illustrates the problem faced by the company. The petroleum business is an internationally competitive one and it is a business in which Mobil as a smaller refinery must be competitive and must continue to be competitive if it is to continue operating. There is no secret in that. The company has said publicly on numerous occasions that it must ensure that its operating costs are kept at a competitive level or it will cease to operate as a refinery. Certainly the member for Kaurana would be well aware of that, as he himself has had briefings on various occasions from the refinery.

As to whether or not Mobil negotiates with its work force or with unions representing its work force for a reduction in employee numbers is a matter for Mobil. It is not a matter for speculation within this parliament or by any parliamentarian, other than, it would seem, by the Leader of the Opposition as he gleefully tries to seize an opportunity where he can yet again become negative. Perhaps he will demonstrate the extent of his creativeness, and perhaps 'Summit Mike' will call for a summit on this matter also. If he does, again, there is no need for a summit on this issue. I am confident that the unions representing the workers at Mobil and management will work this out sensibly around the table, and it is worth putting on the record that the unions have declined to comment publicly and that Mobil is not commenting publicly but that they are sensibly and rationally talking through issues in relation to the company and its employees around the table and, frankly, that is where it should start and end.

KUITPO FOREST

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Before asking my question I say how nice it is to have the member for Price back in the Chamber. My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Will he advise the House why it has become necessary to now burn unsuitable logs from the Kuitpo Forest? I am aware that a meeting of residents was called last Saturday and that some 12 members of the community were in attendance at that meeting and had the situation explained to them, but I ask the minister to explain the situation to the House.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the honourable member for his question, which involves quite a topical issue. As members would probably be aware, inevitably not every bit of wood grown in a plantation forest is actually suitable for commercial saw woods. Forestry SA endeavours to find organisations to utilise unsuitable logs—those which have knots in them, have too many branches, are bent, and so on—but sometimes nobody is found willing to take the logs without a significant cost burden to Forestry SA. In those circumstances, Forestry SA has adopted a policy of burning the excess unsuitable logs. As the member for Heysen identified, it is careful to consult the local community. A meeting was held last Saturday, and more than 80 per cent of the people who attended requested Forestry SA to get on with the burning process. Forestry SA—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It was 80 per cent. It is even more than you get in your electorate: 80 per cent of the people said that it was a good idea. So, Forestry SA selected this period in particular to burn the logs, because the fire restrictions have been lifted and the logs are factually dry. This ensures a clean and efficient combustion and therefore minimises the impact on the local affected parties and, perhaps most importantly, enables Forestry SA to get on with replanting new trees so that the greenhouse effects of the growth of the new trees can provide a more suitable carbon sink. Of course, that is very positive. So, we have taken our usual careful and consultative position in the implementation of this program.

However, fascinatingly, the shadow environment minister, the member for Kaurana, has made a major error in relation to this matter. It is, in fact, the case that the member for Kaurana is wrong again. But, perhaps more importantly, it is really worrying that he is wrong so badly. In the member for Kaurana's media release this morning, as shadow environment minister, he indicated that burning the logs was bad for the greenhouse effect and that they should have been mulched, therefore immediately implying that mulching them was better for the greenhouse effect. That was a major, 100 per cent error. If the greenhouse effect was some minor little worry for the community, perhaps we could shrug our shoulders and say, 'Oh, he has done it again.' But, factually, the greenhouse effect is one of the major concerns affecting the world, and the shadow environment minister does not understand the process, because—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Spence asks me to enlighten both himself and the shadow environment minister, so I shall take that opportunity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will settle down.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Factually, what happens in the process of the growth of a tree and photosynthesis is that the carbon (for the shadow environment minister's perspective, that is the nasty in the greenhouse area) is taken into the tree, and the technical term is that the tree becomes a carbon sink. The minute that wood is used, either by decomposition of mulch or by burning, the carbon is released back into the environment. So, to say, or even to imply, that burning is bad for the greenhouse effect but mulching is good indicates a simple misunderstanding of the process. He has simply got it badly wrong, and I am absolutely sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am absolutely sure that the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible interjection now from my right.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am absolutely sure that the environmentalists around South Australia will be flabbergasted to know that the shadow environment minister, who takes, allegedly, such a high profile in these issues, simply does not understand the basic process. He has a heck of a lot of work to do before he will understand the basic greenhouse effect. So, it is a major blunder on behalf of the opposition. It is a major blunder for anyone who has any interest in the environment even to purport to understand this and get it so badly wrong.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Schubert and the Minister for Government Enterprises.

EMPLOYMENT, SKILLED

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Given the Premier's announcement last Saturday of the 'Bring them back home' program to encourage the return of skilled South Australians who have left the state, will the Premier outline to the House the cost to the budget of his scheme, as well as the eligibility criteria to be used by the scheme, and will some or all of the 600 workers set to lose their jobs from Mitsubishi, many of whom are highly trained and skilled, be entitled to incentives under the scheme to encourage them not to leave South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The member for Lee has it wrong yet again. He obviously did not read the announcement in detail.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, it's not. Cabinet has signed off on a submission I put forward, which undertakes a consultancy using Professor Graham Hugo. The idea with his consultancy, which will be for a period of three months, will be to give detailed advice to the government as to the skills base where there are specific shortages, where interstate we might best target South Australians who have left this state to go interstate, so that we can match skill therefore, job availability and marketing and present the case for South Australia. I have referred in this House on a number of occasions to the fact that constantly reported on the eastern seaboard is South Australia and its economic fortunes as per when the honourable member opposite's party was last in government. This does not reflect economic circumstances as they are in South Australia. I highlight that the Westpac report yesterday and the ABS statistics, also released

yesterday, further confirm economic recovery in South Australia and the sustainability of that economic recovery in the future. In fact, the Westpac report yesterday indicated a continuing trend of reduction of unemployment in South Australia as it relates to the jobs at Mitsubishi. The member for Lee tried to expand his question to put in the context of, 'You are trying to bring a lot of people home, but what about the locals?'

Mr Wright interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am glad the member for Lee has asked the question: What have we done for jobs for locals? I will tell you what we have done. We have taken the unemployment list from 12.7 per cent to about 8.7 per cent. We have had 21 or 22 months of employment growth in South Australia. When in government the honourable member's party did not have a track record like that. The member for Lee wants to conveniently overlook that and try to denigrate a new policy direction, but at least we have some policy direction. That is more than the Labor Party can say; it has no policy, no idea and certainly no direction. I will provide a couple of analogies for the simple mind of the member for Lee. When the banks were undertaking their restructuring in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If the member for Lee would stop embarrassing himself and listen to the answer, he would find that we sought, with bank and financial restructuring for example, to get new investment. What did we do? We brought Westpac to South Australia.

Mr Foley: Policy on the run.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is not a bad policy on the run for the member for Hart.

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart chips away, 'Policy on the run.' With regard to Westpac, we signed a contract—and I am rather proud of this fact—for 900 jobs. How many do we have? About 2 000 jobs. We went further than that: we went to Bankers Trust. We have had people transfer here from Chifley Square in Sydney—originally 150, but the target now is 450 to 500 jobs. What did we do with Optus? We won Optus in the first round, and then we won stage two, which is over here in North Terrace—a further 450 jobs. We have outperformed the other states with a 20 per cent growth in the industry sector each year. In his address to CEDA in Sydney last week, Premier Peter Beattie said how good Queensland was doing with back office operations, that they had had growth of 10 per cent. Our growth year after year is double Queensland's in that area.

I now turn to Mitsubishi and the 600 jobs. It might have escaped the attention of the member for Lee, but the fact is that 20 per cent of Mitsubishi's white collar work force is over the age of 55 and a further 20 per cent is over the age of 50. The lucrative package put forward by Mitsubishi comprises two years' pay for those who wish to take early retirement or leave on a voluntary basis. One does not have to be Einstein to work out that a number of people will take early retirement.

How have we hedged against that? We won the BHP Shared Services Centre for South Australia—508 jobs. Many of the industry sector jobs in which BHP is involved will attract some of the people from Mitsubishi who have the necessary expertise, qualifications and experience. Why have we put together with Mitsubishi a dollar for dollar (up to \$1 500) re-employment package for those people who want

to be re-employed? It is to match the existing skills base with the new emerging opportunities in South Australia. Winning the BHP Shared Services Centre for South Australia was a major coup for this state. The eastern states (Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland) bid strongly for that centre, but we won, and it is now coming to South Australia.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The deputy leader wants to knock it down and dismiss it by putting a dollar figure on it. We have achieved significant re-employment. We have an emerging series of industry employment categories for which we do not have a skilled work force. That is acting as a deterrent to new private sector capital investment in this state. You must have a human resource base to get a private sector capital base. As we rebuild and rejuvenate an economy that has some grunt in it, for a change, unlike the one we inherited, we are emerging with new job opportunities. Now that they have achieved experience in other areas, we want to bring home those South Australians who have gone interstate so that they can contribute to what is this great economic recovery for South Australia.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I ask the Minister for Water Resources: is it the government's intention to flush the Murray on a regular basis right through to the mouth; if so, how frequently; what quantity of water will be used on each occasion; how long will each flush take—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Well, you have to do these things: you can't leave it lying around or there will be terrible consequences. Further, what benefits does the minister think that the river's ecosystem and users will get from the flush?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has not yet been called. I ask members when framing their question to remember that they are supposed to ask only one question.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I thank the member for Hammond for his question without notice! The answer to the first part of his question is 'Yes', provided that the Premier, who has been showing leadership on this issue, gets the acceptance of the other states and the Prime Minister in terms of looking after what is, after all, our most precious resource. I remind members opposite that the Murray-Darling basin contributes something like 40 per cent to all the agricultural and horticultural wealth of this country. Not only is it an important tourist attraction but also it is an absolutely essential economic resource for the health of this nation; and that, for the benefit of this House, is why, I am sure, the member for Hammond asked such a detailed question.

The answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is 'Yes.' The answer to the second part is that it must, as the member for Hammond knows, depend on the amount of available water which other states and matters outside our control, such as rainfall and snow melt, make available to the river system. Those two factors are critical. Due to a rain event in the Darling part of the catchment and a trigger mechanism which has occurred in the Meningie Lakes, there will be a release of 25 000 megalitres a day for the next three or four days in terms of further flushing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: As the member will be aware, it will depend on the amount of water flowing down the river and the amount that we can release. I would say to all members that, whatever amount is released, it is not water that is wasted. It is water that, having reached the lakes, can and should be used for the health of the environment and for the future of the mouth. I inform this House that we are not sure whether this will work. We are not sure whether it is enough water. That is exactly why this government has been pursuing the upstream states in their quest for water. However, this will not be water down the gurgler, and that is in sharp contrast to those opposite who appear to be doing some very smart flushing of their own lately by washing some of their most longstanding and most loyal members down the plughole.

Today I heard the Leader of the Opposition waxing lyrical about one of their people who may well have been tapped on the shoulder—and he is retiring to other pastures. What he did not say is that in fact he had pulled the plug on a member in this House whom everyone knows and respects and who has been congratulated on his return. What he did not say is that it is not so much a flushing of the waters as a changing of the waters. This is the party that gets accused of patriarchy: this is not a party which is normally given to moving one relation aside for another—and you could be forgiven for thinking that that might have happened today. One should ask the leader opposite why he has gone to water when it comes to looking after his parliamentary mates, and then jump up and down—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the minister to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Instead of jumping up and down and calling for water summits, he should take note that water is indeed a cycle. In conclusion, I thank the member for Ross Smith for his very kind little note to me. As it is a personal note, I will not read it to the House, even though I would like to do so because it shows that the member for Ross Smith has a wonderful sense of humour, and I appreciated his comments. I appreciated most the concluding couple of phrases, which state, 'Yours sincerely, Ralph Clarke, Labor member for Ross Smith, candidate for the state seat of Enfield.' I find that quite interesting. As with rising salinity, there is water that can be discarded and it comes back to bite you.

WOOD BURNING

Mr HILL (Kaurna): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Heritage. What is the environmental impact of the burning of 120 piles of logs by Forestry SA, currently under way—

Members interjecting:

Mr HILL: —it is okay if members opposite think that it is amusing—at the Kuitpo Forest, which is predicted to burn for all of this week; and does the minister agree with his colleague the Minister for Government Enterprises that burning the wood is better for the environment than mulching it? The land involved at Kuitpo Forest was cleared about three years ago. Up to 10 per cent of the product was left. Eight months ago residents were promised that the wood would be mulched. Last weekend, on the last day of the fire ban season, residents were told that mulching was off the agenda and that burning would happen. Within 48 hours, before parliament could sit and under the cloud of darkness

and in secrecy, the burning started, filling the skies with smoke and soot, as well as greenhouse gases.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): Once bitten, twice shy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: What the shadow minister for the environment simply does not realise is that growing more trees puts more carbon into what is known as carbon sinks, and that is a bonus for the environment. I know exactly what the shadow minister for the environment will do faced with this extraordinarily embarrassing admission in his own media release that he does not know. I quite specifically identified that whether the mulching or the burning occurs the same carbon is released back into the system. There is absolutely no way that the decomposition of mulch (which is what the shadow minister for the environment said was better for the environment) is better for the environment than burning because the same amount of carbon is released.

The same amount of wood is removed no matter what method is undertaken. What is of importance is that Forestry SA's task is to grow new trees and, as they grow, they are beneficial for the environment, and that is exactly the job that Forestry SA is getting on with.

INFLUENZA EPIDEMIC

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House about the special preparations being made by the government to deal with a possible influenza epidemic?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): This year we are expecting a winter with a very high influenza load following what occurred in the Northern Hemisphere. Last year we had an exceptionally quiet year in terms of the flu but, as I said, this year all the projections from the medical profession are that the load will be very high. We have put in place a number of steps, the first of which is to increase the potential for additional admissions through the accident and emergency department of our major hospitals. The second step is to ensure that the staff of the hospitals are immunised. We have already made available free flu vaccine for all staff in our public hospitals.

The third step is to ensure that we strengthen the accident and emergency provisions at the Noarlunga Hospital. We are hoping to take some of the pressure off the Flinders Medical Centre, which tends to have a very busy accident and emergency department, and to divert some of the people who otherwise would come from the southern suburbs to the Noarlunga Hospital. The Noarlunga Hospital has in place a \$6.5 million upgrade of its accident and emergency facilities. They will not be ready for this winter, but this step shows that this government is very responsive in terms of trying to get additional accident and emergency patients to go to Noarlunga and increasing Noarlunga's profile compared to Flinders Medical Centre.

I mentioned in this House a few weeks ago that the vaccine was available, and we are urging all those at risk in the community, particularly those over 65 years of age, to avail themselves of the flu vaccine. In fact, the flu vaccine is supplied free of charge by the state and federal governments to people over 65 years of age. We have provided about 200 000 vaccines to the community already, and we believe

that that is enough to cover all people over 65 years of age. We would urge others who are susceptible in the community, particularly asthmatics, to avail themselves of a flu vaccine to reduce the likelihood of getting the flu this year.

We have taken a number of steps. The final step is to ensure that we monitor very closely the level of flu in the community so that we have a warning when the level of flu within the community may be about to increase and therefore the level of effort within our accident and emergency departments is likely to increase with it. We are expecting a high level of flu this winter. We urge the community to take precautions and to be vaccinated, but at the same time we are taking measures within the hospital system to ensure that we are better able to cope with the additional measures.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Again I address my question to the Premier. Given that it was announced on 18 February 1998 that Billa Kalina in South Australia had been chosen as the preferred region for a radioactive waste repository, what was the Premier's response to the letter from the Prime Minister in which the Premier was informed that the preferred option was to collocate both the low and medium level radioactive waste dumps at the same site; and will the Premier table the Prime Minister's letter and his response? In a second ministerial statement concerning radioactive waste, on 19 November 1999 the Premier told the House that he had received such a letter from the Prime Minister in early 1998. Will he release that letter and his response regarding collocation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): If the leader is expecting me to recall off the top of my head what was in a piece of correspondence in 1998, I shall not do it, but I will certainly go back and look at the correspondence. However, let me reiterate for the leader's benefit, as he attempts a political point scoring exercise, that my ministerial statement to the House last year and the public comments I have made in relation to medium and high level waste are consistent, and the position has not changed; that is, I oppose a medium and high level waste repository in South Australia. I have made that perfectly clear, and the ministerial statement I made last year stands.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development please detail the importance of the citrus industry to South Australia, particularly the Riverland, and indicate any actions being taken to create new export marketing opportunities? I am advised that in recent years the citrus industry has undergone significant changes, with the market focus turning to exports and in particular the US export market. I am told that the success of this export market has led to a resurgence of the industry resulting in increased plantings in the Riverland, and that the industry is now looking to expand world markets to sustain growth.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): As the honourable member said, citrus has been a major success story for the state. Most members could cast their mind back five or six years and recall stories of growers receiving \$30 to

\$60 a tonne, leading to a lot of oranges being dumped at tips or on sandhills. We also had the issue of orange juice concentrate being imported into Australia and Californian oranges in the supermarkets, and there were calls for protection.

Against that background, it is interesting to look now at what they have done. That local competition forced industry to have a look at where they could focus overseas in relation to exports, and certainly the USA, Japan and Malaysia were markets that they picked out. It also forced them to focus on quality and certainly shift largely from the juice market to fresh fruit. Last year, most of the growers received in excess of \$1 000 a tonne and some up to \$2 000 a tonne on the US market. Farm gate raised \$100 million, and the one-third that went to the US raised an impressive \$65 million. Last year eight boats left Port Adelaide with nothing but oranges on them, which is a big turnaround from where they were and which shows that when industry really focuses it can achieve a lot. It is interesting, from the viewpoint of the member for Chaffey, to note that most of the income went back to the Riverland. It certainly played a major role in reviving the Riverland as a region.

Federal and state governments and industry are working together on a whole range of projects. There are salinity projects in the Riverland and the Loxton irrigation scheme. We have the \$5 million Riverland rural partnership. There is enormous effort to create and maintain fruit fly free status. We are currently working hard to get that area extended to include the area from Morgan to Walkers Flat.

Recently I met with seven senior United States quarantine service people to quicken up what is normally a long process. They have responded by sending two senior officials, who came to Australia just before Easter, in the hope that protocols will be in place for the 2001 export season.

I can also announce, after much effort by a lot of people, that Korea has decided that from May it will allow imports of our citrus, and that is an important market and a major breakthrough. The breakthroughs we have seen in the citrus industry certainly give an example to other industries. They demonstrate that when industry and government work together it is amazing what can be achieved and that not just pest control but also the focus on export markets can be extremely rewarding.

We have had talks with both the US government and with companies about jointly marketing into Asia. With the counter seasons between Australia and the US there are opportunities there for us to jointly market, particularly to supermarkets in Asia, where we can walk through the door and offer supplies for 12 months of the year.

Citrus has been an outstanding success story, and pork is heading in the same direction. There is no doubt that that focus on exports, with industries starting to do very well, brings enormous benefits to regional areas.

INMAN RIVER POLLUTION

Mr HILL (Kaurna): Has the Minister for Water Resources acted on complaints by the member for Finnis about the Government's failure to act on a promise made in 1996 to stop the discharge of sewage into the Inman River? Has the Minister asked the Minister for Government Enterprises to explain this failure, and will the minister tell the House when the deliberate pollution of the Inman River will cease? On 26 April the member for Finnis said that the Inman River was polluted by sewage discharged by SA Water and complained

that the government had failed to deliver a promise made in 1996 to build a new sewage treatment works. The member for Finnis said, 'Putting effluent water in the Inman River I find is against all the principles we are trying to uphold.'

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I am delighted to be given the opportunity—

An honourable member: You're always delighted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is a particularly delightful story as it is such a bonus for the environment of South Australia, because this government has done more in the past five or six years for the environment than the ALP in its entire two terms of government before this could even have contemplated doing. I note that the member for Lee and the member for Hart (who is not here) have been most enthusiastic about the government's recently announced plan to remove all discharge from the Port River. That is a major bonus for the South Australian system, for the Port River, for Port Adelaide, for the environment, for tourism and so on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: One might ask rhetorically, 'Did the ALP have any such idea?' The answer to that question is no. One only has to look at our record at Bolivar—which I know that the member for Taylor will be particularly interested in, because she has made a number of complaints about odour and other things at Bolivar. Because of the government's environmental improvement program (the EIP), we have the fantastic initiative at Bolivar. Not only is the system that is employed there being altered so that that problem will be solved but, better than that, we are taking the discharge, treating it, moving the treated water up to Virginia and doubling the productive quantity and quality of the horticulture and vegetable growing there. That is a fantastic bonus for the economy there and it is also good for our environment, because we are not belching that stuff out into the marine environment, which the ALP government did and for which it had no solution.

We recently received a report into the possibility of altering the Glenelg waste water treatment plant. As I have indicated to the House, I have asked SA Water to come back with a strategy that might, in fact, see the waste water from both Glenelg and Christies being utilised into the very creative scheme at McLaren Vale, which is again using treated water—and that is much better than the ALP ever did.

The SPEAKER: Order! A point of order has been raised.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The minister seems intent on visiting every water course in South Australia except the Inman River. I ask that he answer the question.

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

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: And I have a couple more to go. The point I am making is that the ALP had absolutely no strategy when it was in government for dealing with reuse. When the now shadow minister for the environment (who, as I indicated before, does not understand the greenhouse process) was secretary of the ALP, he was quite happy to have our waste water belching out into the marine environment: he was sitting quietly pulling all the strings in South Terrace, making no move for the environment whatsoever. But we are intent on improving our waste water reuse, and that is what we will do at Victor Harbor. We have identified that we are keen to see the reuse of the treated waste water there. That matter is being explored as we speak. We have made all the relevant inquiries regarding the discharge into

the river, recognising that it is not adequate, it is not up to scratch, but it is what the ALP put up with during the whole of its term in government. Did it have a strategy for stopping it? Absolutely not. Do we have a strategy for fixing it? Yes, we have. We have discussed with representatives of the EPA the fact that we have a long-term strategy to put a new waste water treatment plant not on the same site but to move it off site, which will be a great bonus for tourism and for all the residents who live there and which will, at the same time, increase the quantity of reuse and be much better for the environment. The EPA has given us the sign off until that is completed. There is nothing that we are doing there that does not have EPA agreement.

LEGIONAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In light of the outbreak of legionella infection in Melbourne, I think it is appropriate to outline to the House what measures are in place to minimise the likelihood of an outbreak of legionella disease, or infection, here in South Australia.

Local councils were advised by circular in October 1999, and again in February this year, about the need to undertake surveillance of cooling towers, warm water systems and spa pools and to ensure that they are correctly maintained and operated. In view of the situation in Melbourne, advice to councils will be reissued this week and will contain a reminder to environmental health officers to undertake appropriate surveillance. A draft South Australian code of practice has been prepared, along with draft regulations, for presentation to the Public and Environmental Health Council and then finally to cabinet for approval. Local councils are being encouraged to maintain a register of cooling towers within their area so that, in the event of an outbreak of legionella, the source can be quickly identified. A workshop is being planned for environmental health officers on changes in technology, legislation and management practices in the operation, care and maintenance of cooling towers, warm water systems and spa pools.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I would like to congratulate the Oakbank Racing Club for its performance on the Easter weekend. It was another fabulous weekend of racing. We all know that Oakbank provides great family entertainment. It is a carnival type atmosphere, unmatched by any other race meeting in Australia, and possibly the rest of the world. It is an authentic picnic type meeting, which attracts a large number of families with young children. This is a unique event, which also has a genuine tourism impact for South Australia.

This year, on the Saturday some 43 000 people attended Oakbank and over 65 000 people were in attendance on the Monday, giving a total of 109 438 for the weekend. In addition, one only has to look at the tote figures. On the Saturday it was a record \$838 000 and on the Monday it was \$771 000, giving a total for the two days of \$1.609 million.

In addition, the bookmakers held \$1.025 million on the Saturday and just short of \$1 million on the Monday, giving a total of \$2.019 million for the weekend. These figures are a fabulous reflection of how successful once again Oakbank was.

Oakbank has true charm, is very unique in its nature and, of course, is a superb event for South Australia. But for the second year in a row the government has put this event at risk. For the second year in a row, there has been no police supervision of the track. Oakbank is a unique arrangement and there must be mounted police supervising the track, because of its unique nature.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many audible conversations around the chamber. The member for Lee has the call.

Mr WRIGHT: This is a unique arrangement. It is unique to South Australia because of its carnival type atmosphere and because of the families that it attracts, with its picnic atmosphere. Year in and year out record crowds attend this race meeting held over the Easter weekend, and we cannot do without proper supervision of the track. The most appropriate supervision of the track is provided by mounted police. Despite meetings this year between Oakbank officials and the police, which included walking around the track and pin-pointing four key areas, the police did not go where they said they would go. The safety of racegoers, horses and jockeys was clearly put at risk.

