

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 8 May 2002

The **SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

SAME SEX COUPLES

A petition signed by 50 residents of South Australia, requesting that the house support the passage of legislation to remove discriminatory provisions against same sex couples from South Australian legislation, was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: Today I address a matter that is of great concern to the overwhelming majority of South Australians: the commonwealth's plans to establish a national radioactive waste dump with preferred sites earmarked in South Australia. As many as 120 000 South Australians signed a public petition to parliament saying that they do not want their state to become the radioactive or nuclear waste dump state.

This South Australian government is taking a tough stand in opposing any national radioactive or nuclear waste dumps being established in South Australia. No state in Australia has paid a higher price for nuclear waste than South Australia. Between 1953 and 1963 the British government conducted nuclear warhead development trials at Maralinga and Emu in the South Australian desert. An extensive area of South Australian land was granted in trust to the commonwealth for defence purposes for the carrying out of these trials. Nine major nuclear trials involving atomic explosions were carried out dispersing radioactive material by various methods, contaminating the land and air. There was dispersed plutonium, uranium, caesium and strontium across the South Australian outback.

The effect on many people and the cost of the atomic testing program has been far reaching. There has been a growing number of media reports about the effects on those who worked on the tests themselves. Then there was the impact on those who lived in these areas—people who had occupied these lands for thousands of years. In fact, for the Maralinga people these tests meant being unable to occupy their traditional lands for decades.

Over the years the British and commonwealth governments conducted a number of limited clean-up initiatives on these outback South Australian lands. I understand that there was an attempt in the late 1970s to retrieve some plutonium and repatriate it to Britain. This was apparently intended to give comfort to the people of Australia that there has been a genuine effort at cleaning up the dispersed plutonium contamination. In fact, it was no genuine effort.

However, it was not until the Royal Commission into British Nuclear Tests in Australia handed down its findings in December 1985 that a serious attempt to clean up nuclear contamination of the lands was made. In the most recent clean-up activities, the commonwealth used a technical option costing just over \$100 million, with the British government contributing some \$45 million. As Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the previous Labor government, I was involved in lobbying the British Conservative government in London to help secure a commitment to compensation.

The people of South Australia have made it clear to us (both in opposition and as the government) that they oppose any plans to dump radioactive or nuclear waste in the outback of this state. They are deeply concerned about the long-term effects on the environment. One of South Australia's greatest assets is a clean, green image that bolsters the reputation of our quality foods and wines exported around the world. We enjoy a quality of life that attracts tourists to this state. This is the Year of the Outback, a time when we are celebrating and promoting our unique rural heritage and environment around the world. Becoming the nuclear dump state would jeopardise all that.

The commonwealth government identified eight regions of Australia which could be suitable sites for the establishment of a national radioactive waste repository, and in 1998 the central north of South Australia was picked out as the preferred region for further detailed work to select a more specific site for a dump. In early 2001, the commonwealth announced sites near Woomera as the preferred specific sites for the dump. After Labor in opposition moved in this house to ban it, the previous South Australian government introduced a policy of rejecting the storage of national medium and high-level nuclear waste in this state and legislated to this effect—I want to acknowledge that level of bipartisanship—but the previous government agreed with and cooperated with the commonwealth's plans to place the nation's radioactive waste in our state. We do not agree and we will not cooperate.

My government is now acting to make sure that South Australia is never used as the place for dumping any radioactive or nuclear waste from other states or overseas. During the recent election campaign, Labor promised to fight any national radioactive or nuclear dump being built here and indicated that we would legislate for a referendum if a commonwealth government of any political persuasion at any time in the future decided to try to override state laws banning such a dump.

I stated that I looked forward to having a positive and constructive relationship with John Howard and his government. On my first full day in office as Premier, I wrote to the Prime Minister outlining our intention to legislate against a dump. I indicated that small amounts of radioactive material are generated within the state as waste from important medical treatments and research from such institutions as hospitals and universities. The South Australian government, as part of its radiation protection role, accepts responsibility for the oversight of handling and storage of these materials, but I made it clear that my government and South Australians were opposed to this state becoming the nation's nuclear or radioactive—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Bright will come to order. I remind the member for Bright that leave has been granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: Apparently, members of the Liberal Party opposite do want us to be the nuclear waste

dump state. That is a great disappointment. The South Australian government, as part of its radiation protection role, accepts responsibility for the oversight of handling and storage of these materials in our own state. However, I made it clear to the Prime Minister that this government—and, indeed, South Australians—were opposed to this state becoming the nation's nuclear or radioactive waste dump.

This week I received the Prime Minister's response. Disappointingly, it urges my government 'to support, rather than hinder' the development of a low-level, national radioactive waste dump here in South Australia. The Prime Minister points out the level of cooperation he received from the previous state government stating that the South Australian sites were chosen after—and let me quote directly for members opposite—'extensive scientific assessment and consultation with the community and South Australian government'. And ominously, while he says—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do not care whether it is Keating or Howard: I do not want South Australia to be the nuclear waste dump state. You might, but I don't. I will continue: and ominously, while he says there has been no decision on an appropriate site for a medium level nuclear waste dump, he fails to rule out such a dump being created in South Australia as well. I am responding to the Prime Minister. I will enclose this ministerial statement and draw to the Prime Minister's attention the following statements: the South Australian Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. John Hill) will today be giving notice of the introduction of a bill to extend existing legislation to prohibit a national low level nuclear waste repository in South Australia; to ban the transport of radioactive waste from interstate or overseas in South Australia for the purpose of sending it to a national nuclear waste dump in this state; and to introduce new laws to trigger a referendum if the commonwealth ever moves to establish a medium or high level nuclear dump in South Australia.