Let me share with the House some alarming incidents or near misses. On the Saturday at Oakbank, the field galloped up to the 1 400 metre start and two jockeys, Chad Lever and Jarrod Lorensini, with the assistance of the clerk of the course, Steve Pearson, were only just able to swerve to avoid a small child, about four or five years old, sitting in the middle of the track. Two mounted police officers were sitting outside the track powerless to do anything, because they had been ordered not to assist in clearing the track under any circumstances. Normally, mounted police would have been stationed between the 600 and 1 200 metre marks. A report on this issue has been submitted to the next SATRA board meeting.

Secondly, on several occasions, patrons, mostly children, strayed back onto the track between the 1 100 and 600 metre marks after the clerk of the course had cleared the track and just before the field jumped. Normally, once again, there would be two mounted police at about the 1 000 metre mark to prevent this occurring. Other incidents occurred which I do not have time to relate to the House. However, this is another example of this dopey government's not providing support for the racing industry.

If ever there was a race meeting that needed clear direction, where the police should fulfil their responsibilities as they have always done up to two years ago, it is at Oakbank. The only way they can provide that proper supervision is for the mounted police to go onto the track where hundreds of families, many of them with children, are wandering around. In two consecutive years there have been near misses. Who is the local member for the area? None other than the Premier, who last year committed the police to providing the correct supervision. I would not have thought that it would happen two years in a row.

Time expired.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I want to draw attention to some problems that Telstra has been creating for my constituents in consequence of the bureaucratic idiocy of some of its

decisions. I will not name the person in Telstra who is responsible for this, but I will say that you, Mr Speaker, and every other member in this place—and, indeed, any member of the general public who takes an interest in this—ought to know that there is a division in Telstra that has a responsibility for determining where to locate the POPs. Most members may not know about ‘POPs’: some may think it refers to popular music, while some may think that it is an out-dated name for soft drink, and others will have a different understanding of the meaning of the word. However, in Telstra’s language, it is the location of facilities where the internet interconnection is made to its server, called Big Pond.

In this instance, Telstra had the option of locating its POP at Willunga, and that would have provided everybody in Willunga with a local call access to the POP. It would have provided everybody in Victor Harbor and the surrounding areas in the Fleurieu Peninsula with a local call access to the POP, and it would have provided—and this is the important bit—all the people in Strathalbyn, Milang and Langhorne Creek with local call access to the POP. However, this nitwit in Telstra—and I use that word with care, not wishing to offend any nits—decided to put it at Victor Harbor. The consequences are that residents, businesses and government agencies such as schools in Strathalbyn, Milang and Langhorne Creek do not have a local call access to a POP, and that will cost them thousands upon thousands of dollars extra a month if they have regular use of it, as they must. That would not be too bad except for the fact that the local Fleurieu East school is a multi-campus school, and it is about to install its Big Pond connections and access to the internet for all the children in the Ashbourne, Milang and Langhorne Creek Primary Schools. Then there is the primary school in Strathalbyn and, most important of all, the middle school and senior school in Strathalbyn, and this will cost that school a hell of a lot more money to get access to the internet than otherwise would have been the case.

The most despicable part about it all is that Telstra, in its marketing arm, convinced some small businesses that they could set up in Strathalbyn and enjoy the benefits of being there and, as part of going to Strathalbyn, they would have local call access to their POP, so that on Big Pond it would not cost them any more than if they were located in the metropolitan area. Thereby, Telstra was hoping or saying that some small businesses could operate in the periurban areas, thus reducing or eliminating the need for people to commute to the city every day. That would be great in principle, if Telstra only did that. However, in this instance, it did not. It is a credit to one part of Telstra in terms of what it did in respect of the initial charges it made on one business there, run by Linda Putland. That business got an enormous shock as it was billed \$6 000 for the first month of access. That would kill the business within a matter of months if it were to continue. Those call costs have been forgone, and they will be reduced to \$1 000 a month. But they ought to be only \$430 a month, because that is what it would cost if the business were located in the Willunga region or in Adelaide, Salisbury or Victor Harbor.

‘Why was the POP put at Victor Harbor?’ is the question to which we ought to get an answer. The person in Telstra who made the decision ought not to be allowed to continue making such inept decisions with such destructive consequences for the wider community where they engage in this practice to the detriment and not the benefit of those people who will be its users rather than ensuring that the other arm

of Telstra has its promises complied with for the benefit of the internet access group.

Time expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Last Friday was the International Day of Mourning observed by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the International Labor Organisation to commemorate workers who are killed, injured or become ill because of work and also union activists who experience repression because of their efforts to support human and union rights. The statistics for these consequences are appalling. Over 1.1 million workers die annually. This is equivalent to 3 300 workers per day. That is double the number of those who die because of war and triple the number who die because of HIV or AIDS related illnesses. There are further statistics: 3 330 die because of accidents, and this includes 12 000 who are children; and 325 000 deaths are caused by occupational diseases. Asbestos is the largest single killer, with 100 000 dying from asbestos related diseases. In South Australia we are grateful to Jack Watkins for his work on asbestos within the building trades industries. Over 160 million new cases of work related injuries and illnesses are reported each year.

The day of commemoration also looks to the activities of union officials who have to face repression because they try to protect workers’ rights. In 1998 alone, 1 650 were attacked and injured; 3 660 were arrested; and 21 427 were sacked because of their commitment to union work. Countries with the highest number of workplace deaths and injuries tend to be the least respectful of union or human rights. Unfortunately, Australia has a very unacceptable high rate of death, injury and illness each year. Last year, 500 workers were killed, which is an average of nine a week; 2 500 die from work related illnesses or injuries; and approximately 170 000 suffer a compensatable work related injury or disease.

Sadly, the situation can be expected to worsen because of attacks on Worksafe Australia and the thwarting of efforts Australia wide to make workplaces safer. An unfortunate trend is emerging with the policies of the economic rationalists coming into full swing. In pursuit of a surplus for their bottom line, they are happy to practise the false economy of not pursuing good and strong workplace practices. It is inherent that we all understand that we must put money into safe workplaces rather than into the rehabilitation of workers who are injured or maimed in some way or into the support of workers’ families decimated by the death of a loved one who goes to work but unfortunately does not come home.

Throughout the world we can see examples of what is happening in Australia. Before Margaret Thatcher became Prime Minister in Britain, that country had achieved a good record for occupational health and safety. However, because of Margaret Thatcher’s economic rationalist policies, many of these achievements have been destroyed, and Britain is no longer looked upon as a good occupational health and safety performer.

Of course, a similar process is under way in this country, with John Howard and Peter Reith also wanting the marketplace to determine the outcomes in respect of occupational health and safety and workers’ rights. This means that Australia is going down the same road as the former Thatcher government. However, the big problem is that we have yet to achieve the same levels of excellence in occupational health and safety as pre-Thatcher Britain.

On the Day of Mourning this year, Australian workers, unions and union leaders recommitted themselves to fighting

for improved working conditions to reduce the levels of work related deaths, injuries, suffering and grief. Last Friday, as part of that week, I attended a very moving ceremony in the Pennington Gardens where a plaque was unveiled to commemorate South Australian workers. This year, the focus was on young workers, and I heard a couple of particularly sad stories. One involved a young union official in Western Australia who had gone to a building site to make sure that worker safety was observed. He went up onto the scaffolding to speak to the workers and, unfortunately, fell to his death.

It was also highlighted that, in matters of occupational health and safety, young workers are particularly vulnerable. They work long shifts, often in wet conditions, and it was pointed out that when you are tired accidents happen.

Time expired.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I bring to the attention of the House an important issue that has been raised by one of my constituents, a senior citizen who lives at Tranmere. We are all aware that our senior citizens have had to cope with many changes in recent years. Senior citizens have come to my office to tell me about the closure of their bank branch and their difficulties with ATMs (because they are not used to doing their banking in that way) and large shopping centres. I refer to a letter that I received from a constituent who has raised some concerns. Relating to post boxes for senior citizens, the letter states:

Dear Mr Scalzi,

Could you please find out what has happened to our pillar boxes in our area? I went to our usual one in Rodney Avenue and it's gone, then on the way to see my husband in Warrina Homes, the one around the corner from John Avenue in Barons Street has also gone and the one in Reid Avenue (not the post office) is also missing, and around the corner on St Bernard's Road that's gone too.

I'm really cross by this. There's been no advice as to where they've been relocated, which is pretty sick. I'm an 80 year old and can do short walks, but there's a lot of us oldies who can't get far. I've lived in this house for 50 years. I'd be grateful if we could get some feedback from this plus get a box for us.

Sincerely,

(Mrs) M. Hart

PS It's either Reid Avenue, the post office or KMart Plaza.

For anyone in this area, it is a considerable distance to go from John Avenue to KMart Plaza at Firlie to mail letters.

Many elderly citizens have adopted computer technology, and I welcome that, and some use e-mail, which is also a good thing. However, there are senior citizens such as Mrs Hart who would like to write letters as they have for many years. I do not believe that they should have to walk the distance caused by the removal of these post boxes in order to post their letters. This is an important service, and I am disappointed that Australia Post has seen fit to remove these boxes.

I was not aware of these changes. Having made some inquiries this morning, I was told that notification was placed on some of these post boxes. However, as far as I am aware, there has been no letter drop in the area. I do not think that is good enough. We should not treat our elderly citizens in this way. It might not be profitable to collect mail from all these post boxes, but that is not what this is about. People should be given the opportunity to communicate in their usual way—through letter writing, if they wish—and elderly people should have a post box within walking distance. What will happen when people such as Mrs Hart and her friends, who are in their 80s, are older and cannot drive? Where will they post their letters? Will Australia Post provide a service where people ring up and their mail is collected? Surely not!

I think Australia Post has been insensitive—it should have given prior warning—and I believe there should be adequate distribution of mail boxes in this area. This is just one area from Glynburn Road to St Bernard's Road and Hallett Avenue. It is not a large area, but two or three boxes have been removed. I want to know why they have been removed and I want Australia Post to give a little more consideration to our senior citizens and, indeed, all citizens and provide them with these facilities.

Time expired.

Ms KEY (Hanson): This afternoon, I want to speak about May Day which, as most members would know celebrates International Workers Day. An important function was held yesterday in South Australia to commemorate International Workers Day and the work and contribution of the previous President of the ACTU, Jennie George. Last night Jennie George addressed a large number of guests at the May Day dinner and reminded them of some of the major issues on the industrial agenda that are being looked at by the Labor movement.

Unfortunately, many of the issues that face workers and employers today have been raised for the past 100 years. I remind members that International Workers Day (May Day) originated at the start of this century because of concerns about the eight hour working day. Yet, at the start of this century, we find that our working day is often more than an eight hour day and many of those workers who are fortunate to have a full-time job are working longer hours to bring home a living wage.

Jennie George also reminded us that, by its very name, International Workers Day is a celebration of the struggle at an international level. Although a number of issues have not been resolved in South Australia or Australia, we need only to look at what has happened to workers in some of the developing countries such as Bosnia to feel lucky about the situation in which we find ourselves.

A number of points should be made on a day such as this. Although we are always being told by this government that more and more people are finding employment, about one in four members of the permanent work force do not have full-time employment but are employed casually or part time. More and more workers are finding it difficult to pay their basic costs, that is, rent, trying to put their children through school and, in many cases, finding enough money to pay the food bill each week. Despite Jennie George's words about our situation in relation to some of our brothers and sisters internationally, a number of workers in Australia and certainly in South Australia are living in dire poverty and do not have much chance of getting out of that poverty cycle. I think it is fitting that May Day continues to be on the agenda—certainly on the Labor movement agenda—and that issues facing workers, particularly workers who are below the safety net and below the living wage, are put into the forefront.

The last point I would like to make concerns the wage case decision that was handed down yesterday. As members of the chamber would be aware, the wage case is for workers who have no other way of getting any wage increases or indexing on the money that they receive. Yesterday, some 1.7 million workers received a measly \$15 a week wage increase. Somehow that is supposed to pay the bills and assist workers to survive. The workers about whom we are talking are workers who, in the main, earn under \$400 a week and many of those people are the bread winners for their house-

hold and have families and commitments like anyone else. Although \$15 may have been scoffed at by some people as being an enormous amount, we still find that, in the first celebration of May Day in this century, a number of workers are living below the poverty line: that is, if they have work, and for those who do have work many of them still do not have full-time work. This is a disgraceful situation.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I want to raise an issue which has concerned me for a long time. During the last parliament the Hon. Peter Dunn and I attempted to take action to try to have it addressed; that is, the deplorable conduct on North Terrace by certain sections of the community who also frequent Victoria Square. These people seem to have no regard for the rights of other citizens who want to use North Terrace. They harass, intimidate and terrorise old and young people, bang on the windows of motor cars, consume large amounts of alcohol and also generally turn the area outside Old Parliament House along North Terrace into a most disgraceful area. They use it for smashing bottles, spilling food stuffs and other antisocial behaviour.

I do not mind anyone having a drink, but I believe that there are appropriate places and that drinking on the streets is not acceptable. Therefore, I believe that North Terrace should be declared dry, as should other parts of the city. If people want to consume alcohol, then they do it in licensed premises, in their homes or other suitable premises. They should not use the streets where it will interfere with the rights and privileges of other members of the community. When you see elderly people petrified and when you see young people, particularly females, coming from the university being interfered with and absolutely terrified by these people, then the time has come for this parliament and for the city council, particularly the Lord Mayor, to do something about it. In my view, they have been negligent in carrying out their responsibilities.

Some years ago the Hon. Peter Dunn and I approached the former Lord Mayor in relation to this matter and we did not get very far. We met some very wobbly people who talked about social equity and so on but had no regard for the rest of the community. We know what has gone on down there. I must record a little incident where on one occasion I was asked to go into the mall and represent the Premier. The now Lord Mayor was there and she had some very unkind things to say to me about my views on this matter. I understand that the member for Elder referred to her as 'Her Royal Highness' and I understand he had several things to say about her again in the past few days. That may be his view, but my view is that the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and the city council should have been pro-active and should have brought in dry areas to ensure that these people are not continuing to make a thorough nuisance of themselves, unduly interfering with ordinary, decent law-abiding citizens.

Staff of this parliament were interfered with on leaving this building on the last night we sat. These people regularly use the back of this building as a toilet. The time has come for these people to accept some responsibility. I think it is disgraceful that the city council, under the leadership of the erstwhile Lord Mayor, has not done anything about it. A huge number of people use North Terrace, particularly in the evening. If members go out and have a look as I have done on a number of occasions, they will see people smashing bottles, going up to motor cars and stopping girls coming from the university and absolutely terrifying them. The police

come as quickly as they can, but they cannot be there all the time.

I have a view that these people should get a number nine and be sent on their way. Alcohol should not be allowed there—and I am not a teetotaler. I believe that some commonsense should take place in relation to how that is administered and I call on the city council to have a bit of courage, a bit of social responsibility and a bit of wisdom and look out for the ordinary law-abiding citizen and not have this bleeding heart mentality with people of whom I have had enough. My constituents have had enough of do-gooders and bleeding hearts and the Lord Mayor should put on her real hat, instead of having a conflict of interest about why she has not done something about it. I call upon the government and all those responsible to deal with this issue and look after the average citizen of South Australia who is sick and tired of these people lying around Victoria Square and particularly polluting North Terrace.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION (DIRECTION OF HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTRES) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I highlight that, when this bill was debated in the lower house, members of the opposition raised certain issues and asked me to look at the possibility of certain amendments, and I agreed that I would do that. I said that rather than deal with some of those proposals in the lower house, we would take some advice and look at them in another place. There are three amendments before the House this afternoon. Two of those three are moved by the government in another place and result from the commitment that I gave in the lower house.

The third amendment was moved by the Hon. Sandra Kanck in another place and requires that, in addition to a direction being in writing and published in the hospital's annual report, it also be gazetted. In relation to open government, we will have three notifications of any direction given to any hospital by the minister: in the *Government Gazette*, the annual report and in a letter to the hospital board. Members can see that you could not ask for more than that, and therefore we have agreed to the gazettal as requested by the honourable member from another place, which is what the opposition put forward in this place. I have to say that, if ever I thought there was an unnecessary administrative step, it was putting the third of these three measures in place. The fourth proposal could be to wrap it in a bunch of flowers and send it to each member of parliament or something like that.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I do not wish to put that into the bill. In fact, we are required to table it in parliament within 12 sitting days. The first of the other two amendments spells out with greater specificity the assets that are not subject to the power of direction of the minister. In doing so it ensures that the concerns of hospitals and health centres to retain control over their own assets, which they have acquired through local fundraising, are addressed. This is one of the issues that were raised. The second amendment seeks to include in the bill a provision similar to one existing in the Public Sector Management Act. That act precludes a minister from giving a direction to a chief executive relating to the

appointment, assignment, transfer, remuneration, discipline or termination of a particular person.

As I said to the House at the time, this was not about trying to sell off assets that we did not own and over which we had no say. I believe that the constitutions of the hospitals already protected those but we have made it clearer to ensure that there is no doubt. Equally, in terms of the employment of individuals—unless, of course, there is a very serious breach of a medical practice, which will be dealt with by the Medical Board or the Nurses Board—any person is covered by the Public Sector Management Act and the minister cannot give a direction, and that is appropriate. I urge the committee to support all three amendments.

Ms STEVENS: The opposition supports the amendments and agrees with the minister's comments.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April. Page 790.)

Mr HILL (Kaurua): The opposition offers general support for this legislation. I indicate at the outset that the opposition has one amendment to clause 17 (No. 62(1)), which has been circulated. I also indicate that the opposition will oppose section 24A, which creates a number of offences by wardens. In general terms, however, the opposition supports the legislation. As members know, this measure has been developed as a result of a review of the act in terms of the competition policy principles. All acts of parliament must go through this process so it is not a radical set of proposals. It does tidy up and clarify a number of matters.

This bill does not address some of the more central issues, I suppose, in the area of national parks in relation to the issue of comprehensive and representative areas of the state. I hope that at some stage the minister will introduce some legislation that looks at the current principles. This bill does not really deal with biodiversity issues, and I think that that is something that needs to be addressed at some future stage, too. I gather that when the federal government goes through its review process there may well be responsibilities that come back to us which will raise all these issues.

Nor does the bill deal with mining in national parks, and in that context I would say that the opposition expresses its concern that the biological survey of the Yumbarra National Park has not been made public (I am not sure whether the minister is aware of this) and we understand that there is no intention to make it public. If this is true it is an outrage. I indicate here, at this opportunity (which is the first opportunity I have had), that we would expect to see the biological survey undertaken for Yumbarra and that it should be open for public discussion and scrutiny. Having made those few introductory comments, the opposition supports the legislation, other than that involving section 51A, which I will seek to amend. I will discuss our concerns about that matter during committee.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the opposition for those comments. We have had a number of discussions with the opposition. We will be supporting the opposition's amendment involving section 51A. Again, I thank the opposition for its involvement

in the discussions that have occurred in resolving certain matters involved in this bill.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr HILL: The opposition expresses its opposition to this clause. I understand that, in the past, the parliament has included similar provisions in other legislation. I can only say that I do not believe that I was here at the time that happened. The opposition thinks it inappropriate to include in a section that deals with the national parks and wildlife a statement relating to the behaviour of public servants who happen to work in national parks. If there is a problem with the behaviour of national parks wardens, then I would have thought that the more appropriate place to deal with it is within whatever legislation relates to government employment.

If it is inappropriate for a warden to use abusive language with another person it should be inappropriate for a teacher, a librarian, a policeman or someone else: a specific provision should not be included in this act. The aim of this section of the original act, of course, was to protect wardens against members of the public who abused them and did not follow their authority in relation to their powers. I believe that this is an inappropriate place to include a mirror provision to apply the same sort of penalty and the same sort of offences to wardens who may have directed offensive language towards any other person or done other things that are inappropriate.

I am not defending public servants, whether they are wardens, school teachers or anyone else, from being able to offend the public, but it is an inappropriate place to include such a provision. I indicate that the opposition will not support this clause.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I thank the honourable member for his comments. I certainly understand the sentiments expressed by the opposition. Very similar wording already exists in other acts, so the parliament has already established this principle in relation to public servants. The Environment Protection Act has similar or the same wording, as does the Native Vegetation Act. Although not necessarily public servants, local council officers operate under the Dog and Cat Management Act, which has similar wording, as does the Partial Land Management Act. This debate is not new to the parliament: it has occurred four or five times previously. As I do not think that either the opposition or government can add further to previous debates, the government will be holding firm on this provision.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 16 passed.

Clause 17.

Mr HILL: I move:

Page 8, after line 16—Insert subsections as follows:

- (2a) The council's advice must be in writing and must include advice—
- (a) as to whether the killing of animals pursuant to the notice is likely to affect significantly the population of animals of that species in the state generally or in any part of the state; and
 - (b) as to the monitoring (if any) that should be undertaken of the effect of killing animals pursuant to the notice on populations of those animals.
- (2b) The council must include a copy of its advice to the minister under this section in its annual report under section 19D.

This amendment has been circulated. The government's bill attempts to remove what has been included as a sunset clause, which I think runs out some time this month. My amendment would restore that sunset clause. It would also impose on the minister some guidelines or controls in the way that he or she might operate the act. So, if the minister is of a mind to declare a particular species of animal or bird basically a pest species he or she must seek advice and that advice must be printed in the annual report. That is a prudent measure. I did attempt another amendment at one stage and the minister indicated that it would cost a substantial sum of money. I am not interested in money being spent on bureaucratic matters in the environment area: I would rather that it be spent looking after parks. So, I am pleased that the minister has agreed to this compromise position. As he said, we worked reasonably well on this, and I appreciate the cooperative spirit in which he presented this bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The government supports this amendment, although we do not support the principle of an expiry in five years' time—a sunset clause, if you like. We do accept that the government of the day can review the legislation at any time it wants, anyway, so we do not intend to fight that section of the amendment; we are happy to accept that. We make the point to the parliament that governments can review the legislation at any time they wish, so to provide that we must do it in five years is a little pointless. However, given the nature of the amendment, we certainly agree with the other intent of the amendment that has been outlined by the opposition. The government will support the amendment, even though it does not think that the five year sunset clause is necessary.

Amendment carried.

Mr HILL: I move:

Page 8, after line 31—Insert subsection as follows:

(7) This section expires on the fifth anniversary of its commencement.

The intention here is not that the government cannot bring it back at an earlier date but that this causes the government to bring it back within five years so that we can review the provision and look at the annual reports that have been brought before parliament over those five years to determine whether or not the provision has worked well.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 and 19 passed.

Clause 20.

Mr HILL: The notion of the royalty to apply is broken into a variety of classes. I was confused about this; it seems to relate to both the vulnerability of the species and the administrative costs. Is the minister's department saying that the more vulnerable the animal is the more administrative work must be done to determine whether or not it should be allowed to be captured?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that, as a general principle, the more vulnerable the animal the more costly is its monitoring. Because there are fewer of them they are more difficult to locate and monitor, and they also tend (although not always) to be in the remote or difficult habitats, and therefore the costs to get there and so on are generally higher. It is a general rule; it is not hard and fast.

Mr HILL: I imagine that the amounts to be charged are subject to change by regulation. Is that correct?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, by regulation.

Clause passed.

Clause 21.

Mr HILL: This clause deals with the molestation of protected animals. I understand that the bill amends the wording so that indirect molestation is now an offence. I gather from the minister's nodding his head that that is correct. Touching an animal and interfering with it has always been an offence, but interfering with it from a distance, as one would if one were buzzing a whale, is now an offence under this provision. Is that correct?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It is an offence if there is deliberate intent. If, as in the example you give, a jet skier is deliberately going around a protected whale with the intention to annoy the animal—that would have to be proven of course—it would be an offence. But, if you happened to ski past not knowing, that would not necessarily be an offence, because the intent would not be proven.

Mr HILL: So, indifference or behaviour which ignores the fact there is a whale there but which might persist for some time would not be caught under this legislation—for example, loutish behaviour which did not involve an intention to upset the whale but which might have upset anyone who happened to be around?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I understand the opposition's point. There is always some judgment in these matters. In the circumstances that the honourable member described, an officer might lay a charge and the court would then have to decide whether or not those circumstances were covered by the act. The government is trying to strengthen the act, because there are circumstances where tourists or locals in an area for whatever reason take some joy in deliberately trying to harass animals without actually touching them. Under the act as it exists, that is not an offence. What we are trying to do is tighten it up so that a deliberate intent to harass a protected species would become an offence, but there will always be grey areas which will have to be a matter for the courts. We have tried to make the provision as tight as we can without making it impracticable.

Mr HILL: A defence is provided so that if the act of molestation were somehow in the interests of the animal, such as if it was being moved or shooed away in a perfectly logical manner, that is a defence. I note that the minister's briefing notes mention when the molestation is for the protection of stock, crops or property, and they then particularly refer to the issue of bird scaring guns and scarecrows. That idea does not seem to be picked up in the act. I am pleased about that because, as someone who deals with constituents who are most concerned about the effects of gas guns on their quality of life, I think that if there was a general provision in here that gave gas gun users carte blanche authority to explode their devices which could then be subject to by-law by council, I would strongly object to this provision. I seek advice from the minister on that.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We cannot find that provision in the existing act. Certainly it was meant to be as per the briefing note, which I understand you disagree with, but with your agreement we will pass it as it stands and either we will have to insert the clause as it is not covered in the existing act and we will have the debate in the upper house or, if I can show you where it exists currently, you will have to oppose it in the upper house and move the amendment there. With your agreement we can sort that out after it goes through here.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (22 to 30), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on the second reading.
(Continued from 12 April. Page 921.)

Mr HILL (Kaurna): It is my pleasure to support the Supply Bill, as the opposition always does. Tonight I will talk about some of the issues effecting my electorate in relation to supply matters. The most important issue in the electorate of Kaurna, in the southern suburbs generally and probably in South Australia, is the issue of employment. We have seen a pleasing fall in unemployment levels in South Australia over the past few months. However, while the overall trend might look good, the impact on particular suburbs is not necessarily as good as that. For the benefit of the House I will explain it in some detail.

The figures I am relying on are 1996 ABS figures, recently published on a suburb by suburb basis by the Onkaparinga council. They indicate a trend. I am not trying to pretend that the unemployment level is as great now as in 1996, but the trend is still the same. In 1996 the unemployment rate in the Adelaide statistical division—that is, the Adelaide metropolitan area—was 10.6 per cent and youth unemployment was 18.5 per cent. In the Onkaparinga council area unemployment statistically at that time was 10.8 per cent and youth unemployment was 19.5 per cent. So, the Onkaparinga area seems to be about the same for Adelaide generally, but if you look at the figures on a suburb by suburb basis you see a starkly different picture emerge.

In some suburbs in my electorate the unemployment rates at that time for adults and youth respectively were as follows: Christies Beach, 17.4 per cent and 27.6 per cent; Christie Downs, 19.9 per cent and 31.2 per cent; Port Noarlunga, 15 per cent and 21.6 per cent; Seaford, 15.4 per cent and 25.3 per cent; Port Willunga, 20.2 per cent and 40 per cent; Aldinga, 38.2 per cent and 60 per cent; Aldinga Beach, 18.6 per cent and 27.5 per cent; and, Sellicks Beach, 16.4 per cent and 15.5 per cent. There is a stark difference if we look at the micro level. Unemployment does not affect everybody in the same way. In my electorate all but one of the suburbs are over the averages for Onkaparinga and over the averages for Adelaide. That situation produces particular problems.

In that context I will refer to the recent decision by Mitsubishi to reduce the number of jobs by 600. One understands the need for Mitsubishi to make a profit and one understands that it is under pressure from its overseas owners. It is hoped by all of us here that Mitsubishi will continue to trade and will grow in future and be able to reemploy people, but it is a concern that 600 jobs will go. Recently the Chairman and CEO of Mitsubishi Motors, Mr Takehara, wrote to me as the local member and told me, amongst other things, in his key paragraph:

Continued speculation about our future in Australia, combined with adverse exchange rates due to the strengthening Yen and discounting to keep sales moving in a softer domestic market have severely impacted on our bottom line over the last two years.

He makes three points: first, speculation, which is outside all our controls, as it has been happening; secondly, it is combined with the adverse exchange rate. It is true that the Australian dollar has collapsed, particularly in relation to the Yen, and that has affected the cost of components used by Mitsubishi, which it has to import and which affects its bottom line. The third point is 'discounting to keep sales moving in a softer domestic market'. That is code for a GST affected market. We know there has been a buyers' strike in

anticipation of the GST. The federal government has refused to address that issue and as a result we have seen this impact on Mitsubishi. It is one of several factors. As a member from the south I certainly hope Mitsubishi continues to grow and trade its way out of these difficulties.

The impact of unemployment on people in the south as everywhere is dramatic: it affects families and people of all age groups. I draw to the attention of the House a problem that one of my constituents put to me. The gentleman concerned is in his fifties and has been out of work for about 18 months. He is struggling to get work and is on NewStart. He is not able to get a concession on the registration of his motor car. If he were a pensioner or single parent he would be able to get a concession worth \$95 a year for a four cylinder car and \$131 a year for a six cylinder car, but because he is on unemployment benefits he does not get that concession. Yet as he and his wife said to me, it is imperative to have a car, given that he lives in the south, in order to get to the places where there is potential work. I ask government members present—not that many are here—to look at extending this concession to unemployed people so the opportunity of going out and seeking work is made easier for them.

One of the opportunities in the south is tourism. The Onkaparinga council contains 35 kilometres of beaches, most of which are in my electorate. They are beautiful and attractive but are poorly exploited by the tourism industry. I am glad the Minister for Tourism is in the House at this stage. The south, one of the great secrets of South Australia, needs greater attention. Certainly McLaren Vale through the Fleurieu gets attention, but the coastal area does not get sufficient attention. To quote briefly from Rene Rivkin, who came to Adelaide some time in March:

You have to build tourism and you need fairly outrageous people promoting your state.

I do not know whether the minister considers herself an outrageous person, but we need such people promoting our state. Speaking at a lunch he praised South Australia for being a wonderful place but said that it lacked promotional skills and was too conservative. We would all agree, certainly with the latter part. He related that he rarely saw South Australia promoted on TV but he always saw Victorian tourism commercials. He said, 'You have far more to offer than Victoria though—you have a great lifestyle here.' I commend his comments to the House.

I also commend to the House the activities of a number of small promoters and entrepreneurs in my electorate who are getting going bed and breakfast places. I was pleased last night to attend the opening of Summerville in Sellicks Beach—a new bed and breakfast establishment which has just opened and which I am sure will be a great drawcard for people in the southern suburbs.

Briefly I turn to the issue of library funding. Members will be aware of the government's pea and thimble trick with library funding. The government is trying to say that some built up reserves should be included in this year's budget. If you do that library funding has not been cut but has been increased. We all know that that is not the case. The impact of library funding is severe, and I would like to refer to it in relation to my own electorate—in particular, the Noarlunga Library. From figures provided to me I understand that, in the 1999-2000 budget, the library obtained \$500 000-odd for materials and \$392 000-odd for operating expenses, giving it a budget of about \$892 000. Yet this year, 2000-01, the

amount for materials has been reduced to \$481 000-odd and operating has risen to \$408 000, but \$39 000 for internet charges has had to come out of that. So, in fact, there has been a reduction to \$850 000, involving a cut of over \$40 000. I am advised that the Noarlunga library has 1.7 million loans a year, receives 1.2 million visits and has 75 000 active borrowers. It has 30 computers that are used by the public, especially for internet access. As I indicated previously, the people in areas where there is high unemployment cannot access the internet from home, as can many other people, and they need to use the library to see what is going on. The state government provides only 18 per cent of the funding to the libraries and local government provides 82 per cent.

I am very concerned about the cuts in library funding. I tabled today in the parliament a petition containing signatures from more than 1 600 southern residents who are opposed to these cuts. If the government cannot restore the funding, at least it should be honest about what it is doing and not pretend that there is more money when we all know there is less. In my view, any society which cuts funding for knowledge, which cuts funding for libraries, is a society doomed to disaster.

I refer now to the issue of ETSA and privatisation. To indicate to the House how appalling this ETSA privatisation is, I will just give one very simple, small example. A constituent wrote to me on 7 December and said:

I have enclosed a copy of the letter that I sent to ETSA on 7 December, regarding damage to electrical appliances suffered during the power failure in early December.

At the time I spoke to someone in the risk management area, they advised me to put my claim in writing, and I would be further advised once the liability was assessed. I understood that if the power failure was caused by lightning, I would receive a letter to present to my insurers, however if the liability was ETSA's then damage to our property would be rectified by ETSA. I have to this point in time not received an acknowledgment to my letter, and quite frankly, I am a bit frustrated that we have to continually monitor the spa, to make sure that we have not left it turned on at the power point, as the electricity bill would be astronomical, and we are rather fed up at having to peer at a television set that is almost black. Whatever occurred on that day definitely upset the electrics of our home, and we would welcome any intervention by yourself, to see this matter cleared up.

I wrote to the minister (the Treasurer) about this matter. He finally replied to me in April and said this in relation to my claim:

As all three state electricity entities are represented in this incident, and those entities are now all distinctly separate, each entity has had to investigate the loss from the perspective of their own organisation. While ETSA Utilities regrets the delay in responding to the claim from Mr and Mrs M, I understand that it will be in a position to do so very shortly.

So, about four months later this new privatised electricity system, which was supposed to make things much more efficient, has resulted in no action in relation to a claim made in December because there are now three entities, none of which wants to take responsibility for this at all. It is an appalling state of affairs. I hope that, as a result of raising this matter here, some action will take place now.

I wish to refer briefly to young people in my electorate. I cited some figures earlier about the high level of unemployment, particularly in the Aldinga Beach and Port Willunga area. The Onkaparinga council, which has been doing its best to try to include young people in a range of activities, recently organised a youth forum in the Aldinga area under the chairpersonship of Fiona Boyle, the youth officer who has been appointed by the council to that area. She has told me

that the young people have told her that the things they are most concerned about are the lack of services for employment and training in the area. They have to travel quite some distance to receive any help at all. There is no TAFE, no CES, no Centrelink and no job network in that area. They have concerns about the lack of health services: there is no Second Story there and there is no sexual health information and networking. They are concerned about the lack of drug and alcohol services. They need a safety house in a particular area there which is close to where they have some recreation opportunities. There is little or no transport that will help them. There are no multi tickets they can use. Transportation is difficult at night time and on weekends. I do not say that the situation for young people is totally bad in the south but there are some particular needs in this area that I think need to be addressed.

I am also concerned about the level of youth homelessness. Chris Halsey, the Southern Junction Youth Services manager, said in April in the local *Southern Times* that there was usually a waiting list of up to 20 young people needing accommodation. She said that young people often lived in unsuitable circumstances, such as abusive or overcrowded situations, waiting for something to come up, and she says the service in the Christies Downs area has been contacted 650 to 700 times by young people seeking assistance or accommodation. So, there is a real problem there.

There are some positives, though. We had the establishment of the vocational college at Christies Beach High School, which incorporates a range of schools in the area, and that seems to be working well. I congratulate the high schools serving my electorate, Seaford Rise, Willunga High School and Christies Beach, which I know all work very hard for their local community. In particular, I congratulate Seaford Rise 6-12 school, which last year had its first year 12 and successfully matriculated a number of students. I congratulate them on that and take particular pride that my son was one of those who successfully passed through the system.

I would also like to mention the relationship between these problems, particularly in some areas where there is a lack of services with the proliferation of some gangs in the southern suburbs. Fortunately, the police have been able to crack down on these gangs, and some of the greater problems have been ameliorated. But it does not affect the underlying cause. The police can do their job but if there are no opportunities for young people, no educational training or recreational opportunities, they will get into trouble one way or another.

I briefly refer to hospitals and health issues in the southern suburbs. We know that we are 650 beds short since this government came into office—there are 650 fewer beds now than there were when it came to office—and that is certainly affecting people in the south as well. There has been an upgrade at the Noarlunga Hospital, and I suppose there is a question mark as to whether that is sufficient.

There is a particular need for residential care. One constituent contacted me recently, and she is a full-time carer for her husband, who is ill. She needs a minor, but urgent, operation. If she does not get it she could haemorrhage, so she needs respite in residential care for her husband for about two or three days. She needs the operation in May. Her doctor is ready to perform the operation but she cannot get respite care for her husband in residential care until August. So, she may well have to wait four months, which will put both her own health and that of her husband at risk.

In the remaining minutes I would like to refer to a number of planning matters in the southern suburbs. For some time

now I have been trying to obtain some answers from the government in relation to where the metropolitan boundary ends and whether there is a consistency across government departments about where it ends and, in particular, the effect on my constituents who live in the Aldinga and Sellicks Beach area. I have raised a number of times in the House the concerns they have about receiving country services at a reduced level in some areas and having to pay city rates for things such as car registration and so on. I have twice placed a number of questions on notice, and none of these questions has been answered. The Premier did set up some sort of committee through Flinders University last year. I understood that that committee, or that consultancy, was supposed to report at Christmas time. It is now May and we have heard nothing about it. No action has taken place, and my constituents are deeply concerned about it.

I am pleased to note that Telstra is undertaking a review into its zoning system. That may help my constituents, because they pay STD rates—although I am concerned that Telstra says in its press release that people should outline their issues and suggest alternatives which do not involve moving the boundaries of zones. That is exactly what needs to happen in the southern area. The city zone needs to be moved further out so that people who live in that peri-metropolitan area can be included.

I believe that what we need in South Australia is an urban growth boundary. I know that the Minister for Urban Planning supports this, and I have read her speeches in another place to this end. We need to have a very clear boundary, and we should be able to say to our citizens, 'If you live on this side of the boundary, you are in the metropolitan area, and you can expect metropolitan services; if you live on the other side, you are in a rural area, and you will get a level of service which is equivalent to living there, and you should pay rates which compensate you for that. There may well need to be some area which is a kind of halfway house for a period, because we cannot give these services immediately, but over time we will build up to provide those services for you.' I know that on the edge of my electorate, in the Aldinga and Sellicks area, this is a matter of great concern. I also indicate in relation to the southern suburbs the Onkaparinga city council indicates that projections for its district are down 40 000 by 2011. So, growth is certainly slowing down. It is a good opportunity to try to get a boundary in place while the population is slowing, so that we can get some sensible planning in place.

I note that the government is again talking about putting an O-Bahn into the southern suburbs. It is obviously in political trouble, because every time it has a political problem it raises the issue of the O-Bahn. I am concerned that the treatment of it would see the O-Bahn finish in the inner southern suburbs, the area in my electorate south of Port Noarlunga, where there is no railway system. Certainly, it needs some improved public transport, and it is just a craziness in our society that we build these new suburbs without having first established appropriate transport systems. If the government is fair dinkum about an O-Bahn, it should look at where the population is and put in an appropriate transport system.

I am also concerned about the use of open space in suburban areas, and I refer to the sell-off of the Christies Beach High School West Campus and the opposition to that being used for anything but open space purposes by the local community. A recent public meeting emphasised that point,

and it is a regrettable there has been improper consultation over it.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Today in my supply address I would like to touch on a number of matters. At the beginning, I would like start on what is both a pleasant and a sad note. I want to pay a tribute to Christine Kerslake who was, until the end of last term, the Principal of the Hampstead Primary School on Muller Road, Greenacres. I say sad, because she has now left that school and transferred to the Northern Territory, and I have yet to catch up with her to find the reasons for it. However, I understand there were a number of reasons, not the least of which was the fact that her workload and the type of work in which she was involved virtually exhausted her and she was looking for other challenges. I would like to pay a tribute not just to her but also to the whole school community for what has taken place in that school since I first became the member for Ross Smith in December 1993.

When I first went to that school early in 1994, I found that it was somewhat dispirited. It had little by way of esprit de corps. Like a number of schools, it had behavioural problems with primary schoolchildren, vandalism and a school council that was virtually incomplete in terms of numbers who were eligible to stand, and generally a deteriorating position.

In July that year, Christine Kerslake took over as the Principal. I can only wish that all members here had the opportunity to visit that school and see the enthusiasm and dedication that she and her fellow teachers, parents and, more importantly, the pupils at that school applied to turn that school around.

The school now virtually has a full school council. To date, it is the only school in Australia to be the recipient of two national awards given by the federal justice minister with respect to the prevention of violence, and also the winner of the National Australia Bank award last year with respect to excellence in volunteering.

Ms Kerslake and her staff tackled the problems of the school through the use of music and singing. It might sound strange, but that school had not one musical instrument to its name in 1994. However, Christine Kerslake, with her boundless enthusiasm, encouraged the primary school to improvise and make their own instruments—for example, bottle tops on coat hangers and the like. The school is not a wealthy one, because many of the parents who send their children to the school have limited financial means. Gradually, using her contacts with the Department of Correctional Services and with the support of successive senior bureaucrats of the Education and Children's Services Department and ministers, Ms Kerslake was able to enlist the services of people who chose to work off their fines rather than pay them. She used those people who had some musical ability and were able to play a musical instrument or whatever to spend their time with the children on a Friday afternoon, and many of them did so. Having served out their community service orders, these people still retained an affection for the school and went back and serviced the needs of those children by volunteering to go there, act as the back-up musicians and to assist the children.

Gradually, through her enthusiasm and guidance at that school, Ms Kerslake in the very first year got the children to establish the Hampstead Primary School bush band. The band used to go around the shopping centres and sing and raise the money to collect funds to hire a bus. They would then busk through Port Pirie and Port Augusta. They then went to

Warrambo, a little town on the West Coast. In 1995, that area had been subjected to five years of drought. The farmers there had no money, the school reflected it, and the facilities that were available for the children reflected the fact that there was no money in the district. The children of the Hampstead Primary School bush band raised \$1 000 and donated that money to the school community at Warrambo. This involved not just the money they raised but also the generation of feeling between two school communities, both of which were in fairly straitened times financially. Here was a school—not a wealthy school from a metropolitan area—going down to a small farming community on the West Coast to give them \$1 000 to assist them to buy much needed equipment. I thought that was a fantastic effort on their part.

In succeeding years, as part of their growth and development, Christine Kerslake and her school community, led ably by the school council chairperson at the time, Kevin Harper and his wife, went across to Kalgoorlie, on the AN tea and sugar train when it was government owned, and sang Christmas carols to the railway fitters and their families along the Indian Pacific railway line route. They did not use or keep for themselves the money they raised from that; rather, they donated it to the Boylan Ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital, which is the psychiatric ward for children. Why the Boylan Ward as against any of the other wards, one might ask? Because, as Christine Kerslake and the school council determined, that was not a soft, cuddly ward that attracted a number of sponsors or donations from other sections of the community, as it was the children's psychiatric ward. So they determined that they would put their money there, and they have continued to do so.

On two occasions, they went down to Tasmania, the first time in the same year as the dreadful Port Arthur massacre, and sang amongst the school communities in an around Port Arthur. Some thought was given to whether or not they should go ahead so soon after this dreadful massacre, but following consultation with the Tasmanian education department and local school communities in Tasmania it was agreed that they should—and they did, to the great pleasure of all those who listened to the music they played.

In 1998—or 1999, the years go so quickly that you forget—when they last won the federal justice minister's award for the prevention of violence, they were transported across to the federal parliament in Canberra where they performed in the Great Hall. An adjunct to their bush band was The Stomp Boys, a group of young lads from years 6 and 7 who used metal garbage bin lids, wheelie bins, etc., as their musical instruments. With some assistance, they performed their own choreography, and they did a fantastic job. I understand that the Minister for Justice, Amanda Vanstone, was so overcome that she jumped in with a pair of drum sticks and bashed away at a wheelie bin with great enthusiasm.

The money that this school has received from these awards has been carefully invested. It is used to help develop students who might not otherwise get an opportunity. At the school last year I saw a beautiful mural being painted by the children with the assistance and under the guidance of their art teacher. I was introduced to one of these children and told that, whilst he might not have much of a future academically, the art teacher had recognised that he had a gift with respect to art. So, the school put aside some of the money that it raised through the various awards that it had won to pay for a scholarship for this young lad to enable him to receive

private tuition to develop his art work so that he could express himself and follow a career in the arts.

The annual general meeting of the school council two years ago was attended by 240 parents. I do not think that any other school (private or public) in this state could brag about such a high attendance of parents at the annual general meeting of their school council.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Which school is this?

Mr CLARKE: The Hampstead Primary School. I am pleased to report that the level of vandalism at this school has been reduced to virtually nil unless someone from outside the local community happens to come along to the school for that purpose. Bad or poor behaviour of students has also been reduced to virtually zero. This school has accepted school children who have been excluded from other schools because of their poor behaviour. They have adjusted very well to the school environment, because they were told that if they wanted to participate in the bush band and the visiting program (a couple of years ago they went to Tenant Creek because a number of young Aboriginal children from the Northern Territory were students at the Hampstead Primary School) they had to behave—and it worked. In addition, cooperation has been received from the Department of Correctional Services with a number of prisoners using silk screening to place motifs on the T-shirts that are worn by the children when they perform in public.

I could wax lyrical about this school and the work of the Principal, Christine Kerslake, and the Chairperson, Kevin Harper, and all the other individuals, including parents, who participate so much in enriching the lives of these young children. As a result of all this, I am now a convert when it comes to art. I used to think of art along the lines of: 'It's nice to have, but you can't eat, drink or wear it, so what do you do with it?' What Christine Kerslake and the school community have taught me about music and art is that it enriches the lives of young children and gives them something meaningful. It has turned this school around in a most dramatic fashion. Literacy levels have improved because if you cannot read you cannot read music. These young children have been inspired to learn because they want to participate in the artistic life of the school.

I wish Christine Kerslake and her husband the very best in whatever endeavours they now undertake in the Northern Territory. They have done something which few of us ever have the opportunity to do: that is, they have influenced the lives of young children to make them better and more meaningful and to ensure that they grow up to be well rounded citizens of this country in the decades to come. I wish I could say that I have contributed as much to this state as Christine Kerslake and her supporters have for the children of the Hampstead Primary School.

In the few minutes remaining, I would like to refer to a couple of issues that have not yet been resolved. One relates to SA Water. I can never understand why some government agencies go out of their way to make life difficult for innocent citizens, why they stand on their dig over what they perceive to be a principle just to frustrate ordinary citizens. A couple of months ago in Archer Street, North Adelaide, one of my constituents parked his car next to Fasta Pasta. Suddenly, a water main burst and rubble was thrown into the air, breaking the windows of my constituent's car, denting it and filling it with water.

That car was worth only about \$5 000, but it meant a lot to my constituent who is a 20 year old university student with limited funds. It was not his fault that he happened to park his

car in Archer Street at the very time the water main burst. His car was not insured. When he went to SA Water and asked for compensation for the damage to his vehicle, I am advised that he was told that it was an act of God and that, therefore, no compensation would be payable.

I found out about this only yesterday afternoon. The claims manager of SA Water, with whom I tried to speak today, was not available, but I hope to speak to that person tomorrow. I would like a good explanation of what he means by 'an act of God'. Those pipes were put into the ground by men, not by God, knowing that from time to time they would be liable to break or leak. From my point of view, it is a question of whether proper inspections have taken place over the years to ensure that those pipes were in good order. In any event, even if these pipes do break and the government has done everything that it can—the government can only do so much in terms of inspections and the like—the innocent citizen, who has their property damaged, should not bear the whole burden of that cost, when the community as a whole shares the benefit of having water mains and reticulated water delivered to its homes and businesses.

From time to time, we expect that breakdowns will occur and damage might take place, but the community as a whole wears that cost. For a young 20 year old university student to have his car written off and SA Water to say that it was an act of God, tough luck about the \$5 000, is not acceptable to anyone. I will certainly fight hard to ensure that this student's rights are protected.

The other point I would like to raise is in respect of Anzac Day services, which a number of us in the parliament would have attended, and in particular—and I am not the first one to have noticed it—the number of young people who are attending not only the march as observers but also the dawn services. My own daughter represented me at the dawn service at the Prospect RSL and spoke because I was at the Enfield RSL at the same time. I must say for anyone's teenage daughter willingly to get out of bed at 5 o'clock in the morning rather than getting home at that time says something about the feelings that young people have towards the history, the tradition and the emotion surrounding Anzac Day and what it means. I doubt whether when I was 19 I would have got up at 5 o'clock in the morning to attend an Anzac Day service, but a number of young people do today in ever increasing numbers and I commend them for it, and in particular the RSL and the teaching of our history and so forth in schools these days that is engendering this greater interest in the activities of ordinary men and women who have done so much to defend this country.

I would like to raise many things, but one matter I will raise concerns something that appeared in the paper recently about the lack of accountability of this government in answering questions. I again draw the House's attention to the fact that, for over a year, I have asked the Minister for Tourism certain questions relating to how many MPs have been invited to attend the Entertainment Centre since 1994, the names and the values of that. I am still yet to receive an answer. It is about 18 months since I asked that question and I am yet to receive an answer.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I start by endorsing the comments of the member for Kaurna about the importance of employment issues in the southern area and the need for measures in this forthcoming budget indicating that this government will work on practical initiatives in partnership with bodies such as the City of Onkaparinga to develop new

employment initiatives in the south. The impact of unemployment, as the member for Kaurna pointed out, is far from even and in the City of Onkaparinga there are areas where unemployment is as low as 4.3 per cent, but there are other areas where it is closer to 13 per cent and youth unemployment is over 30 per cent. The problems in these areas have to be tackled directly.

The needs of these people have to be tackled directly and they have to be able to work within their community to develop skills that are appropriate to the new industries, and we need to be able to work in the local community to develop those new industries. Of course, there are the challenges presented by the impact of cutbacks at Mitsubishi and the precarious situation with Mobil. Unfortunately, the government's track record in working with both these organisations, for all the Premier says, is not as good as it could be, and their employees and the businesses that depend on them deserve better treatment from this government.

The major issue that has come to everyone's attention as a result of the last budget is the emergency services tax and the outcry in the community about the unfair impact of that tax and the dishonest way in which it was introduced. The Minister for Police and Emergency Services was the one who stood up in this House and indicated that he had asked the minister then responsible (the member for Davenport) whether or not this tax would bring in more revenue than was raised through the insurance levy. The minister indicated that he had been assured that this was not the case and that this was simply a new way of raising the same amount of money. Of course, as we know, that is not what has happened.

I asked people in my area to indicate their thoughts about the emergency services tax and how it was impacting on them, and the responses were amazing. I had over 700 replies, and I have 23 pages of closely typed material indicating what those replies were and the messages that the people from the south wanted to convey to Mr Olsen. I will not read all 23 pages, but I will read some of the responses so that the comments of the people who took the time to reply to my letter are clearly on the public record. G.P. of Morphett Vale says:

I have always had my house insured including a levy. My vehicles have always been registered and insured including trailers. I am on low income (student) and volunteer currently around 26 hours per week to community service. I feel penalised for other people's foolish behaviour and recklessness. I do not mind paying what is fair, but this is not a fair levy.

R.S. from Hackham West says:

Our family is paying this tax five times: the house, trailer, our two cars and my son's car. Why did they not just make house insurance compulsory and stop double and triple dipping? This is very unfair.

E.B. from Christie Downs says:

I do not mind it, it is a good idea but, once off is enough, not everything that moves. I am only a pensioner trying to survive.

F. and M.J. from Reynella say:

We are a struggling family on two part-time jobs; we have a house and two cars plus a huge mortgage. Because of this we are slugged three times. This money could go towards our child's education but instead our child will miss out on some necessities.

R.G. from Morphett Vale says:

\$32 per vehicle is way too high; \$12 is more like it and \$4 for trailers.

H.S. of Morphett Vale says:

With two new extra levies on my house and car I find that I am no longer able to afford the luxury of living in my own home and

now must sell my house and apply for a Housing Trust unit. I have been a pensioner for 20 years and am still fit enough to look after myself. This is the final straw.

When comments such as this are made as a result of one of the government's poorly thought through tax measures, it is no wonder that people in the community feel that this government has abandoned them.

What I am hoping to see in this budget is more emphasis on preventive measures. In this House I have raised the issue of financial counsellors who are often volunteers but we also need to look at paying financial counsellors to assist people who every week and every year have to consider the best way to spend every last dollar. I come from a family where my mother had to consider whether she could afford tuppence for some chewing gum or whether that tuppence could be better spent. I know the strain that it places on families when every single dollar has to be looked at twice to work out the best way to spend it. I have also seen the difficulty when people are not even aware of the options as to how they could spend that dollar because their lives have become so disrupted that they are not able to think very widely about the options they might have, few as they are.

Financial counsellors offer a really valuable service in assisting people to take control of their lives and their budgets and get onto a path where they can stop worrying about every single dollar, yet this government does not support financial counsellors to the extent that they are required in our community. Our schools need more help. Again, we need to look at those students with particular needs. We need to look at those who have learning difficulties and the support that they and their schools need. We need also to look at the provision of school counsellors on a much more widespread basis so that they can work with students and teachers to find ways to make school more attractive and interesting for students who have difficulties, and to work with the families so that they can support these students in reaching their full potential. We need more attendance officers who can work with families to discover what is preventing children attending school.

A recent study indicated that in areas of poverty and low education levels as much as 45 per cent of boys suffer chronic health problems. This means that they are frequently away from school. Other issues prevent children from getting to school and stop families from getting the children there in a way that enables them to take advantage of the wonderful learning opportunities that are available. Children coming to school without breakfast cannot pay attention. Children who are worried about a sick parent at home cannot pay attention. Children who are worried that a parent will lose their job cannot pay attention.

We must find ways of working better on the problems that beset these families and focus on the need to support the children to attend school. Unfortunately, I find that when I attend schools on many special occasions just too many children are absent. I attended a function where, despite the fact that a number of children were to receive rewards and recognition, a third of the class was absent. It is very difficult to learn constructively if you are absent a third of the time, which is what that reduces to mathematically. However, we know that that will not be the situation: some children will be constantly absent and their learning suffers incredibly.

We need to find ways of raising the aspirations of some families in terms of what their children might be able to achieve through school, TAFE and university. It is very difficult if you do not know anyone other than a teacher who

has ever been to university to appreciate the benefits that can be derived from education. Only about 7 per cent of the Reynell community has undertaken any post-secondary education, and that makes it very difficult for the next generation to take advantage of the opportunities. These families need special help to take the risks that are involved these days in going on to TAFE, paying all those fees, going on to university and incurring a huge HECS debt.

We need more prevention in terms of more police on the street. People tell me repeatedly that they want to see police on their streets. They want to see them out and about at shopping centres. People want to know that when they telephone to report a crime something is done. We need support for crime prevention initiatives so that communities can come together—as those in Old Reynella did recently—to work out ways of preventing crime in their area. But again and again hospitals are raised as the number one issue of concern to our community. The fact that the Minister for Human Services believes that bed cuts do not equal service cuts does not impact at all on what the community thinks.

The community knows perfectly well that, while there might be some new modern methods of day surgery, fewer beds and fewer staff mean the less chance our wonderful hospitals have to meet their needs. This issue is particularly a problem in the area of joint replacement. I am now finding that there is beginning to be just the same sort of terrible waiting times in the area of ear, nose and throat surgery. I bring to the attention of the House the case of Mrs V. from Old Reynella, who was originally told that she would have to wait approximately 18 months for a hip replacement. She has now been told that the wait will be another 22 months, or even longer.

Mrs V. was told in June 1999 that the wait would be 18 months. In March 2000 she was told that the wait would be 22 months plus. I have written to the minister on this matter and received a reply last week: yes, another 22 months wait it is. The fact that Mrs V. is taking anti-inflammatory drugs three times a day and that this makes her quite ill, not to mention the expense that she incurs, does not help her wait that 22 months. The fact that she is no longer able to live an active and outgoing life does not help her wait that 22 months. It does not wash with her that bed cuts do not mean lack of services—they do. It does not wash with her neighbours, it does not wash with her family and it does not wash with anyone else in the southern community. Too many people are waiting too long, particularly for joint replacement surgery.

There is an urgent need for more funds to be devoted to dental schemes. Some of the saddest cases that I see in my office relate to people who need urgent dental treatment and who are simply not able to get it. One case involves Mr G., about whom I wrote to the minister on 11 February this year. Mr G. had seen Professor Richards from the Adelaide Dental Clinic on 28 September. Mr G. had waited a long time to be seen, but on 28 September he thought that he was finally going to get the dental treatment that he needed. However, treatment was cancelled and he is still waiting.

Here we are, May 2000, and Mr G. is still waiting for treatment that was promised on 28 September. Mr G.'s upper denture is completely destroyed. He is having to eat pap and he cannot talk well. He already has a heavy European accent, and the absence of his teeth is making things much more complicated.

When we see numbers and times on lists, behind them are hundreds of stories just like those of Mrs V. And Mr G.,

people whose lives are being terribly diminished by the inefficiency of this government. What I do not want to see from this government in the next budget is the sort of waste of money that we have seen in the past six budgets. I do not want to see initiatives that are supposed to bring jobs to this state, but the lack of accountability means that we never really know what happens.

After several announcements indicating that these jobs will be created, we then have an announcement three years later stating, 'Well, they did not actually eventuate' or 'only half the jobs were created,' which is reflected in an article on page 27 of the *Advertiser*. I do not want to see huge payments to consultants in relation to selling off our assets and, in the case of ETSA, for far too small a price. We did not want to see ETSA go. We did not need the consultants in their \$3 000 suits to help it go and, when we are paying them enough to be able to afford those suits, we would at least expect a decent price, and we certainly did not get it.

I do not want to see stitched together projects that fast track all sorts of deals, such as the Pelican Point Power Station, which involved no consultation with the community, where the environmental impacts were not properly considered, where the contractual arrangements—or what we can glean of them—seem to be to the disadvantage of the taxpayer and, more particularly, the electricity consumer in this state, and where a cloud of confusion reigns so that no-one can really tell. What we do know is that the deal was stitched together because the Premier was embarrassed about the need to get more electricity in this state when the interconnector project fell over, and it just has not worked. I do not want to see more deals that abuse public land such as the parklands and the wine centre, where we are putting industry offices in the parklands. We needed a national wine centre—it was terrific—but we did not need it in the parklands and we certainly did not need an industry facility in the parklands.

I do not want to see deals that have a continuing impact on public amenity such as the Holdfast Shores development. The fact that we can no longer drive down Anzac Highway and see the sea is something that affects every one of us in terms of our heritage. For many years I have enjoyed being able to go down the highway and see the Norfolk Island pines and the sea. That loss of amenity is the smallest of the problems with that development. The impact on the Patawalonga and the Barcoo Outlet and the damage that it will do to the environment, the waste of money on the Barcoo Outlet when the money could be much better spent, and the horrible damage that has been caused by the groyne are real indications of where this government has rushed a development again. It wanted to show that it was doing something, but we have seen the taking away of public land in Colley Reserve, and the taking away of public amenity and a view. A new boat harbour has been imposed that is having a tragic impact in terms of the amount of sand that has to be trucked down that coast. The damage this is doing to the environment in a prime tourist area as well as to a prime recreational facility is just stupid, short-sighted and inefficient.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): In supporting this bill this afternoon I will speak briefly on the impact that this government's budget has had on my electorate. Let me say first of all that it is increasingly the view of many of my residents that this government simply has its priorities wrong. We all accept that there is only one bucket of money, and any government faces that—you cannot do everything for everyone—but it is what you do with that money that is

important. So often the initiatives of this government—if you can call them that—are false economies; they end up costing us more. During the last week of sitting I gave the example where the penny pinching in relation to mental health, rather than costing us a few hundred dollars for a relief case worker, ended up costing us thousands of dollars, resulting in Star Force attendance, admittance in and out of health institutions and finally a mental health patient being charged with criminal acts. That is quite scandalous and a disgraceful waste of money.

An issue that I have raised in relation to my electorate is safe access and car parking to the Golden Grove bus interchange. This is extremely important. This interchange is unacceptable, dangerous and congested. We have large articulated buses using this interchange and the smallest suburban link buses as well as normal sized buses. Hundreds of school children every day flock to this interchange, and how one of them has not been injured to date is beyond me. If you are to establish a bus interchange one would think it is obvious that some sort of car parking should be available. There is none at Golden Grove. It is a ridiculous situation. It is a disincentive for people to use public transport and, if they do go to the shopping centre where the interchange is located, they face a fine for doing so.

I took up this issue with the minister when I wrote to her in September of last year, and she wrote back telling me that she expected to have some improvements in relation to this within six to 12 months. I suggested that a suitable location for an interchange would be the adjoining district sports field, if and when that is developed, and I understand that about 1 000 car parks will be vacant there during the week, so it seems an ideal location to me for an interchange during the week with a bus stop at the shopping centre to service patrons who want to access the shops. When the announcement was made that our services in the northern suburbs would be privatised and that Serco would be taking over all the services, I again contacted the minister seeking some assurance that this upgrade was still on the books and would still proceed. My question received an interesting and pleasing response, in some regards. I am glad that the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services is here to hear this, because he will not be able to say he does not know about it and has not been approached about it.

In response to my query the minister assured me that the upgrade would continue, and she advised that options were being considered, such as the district sports field, some land behind Woolworths in Aeolian Drive at Golden Grove, some land leased from the Golden Grove village shopping centre—and I understand there are some real problems in relation to that—and also surplus land at the Golden Grove High School. I had a representative from the Public Transport Board and Serco come out to meet me and discuss these options. After considerable discussion by all of us the option most favoured was the land at the Golden Grove High School. The operators of the shopping centre and I both said, 'Hang on a minute; we have this earmarked. We have tweaked the minister's ear on a number of occasions about establishing the promised Tea Tree Gully police patrol base on this land.' The indication I had from the Public Transport Board was that it was prepared to buy the land and have a joint facility on that land. There would be a bus interchange at the shopping centre for commuters not needing to park their cars and a parking facility on the land the high school has for sale, but all the

land would not be needed and the Police Department would be allowed to build its patrol base there.

That would be extremely useful for our community. Serco was very supportive of the idea and I know the Golden Grove community would welcome that with open arms. The police patrol base was a commitment that the government gave two years ago. This land at the high school is government owned land in a prime position, and it is available. The Public Transport Board will buy the land for you; all you have to do is put the police station on it. This is an opportunity for a useful joint public facility. It would solve two important issues in my electorate. It would provide security for transport commuters; it would provide the police with the opportunity to build and develop links with high school students; and it would provide a real and visible police presence in our community, acknowledging that that presence has a real impact on crime rates. In 1998-99 break and enters in the Tea Tree Gully area went up 31 per cent. My community is not prepared to continue to accept this. Illegal use of motor vehicles went up 30 per cent, property damage and arson went up 50 per cent. This is staggering.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: From the police report.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: The latest one.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Who was the officer who gave it to you?

Ms RANKINE: It was not an officer: the department published it. A senior officer raised that question with me. They said, 'Who leaked you this information?' Guess what, minister: you publish it annually. That is where I got the figures.

Mr Hanna: Maybe you should send a copy to him.

Ms RANKINE: Maybe we need to. Tomorrow I will be lodging a petition in this House that has over 1 300 signatures and there are more to come. The people out there want the promised police patrol base; they want you to honour your commitment.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: You have been reviewing it for over two years; how long does the Minister for Police need to navel gaze? This is a nonsense. Focus 21 was supposed to be a vision for the future. This is a very dim vision. I think the person who implemented this needs to have their eyes tested, because their vision is not too damned good. This is an opportunity for the government to do something positive, so stop sitting on your hands and take some action.

Another issue that is causing me concern—again, it is another example of this government's not understanding priorities and not getting things right—is that involving Golden Grove Road. Golden Grove Road, from Grenfell Road through to One Tree Hill Road, is in a dangerous and disgraceful state. It is little more than a country track and it is totally unsuited to the demands being placed on it. It is dangerous and in dire need of upgrade. This road now abuts the new housing development of Golden Grove and also abuts Industry Park. Heavy transport companies, extractive industries and brickworks located on Greenwith Road all use this road, as do large B-doubles. This road is unlit, narrow, has no footpaths and all the verges are unsealed. Basically when residents drive up this road and large transport operators use it they are virtually taking their life in their hands.

I have taken up this issue with the minister on a number of occasions. Golden Grove Road not only abuts Industry Park, but the council is about to establish a waste transfer

station on Golden Grove Road. The vehicle movements along that road will increase by 2 400 per week as a result of this. Delfin, the developers of Golden Grove, currently has a planning amendment report before the government for a rezoning of a new Golden Grove neighbourhood centre. This is land immediately abutting the existing rural A zone, which contains the Golden Grove township. The developers envisage developing a new neighbourhood centre that will accommodate land uses such as a sales centre and offices, shops (such as a coffee shop and delicatessen), a community centre, consulting rooms and more medium density housing. That means more traffic on this section of Golden Grove Road.

In my discussions at a meeting I had with Serco and the Passenger Transport Board, Serco mentioned its desire to develop an interchange for an express service on Golden Grove Road. Immediately adjacent to Industry Park, it wants to develop a car parking facility for public transport commuters to park their vehicles, get on the bus and have an express into the city. They cannot and will not do it while Golden Grove Road is in its present state. Industry Park is really the hub of any industry in my electorate—a very small pocket—is now in stage 3 of its development. When I contacted the minister about the upgrade of Golden Grove Road she claimed to have undertaken an investigation. I have written to all the businesses in Industry Park and surrounding areas.

I have written to Garden Grove, to the extractive industries, transport industries and light industrial, and also to Air International, the largest employer in that area. None has confirmed with me any approach from the minister's department. Would you not have thought that, if any proper investigation had been undertaken, the minister's department would have gone out to ascertain how many and what type of vehicles these companies operate on Golden Grove Road and what their projections might be into the future? But what has happened? Nothing! In fact, I was contacted by Air International, from whose letter I will quote. We all remember the member for Davenport getting up and telling us about Air International winning some new projects. In fact, I received a letter from Ray Waters, the Operations Manager of Air International, advising me that they had in fact won several new projects which will result in a considerable increase in large trucks to and from their works. He went on to say:

One of these major projects we have won requires delivery of completely fabricated components to Victoria. We are currently assessing the alternatives of complete manufacture and assembly here with freight to Victoria or manufacture only of components and freight to Victoria with complete fabrication there. One of the major cost factors is freight of the larger fabricated assemblies, which would require several B-double trucks to and from our works each day.

In fact, they tell me there will be an increase of something like 40 per cent. Mr Waters goes on to say:

While we wish to keep all of this work in South Australia, it may not be practical if we cannot ensure safe access to these large trucks to and from our works. We would therefore be willing to be involved in any study by Transport SA.

Guess what! They were not contacted. We could lose 40 to 50 jobs out of the Wright electorate and Golden Grove because this government refuses to upgrade this road any sooner than in 10 years' time. The minister wrote to me and said:

Future traffic demand modelling indicates that duplication would not be necessary for at least 10 years.

What an absolute nonsense! This delay will cost us jobs—jobs we simply cannot afford to lose. It is a false economy; we cannot wait 10 years. Business wants it, the community wants it and the council wants it. In fact it wrote to me also saying that it wanted this road upgraded; it needs to be done. A proper assessment also needs to be undertaken, taking into account future needs. We need to give this road proper and appropriate priority. Again the government has its priorities wrong. Sitting on its hands will cost us.

We constantly see how this government is spending literally millions of dollars on consultants while the dire needs of people in our community are simply not being met. I am talking about basic needs—basic areas of human need. Housing, for example, is in a crisis situation, and I have addressed that issue on previous occasions in this House. The other area of grave concern is health, and again I will detail that more extensively on Thursday when I address the motion, notice of which I gave the House today.

I will touch briefly on equipment supply for people with disabilities. Whilst we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on the upgrade of the office of the Minister for Human Services and the Minister for Disability Services, I am being told, when I ask questions about waiting lists for equipment, priorities and the cost to fulfil all this, that Options Coordination Agencies have prioritised their clients according to greatest need. As a result, some of those clients who need to have been assessed as having lower priority are being placed on a waiting list. So, basically people classed as a high priority are having their needs met soonest and the rest are on a waiting list.

I will tell members about Mr Ross in Greenwith. Mr Ross has been a hard-working member of our community all his life. Mr Ross, who has never asked for anything, has suffered for many years from multiple sclerosis, but in the past few years it has progressed rapidly. His mobility is now significantly impaired. He is suffering emotional distress and a lack of self-esteem. Personal pride and independence are vital for this man's stability. He is very much limited to his home these days and he often falls. I have seen him move, and his walk has been reduced to a sad shuffle. This man has been told that he has to wait three to five years for an electric wheelchair. How many wheelchairs could we have bought for these people if we had not spent this money on the Ministers's offices, or if we had not spent nearly \$25 000 advertising job placements for the staff of the Minister for Administrative Services? It is an absolute disgrace. People in my electorate want to see these basic needs met for the people concerned. They do not want to see the money wasted on consultants or on flash offices for ministers who simply are not doing their job and do not have their priorities right.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I want to speak on a number of issues relating to this bill and to supply. Today I went shopping in Rundle Mall, and it made me realise how good it is to live in country South Australia, how much I like living there and how much I dislike having to spend time in Adelaide, because of the number of people who were in the city—the shops were full, and in every shop I went into I had to wait. While this is good for business in Adelaide I am afraid that, for a country person, it becomes a little tiring, and I will be pleased to go home at the end of the week. I particularly mention this matter because a lot of us in the country now have the reputation that we whinge, whine and complain about country life and what is happening there—and we do, because there are many issues in country South

Australia in relation to which we feel that we are disadvantaged and discriminated against. However, we do like our life in country South Australia, and certainly most of us do not want to move away from the country to metropolitan areas.

I was pleased to receive a reply today from the Minister for Education regarding replacement of the school at Oak Valley and the progress of the new school building. I am told that the project is currently with the Development Assistance Commission for approval and that the new building will be installed, depending on local weather conditions and other conditions in that area. However, it is planned in the very near future. So, I am very pleased that Oak Valley will get its new school, and I hope that will happen very shortly. However, having regard to other schools that we have asked for in those areas, I think it may still be some time before the community can celebrate the opening of its new school.

I have previously mentioned Oak Valley and the conditions in that school: the buildings are not airconditioned, there is no running water, there are no toilet facilities and people are travelling 2½ kilometres from site to site at Oak Valley to reach the school facilities. It is in a shocking state. It is probably the worst school I have seen in the Aboriginal lands areas, but it is certainly not an unusual site. If one visits any school in the Aboriginal lands one will find that there are inadequate conditions in all but one site that I can particularly think of. I wonder whether any parent in this building would allow their children to attend these substandard schools, with their Third World conditions. Would any parent accept that for their child? I certainly would not. So, the question is why it has taken so long for successive governments (and I do not blame just this government, although I believe that it should be taking more action than it is), including previous Labor and previous Liberal governments, to recognise that there is a real need in these schools for money to be spent on them to bring them up to a standard which is acceptable in the year 2000. Aboriginal children are no different to white children: they learn in the same way, they expect certain conditions and they are entitled to the same sort of working conditions that exist in our southern schools. The staff who work in these schools are not second class; they are usually very skilled people. They have to be skilled to work in the conditions in which they are working. So, they should not be subjected to second-class conditions, either.

Last year I mentioned Mimili school, where a caravan has been converted to teaching space. I believe that a replacement will occur. In November or December I was promised that it would happen very shortly in the new year. I was told that a building is to be transferred from Marla, and I would like to know whether that new school is in place.

School toilets in any of those lands areas are in a shocking state. In particular, I mention Pipalyatjara school, which is about as far as you can go in the Pitjantjatjara lands. The toilets there are in a shocking condition, as are many other facilities at that school. Recently, because of the rains in the area, the school was closed on a regular basis (I think that during a three week period it was closed for half the time) because of a leaky roof: the rain came in and the students had to be sent home. Any of the school playgrounds in the Aboriginal lands areas are unsafe and would not pass occupational health and safety standards. There are blocks of concrete all over the place, there are big holes in the ground, equipment is outdated and broken down and items are lying around that are not safe for children. The playing areas are not safe for children and they are in an appalling condition.

These schools must be attractive to make these young students want to attend school. This is the case with respect to any school, but it is particularly so in those lands, when the community lives around the site and it is very easy to go hunting one day, or swimming, if there is water around. We must make the conditions attractive for these young children to entice them to attend. We receive promise after promise. We are told that plans are on the board and that there is consultation with the communities, but nothing ever seems to eventuate. It takes months.

During the school holidays I was appalled to hear from people who are living in the lands areas that one of the problems with renovating and doing work in these schools relates to the cost of contractors. There are some very serious issues involving the issue of the prices paid to contractors and pricing. I was told that at one school it cost \$5 000 to replace a door. It must have been a pretty exciting door to cost \$5 000—and I am told that that did not include paint; the school had to paint the door afterwards. This was the cost of paying the contractors who came from down south to renovate that door. They were not brought up especially to do the door: they were already there, but they were still able to charge these sorts of prices.

I was told of another instance where the occupants of a house in which school teachers lived wanted a pot plant hook screwed into the wall. They were not able to do it themselves because the walls were reinforced, so it was not a simple job where they could to it themselves. They had one of the contractors put in the pot plant hook and it cost \$300—and this is something to hang a pot plant on. I was also told that the principal of one of the schools arranged to have a toilet seat changed in the school and it cost him \$300 out of his school budget. He could have picked up a toilet seat for \$10 or \$12 if he had gone to Alice Springs and replaced it for \$30, at a maximum. It is a pretty expensive business to install a toilet seat for \$300 when you have 12 toilets in your school. No wonder their budgets are blown to bits. This must be investigated, because the consequences for these schools, which receive minimal amounts for maintenance, is just ridiculous.

Another big issue for country people is that of transport. I was interested to meet yesterday with representatives from the Bus and Coach Association with respect to correspondence that I had received from them regarding subsidies for travellers on country buses. Country route operators such as Stateliner and the Murray Bridge bus company are essential to life in regional South Australia. They provide a service where people can travel backwards and forwards from their communities to Adelaide if they have no transport of their own. The country route service operators had a meeting recently on 4 April which was attended by officers from the Passenger Transport Board, and it was made abundantly clear that the present situation for these operators just cannot continue. They are finding low patronage and an increasing cost regime within which the services must operate, bringing the entire network of country services to a point where many will not be viable. This would be terrible for those communities that are involved. I believe that they have approached the Passenger Transport Board and the Minister for Transport on the subject on a number of occasions in recent years and were given very sympathetic hearings. However, it is not up to them to make the decisions: it is up to cabinet. I urge any country members in the government to listen to what I am saying and to urge cabinet that this be taken into account and

that these subsidies be looked at, because they are essential services for our regions.

Some improvements have been made possible, and I believe that the student concession initiative which was introduced on 1 February last year was a welcome and positive step which made life somewhat easier for these bus operators. City bus services consume large sums of the government's money, yet rural services receive very little and, in addition, they must pay a fee for the privilege. It is very easy to say that they have paying passengers and it involves a huge amount of money. But I was very interested to hear that, on average, about 70 per cent of their passengers have concession cards. So, 70 per cent of their patronage is on concession cards, and subsidies from the state government are very important to them.

It is important to make a clear distinction between the two costs mentioned. The net cost of providing city services represents direct funding, without which the network of city routes could not exist. However, in the case of country route services, the operators rely on takings from the fare box, and the only government cost is reimbursement of some concession fares. On top of this, the route service operators pay a government a fee of 2.5 per cent of their total passenger revenue to be able to conduct this service.

A further distinction between the two types of bus operations is that the city residents are entitled to a much wider range of concession fares than their country cousins. Of course, unemployed people in the country get no concessions on their bus fares when they travel to Adelaide. This inequitable situation is, therefore, compounded for the operators who cannot obtain the same reimbursement as their city contractors. There remains some longstanding requests for assistance designed to bring parity with the city operations. The removal of the 2.5 per cent fee paid to the government, as set down in the contracts, and the reimbursement to the operator to bring existing concession fares to full fare levels and additional concessions in line with those available to passengers on city services is what is required.

A recent press release on the outcome of competitive tendering for city bus services identified expenses savings of \$7 million each year for the next 10 years in city services. Estimates of the cost to the government if the rural service concessions were brought into line with these benefits would be under \$1 million a year. So we are not talking about huge amounts of money. Again, the press release specifically talked about improved regional passenger services in the hope of stemming the exodus from country towns. The survival of any substantial network of public bus services outside the metropolitan area requires this improvement to be put in hand immediately so as to arrest the decline of recent years. The bus industry does not wish to join the banking sector or other sectors in our country areas where they have abandoned large areas of the bush.

So a neglect of remote area services, built as they have been on years of hard work by the operators concerned, will cause a removal of the services permanently. Once the services have gone, the capital and operating costs will be too high for anyone to attempt to revive them. The only reason that we still have the services at present is that they have been built on the efforts and resources of the past. I ask cabinet members to consider in their budgets the things these country operators are looking for. Pensioner and student concessions should have full reimbursement. What actually happens is that a pensioner is charged 50 per cent of the standard bus fare. The government then reimburses 80 per cent of the

50 per cent that is lost. So these operators are looking for full reimbursement of that 50 per cent that is lost from pensioner fares.

They are also looking for no service fee. They are paying the 2.5 per cent levy that city operators are not paying. They want unemployment concessions to be made available to unemployed people who are travelling backwards and forwards from Adelaide. Then they want reimbursement of the total 50 per cent that is lost on those concession fares. It is not much for them to ask. The service is absolutely essential to us in country South Australia, and I would ask that cabinet look at those issues.

The third issue I want to look at is that of regional health services. This matter has been mentioned on a number of occasions in this place, and I am aware of the lack particularly of adequate mental health services in regional South Australia. There is a shortage of dentists and doctors in regional South Australia and any health professionals in our regions. Specialist services are provided often only in Adelaide. Last week, I was visited in my office by a woman from my electorate whose daughter was recently diagnosed with cancer and who had to come to Adelaide for chemotherapy treatment. An appointment was made, and her husband brought the daughter down to Adelaide for her first chemotherapy appointment. He had taken time off work. He brought her down here, and his intention was to leave her here for a couple of days and then come back and collect her.

When they arrived in Adelaide, they were told that no bed was available at the hospital and that they would have to come back some other time when a bed was available. This is not an isolated incident. I know this has happened before to country patients. I know also that often country patients get a call at 5 p.m. the night before to be in Adelaide next morning at 7 o'clock if they want a bed in the hospital. This is very difficult for country people, particularly if they live more than about four or five hours outside Adelaide. I am asking that provision be made for these people, that beds be kept available for country people. Often they get down there, get a little bit of treatment and get told to come back next week. That is fine for someone in Adelaide, but it is very difficult if you are a country patient.

This woman who had been in to see me rang a local MP's office in Adelaide—really to complain rather than expecting anything to be done. I am pleased to say that, following a phone call from the MP, the minister was able to respond. He responded very quickly, and a bed was found for this patient in 2½ hours. That was a very good response from the minister, and I am pleased about this. I ask that provision be made in future so that this practice does not happen again. The constituent visited me last week and asked me specifically to thank the MP she contacted. Apparently it was someone she just got out of the phone book, as she did not know any members of Parliament in Adelaide. The member of parliament was the member for Ross Smith. Members know of my allegiance to and support of the member for Ross Smith. However, to this woman he was totally unknown, and it was in a totally unsolicited manner that she came in, spoke to me and specifically asked me to thank this member.

Not only did he act immediately and contact the minister and get some action there, he spoke to her three or four times in the ensuing couple of hours to assure her of what was going on and then arranged to take her daughter to the hospital from where she was, because he said that he was quite happy to do this for her. He knew the situation, and he knew how upset the young woman was. He went far beyond

what was called for in his duties as member for Ross Smith. This was wonderful behaviour of him because, when somebody comes to you from outside your electorate, you often think twice about taking action such as this. She was most appreciative of it. It was an awful situation for her to be in and the actions of the member for Ross Smith are a true measure of him.

I mentioned the issue of bus operators and people travelling to and from Adelaide. There are issues in local communities regarding transport. In Whyalla we have had a number of letters and petitions to the minister regarding trucks which travel up Norrie Avenue, in the middle of Whyalla. It is a main thoroughfare in the city, and huge numbers of trucks, road trains and so on travel up and down this road. This is a real issue for the residents who live in the street, because it is a residential street. There is some business in the area, but basically it is a residential street. A lot of noise is created by these trucks, which thunder up and down the road at all hours of the day and night. There is also an issue of dust, because many of these trucks are loaded with BHP iron ore and come from Iron Duke. Residents in the area have petitioned for a bypass from this road. They were told it was not acceptable. They have now been told that the traffic will be diverted up another main road in the city, about two kilometres away, so it will still travel through the centre of the city. The dust and noise will still be a problem, and safety will still be an issue, but nobody is looking at diverting this traffic. This is appalling when we can spend incredible amounts of money building a bypass and a tunnel under a hill, yet we cannot get what would be a piddling amount to build a bypass in our city.

I know we are an industrial city. Often the comment is made that, because we are an industrial city, we should expect to be a dirty city. However, this is not acceptable in our day and age. I know there is a dust problem, because I have seen the dust problem created by these trucks as they travel from the Iron Duke mine, which is about 50 kilometres south of Whyalla, up to Whyalla. You can see the red line of dust where those trucks travel through. It is making an impact on the city and on the local residents' homes. We need to have a bypass outside the city because it is not just BHP trucks but other trucks and road trains that travel through from the south or heading south. Road trains are a major problem in our society today. Being an extensive traveller of outback roads, I understand the problems that they create, but I also recognise the need for them. This government really needs to look at this situation, as the number of trains is increasing.

I have some other issues that I want to talk about later; for example, road markings, use of headlights, and so on. However, I do not have time to do so now. I hope that this government will look at what it is doing in regional South Australia, realise we have needs out there that must be considered and allocate money accordingly.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): In speaking to the Supply Bill, which ensures the continuation of the state's finances until the next budget is passed, I want to reflect on an area of grave need. I refer to the provision of psychiatric services, which is certainly a problem in my electorate. It is also a prominent problem in the electorates of other Labor members and, to an extent, in other areas also, but there is no doubt that, in areas which are struggling more in socioeconomic terms, problems associated with mental health and lack of treatment are more acute.

There is not only the question of lack of funding in this area, but that is certainly part of the problem. I refer to the recent evidence of the reduction in public hospital beds by about 650 since the Liberal Government came to power. I refer, in particular, to the Flinders Medical Centre and the Daw Park hospital, because most of my constituents would attend one of those hospitals if they needed public health treatment.

A new psychiatric care facility has been long promised for the Flinders Medical Centre. In fact, it was due to open in February this year. One of my constituents, a nurse at Flinders, suggested to me that it would be a wonderful political stunt to arrange an 'unofficial' opening of the psychiatric care facility in February this year—even though there will be no such opening and no such facility is about to come on stream—purely to embarrass the government and the health minister over their failed promises for this much needed facility.

In addressing this budgetary issue regarding psychiatric care in our public health system, I will cite two examples which illustrate that for a long time there has been a failure in the system where patients have both physical and psychological problems. An extraordinary distinction seems to be made between patients who need psychiatric care and those who need physical care. The first example relates to the case of a young woman who told me about her experience in the high dependency unit at Flinders. She could get no rest because a patient who was situated close to her clearly was emotionally unbalanced and highly distressed. This patient should have been cared for in a psychiatric facility by specialist psychiatric care nurses and doctors. The problem with this patient, who was being such a nuisance to the staff and the other patients, was that some physical attention was needed. The patient was attached to an intravenous drip and therefore required a minimal level of what I have termed 'physical' treatment.

From what I understand from my limited investigation of what happened in this instance, if that patient had been transferred to a hospital which was able to give specialised psychiatric care, there would have been no staff able to treat appropriately the physical problem. There is this insane demarcation dispute which prevents the proper care of patients and causes distress for untrained staff and other patients in an area primarily designed for physical health problems. This is just one example of this system failure. Clearly, there needs to be better coordination between psychiatric and physical health care sections, even in the same hospital.

The second example that I cite involves Glenside and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. One of my constituents related to me the story of an elderly lady who was admitted to Glenside by her family because it was clear that she was losing touch with reality. It was equally clear that she also had an unexplained physical problem in that she was not eating or caring for herself properly. On a daily basis, the staff at Glenside would transfer her to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but the RAH did not want an elderly woman who was not able to speak quietly and politely to people. So, because she was a bit rowdy, as soon as they possibly could they would transfer her back to Glenside.

On one particular day, this woman, aged in her 70s, was transferred backwards and forwards four times. No sooner would she arrive at the Royal Adelaide than the staff would say, 'We're not meant to deal with psychiatric patients.' They would administer the minimum test or physical care that was

required and send her back in the ambulance to Glenside where the staff and doctors would say, 'She has a physical problem which we're not equipped to deal with because we're psychiatric care people.' This is despite the fact that psychiatrists receive the same medical training initially as do registrars in public hospitals.

I cannot understand this problem, but it is something of which the health minister should take note. I do not blame the minister because, obviously, this is a systemic problem which has been going on for many years, but he is the current minister and he must take action to address these sorts of issues. The woman to whom I referred eventually died in Glenside of heart failure after she became drastically dehydrated through not eating or having an intravenous drip attached. There were no adverse coronial findings, so whatever failure accounted for her problem still exists and nothing has been done about it.

I have highlighted these unfortunate examples to make it clear that there are budgetary problems—there is no doubt about that. They have reached the point where, sadly, people are being neglected in our public hospital system, especially if they have psychiatric problems as well as physical health problems. These problems are in addition to all the relatively untreated psychiatric problems in the community.

I see a lot of these problems, particularly in housing trust homes. These matters usually come to my attention through neighbours who are distressed by the behaviour of the tenants next door. Sometimes there are extremely offensive smells or screaming in the middle of the night or during the day, and inappropriate nakedness, etc. The housing trust simply refers these problems to Family and Youth Services, which is terribly understaffed. Quite often these people are not cared for appropriately because they do not have contact with the trained health care professionals whom they need.

The topic of deinstitutionalisation needs to be raised again and again because the psychiatric care system that has been created just does not work. It contains so many loopholes that many people fall through the cracks and are left uncared for. Although this speech is in support of the Supply Bill, I have highlighted this problem which is an acute problem for many people in the electorate of Mitchell, and I know full well that the problem also exists in many other parts of South Australia.

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

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): On behalf of my constituents, I speak on the question of supporting supply. The Supply Bill enables this government to continue the day-to-day running of the state. The Liberal Government has now been in control of this state's finances for six years—years of policy drift and shift. We have been promised an economic renewal of the state, but instead we have seen our state's economy dwindle and shrink, especially in our regional communities. It must be asked whether this government has any real direction for South Australia. To many of my constituents there seems to have been the adoption of a holding pattern, a 'hanging on' approach that is having trouble providing our communities with the capacity to exist, let alone maintain or improve the standard of living.

We have a 'not quite hanging approach' to employment because unemployment continues to remain at unacceptably high levels and the government continues to deny its responsibility to bring those levels down. What has the government really done to improve the lot of the unemployed

person in South Australia? It is hard to see, and we are losing our best and brightest people, the ones whom we need to lead the revival. The best the government seems to be able to do to combat the so-called 'brain drain' of university graduates to the eastern states is to establish a youth recruitment scheme, which marginally redresses the cuts in public sector recruitment that we have experienced in recent years. Meanwhile, this state, unfortunately, continues to be among the worst performers on reducing unemployment.

The Florey electorate is the home of the St Agnes bus depot. As with the Modbury Public Hospital, it was the best of its kind and so the most attractive in the recent round of private tendering that has seen the decimation of our public transport system. Drivers at this depot have been forced to accept lower wages for the same and, in many cases, more work. Nowhere should this be an acceptable outcome. This is becoming a worrying trend on the Australian industrial scene. It is not the only option in a world where work and the definition of work is changing. However, it is being presented as the only way workers can have a job. That is simply not true.

In South Australia we have a 'hanging on' approach to economic development, with the government's pivotal idea being to spend massive amounts of taxpayer funds to induce companies to establish their operations in this state. How many jobs, though, has this really created and how much money has it cost us to do so? Would it have been wiser to maintain the work force rather than see hundreds on re-deployment while others received TVSPs which produce nothing and which are a drain on our economy? Would it have been cheaper and easier to create those jobs in the public sector, or perhaps, instead of cutting the public service back to the bone, maintain it at a level which could really have created and provided innovations that enhanced and value added to our economy?

Tragically, we have a much less than 'hanging on' strategy in health, with hospital waiting lists continuing to blow out to unacceptably high levels. We are still playing at the old game of 'blame it on Canberra' while public wards and hospital services continue to be surreptitiously closed or reduced behind our backs. Staff at our hospitals continue to battle unrealistic workloads to the best of their ability, above and beyond the call of duty in many cases. We can strive for efficiencies and cost effectiveness but, in the end, we must surely accept that hospitals cannot and should not be expected to make a profit. It is indeed a false economy to send people home hastily when, in reality, an extra day's care may be necessary to prevent readmission and further intensive treatment.

Recent personal experience has proven to me that no-one should leave anyone they love in any hospital (public or private) without assisting ward staff in the monitoring of their care. There is simply not enough staff to provide care for the patients in our hospitals.

In my local community, despite many inquiries with the minister and the Health Commission about the Modbury Public Hospital contract, no-one seems to be able to provide us with any figures to show us the benefits of the experimental privatisation of this facility, nor indeed do they seem able openly to declare the number of beds and services lost. Apparently a committee is responsible for overseeing the hospital contract. The private managers of the Modbury Public Hospital have already been bailed out twice by this government. It is not apparent who the members of the

committee are or how often they have met. How can lack of review be building for the future?

Worrying complaints on the standards of the Modbury Public Hospital, and in fairness hospitals throughout the state no doubt, are made on a disturbingly regular basis and 'commercial in confidence' seems to be the way in which to keep the public in the dark. There seems to be no doubt that in the area of mental health the system barely exists and what is left of it is in crisis. This is despite the fact that mental health and depression are the fastest growing conditions resulting in poor health. Left unaddressed, the cause of this obvious symptom of crisis will present us with the greatest drain on this state's economy, not to mention the huge cost to individuals and families.

Decision makers must face the fact that, unless priority is given to worthwhile employment and a reasonable wage paid for work done, there will be a growing army of working poor. Poverty produces poor health. Low incomes fixed by individual agreements rather than a central wage system that fights for increases to secure a living wage for workers will see depression increase at a sharper level, with the resultant problems of domestic violence and law and order issues such as break and enter and robberies on the increase as well.

We have less than a holding pattern on education where parents are called on more and more to help run their schools and raise the money necessary to keep schools running at an acceptable level. Parents in schools in the electorate of Florey are concerned about the impact of measures in the Partnerships 21 initiative. They are beginning to grapple with the consequences of participation in this brave new world of school management, along with new measures such as the GST, and they are beginning to find the burden almost unbearable.

Retention rates in schools are down and our young people, who need to learn skills to survive in the new realities of employment and workplaces of the 21st century, do not want to stay. They tell me that they see school as irrelevant for many reasons, and especially because there are too few opportunities for employment in a narrowing job market over a range of occupation categories which fail to recognise that students are not all academic achievers.

My constituents tell me that they want a fair go. They are not greedy: they only aspire to have meaningful jobs that pay them enough to live on and look after their educational and health needs and give them the capacity to provide for their family's physical and social needs.

Many very worthwhile contributions have been made in the House today. I do not want to raise individual cases in each portfolio area. Each and every member can supply examples of cases in their electorates which demonstrate that this state's finances are not addressing the very real needs of the community.

There are no apparent measures to reignite the drive that saw South Australia lead the way in so many areas as we have done in the past. Too few measures are being implemented to bring us the industries or infrastructure to provide jobs—and jobs are what we need to stimulate the state's economy. My constituents want to send this message to parliament: the people of Florey and South Australia in general are aware that times are tough and that we must make changes as times change. They anticipate and enjoy the benefits of the global village—what we used to call 'progress'. However, they question the effects of the global economy—what they see it is doing to the Australian way of life. Change in the ways of the past they are being forced to

accept as the only way in which we can survive. It is simply not true—there are alternatives.

There is always more than one way to achieve any result. Some say that you can do it the hard way, while others say that you can do it the easy way. Others say the wrong way or the right way. The people of Florey want a fair and balanced way. They have accepted changes to date unquestioningly. Now they want a clear explanation of what is going on. They want a budget that is presented in plain English, not poli-speak. They want no more of the same where they are treated like mushrooms and kept in the dark. They want honesty, not the best gloss on a really poor state of affairs. The people of Florey want recognition that they contribute a portion of the state's revenue and they would like to see a comparable expenditure in their local community.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I am delighted to get the call and I am surprised that the honourable member has finished so quickly. I thought that, being in opposition, the honourable member would have raised a considerable number of issues, particularly matters related to Labor Party policy. On second thoughts, she could have explained Labor Party policy in about two seconds! This evening I want to address one or two matters in relation to this Supply Bill, which deals with the annual appropriation of funds for the services of the state. I am pleased to see that my colleague the Minister for Education is present. Of course, he is one of the biggest spenders in that area.

If one listened to the Institute of Teachers one would think that he is a miserly character, but those of us who know him well know that that is not correct. When one listens to the likes of Janet Giles one would think that the government has unlimited money. People such as Janet Giles really want to put money only in the pockets of teachers: they do not want to improve education standards. First, I want to talk about the great difficulties faced by my constituency at the present time—not as a result of the activities of its local member. I understand that the people are pleased with the local member but, like the Deputy Speaker, we have been here for a long time and we are not easily frightened or ruffled on particular occasions.

I want to talk about locusts which are currently present from Yunta to Broken Hill, across the whole of the north and working south. A tremendous effort has been made by the Plague Locust Commission, and I hope that the Commonwealth Government continues to supply plenty of money for that purpose. There will also be a need for the state government to continue to contribute. Already people have lost their crops, but the real difficulty in those marginal and semi-marginal areas is that farmers have had a very excellent start to the season. The season has been early and perfect for people to put in their crops. Already people have had their crops eaten off at Mambray Creek and across at Orroroo in the Willochra Plain.

There was more rain at the weekend which, of course, under normal circumstances, creates absolutely perfect conditions in which to grow crops, but farmers are concerned that the next wave of grasshoppers may come through and eat them off. They will then have to go to the effort, time and expense of again planting their crop. There will be a need to consider carefully what is the best strategy in relation to this matter. It has been unfortunate because there has been some confusion in relation to whether one of the misters which the government has put at Hawker ought to be made available. I cannot understand why anyone would want to keep them in

a shed when people want to use them. It seems to me that we do not need to put them in cotton wool: we need to have them out on the backs of utes where they are doing some good.

Also, I believe that it will be necessary in the future to provide more aeroplanes because when the locusts start to hatch again in September it will be necessary to make a very concerted effort to control them. Some people like myself, until a couple of years ago, did not know the difference between a grasshopper and a locust. Last year we had plagues of grasshoppers, which the department and all those associated did a good job of controlling. But, of course, the locusts are somewhat more difficult to manage and handle. I believe there needs to be careful planning. When this phase is over people need to be well organised in July and August so that if the locusts start to hatch in September they can be effectively dealt with.

Earlier this year there was considerable controversy in relation to a blackout that occurred in South Australia. We had the member for Hart and others waxing lyrically at great length but, unfortunately, not very effectively in relation to the cause of this blackout. It was a great pity because that really was a reflection upon the hard-working people who run the power house at Port Augusta. Throughout the continued controversy about power I note that the Public Works Committee tabled a report into the power station at Port Augusta and was somewhat critical of the management of that facility. May I say that was unjust, unfair and without any foundation. It is a great pity that these erstwhile people who comprise this Public Works Committee did not do their homework and did not address themselves to the great contribution that those people have made towards ensuring that people in South Australia have a reliable source of power.

If those people had not carried out this very valuable maintenance work we would not be in the current situation where, after 13 years of being idle, the Playford Power Station is once again generating electricity from the whole of its six boilers and its four turbines. The 40 year old generating plant, which had a design life of 30 years and which has twice been scheduled for closure, was brought back into service in time to meet the extraordinarily high demand for power in South Australia. The Playford power house generated from all turbines and boilers together for the first time on 3 February when the state was at the start of another heatwave and power shortages were being forecast as a result of lower supply from Victoria. 'The extra 210 megawatts it provided was essential,' said the maintenance engineer.

It is a great pity that the Presiding Member and others who were so obsessed with making lengthy reports to this House did not check with the people who have given their utmost time, ability and energy to ensure that both power stations are operating at world's best practice. I repeat: world's best practice. With fewer than 180 people employed at Port Augusta, the station has taken every step possible to ensure that the facility is efficient and well run. I want to pay a tribute to Mike Phillips, the management and all the staff in those power houses for their outstanding work and I totally reject the criticisms that have been heaped upon them, because they cannot be substantiated. Let me say that that criticism has greatly annoyed the management of those particular facilities because it is unfair criticism to which they are not in a position to respond. I have taken the opportunity today to respond on their behalf.

Every time during summer when I visit Port Augusta and I know that the wind is blowing from the north, when I see

the smoke coming from the old power house I say, 'Thank God that the people have been well organised who carry out all this maintenance work. They have got everything back on stream and we know we will have sufficient power.' If that power house had not been operating, we would have known all about blackouts in South Australia. The little plants at Snuggery, Mintaro and Port Lincoln would have been as good as spitting into the wind in a fire. That is how good they would have been. I want to say that all those people, from the chief executive down, should be commended. I say to the Presiding Member, with his rather colourful comments—I do not know whether he writes them or whether he has a speech writer—that the committee's reports should be a little more factual. The committee should leave these people to get on with their job, that is, providing cheap, effective and reliable electricity to the people of South Australia.

What the honourable member did not say is that every step has been taken by this government to ensure that everything is in order. We have installed a new crusher plant at Leigh Creek. The government agreed to purchase the 240 tonne dump trucks, the big loaders and the new loading facilities, as well as taking and upgrading the railway line. The new operators of the railway line have done an outstanding job. They are very efficient people. They have many dump trucks, the same as are used for wheat, which are far more efficient. The whole operation has been a success. The General Manager, Mike Phillips, said:

Bringing the plant back into full service was a remarkable achievement. It has been virtually out of action since 1987 and was first scheduled for closure in 1996 and again in the year 2000. 'To be able to resurrect this plant is a credit to all the operators, maintenance staff technical people and contractors who had worked long and hard to make it happen. It is running now—it ran through nine straight days—without any unexpected problems,' he said.

I think that says it all in relation to that matter. I wanted to put this on the public record because we have had this report. I have been waiting for a considerable time, because I wanted to ensure that those people up at Port Augusta are aware that the majority of the House does not agree with some of the comments contained in this rather colourful report. This is what the report had to say:

The tardiness of Flinders Power in submitting the correspondence and the company's failure to appear before the committee constitute a contravention of the direction of the motion of the House.

Let me say to the honourable member that if there is any attempt to bring them before the House you will not have my vote. What does the committee want? Does it want them down here appearing and answering rather naive and unnecessary questions, or does it want them up there running, managing and keeping the power station in top order? I think that most people in South Australia want the power house to run on a sound basis and are not interested. The report continued:

Flinders Power has neither complied with the motion of the House, nor with the assurance given by the Treasurer.

The advice given to Flinders Power was that it did not have to do so. It goes on to state:

The response by Flinders Power Pty Ltd to the House's motion is in contravention to this direction. Flinders Power did not approach the committee to establish the nature of the intended inquiry and was tardy in submitting its written submission. The contents of that submission are inadequate and do not satisfy the committee's minimum requirements that enable it to fulfil its responsibility as detailed in S12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

I say to the committee that I believe the company has fulfilled its obligation. It has supplied regular power to South

Australia, and the lights have certainly stayed on. It is of the view, as I am, that it was not necessary, because the work carried out was purely of a maintenance nature. I believe the money has been well spent and the taxpayers of South Australia have value for money.

The next matter I want to raise involves the tourist industry, which is one of the great developing industries in South Australia, employing many people. My electorate has a number of areas that are very suitable for tourism and many tourists travel there. The government has provided facilities and the private sector has done a wonderful job. We have to ensure that all those associated with the industry, that is, government departments and bureaucracy, clearly understand that it is in their interest to encourage tourism and not to impede or hinder it. The lead given by the national parks service in the Northern Territory and Western Australia set a fine example of how public utilities should carry out their duties.

I am aware that from time to time there are conflicts between conservation and tourism. I think those problems can easily be overcome but, at the end of the day, if we are to have adequate resources to do the sorts of things we want to do, we will have to promote, develop and encourage our tourist industry. The upgrading of the Hawker and Balcanoonna airports, the improvements to Wilpena and the improvements at Arkaroola are all great developments which have encouraged people to travel to the north of South Australia. The ongoing improvement in the road system is something that lends itself to further tourist activity. One of the things that have concerned me for a long time is the need to get through to sections of government that their role is to encourage, not to impede.

I think that one of the great mistakes that were made in the 1970s, particularly as it affects rural and pastoral industries, was when the Department of Lands was abolished and the environment department created. It was probably done with the best will in the world, but in my view it has not been a success. When I first became a member of parliament the then Department of Lands was a friendly place for rural members to go and have discussions. When rural people came to Adelaide and wanted to make inquiries about their leases and land transfers it was a friendly rural orientated organisation. The people involved knew their way around South Australia. There were people such as the former member for Victoria, Mr Rodda, who spent years of his life in the Department of Lands, and they were all very friendly and cooperative. Unfortunately, when you have an import of academics who have little understanding of the rural sector, and many of them are anti-farmer, that has not been conducive to good relations with the new department.

Finally, I wish to talk about the need for the government to have adequate resources to ensure that the state continues to operate and provide those services that the community not only expects but also needs. Those of us who have been watching on TV what has been happening in places of the world such as Zimbabwe can clearly come to the conclusion how fortunate we are to live in this country. It is very sad that a country that receives such tremendous support, goodwill and aid from the free world in gaining its independence from the United Kingdom and establishing a so-called democratic system is acting in such an outrageous, undemocratic and belligerent fashion toward people who are only doing good for that country. It would appear that President Mugabe has no understanding of democracy and cannot bear to bring himself to the conclusion that the people of Zimbabwe no

longer want his type running their country. This country continues to give aid to that country, and it is appalling to see on television another African country heading on a course of destruction purely to appease the whims of a dictator who is well past his use-by date and who does not respect democracy or the rule of law.

I sincerely hope that the sooner pressure can be brought to bear on people like that to hold free and fair elections the better. Those people who may be forced to flee that country would certainly make good Australian citizens. The ones who have already come here are very good citizens; they are hard workers. They should not be forced to flee from their country of birth because of the rantings and ravings and the desires of a tyrant to remain in power against the wishes of his community. I hope that there is no further aid from the commonwealth government. I wrote to a Senator the other day asking that this would be taken into account before providing any more money to the likes of this character.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Supply Bill. I look forward to the government bringing in many more such bills, because it has put the affairs of South Australia in good shape, and the people are about to benefit from sound economic management.

Bill read a second time

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

That the House note grievances.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Members would be aware that it was the South Australian Parliament under the aegis of Premier Don Dunstan that led the way on many law reforms. In 1972 parliament passed the Criminal Law Consolidation Amendment Act, which repealed criminal sanctions against homosexual sex in private. In 1975, this was followed by the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Amendment Act under which South Australia became the first state to decriminalise homosexuality. Things have come some way since then.

The passage of federal anti-discrimination laws in the 1980s and the establishment of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission have been significant landmarks in the increasing liberalisation of community attitudes.

In Tasmania, a state which until recently was notorious for its antiquated criminal provisions against homosexuality, the Education Department in a national first has initiated a mandatory anti-homophobia campaign in state schools. New South Wales also recently saw the passage of new anti-discrimination laws. Despite these achievements there is still much discrimination. This year the Australian Council for Lesbian and Gay Rights has made its No. 1 priority the removal of continuing discrimination against gay and lesbian people persisting in our superannuation laws.

Under existing superannuation legislation, when a lesbian or gay superannuation contributor dies, there is no guarantee that superannuation benefits will be paid to their partner. In a few cases where payments are made to a partner, they are subject to a much higher rate of tax than that paid by heterosexual couples. In fact, it was the evidence of several superannuation providers before the Senate Select Committee on Superannuation and Financial Services that the legislation virtually makes it unlawful to make such payments even on an ad hoc basis.

Under section 62 of the federal Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993 the trustees of a super fund are required to maintain the fund solely for certain purposes.

Among other things these purposes include the provision of benefits in respect of each member of the fund on or after the member's death if the benefits are provided to the member's legal personal representative or any or all of the member's dependants or to both (section 62). A dependant is defined as a spouse who is 'another person who, although not legally married to the person, lives with the person on a genuine domestic basis as the husband or wife of that person' (section 10). According to the Senate committee the phrase 'husband or wife of the person' is viewed by trustees of fund administrators as being gender specific and therefore effectively excludes a partner of the same sex (paragraph 2.5). The report goes on:

Superannuation funds can become non-complying either through choice or through failing to meet the necessary standards and conditions required under the SIS Act to qualify for tax concessions. Under the current legislation, therefore, it appears that trustees of a superannuation fund may be risking their fund's complying status and hence concessional tax status should they pay a death benefit to a same sex partner (paragraph 2.6).

This report, which was tabled in the Senate on 6 April this year, was in response to a private member's bill presented by the federal member for Grayndler, Anthony Albanese, entitled the Superannuation (Entitlements of Same Sex Couples) Bill 2000.

The majority on the committee recommended that the Senate pass the bill. However, as the Howard Government has blocked its passage since it was first introduced into the House of Representatives in 1998, it seems likely that the Albanese bill will pass the Senate but not the House of Representatives when it is reintroduced there. This is despite the fact that of the 41 formal submissions to the Senate inquiry only five opposed the bill, and the committee also received 320 items of correspondence supporting the bill and another 856 e-mails, largely unattributable, also in support. That is to say, 1 217 submissions were made to the committee, of which only five were opposed to this important reform.

The federal government's position has not changed, however. It continues to argue that existing loopholes in super legislation make the Albanese bill unnecessary. The government continues to refuse to allow a conscience vote on this issue. The government continues to block debate on this issue in the lower house. It is shameful that in this day and age the federal government continues to defend a legislative prejudice which entrenches discrimination against Australian workers on the basis of sexual preference. Their argument that such benefits are already available through loopholes in the act is specious and insulting. For example, a death bed declaration by a same sex partner would enable the other partner to receive his or her super benefits. However, as Mr Albanese put it in his submission to the inquiry, real equality is not about knowing where to find the loopholes in existing legislation but about legislation that treats all people the same (paragraph 2.13).

It is astounding that the government even attempts to mount such an argument, although it should not necessarily surprise us, for while ever John Howard remains Prime Minister gay and lesbian Australians can be sure of one thing: existing legal discrimination will not be changed. Symbolic of the Prime Minister's attitude is his continued refusal ever since being elected in 1996 to send a message of support to the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras, an event which has the wide support of the Australian community. No doubt the Prime Minister would approve the ponderous moralising of

the minority report from the three Government senators on the select committee—Senators John Watson, Ross Lightfoot (the same MP who said that Aborigines are the lowest colour on the race spectrum), and Grant Chapman from South Australia. I will quote briefly from the government senators' report, the minority report that rejects reform of superannuation provisions for same sex couples.

Senators Lightfoot, Watson and Chapman have placed their moral prejudices ahead of human rights. In presenting their arguments, the three government senators placed heavy reliance on two submissions that opposed the bill. I remind the House that only five out of the 1 217 were opposing submissions. In their report the three senators propagate the old stereotypical prejudices, saying that there are 'good sociological, psychological and health reasons for governments to continue to discriminate in favour of those men and women who take the trouble to make a lasting legally binding commitment to each other and their children through marriage' (paragraph 1.5). They go on to say that they 'consider that this bill would effectively put same sex relationships on the same basis as heterosexual relationships and therefore the bill is initiating significant social change' (paragraph 1.13). This is about the extent of the government Senators' arguments.

Put simply, it is according to them the proverbial thin end of the wedge. This is not an argument but a stalling technique. They have not been able to argue against the good sense and justice of removing a blatantly discriminatory law from the statute books. Same sex couples pay the same superannuation as do heterosexual couples, married or not. Why should they not have the same benefits as heterosexual couples?

How far behind Australia has now fallen on this issue is well demonstrated by advances in anti-discrimination legislation overseas. In Denmark, the Netherlands, Greenland, Norway, Sweden, Hungary, Belgium, Iceland, France, Finland, Portugal, Spain, the USA, Brazil and South Africa legislation has been passed or is expected to be passed in the near future providing legal status for same sex relationships and removing financial and other discrimination.

The Canadian parliament is on the verge of passing a new federal statute that would remove discrimination against same sex couples from some 70 federal statutes, ranging from income tax to prison visits. That country's supreme court found that defining spouses to exclude same sex couples was unconstitutional. The federal government has a unique opportunity to remove discrimination against gay and lesbian Australians in the Albanese bill, and we all hope that it will see the sense of at least allowing a conscience vote on this issue.

Regardless of whether the federal parliament passes the Albanese bill, the reality is that the bill's operation will be limited. The federal parliament has no power to control state based superannuation funds. This parliament has passed legislation enabling several superannuation schemes, including super for the police, the public service and justices. None of these state based super schemes would be affected by any amendments to the federal superannuation legislation. These people do not deserve to be forgotten. This parliament has an historic opportunity to reclaim its reformist credentials in this area and once again lead the nation in this important area of law reform.

I take this opportunity to announce my intention to introduce a private member's bill removing discrimination against same sex couples from our state superannuation

legislation. The bill is intended to be complementary to the Albanese bill, and I hope it will be looked upon favourably by those opposite as a sensible and just reform of our state's super laws. This debate has been visited before in this Chamber when the then Brown government introduced the De Facto Relationships Bill, declining to support an amendment from my colleague the member for Spence which would have extended the provisions of the bill to same sex couples. I am hopeful that when my private member's bill is debated all members of this place will see the merit of moving forward by removing an outmoded, unreasonable and unjust prejudice from our state statute books.

When this bill comes to a vote, I ask that those opposite vote according to their conscience and not slavishly follow the example of their federal colleagues. We have led the nation in pursuing anti-discrimination law reform in this state. The time has come for us once again to set the agenda and lead the way in ensuring that all South Australians are entitled to the same superannuation benefits, regardless of their sexuality.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise tonight to speak on an important issue facing our society, an issue which concerns the very future of our state and, indeed, our commonwealth. I speak about the development of our younger generation and the potential leaders to come from its ranks. I note that the government has sent 10 young farmers to Orlando in the United States to attend the World Congress of Young Farmers. This type of activity is commendable but it needs further promotion and support, because where are this state's future leaders, particularly leaders in our rural communities, to come from if we do not fully embrace this issue? I understand that budgetary constraints determine the number of young people sent overseas, but I am a strong supporter of increasing those numbers. Developing leadership skills does not mean that all those people have to embark on a parliamentary career. They can aspire to being captains of our rural industries, leaders of the public sector or leaders in their regional communities. I know that tertiary education is available for people's development, but not everyone has the ability to attend university, particularly those younger people who live in our rural areas and our far flung regions.

This issue needs some real focus. We have an organisation in this state that has been able to embrace this philosophy with real gusto. I speak again of the Rural Youth organisation—or the movement, as we used to call it. Rural Youth is a favourite subject of mine and I have raised it in this place many times, but not very much in the last couple of years. I raise it again tonight, because I think it is still very relevant. I am sure that all the members of the parliament are aware of this organisation. I know that many past and present members were directly involved in Rural Youth. I was personally active and held several executive positions in the organisation. Indeed, our Premier was the state president of Rural Youth. The Hon. Malcolm Buckby was also a very keen activist in South Australian Rural Youth as was, I believe, Graham Gunn, the member for Stuart, Peter Lewis, the member for Hammond and Peter Blacker, the previous member for Flinders.

When Peter Blacker was here he was a great supporter of mine in my many little campaigns on behalf of the Rural Youth organisation. They were critical members, to name but a few. No doubt, other members in this House have been involved over the years, and also people outside this parliament, leaders in this community, leaders in the Wheat Board,

the Barley Board, the Farmers Federation and the Grains Council of Australia. Most of them have had their leadership training either through, or generally aligned to, our Rural Youth organisation. It was extremely strong when the Hon. Malcolm Buckley and I were involved back in the mid 1960s.

I strongly believe that younger members of our community need the type of training and development that Rural Youth provides—public speaking, organisational skills, correct meeting procedures and chairing meetings. We learnt all these skills. These skills are most valuable in developing a more responsible society. During our time in Rural Youth we were trained in these specific skills but, most importantly, we did not realise it. We were being trained and we did not realise that we were going through the process of learning leadership skills, because it was fun; it was doing these things with our peers and our friends. We were developing real leadership skills while we really were not aware of it. We had experienced field officers guiding us who made it fun, but we were also being skilled at the same time.

These field officers were very astute people funded by the government through the Department of Agriculture, and they always made sure that the right people were in the right jobs. Also, when there was the potential for an incident, they were there to make sure that it did not occur, or that the impacts were, indeed, softened. Many prominent sponsors were most willing to support Rural Youth, particularly major companies such as P&O, which donated a most coveted award, an overseas trip. My brother Max was one of the recipients of that award. I was headed that way but I was called up for national service instead, and that put my Rural Youth career somewhat on hold. When I returned from my national service I married, and I became president of my local branch. I was one of the first married presidents of Rural Youth. Back in those days our country branches were so successful that they even owned their own club houses and their own machinery to go carting hay and all sorts of things. Certainly, they were very progressive and industrious, and it is sad to see what has happened to that organisation. We enjoyed our overseas exchanges, hosting billets. I even met my wife through Rural Youth. Rural Youth formed part of a very strong foundation of success in adult life. I speak very personally now: Rural Youth gave me a solid grounding in many facets. It stood me in good stead to carry out my parliamentary duties and responsibilities and also for my 10 years in local government before I came here in 1990.

Today, that organisation is only a shadow of its former self. It has been pulled apart to a point where it works with only a part-time staff member, with only a handful of branches left to struggle on. It used to have three full-time field officers. I remember them with great fondness. They were Mr Max Glen, Mr Paul Guerin and Mr Playford (I have forgotten his Christian name). The chief adviser, Art Hooper, was a real character. He was an ex-dairy man, employed by the Department of Primary Industries (the Department of Agriculture in those days). It was a fantastic organisation with two clerical staff, all salaried and funded through the government via the Department of Agriculture. It started to come unstuck when the Labor government came to power and it cut the funds, purely because it saw the organisation as a source for young Liberals. I thought that was very unfortunate, because I did not agree with it at all. But in the late 1970s the government started to cut the funds. It was not only Labor: I have to say that subsequent governments, including Liberal governments, continued this course of action. They

screwed it back, cut the funds, cut the staff members involved and, really, the plant strangled for lack of nutrients.

Our society needs the leaders of tomorrow. We need them to be prepared to hit the ground running when the opportunity arises. I have seen instances in the rural sector where we have had to recycle executives through senior positions because we do not have any new blood ready to take over. We see an ageing level of executives without any readily prepared successors. My concern is further heightened by the fact that our young people are hesitant to come forward and take on leadership roles, our own families included, for two reasons: first, and the biggest concern, is the lack of desire to take on these positions and, secondly, a lack of confidence, because they have not had the training. Here we have obvious results for an obvious problem. We certainly now do not have this organisation to train our rural leaders. Many organisations have come along since and tried to fix the problem. But why bring on new organisations when the old one did the job perfectly? For the future of this state and, indeed, the commonwealth, I commend the government for its initiative in sending these young folk to the United States. I urge that these programs be ramped up to accelerate the development of tomorrow's leaders.

I note the comments made earlier by the member for Stuart in relation to locusts. I know only too well the plague that is occurring. Certainly, in my 53 years, probably 45 of them active on the land, I have never seen plague locusts like this. When you see a satellite image on the television at least 200 kilometres wide and it is all locusts over, say, Woomera, we know that we have a serious problem. The problem we have now is that many of our farmers in the north want to plant their crops. If they plant them now they will be up in say 10 days to a fortnight—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: Dry up. I didn't interrupt you. I am worried because if the crop comes up in 14 days the locusts will be there to eat it or, worse than that, they will lay their eggs in the ground and be there when the crop is halfway through its life in September. We are told to defer the seeding until we get a frost or two so that the locusts will then die, even if they lay their eggs, and the working of the ground will kill the eggs so that we can minimise the impact.

Time expired.

Mr HILL (Kaurua): Today in Question Time we saw a very sad occurrence—a man who formerly strode this Assembly with some dignity, power and authority make an absolute fool of himself. Of course, I am talking about the member for Adelaide, the Minister for Government Enterprises. Today, in answer to a question of mine and of one of his backbenchers, the minister said, in effect, that there is no environmental difference between burning off and composting, there is no difference between incineration and mulching. Mr Deputy Speaker, as a former minister of the environment, you would know that there is a great deal of difference. This matter arose because of an absolutely appalling management strategy employed by Forestry SA which sadly is in the province of the member for Adelaide. I must say he is a member who is obviously rattled and is under real pressure because he knows that at the next election he will face his comeuppance. It is sad for him that he is in a marginal seat, but it is even sadder for him that the current Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Jane Lomax-Smith, will take the seat away from

him. He is clearly rattled. He has lost all judgment and lost all dignity, and he showed that in the House today.

Three years ago, Forestry SA cut down timber on about 60 acres of land at Kuitpo Forest. I understand it did such a bad job that about 10 per cent of the product was left on the site, and that caused a problem for the people. The pseudo Deputy Premier comes into the Chamber. He hears me having a go at one of his members, and he is in here to defend, to interject and cause problems while I am making my speech. I welcome him; I am pleased he is in here. However, I hope he gets into his seat before he starts interjecting on me. Three years ago, Forestry SA, which is sadly under the control of the Minister for Government Enterprises, cleared some land and made a hash of it: 10 per cent of the product was wasted. It was wasted because some of the larger logs could not be milled by the sawmill adjacent to the property. It could not be milled, because it was a privatised operation and it did not have plant big enough to take the big logs. This is the truth. It did not have plant big enough to take the logs, so it was just left on the ground, along with all the other debris that was there. The local community quite rightly was worried about what might happen. It was worried about bushfire and it put some pressure on the department to do something about it. And it has taken three years for the department to do something about it. Eight months ago, Forestry SA said to the local community, 'We will mulch that product. We will turn that into mulch. That is the best thing we can do.'

An honourable member: What sort of mulch were they going to turn it into?

Mr HILL: That was what they promised. A very good question.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HILL: Whereabouts is your seat? I kind of lose track of where you are these days, Mitch. Eight months ago, the local community was told, 'We will mulch this material.' They thought that was a reasonable thing to do. On this weekend, at the end of the fire ban season, Forestry SA came down to the area and said to the local community—80 per cent of whom agreed with them, according to the minister but, of course, there were only 10 people there; I do not know how widely the information was circulated—'We will fix your problem. We cannot mulch; we will burn it off.' As I understand it, they were told that it would be burned off in sequence. However, it was decided over the weekend—and I think the fire started Monday morning—to burn all of it off at once. There are 120 heaps of wood, and each of those heaps was approximately the size of a double garage. So, an enormous amount of material was being burnt off, creating a huge despoliation of the local environment and expelling into the atmosphere a large amount of greenhouse gas. When this was put to the minister, he said—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HILL: I welcome the new Acting Speaker into the chair. I hope he knows what he is doing.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Williams): Order!

Mr HILL: That was an act of optimism rather than a reflection, Mr Acting Speaker. Fires were lit, and the minister says, 'That was the best thing to do because, if we had mulched it, we would create the same greenhouse gases. It is much better to burn it off.' How ridiculous is that! How insane is that! What a stupid comment for a government minister to make—to say that mulching has the same environmental impact as burning off! There is clearly no comparison. If you mulch something, if you turn it into compost, it will take a very long time to degrade and then

nutrients from the material will go into the soil and enrich it. What the minister is talking about is burning it off, with the whole lot going up into the atmosphere in very quick time, causing not only greenhouse gas but smoke, soot and all the other problems. I have heard from people in the area that their asthma has been affected by it. Yet the minister comes in here—and I think he has said this on television—and says that there is no difference.

If that is the case, will the government change the laws about burning off in backyards? I know lots of people used to like burning off in their backyard, and that has been banned progressively over the years, because it has been damaging to the environment. However, on the basis of what the member for Adelaide has said, will the government change its position and allow burning off in backyards? Will it say to the people who live in the Adelaide Hills, where the minister for the environment has a seat, 'Well, there's no point in having compost in your backyard; just burn it all off; get rid of it quickly; help the environment'? As the member for Adelaide says, 'Let's get rid of it straight away. That's just as good for the environment.' What an absolute nonsense! The member for Adelaide is really out of his depth on this one. He is obviously on borrowed time. He is a very nervous man, and he should be a nervous man.

It is sad to note that, when I asked a question of the minister for the environment, when I asked him what impact this would have on the environment—and it was clearly a matter about the environment—he was not allowed to answer. However, the member for Adelaide jumped in, the minister for forests and other corporatised bodies jumped in, and tried to explain the impact on the environment. He embarrassed himself, and he certainly embarrassed his colleagues. But what did he do to the minister for the environment? How embarrassed must he have been to hear what the member for Adelaide said?

The government clearly has a problem with the environment issue. Of course, it has such a problem that it had to move the previous minister on. And no wonder; she was a total disaster. I will not speak ill of her now, because she has gone from that portfolio. You only have one Dorothy Kotz in your life. I have had mine, and I sadly see her going by. The new minister for the environment is trying to do his best, but clearly when it comes to a sensitive issue he is just pushed to the sidelines and the member for Adelaide, the putative minister for the environment, comes in. I hope that the people who live in the seat of Adelaide read what he has to say about the environmental impacts of burning off because, if he believes that burning off has the same impact as mulching or composting, there are serious problems with his understanding of the issue.

What should have happened? A range of things should have happened. Clearly, the timber that was capable of being milled should have been milled and, if the plant there was not able to do it, somebody else should have been able to have a go. If that could not happen, then maybe mulching was the way to proceed or, alternatively, maybe the government should have said to anybody in Adelaide, 'If you have an open fireplace and you want some free timber, come up here, take it back to your house, cut it up and put it in your fireplace and burn it.' That way, at least some of the cold and poor people of Adelaide would have got warm in the winter months as a result of this timber being burned. But, no, it is all burnt on a plain up near Kuitpo and it is allowed to burn for a week.

I will mention the other thing that should have been contemplated—and I know this happens in the South-East, and it is a very sensible thing. The remnant timber that is left over from the forestry industry in the South-East is used to create electricity in the co-generation facility there. That is the most sensible thing to do to this kind of waste—to have it burned in the open field without any positive benefits to anybody, not to the soil, not to the amount of energy used in our society, not to warm the people who might be feeling cold in winter, not to create some mulch so that we can contain water in our soils and not to put some nutrients back into the soil! For it not to be used to do any of those things but just to be burnt off and then to say that is equivalent to mulching, equivalent to the best possible environmental outcome we can have in the circumstances, is just a nonsense, and the government must stand condemned as a result of this.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Of late a great deal has been said concerning the Adelaide City Council elections. I will make a few casual observations about that matter. Some criticism has been directed towards our current Lord Mayor, Jane Lomax-Smith, who has indicated to the electorate in the city which candidate she prefers as Lord Mayor and which candidates she prefers as councillors. We should not criticise her for exercising her rights as a citizen and a person who is held in high regard by many people across all political parties within the city of Adelaide. She has chosen not to hide her feelings but to express openly and honestly whom she thinks is the best person to serve as the mayor of the city of Adelaide and which of her fellow councillors she believes are best able to serve not only the city of Adelaide but this state overall.

There has been a lot of criticism from all sides of politics regarding Jane Lomax-Smith's attitude on this matter. I find that interesting, because I read in the newspaper the other day that the shadow minister for local government said that the Labor Party does not endorse anyone. It is well known that, in the last city council elections, Linda Kirk (a member of the Labor Party and the Labor unity faction of the Labor Party) was supported by the member for Spence and the Shop Assistants Union for election to the city council—as was their right. They openly proclaimed it, as was their right—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: As the member for Spence interjects, she was the first openly supported political candidate of the Labor Party in the city of Adelaide—as was their right. However, just because it may not suit the member for Elder as the shadow minister, it is not now their right to upbraid the Lord Mayor for indicating her preference in terms of who she believes should be the Lord Mayor or a member of the city council, because she is not doing so in her capacity as the endorsed Labor candidate for the state seat of Adelaide but in her capacity as the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and as a person who has been a member of the council for some time.

The Labor Party does not endorse candidates for local government elections. The member for Spence does—and he openly proclaims it. He interfered in the city of Charles Sturt and the city of Port Adelaide Enfield. It is his right as a citizen of those areas to do so and to say to his Labor Party supporters, 'I want you to vote against these people because I prefer to have this team as councillors on those city councils.'

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Now, let us not have rank hypocrisy regarding the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party ran the city of

Adelaide for many years. If you did not have an LCL endorsement unofficially you did not get elected as the lord mayor and you were not elected as a councillor when you had a restricted franchise and multiple voting. That is the way in which it was run in those days.

So, in my view there is nothing wrong, particularly when the Labor Party says, 'We do not endorse candidates for local government elections,' for any member of the Labor Party in any capacity whatsoever to express their view and say, 'I believe these persons are the best people to serve in that capacity.' The simple fact is—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Yes, Alfred Huang. I remember the Labor Party sending out letters on behalf of Alfred Huang, when he stood against Jane Lomax-Smith in the last elections two or three years ago, urging Labor Party members of the sub-branch of Adelaide to vote for Alfred Huang—as was the right of the Labor Party and as is the right of the Liberal Party to say, 'We think this person should get the nod.' However, at no time has Alfred Huang or anyone else been given the nod in any official capacity by the Labor Party's saying, 'You have our support; you have promised us this or you support our policies on that.' That is straight up.

So, for members of the Labor Party to criticise another Labor Party candidate for a parliamentary seat who gives an honest, up-front view as to who she believes should lead the city of Adelaide is rank hypocrisy. Not so long ago, I saw Alfred Huang at a city restaurant in close conversation with Pat Conlon, Senator Nick Bolkus and Ian Hunter, the State Secretary of the Labor Party. They are entitled to have meetings and do what they like, but it is not right for them then to criticise another member of the Labor Party for having a different view when there is no Labor Party policy on whom it does or does not support in the elections for the city of Adelaide.

At least the member for Spence has not publicly come out and criticised Jane Lomax-Smith on that matter. I note that he is now the duty labor member for the city of Adelaide. No doubt that will do Jane Lomax-Smith the world of good in North Adelaide with respect to Barton Road. Nevertheless, he and the shop assistants union have in the past openly campaigned for Linda Kirk, as is their right, because there is no official Labor Party stance saying, 'We want Linda Kirk as our preferred candidate.'

It is right for the media to describe her as a member of the Labor Party but not as an ALP candidate or to give any substance to the idea that she was an endorsed Labor Party candidate for local government, because the Labor Party does not do that. Therefore, I simply say that the Lord Mayor is perfectly within her rights as both a leading citizen in the local community and a member of the Labor Party to indicate her preference. As to how people choose to vote, it is a secret ballot and they will vote whichever way they want. I, for one, have been wooed by the thoughts and views of the Lord Mayor on these issues.

Regarding party political interference in local government elections, again, I do not have any problems with that, but I will say that local government elections should be compulsory. The Liberal Party is totally opposed to compulsory voting, but I think it is necessary, because we are now dealing with large councils with very large budgets. The city of Port Adelaide Enfield has an annual budget of over \$100 million. Therefore, I think there should be compulsory voting. I am not talking about the American system. Even with postal voting, we get 40 to 50 per cent at best in terms of voter turn-

out. All that does is cater for sectional interest groups and targeted electioneering which will result in a council which does not necessarily reflect the overall views of the community at large. So, I thoroughly support the Labor Party policy in respect of compulsory voting in local government elections being enacted in legislation.

The point on which I finished my 20 minute contribution to the supply debate related to the accountability of government. At the end of my contribution, I referred to the fact that the Minister for Tourism has not answered any of the questions that I have had on notice for about 18 months. Likewise, with respect to the Premier, I have had a question on notice on a significant issue relating to the number of employees on the public payroll—they may be employed through consultants—who are not employees of the public service but who have been working there for more than 12 months.

The government says that it has cut the public sector by a significant number of people by reducing the number of directly employed public servants, but we find that they are being rehired through labour hire companies. I cite the example of a constituent who has worked for the department of transport at Port Adelaide for four years. His employer is not the department of transport; rather, he works for a labour hire company on far cheaper wage rates than would have been the case had that person been employed directly by the Public Service Commissioner. I want to know the numbers and for what periods of time those persons have been employed. I have had that question on notice for over a year and I still have not received an answer. Just recently, after putting a question on notice again asking 'When will you answer my question on such and such' I received a letter from the Premier saying that they are getting that information together. It is well in excess of a year and I do not think that the delay, the prevarication and the procrastination by ministers opposite does them any credit or the accountability of this government to this parliament. I want to know how many people are involved; for how long they have been involved on these types of contracts working for outside labour hire companies; and at what cost.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take 10 minutes this evening to talk about a matter in which I have a particular interest and it relates to the Investigator Science and Technology Centre. I would hope that most members in this place would have taken the opportunity at some stage to visit the current centre at Wayville and would have recognised the benefits that can be gained through this centre by people of all ages, but particularly young people. On a number of occasions I have had the opportunity to visit a number of their exhibitions and I have been very pleased to observe not only the enjoyment that young people receive but the educational benefits that they gain from this facility.

A number of people have shown a particular commitment to this facility. I think of people such as Dr Barbara Hardy, for example, who has worked diligently as the previous chair of the Investigator Science and Technology Centre and of course the current chair, Mr Hugh Orr. These people and those who work with them and have been working with them since it began are to be commended for the commitment that they are showing.

In 1998, the government gave a commitment to support the investigator financially and to relocate and redevelop the facility. As most members would be aware, having visited the centre, the current site is quite inadequate and the building is

far too small. Also, the lease payments are beyond the capacity of those who have that responsibility. As a result, a substantial government grant was made available for the preparation of a detailed feasibility study. It was started in February 1999 and completed in September of last year and was presented to the government. I have had the opportunity to look at that report. The study is thorough, extremely well researched and ready for final designs to be prepared once government approval is received. I understand that a detailed business plan by Ernst and Young is included as well as exhibition designs and detailed cost estimates.

The concept of the new centre is broadly based in three areas: the tenants, education and showcasing South Australian industry and tourism. It is essential that this is clearly understood and that the project is not thought of as just a larger version of the existing facility. It is much more than that for the reasons I will mention later. I want to emphasise that it is more than just an educational facility. The new facility would showcase South Australian industry and tourism—and I cannot think of any greater need as far as this state is concerned.

The reason for the commitment of those who are working so hard to improve the lot of the investigator is their strong belief in the vital importance of science, technology and engineering in South Australia. We would all recognise that we have to attract more young people into these careers and we need to develop a more technically capable community if our economy is to grow and provide jobs for coming generations. Science and technology are at the heart of our modern world and only the most technically capable societies will prosper in the global marketplace.

I am sure that we would also all recognise that many other countries have recognised this and are investing huge sums in science centres. For example, Bristol has a budget of £100 million and that is only one of seven in the United Kingdom. Other countries are investing similar amounts. Other states in Australia also have far larger centres which are very heavily subsidised. Queensland has recently announced a partnership with the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. I would suggest that is a major coup for them. Those of us who have had the opportunity to visit the Smithsonian in Washington would understand that. One of the greatest opportunities that anyone can have is to spend days at that particular facility.

The vision is for the new investigator to be something very different from the conventional hands on science centre that we have known in the past. It will be much more a community based facility which will showcase local R&D and the innovative aspects of local industries from this state; that is, the exciting things that are being undertaken in various areas. This will boost local pride and inform and attract people into these fields. It will also provide a forum for the community debate on science issues such as genetic modification, uranium mining and so on.

The strong preference is for the TransAdelaide site on North Terrace to be used for this facility. I would suggest to members that this site has excellent public transport access; it is in walking distance from the Convention Centre for tourists; it has access to open space via a pedestrian bridge over the rail lines to the Torrens; and it is in close proximity to the University of South Australia, Hindley Street cultural precinct, skateboard park and so on. It also has the prominence that is needed to get the message across about science and technology. It is intended that the new investigator would continue as a not for profit community facility and it is

believed that this particular location is very appropriate. I would suggest that it will round out the unique North Terrace cultural precinct very well.

The new investigator fits extremely well with the government's directions for South Australia 1999-2000 to which it can contribute in a major way. Regional areas of the state will also benefit from the new investigator by the use of a digital learning centre, an expanded outreach program and virtual laboratories. These features will mean that country students will have the same opportunities as their city counterparts, and again I am sure we would all recognise the importance of that.

The main reason I wanted to raise this matter tonight is that I believe, and I hope that many members on both sides of the House agree, that this is a golden opportunity for South Australia and that we would also recognise that it is something the state is badly in need of. The downside, if this project does not get the go ahead, is that the investigator will become even smaller than it is now and may have to close entirely. I certainly do not want to see that happen, and I think that many people in South Australia would share that view. I am delighted that the minister who has a responsibility for this initiative, the Hon. Malcolm Buckby, is presently in the chamber. I know the pressures that the minister is under as far as funding is concerned and I know that many are knocking on his door looking for increased funds. However, I suggest that, as far as the state is concerned, and in particular for the future of young people in this state seeking employment, this new Investigator Science and Technology Centre for South Australia is an absolute must. I hope that the government and all members in this place will approve the new facility going ahead as a matter of urgency.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Tonight I take a few moments to talk about an issue that is increasingly causing me concern: a quiet process that is taking place of isolating and stigmatising certain sections of our society. The people to whom I refer are easily identified because we always place the tag on them as being some sort of problem. We often hear about the Aboriginal problem, the ethnic problem and the unemployed problem. By giving people this tag of being a problem, we are blaming them—it is their fault! Tonight I want to talk about how we are tagging our youth and older people, about the so-called youth and aged problem.

I want members to think a little about where the problem really lies. I am concerned that we are continually trying to separate and isolate sections of our community based on their age. My concern is not about the provision of appropriate services targeted at certain ages because that clearly is essential. My concern relates to keeping people out of the way because of their age. In relation to young people I think that too often we are uncomfortable with them. They are energetic, noisy, messy and, in lots of instances, not very decorative. I know that when my boys were aged 15 and 16 they certainly were not.

The biggest difficulty with which young people are faced is that they are not us: they are not in that, perhaps, 20 to 55 year age group. Young people are an important part of our community and I do not believe that they can grow into responsive, responsible members of our community if we do not allow them to be a part of our community—if we shunt them to one side all the time. I am sure that probably every member in this House who has a shopping centre in their electorate would verify that when young people go to a shopping centre too often they are moved on. It is not about

their necessarily offending or causing problems: it is just because they are there.

I was speaking to a police officer a while back whom I have known for a number of years. He told me how he had visited a local shopping centre with his two teenage sons. He sent them off into one shop while he went off to do something else. It was not very long before the security guards approached these young boys and told them that they had to leave the centre. These boys were clean, tidy and well dressed. They were going about their business but the security guards just did not want them there because they were young. They explained what they were doing but it did not matter. They were being shunted out of the centre until dad came along and confronted the security guard. I just do not think that it is right.

When I was young we met down the street. We had street shops, and that is what we did to socialise. We would meet at the local deli, sit down, have a Coke and chat to one another. We must recognise that young people need to meet one another. They need to communicate and socialise and sometimes even shop with their parents, but this should not be done in isolation. Isolating young people, I think, promotes problems and unnecessary fear and anxiety among other sections of our community. Just because we see a young person getting around with a baseball cap and baggy shorts does not necessarily mean they will attack a woman and grab her handbag.

In fact, I wear a baseball cap every morning when I go for my walk through the local park. It does not mean that there is something wrong with you. I believe that the use of public space and the right to use public space is an issue we will have to address. We have to recognise that we must allow young people to participate in a meaningful way in our community. The Salisbury council in my electorate is a prime example of this. It has established a youth advisory committee, which has the same standing as other council committees. Young people from the local high schools and youth groups comprise that committee and advise the council of their needs and interests.

It is not just about where they can play football and where they can hang out: it is about a range of issues, including employment and health. I have urged the Tea Tree Gully council to follow this example. It has undertaken a study to look at the recreational and social needs of young people. However, it needs to be greater than that and I again urge the Tea Tree Gully council to follow the lead provided by the Salisbury council. It is very heartening, because we have heard a couple of speeches tonight highlighting the fact that a number of quite young people have nominated for local government, and I hope that a number of them have success.

At the other end of the spectrum are older people, and we seem to be doing exactly the same to them. The 20 to 55 year olds do not want to be reminded, I think, of the ageing process. We are far too eager to shunt them off into what we determine to be seniors' activities—what we think is appropriate socialising for older people. These are real people leading real lives and they want to continue to be a real part of our community. They have an enormous amount to contribute and we must allow them to do that—not close them off. The introduction of poker machines highlighted an enormous amount of loneliness and isolation in our community, and I think that was particularly so in relation to older women.

For the first time they felt they had comfortable access to hotels. They could go along and enjoy a social activity that

is utilised by all ages. It was a normal place to go and they felt comfortable engaging in the activity. Because you are over 55 does not mean that suddenly you are a different person with different interests and different needs. Again, you should not be isolated: it eats away at your confidence and self worth. If anything it increases the ageing process. It makes people old before their time; and who is to say what is old? Again, it is just a tag that we put on people.

If we want our community to work we must allow everyone to participate. Instead of isolating differences we need to encourage and value them. It is the only way we will have a real, healthy and vibrant community.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I want to raise an issue which has caused a great many of my constituents much concern and, in fact, really angered them, and that is the government's announcement that it intends to privatise the Lotteries Commission and the TAB. In fact, even I was surprised about the number of calls to my office on this issue. My constituents, and some even outside the electorate, expressed to me that they are incredibly angry and really disillusioned with this government's consistent strategy to sell off any and all of our profitable state-owned assets.

In their opinion this shows that the government has scant regard for the loss of income to the state and, in fact, has really no concern about the never ending job losses that result from privatisation. They are appalled at the shoddy way that these employees are treated. Workers being faced with the threat of losing their jobs is a very appalling way to live. The Lotteries Commission has been a successful government enterprise. It was established by referendum in 1967 for the specific purpose of returning profits from the gambling industry in South Australia to our public hospitals.

Since 1967 the commission has returned over \$1 billion to our public hospitals, and I understand that the Lotteries Commission put \$82 million into our public hospitals last year. I know that many members in this House would agree with those independent commentators who cannot understand what economic sense there could be in selling off such profitable assets. Why would one want to sell an asset that is so successful and strategic to government funding and particularly to the people of South Australia? The government has said that the annual loss of government revenue to public hospitals from the sale of the Lotteries Commission will be made up out of general revenue. Quite clearly the people of South Australia are very sceptical of this claim, and they have a right to be, given the government's backflips over the privatisation of ETSA-Optima and TransAdelaide, and the ever-increasing little tangible increases in services and resources.

There are also real concerns over the 400 jobs which are likely to be lost because of the sale of the Lotteries Commission and the TAB. At present, workers in the Lotteries Commission and the TAB have reasonably secure jobs. They and their families have now been thrown into major uncertainty as to whether they will have a job after the sale. Those who have not been able to secure jobs with the new corporate buyer could face long-term unemployment, as we have seen happen to many other employees of government enterprises, and they will then have to face the worries and uncertainties that unemployment encompasses.

One of those workers wrote to me and I am sure to other members of parliament as well. The worker's letter states:

I am opposed to the sale of the Lotteries Commission and SA TAB. Having worked at both organisations it is an extremely stressful situation to subject any staff to, knowing that in 12 months'

time they could be unemployed, redeployed (if lucky) or terminated. Do you have any idea how a decision like this affects staff morale? However, we are proud of the work we do, and I am proud to work for a world renowned lottery organisation that is purely South Australian. So it is business as usual. I am, however, deeply disturbed by the need to sell off another two distinctly South Australian organisations. In these times of pride as an Australian, but more to the point, a South Australian, the loss of these organisations to an interstate or international entity is just not necessary. There are too many companies closing down or relocating from the state as it is. Where is the progress for South Australia in this decision? Where will the funds provided to the Hospitals Fund in the last 32 years from SA Lotteries come from next year? The government's excuse that internet gambling will eat away problems is just that—a wonderful, intelligent sounding excuse. SA Lotteries has battled on in the face of the introduction of poker machines and continues to return profits, and last year returned one of its most profitable years to the government of South Australia.

The worker has asked all members:

Please oppose all moves to sell these valuable public assets. Has the government really done its sums right? Why sacrifice another two South Australian assets? Having voted for Dr Armitage and his 'Liberal Party' in the last election, he can be assured that his party will no longer get my vote.

Certainly that theme is coming through to my office and I am sure other members' offices.

Constituents who have family members employed in the Lotteries Commission have complained that the government redundancy package that is on offer falls far short of the Public Service voluntary separation package formula. That formula includes eight weeks pay plus three weeks pay for each year of service and reaches to a maximum of 104 weeks for those employed for more than 32 years. The government's offer includes payment of 48 weeks pay for those employed for 20 years, which means a loss of 20 weeks pay when compared with the Public Service voluntary separation package formula.

Other government nasties related to the sale include no guarantee of involuntary redundancy; no opportunities for redeployment to other jobs in the public sector; and staff in required positions may be required—I guess that could be termed 'forced' if they want a job—to transfer to the new owner without compensation. Staff employed with the new owner will have their employment guaranteed only for six months. That list goes on and on. These issues are currently under discussion with the government, the unions and I understand the Employee Ombudsman.

My constituents have expressed to me their opinion that the government's indecent haste to sell off some of our best public assets will harm our economy in the long term. The best long-term benefit to our state would be to keep the Lotteries Commission and the TAB in public hands. Their contribution to our public hospitals certainly far outweighs any short-term dollar benefit that we might get from a sale. I know that this is an issue in which the member for Peake has a great interest, and I am sure he will be down here in the chamber shortly to say a few words on the issue.

I would like to raise another issue. In the city *Messenger* this week I noticed an article about people who are blind being discriminated against, and I have had a long-term interest in this issue. The accessibility group which had a petition presented in the Legislative Council on their behalf some time ago has been lobbying the government to provide that people who are legally blind are able to avail themselves of the taxi subsidy scheme. This means that these people will have more freedom, particularly at night, because, for totally blind and partially visually impaired people, using public transport is exceptionally difficult, particularly at night,

because they are susceptible to those people in our community who seek to prey on the vulnerable. When I was door-knocking in a 1994 by-election, I met a number of people who were blind or had a visual impairment and who raised this issue with me, which I in turn raised with the government, but unfortunately it fell on deaf ears.

A great advocate for the blind is Mr Richard Berry, who is the Blind Welfare Association public relations officer. He is a marvellous fellow, and I am sure that if we give him our support in this chamber we will find that this service will be available for those who are blind.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): Today I refer to the Premier's proposal to bring them back home. The Premier initiated a program this week to bring back South Australian graduates and business people and families who have left the state over the past five or six years, to bring back their expertise and knowledge to South Australia. When I was first watching this announcement on the television I felt a little bit miffed. I am sure that hundreds of graduates who have graduated from Adelaide University, the USA, and the Levels were saying, 'What about us who have chosen to stay in South Australia?' What about the graduates and families who have chosen to stick it out in South Australia? What about the families who have suffered budget cuts to education, health and police? What about the families who have seen their services privatised and sold off? Where is the Premier's message of hope for these people?

The Premier's message to these people is, 'We want you to stay here, pay an emergency services tax, live in a state with high unemployment, the health service being the worst in the country with people waiting two years to have their teeth looked at, but our incentive programs, our programs for caring, are for those who live in other states. We are not interested in the people who live here in South Australia: our message is for those who have fled, who have left. Our message is for those who no longer reside in South Australia.' What an uncaring, callous government, a government with no priorities, a government whose priorities are all wrong, a government that has no compassion.

Mr Wright interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Lee points out something that is quite right. The member for Finnis, the Minister for Human Services, had a different vision for South Australia—a vision of compassion, a vision of leadership that was pulled from underneath him by the current Premier in a silent deadly coup, seeing the elected Premier of South Australia thrown out by a group of politicians eager to hang on to their seats—sold out for 30 pieces of silver—and we saw what happened to them at the last state election. The Premier's vision for South Australians is not to care about them at all. His vision is for the ones who have moved to Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland.

I accept that what South Australia should be doing is making itself a competitive state, a state where we can offer to these people living interstate economic growth, an affordable and good lifestyle and relatively cheap housing in comparison with the eastern States. You can buy some very nice property in the inner city and in the western and eastern suburbs for quite affordable prices compared with some homes in Sydney. We should be using that as a selling point for families in the eastern and western states to migrate to South Australia. I find it offensive when the current Premier, when we have the highest unemployment rate in the country,

is targeting his program not at South Australians but at people who live in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland.

If you were a family living in the western suburbs watching the Premier gloat about bringing them home, you would be quite upset. If someone was raising a family now and paying the emergency services levy, paying increased motor registration fees, having to get private health insurance, having to wait longer in queues and seeing the police force and emergency services eroded, even though they are paying a huge levy, they would ask, 'What is in it for us?' Where is the light at the end of the tunnel, the hope, the vision? The vision is not aimed at them but at the eastern States.

I want a Premier who is proud of South Australia and South Australians. I want a Premier who is concerned about people who live here. John Wayne Olsen is not the Premier of New South Wales, Queensland or Victoria but the Premier of South Australia. His responsibility lies here with those people with families who reside here and are taxpayers in South Australia—not taxpayers in New South Wales or Victoria. We often hear the Minister for Water Resources talking about the eastern states attacking our River Murray, taking it for granted and not looking after it as it comes down and flows into the river, and he says that they should show some responsibility.

We talk about putting South Australia first at the cost of other states and their interests. Why does the Premier not listen and do it for families living here rather than concentrating on families living in other states? I find it not only hypocritical but also offensive. The Premier should hang his head in shame. He is a minister of the Crown who is washing his hands of the responsibility he has here in his own state. I am the first to get up say that I would like to see the end of the drift of families leaving the tunnel that the Keating Labor Government built for South Australians and see the direction change to coming back into the city rather than leaving to move to Victoria and Sydney. I would like to see that change. However, we should not be aiming our packages or incentives at those families but at the ones who reside here locally in South Australia and who are supporting our small businesses, the entrepreneurs in our own state, the workers. We should be targeting workers at Mitsubishi who are about to lose their jobs and targeting the workers at Holden and making sure their jobs are secure, targeting workers throughout South Australia and not targeting a package at people in New South Wales and Victoria. It is offensive to those families who are doing it tough in South Australia under a state government that does not care and does not listen and has all its priorities wrong.

That is why, when we put out pamphlets about the emergency services tax, we were overwhelmed with complaints. When we hold 'Labor Listens' meetings we get hundreds of people coming along and saying, 'We've never voted Labor before in our lives, but it's time for a change.' People come along and say, 'We are sick and tired of seeing our Queen Elizabeth Hospital with queues waiting hours in emergency, seeing our loved ones turned back from hospital beds when there are more administrative staff than hospital beds in our hospitals. We are sick and tired of seeing our dental hospital waiting list being two years. We are sick and tired of seeing 35 students per teacher in our classrooms. We want a Premier who cares about us and not about what is going in New South Wales and Victoria.'

But they will not get that with the current Premier. The current Premier is not interested in that. If the current Premier was interested in local South Australians he would not have

blatantly lied to them about the emergency services tax. We would not be one of the highest taxed states in the country and we would not be hurting ordinary South Australian families. This Premier, who has no direction, no vision, no guts and no determination or plan for South Australia, throws his hands up in the air and says, 'Well, maybe if we get some net population growth (which is a good idea), we will aim it at former South Australians and just neglect those who are living here.'

There is an old saying that it is easier to remove the imperfection in our own eye than to talk about your neighbours. Maybe the Premier ought to get his house in order in South Australia first, making incentives in the local economy so great that the people who lived in South Australia and who have migrated to New South Wales and Victoria because their economies are bustling and booming would move back because our economy was bustling and booming. He is asking them to come back and offering incentives while ignoring those who are living here now.

The Premier has neglected his responsibility as Premier. How dare he get up and say that we are more interested and concerned about those who have left South Australia than those who are residing here. We should be creating the same kind of economy those people have left South Australia for so they can come back and enjoy the benefits of economic growth and not because the Premier is grasping at straws because he has no vision or plan and because he has failed as a Premier. He should have a genuine plan for South Australia. We are here waiting for the election. As it ticks on closer to election day, government members opposite know certain doom is coming as we will then have a Labor government that is concerned about South Australians first, that is, concerned about getting the economy here in South Australia right and making sure our hospitals, schools, police and essential services are A grade, the best we can give them, rather than grasping at straws and trying to get migrants back from New South Wales and Victoria. It is offensive to every family struggling here in South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I take this opportunity to call upon the government to release two important letters and other documentation concerning plans to locate two radioactive waste dumps in South Australia. Certainly I believe the government should demonstrate its credentials by bringing on the vote in Parliament this week on the shadow minister for environment's bill that would ban a medium and high level nuclear waste dump in South Australia. It is important, in order for the government to show that it is fair dinkum on this issue, to table a letter from Prime Minister John Howard to the Premier from early 1998 where the Premier was advised that Canberra intended to co-locate low level and medium level nuclear waste dumps.

We know, of course, that the Howard Government intends to locate a low level radioactive waste dump in the Billa Kalina region of South Australia. But the commonwealth also wants to co-locate a medium waste dump—an intermediate waste dump—with the low level dump taking the material, including the reprocessed spent nuclear fuel rods from the Lucas Heights reactor, which would then be returned at a later date from France. Of course, today the Premier repeated his claim that he was opposed to the medium level dump. In February 1998, the commonwealth announced that South Australia was the preferred region for the location for the low level dump but what I want to know, and what I believe the

parliament and the public are entitled to know, is: what did the Premier do when the Prime Minister told him in early 1998 that he wanted to put the two dumps together, given that the government here is supposed to be opposed to the medium level dump? How did the Premier respond to the Prime Minister?

We understand that the co-location of the two dumps, both a low level dump and a high level dump, was supported by a joint commonwealth-state committee. I suppose the question is: what did the South Australian representative on that committee do to convey the Premier's message that South Australia did not want a medium level dump? What was the role of the South Australian representative on that committee? Was a vote taken? If so, how did South Australia vote? If South Australia's opposition to the high level dump was explained to the committee, was the committee's view that was then conveyed to the South Australian government and to the Senate committee a unanimous view and, if so, why would the South Australian representative, acting on behalf of the government, support a move that was clearly contrary to the wishes of the Premier, and apparently the cabinet?

I suppose this is about credentials. We understand that, of course, in order to secure the go ahead for the new Lucas Heights reactor, a deal will be put in place that will involve the fuel rods from the Lucas Heights reactor being transported to France, where the material will be vitrified in glass and a quantity will be returned several decades later to South Australia. It could be, of course, that the South Australian government believes that 20 to 25 years down the track it will not matter; it will not be around to cop the flak. The problem for the government, of course, is that a decision has to be made within the next 12 months. A decision will have to be made about where the dump will be located, and that is in order to secure an agreement from France to reprocess, in order to secure the go ahead for the Lucas Heights reactor.

So, the chickens will come home to roost within the next year. That is why I believe that we in South Australia should follow the lead of the Western Australian parliament which, in a bipartisan way, has passed legislation similar to that proposed by the member for Kaurana which would ban intermediate and high level waste being dumped in South Australia. The Labor opposition there put the word on the Liberals, and the Liberals who had made a noise in a similar way to the South Australian government had to come to the party and support the legislation. That is interesting. We now have Western Australian legislation that prohibits high level waste being dumped in that state. Let us see if the South Australian government is prepared to put its money where its mouth is to support similar legislation here in South Australia that would prohibit such a dump being established somewhere in the South Australian Outback.

Of course, I know that some in the government are already going around saying that there is no point in South Australian legislation because the South Australian legislation could be overridden by commonwealth legislation. Let us see them try. Let us see a show down between the federal Liberal government and the South Australian parliament about its legislative responsibilities. Obviously, the matter could end up in the High Court. But it would be a very foolish federal Liberal government that is prepared to risk the political and electoral odium of a backlash from overriding a state law in order to force the state to accept medium and high level waste that would be transported through our ports, along our roads or

railways in terms of finding the eventual facility that would be co-located with the lower level waste.

Of course, we also have people on the other side of politics saying that South Australia has to exercise its clear national responsibilities by accepting this waste that has to go somewhere. I suppose South Australia has already, of course, exercised its national responsibilities through the Maralinga episodes in the 1950s and 1960s. The commonwealth government—the Menzies government—sought advice, as I understand it, from the Playford government, or informed the Playford government that it agreed to allow the British to test their nuclear weapons in the South Australian Outback in the Maralinga area. The end result of exercising our national responsibilities is that the area was substantially contaminated with plutonium, americium, strontium-90, uranium, other isotopes—massive contamination across the South Australian desert. It is interesting that it took decades of negotiations—negotiations of which I was a part, as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs—between the South Australian government and both our federal counterparts and the British government, and a royal commission headed by Jim McClelland, to eventually force an agreement out of the British not to compensate the tribal Aborigines of the Maralinga Tjarutja people but to ensure that the money was in place for a clean-up of the worst contamination to occur.

Of course, there is currently controversy about the methods used in that clean-up at Maralinga, about why vitrification was not used and why the relatively shallow pits were used in the process. So, it is quite clear, given the pollution and contamination that occurred from the Maralinga tests and given the fact that the Aboriginal people were relocated from their traditional lands to various locations, which has caused enduring harm and social and health consequences, that we now have to again be the state that exercises its national responsibilities in terms of nuclear contaminated material. I believe that we have a clear opportunity this week, on Thursday morning during private members' time, for the government to allow the vote to be taken and for it to show whether or not it is fair dinkum in terms of supporting a ban on nuclear waste. That will test whether the rhetoric is matched by action or whether there has been some cosy arrangement to roll over some time in the future to allow the South Australian waste dump to be converted to a high level facility.

I want to refer to a number of other issues. For some time now I have been concerned, having been contacted by a number of constituents in my area, about the impact of the drug company Roche withdrawing a particular drug from the market which could have a serious detrimental effect on about 40 South Australian sufferers of a coronary disease known as slow coronary flow. Certainly, I think (and I am pleased that the Minister for Human Services is present) that time is running out for a small group of South Australians with a critical heart condition as the final supplies of the drug run out. We have been trying to convince the manufacturer of the drug, called Posicor, to continue to provide the drug to patients here in South Australia who are dependent on the drug in order to maintain a normal lifestyle. I have been in contact with the Swiss-based international manufacturer Roche in a bid to see whether Roche or another pharmaceutical company can resume the manufacture of the drug.

Slow coronary flow is a debilitating condition that is devastating, leaving sufferers bedridden for up to 18 hours a day. In terms of the information I have received, and from the people to whom I have spoken, Posicor has literally turned

around the lives of a number of local sufferers of this condition who have contacted my office, and has certainly vastly improved their lives and the quality of life of members of their families. One 36 year old man with three young children says that, before the drug, he was experiencing multiple severe chest pains daily and chronic breathlessness. After Posicor, he experienced only his mild symptoms occasionally and was able to resume his career. Without the drug Posicor, this man and others like Mr David Day, of Salisbury North, literally fear for their lives without the drug that I understand will run out and will not be available for supply by the middle of this year. No replacement drug is currently on the market that can solve the problems that they have.

Mr Day was diagnosed with slow coronary flow in 1998, was suffering from severe angina and acute breathlessness, and was sleeping 12 to 18 hours a day, but Posicor improved his quality of life enormously. However, because of possible dangerous interactions with other drugs in the treatment for conditions other than slow coronary flow, the production of Posicor was ceased by Roche almost two years ago. I certainly want to pay a tribute today to the efforts of Professor John Horowitz and Dr David Beltrame of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who are international experts on slow coronary flow for their efforts to try to ensure that South Australian sufferers continue to be supplied from existing supplies which, as I said, will run out within three months.

Following my contact with Roche, the Australian based division of the company is now asking its Swiss headquarters whether the manufacture of the drug could resume or whether another firm could make it under licence. I have written to Fauldings, which is based in my own electorate in Salisbury, to see whether it is interested in negotiating with Roche to manufacture the drug under licence to Roche in South Australia. I have also raised the issue with the state government, through the Minister for Human Services. However, it seems that a possible outcome really does rest with the drug company itself. I do not want to make this a political—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The minister has just advised me across the chamber that alternative drugs could possibly be available. Certainly, that is something we want to pursue and, if not, we could see whether we could arrange with the Swiss manufacturer to allow a South Australian or an Australian company to manufacture the drug under licence. I hope that, by raising this issue on behalf of my constituents with the minister, the federal government and with Roche and Fauldings, we might be able to get a breakthrough and a positive decision to either resume manufacture of the drug or allow others to make it.

I also want to talk about some reconciliation and other issues. During my supply speech, I talked about native title and possible amendments that are causing great concern to the Aboriginal community in South Australia and about the stolen generation. However, I ran out of time when I was talking about another matter of interest that should be central to the reconciliation process.

Dr Evelyn Scott, the Chairperson of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, has visited me on several occasions to talk about the draft document for reconciliation and the national strategy for reconciliation that will be released on 27 May 2000 at a public event in Sydney called Corroborree 2000. Of course, there is already significant controversy about that national event, which will be held in the vicinity of the Sydney Opera House. Aboriginal leaders hoped that the

event would be an opportunity for the Prime Minister to say 'Sorry' on behalf of the people of Australia for the stolen generation and the events of the past—not to do it personally but on behalf of the Australian people and the Australian parliament and government. Of course, now we understand that any response to the reconciliation process has been delayed, abandoned, vetoed and torpedoed by the government at the same time that we saw an appalling piece of work in terms of a document that tried to diminish and devalue the impact of the stolen generation of Aboriginal people.

Here we have a government that is so shallow and mean spirited in its concern that it was not only prepared not to say 'Sorry' but also then went on to devalue and diminish the actual impact of the stolen generation on Aboriginal people and their families. It actually quibbled about the use of the world 'generation', saying that only 10 per cent of Aboriginal children were taken away and that this could not possibly be described as a generation. As I have said before, no-one has ever quibbled when for more than 80 years politicians, including the Prime Minister at Anzac Cove at Gallipoli, have talked about the lost generation of World War One. No-one has come and asked, 'What about those who stayed at home? You can't refer to a lost generation.' However, because we were talking about Aboriginal people and their hurt, we saw a federal government that was prepared not only to damage Australia's reputation internationally but also more importantly to cause great hurt and pain on the home front.

A number of other issues could be embraced by the national strategy to address Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander disadvantage but will be rolled into the reconciliation document to be released on 27 May. I certainly want to say publicly that, following the launch of the document and accompanying strategies, it is vitally important that they be debated and endorsed by each federal, state and territory parliament. There has to be some national ownership not only of the problems but also of the challenges and solutions in terms of reconciliation and in terms of setting out a long-term strategy to address Aboriginal disadvantage. National strategies will succeed only if they secure national commitment with accompanying federal, state and territory action plans. Without such an approach, we are likely as in the past to see only alibis and excuses from conservative governments at the federal, state and territory levels.

A proactive national approach involving clear time lines and benchmarks is urgently required given that the first Australians, the Aboriginal people, are still the last Australians when it comes to education, employment, health outcomes and longevity. I believe it is vitally important that, once the national strategy is launched on 27 May, a commitment is secured from all levels of government for its implementation. I am confident that this can be achieved in a bipartisan way across Australia. Indeed in South Australia over the years we have achieved a significant measure of bipartisanship in dealing with Aboriginal land rights issues and, more recently, in our parliamentary endorsement in South Australia of an apology to the Aboriginal people following the report into the stolen generation.

Other specific issues need to be addressed by the reconciliation document. In 1991, as South Australia's Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, I expressed concern at national forums about the lack of a coordinated national effort to both preserve and encourage the use of Aboriginal languages. Language is an integral part of every person's identity, heritage and culture. Language is the building block of culture. In many nations, including our trans-Tasman

neighbour New Zealand, a recognition of indigenous languages has been an important move forward in the reconciliation process, and I have already suggested to Evelyn Scott, the Reconciliation Council and Mr Philip Ruddock, the minister, that a meeting with the Chief Judge of New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal could be most helpful in terms of furthering the reconciliation process in Australia.

At the time of European occupation and settlement, more than 250 distinct Aboriginal languages and some 600 dialects were spoken across the Australian mainland and the surrounding islands. Today, in the year 2000, I understand that there are around only 30 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages. Aboriginal Australia has gone from having 250 languages and 600 dialects 200 years ago to 30 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages today used actively in day-to-day communication, and even fewer could be thriving and being actively learned by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children.

Australian Aboriginal languages are rich and an enormous source of pride to their people. I strongly believe that Aboriginal languages have immeasurable cultural and heritage value not only for Aboriginal people but for all Australians. These languages are inseparable from the identity and self-esteem of the Aboriginal people who speak them, whether their language is a strong community language, one left in a threatened state, or one that requires a retrieval or revival project. The further extinction of unique Aboriginal languages cannot be accepted let alone taken casually as it was in the last century.

I believe that the future of Aboriginal languages should be clearly addressed in the document for reconciliation or in the accompanying national strategy. A commitment to establish a national institute for Aboriginal languages with strong links to communities and local language centres as well as to universities and education departments around Australia should be seriously considered in that process.

Let us hope that there will be some measure of decency on behalf of the federal government so that, this year, in the lead-up to the 2001 centenary of Federation, we can see a major breakthrough to address Aboriginal disadvantage in this country and allow all Australians to take pride in the reconciliation process.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Earlier today I raised a number of concerns about the Oakbank meeting and I did not have the opportunity to finish speaking about some of the examples of what took place on the weekend. I hasten to add again that it was an outstandingly successful carnival, and I extend my congratulations to the Oakbank committee and the club on providing such an outstanding event over the Easter weekend for thousands of people.

A particular problem at Oakbank has now occurred two years consecutively, and that is that police are not providing adequate patrols for the event. Police officers were present but they did not fulfil the role that they have filled for many years. Until two years ago, the mounted police provided an excellent service by patrolling the track. We must remember that Oakbank is unique, with its carnival and picnic atmosphere. I do not say that disparagingly from the point of view of its being a race meeting but I am trying to describe the ambience and atmosphere that is the Oakbank weekend. Thousands of children attend, as do thousands of families, and the whole atmosphere is one of a carnival picnic nature.

In addition to the dedicated racegoers, many people who attend Oakbank go to a race meeting on only one or two days

a year, and they are those chosen days over the Easter carnival. Many people travel from the CBD, thousands come from country areas and probably thousands of people come from interstate. It is a magnificent carnival. Until two years ago, the police were providing a service to Oakbank and the public with mounted police patrolling Oakbank in the way it needs to be patrolled—that is, on the track. Unlike the majority of race meetings, as part of the carnival atmosphere, children and families go onto the track before the meeting commences and in between the races when there is a 30 to 40 minute break, kicking their footballs and throwing their netballs or whatever they are involved in. It is essential with an event of this nature that we must have not only a police presence but mounted police patrolling the course because the risk or the danger is on the course itself.

It is all very well for mounted police to go around the car park exercising somewhat of a supervisory control, but they are serving little use. It is lovely to see them there and to say, 'Hello, how are you going?' as they go around the car park, but the critical area where supervision is needed and crowd control needs to be put into place—and I know, Sir, that you were there on the Monday—is on the track itself.

One of the services which historically has been provided by this government through the police force has been the provision by mounted police of supervisory control on the track at Oakbank, not just around the general course or in the car park. However, two years ago, for some unknown reason, that stopped. Whether it was because of this government's penny pinching or some unknown reason, the racing industry has no knowledge of why this has taken place and no understanding of what is going on. Once again, the government is not supporting the racing industry and it is putting at risk thousands of children.

I highlighted to the House earlier today a number of potentially dangerous incidents that took place on the Saturday. I will now cite some further examples of which I am aware. Let us not forget that this is not the first time that these sorts of incidents have occurred, because exactly the same thing happened last year. In addition to the incidents that I highlighted earlier today, on the Saturday, two horses lost their jockeys in the von Doussa chase and the horses ran back along the course proper where there was a large crowd in attendance. Normally, two police officers would be stationed in that area. That is the third example that I have cited of specific potentially dangerous incidents that took place on the Saturday where the element of risk was high—especially the incidents that I cited earlier today.

I also draw to the attention of the House that one of the committee members with the assistance of a 69 year old retired mounted police officer had to perform duties which in the past have been performed by mounted police at Oakbank. This is an absolute disgrace. Two years ago, the Oakbank committee was given an assurance by none other than Premier John Olsen that the police would be in attendance and patrol the race track. Two years ago on the Saturday that did not materialise. The commitment given by the Premier for mounted police to supervise the track at Oakbank did not occur.

When I contacted Oakbank four or five days before the carnival this year, I asked how the negotiations were going, was everything in hand and was there anything I could do to assist. They said to me, 'Thank you for your interest, but we have been told that this year there will be no problems. This year, the police have walked the track and we have pointed out where they will need to be. Everything will be okay. We

are a little worried because the police minister said to us, 'You must understand that I can't tell the police what to do'. No promises have been given, but we think it will be okay. So, thanks for your interest, but we think everything will be okay.'

Well, it was not okay because, for the second consecutive year, the police did not attend to their core duties at Oakbank, which are to patrol the track. That is what is needed for Oakbank. If the police do not do it—and surely that is the best organisation to do it, and it brings enormous positive PR to the police—and if the government is not going to fulfil its requirement with respect to the police patrolling Oakbank, they will have to pick up the duty in some other way and will have to pay for it. I do not think there is any alternative.

Surely, the best possible scenario here for the government, for Oakbank and for the safety of children and families at Oakbank is for the police to do what they have done for many years, that is, to patrol where they are most needed—and that is on the track. Must we have a major accident before this dopey government will realise what is needed, before this dopey government will act and make sure that the racing industry is given the support that it deserves? Must we wait until we have an accident where a child is injured before this government gets off its hands and says to the police, 'We want you to go out and patrol the track'?

This is another example of this government getting its priorities wrong. If this government cannot at least tell the police, 'We want you at Oakbank on the track to provide a police presence to make sure that all the kids, all the families, the thousands and thousands of people who attend Oakbank, are going to be in a safe environment', it does not deserve to be in government. I know that you, Sir, were there on Monday and I am sure that you would support my sentiments. When Labor comes to power, the first thing we will do when Oakbank comes around is sit down with the police and tell the police that we want them at Oakbank on the track, patrolling the track as they used to do, protecting the kids at Oakbank.

Time expired.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I move:

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

Motion carried.

POLICE (COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (SEXUAL SERVITUDE) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WARRANTS OF APPREHENSION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on the motion 'that the House note grievances' (resumed on motion).

Ms KEY (Hanson): Tonight my contribution to the Supply Bill deals with the termination of services of members through the government on a contract called CKS Facilities Management. My office was contacted by Mr Wilf Deakin, the State Organiser for the Communications Electrical Electronic Energy Information Postal Plumbing and Allied Services Union of Australia, Electrical Division, South Australian Branch (or the CEPU, as it is affectionately known in the trade union movement). Mr Deakin contacted my office because he and I have shared a history of concerns about contracting out in the public sector.

For instance, in a previous job at the United Trades and Labor Council, Wilf Deakin, as the secretary of the plumbers union (as it was), a number of other state public sector union officials and I drafted outsourcing and contracting out guidelines for the state government which eventually were agreed to and used to ensure that workers who were on a contract doing public sector work received proper workers' compensation coverage, health and safety coverage and were paid the appropriate award, enterprise bargaining or industry wage and that, if there were any concerns about the conditions for those workers, the contracting guidelines made sure that those workers were protected and that there was an avenue of appeal should this not be the case.

Depending on the type of work or occupation being carried out, it also ensured that long service leave and superannuation provisions were covered by the guidelines, and certainly, in the case of the building industry, that there was some portability with regard to long service leave, leave entitlements and superannuation. However, this brings me to the case that has been raised with me by Mr Deakin from the CEPU. I would like to refer to his letter because it summarises the concerns which I have and which I wish to raise tonight. The letter states:

Re: Early termination of members contract with CKS Facilities Management

I write to you in regards to three of our members who were previously working for the government, contracted to CKS Facilities Management. It was their task to perform maintenance on all government buildings in the city centre.

Under the present government's resources management outsourcing principles, these three members, who previously worked for the government, had another five months remaining on the contract, when the government withdrew the agreement with CKS Facilities Management. The contract stipulated that these employees are guaranteed two full years of employment.

Ferrier Hodgson, chartered accountants, who are the receivers for CKS Facilities Management and the government, are arguing that there are no two year contracts and that the work was terminated when the contract was withdrawn.

I have taken this matter to the Industrial Commission and presently I am still fighting for reimbursement for the five months payment owed to our members or alternatively to reinstate our members either in the work that they were guaranteed or for them to be employed in similar work within the same government agency from which they accepted the contract.

He goes on to say that he would appreciate any support he can get from me on this issue.

As I said, Mr Deakin has quite a long history in ensuring that workers are not exploited just because they have the opportunity to work as a government outsourced worker or on a government contract. I could refer to a number of letters, but I will refer just briefly to a letter that Mr Deakin received

from David Smythe, who is the Acting Executive Director of the Human Resource Management Division for the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The letter to Mr Deakin states:

I refer to your letter dated 11 February 2000 and subsequent discussions with John Shearing of this division regarding the entitlements of three ex-government employees following the government's termination of the maintenance contract with CKS. As advised the government has no legal obligation to maintain or provide compensation to ex-government employees for any unexpired portion of two years employment as provided for in the 'Human Resource Management Outsourcing Principles' (Outsourcing Principles).

The maintenance contract between the government and CKS required CKS to maintain outsourcing principles and this obligation reflects the provisions of the outsourcing principles which state:

'Responsibility for maintaining employment for the minimum period specified will rest with the principal vendor, i.e. the vendor holding the contract within the government/agency.'

The Department for Administrative and Information Services (DAIS) has confirmed that when CKS originally offered government employees job opportunities pursuant to the outsourcing principles, DAIS advised employees that it was the employee's responsibility—and I emphasise 'the employee's responsibility'—

to ensure the letters of employment provided by CKS conformed with the outsourcing principles.

This does beg the question: why do we need a human resource management division in this area if the employees are supposed to check the government's contract? The letter continues:

In respect to these three employees, Messrs Fremantle, Parsons and Kelly, DAIS has confirmed that the government representatives and the administrator appointed to CKS have sought job opportunities with current government contractors. This has resulted in Mr Fremantle accepting an offer of employment from Transfield and Mr Parsons rejecting an offer of employment from Transfield. I understand that Mr Kelly is employed by a subcontractor currently performing work for the building maintenance services in DAIS. In view of the above the government is not prepared to pay the balance of the two year period of employment with CKS, i.e. five months to Messrs Fremantle, Parsons and Kelly as sought in your letter.

A number of concerns have been raised by the unions in relation to the change of employment situation for workers covered by the Public Transport Board. When discussing the future of ETSA workers, there was considerable debate and argument in this House in relation to what would happen to the Electricity Trust of South Australia employees under the new arrangements. Certainly concerns were raised before my time in this House about the water resources and the contracting out for employees in that area. I guess this is just another example—a rather shabby example from my reading of the documentation and information put forward by the government—of outsourcing public sector work. It is with great concern that I raise this issue tonight on behalf of the CEPU, and I say that if this government is hell-bent on changing the work done by the public sector and putting work in the hands of outsourced suppliers then it needs to ensure that its resource management outsourcing principles are upheld by the government and that employees of this state, many of whom have been very loyal and have worked diligently for a long time for the public sector, are looked after and are not left like these three workers from CKS who may or may not have a job in the future.

It emphasises that this whole area needs to be taken seriously by the new Minister for Industrial Relations and, I hope, by the Minister for Government Enterprises, who so far has not shown any aptitude in looking after workers who have worked so hard for the public sector and who are now left up in the air with no idea about their entitlements and leave and who, in many cases, have taken pay cuts. I urge the Minister

for Government Enterprises and also the Minister for Industrial Relations in the other place to take up these issues of transmission and outsourcing and to ensure that workers' interests are protected.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.05 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 May at 2 p.m.