We know that this is a David and Goliath battle. We know the commonwealth could use commonwealth land and indeed commonwealth laws to override those of the state's, but it does not mean that we do not fight for our state. The referendum would not legally block the commonwealth but politically it may prove to be the state's ultimate nuclear deterrent. The referendum question would ask whether the voter approves of the establishment in South Australia of a facility for the storage or disposal of long-lived intermediate or high level nuclear waste generated outside this state.

Minister Hill has indicated to me that he believes that it is possible to hold such a referendum the weekend before a federal election. The political peril of defying the will of the overwhelming majority of South Australian voters, as expressed in a referendum, should be obvious to anyone who has any understanding of politics. Any federal government trying to override state laws would be likely to be devastated in the election following the clear vote of the vast majority of South Australians against any nuclear waste dump being established in this state.

The government recognises that this referendum option is an extraordinary measure and, as I understand it, one that has never before been attempted in Australian history; but it reflects this government's and the South Australian community's depth of concern about this issue. We hope that this

is a referendum that never needs to be held. I appeal again to the Prime Minister to reconsider his government's position and listen to the people of South Australia. We would rather have Canberra working with South Australia, not against us. When we work together we can achieve so much, as we have seen with the Darwin-Alice Springs railway line and with the recent investment in Mitsubishi.

But this state has more than shouldered its burden of nuclear waste over the previous 50 years and it is now time for us to look after our own situation, but we will not be the dumping ground for nuclear waste for other states or for overseas.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As members would be aware, a key issue raised during the recent state election was the state of the budget. On numerous occasions I made requests to the government to allow me access to the head of the Department of Treasury and Finance that were consistently refused. The motive for the former government's actions in this regard is now clear. The 2001-02 mid-year budget review was designed with the sole purpose of getting the former government re-elected, not as a natural reflection of the true state of the budget. How could the former treasurer release the 2001-02 mid-year budget review showing the state to be in surplus to the tune of \$2 million each year for the next four years when he and cabinet knew full well that this was not the case? This is an example of the blatant dishonesty that underlaid the Liberal Party's budgetary practices.

As detailed in this government's 2001-02 budget update, which was handed down on 14 March 2002, the budget is not in balance across the forward estimates, as the former Treasurer (Hon. Rob Lucas) would have had us believe. The update clearly shows a deficit in each year, with a cash deficit for 2002-03 of \$77 million—not two—increasing to over \$150 million by 2004-05, even after taking into account the effects of increased taxation revenue receipts.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Look, if someone has got a tummy ache they can relieve it elsewhere.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: On an accrual basis, the situation is even worse, with the general government net borrowing requirement increasing to \$392 million in 2001-02, and forecast to remain at levels above \$200 million across the forward estimate period. This is the most worrying aspect for the incoming government. After being repeatedly told by the former government that the budget was in balance and that its programs and promises made during the election campaign could be funded from within the existing budget, we found the complete reverse. As a result of the discovery of the Liberal government's previous budgetary mismanagement and deceit—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, they clearly did not hear that last piece. As a result of the discovery of the Liberal government's previous budget mismanagement and deceit, the government has taken immediate steps to rectify this situation. This has included a review of all spending commitments—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, Bill and Ben—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They are a bit like Bill and Ben the flowerpot men, aren't they, Robbie and Wayne.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will continue with the statement.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: A review of all spending commitments by the previous government prior to the calling of—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The purpose of ministerial statements, as I understand them—and I seek your guidance on this, sir—is to put on the record matters of government policy. This matter appears to be straying very much into debate, which is the province of this house and, if the minister is going to make statements like this, the opposition deserves the right of reply. The minister is obviously using a ministerial statement for blatant political purposes, sir, and I seek your guidance on this matter.

The SPEAKER: It is my intention to have a chat to ministers about the substance of their statements to the house. In the fullness of time, I am sure we can rectify that. But I would also remind the house that the statement we are now hearing is a temperate one by comparison with some I heard in recent times.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I would have thought that fixing the financial mess left by members opposite was an important element of government policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will come back to the statement.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. Included is:

- a review of all spending commitments of the previous government prior to the calling of the election, although we will be honouring all their May 2001 budget commitments;
- the establishment of an expenditure and budget review cabinet subcommittee to comprehensively assess all spending across government agencies; and
- a review of all spending priorities of government aimed at reducing waste and improve efficiencies.

There are a number of immediate cost pressures, though, facing the government due to the inaction and deceit perpetrated by the former government. Interestingly, these cost pressures, although known to the previous government—I repeat, known to the previous government—were deliberately omitted from the 2001-02 mid year budget review released by the former Treasurer during the state election campaign. These cost pressures deliberately omitted during the election campaign include some of the following:

- the current negotiations taking place with the education union over the teachers' pay increase;
- a blow-out in the education budget for the current year totalling \$30 million;
- hospital deficits known to the government and to the deputy opposition leader of \$44 million;
- a \$20 million allocation to replace the fleet of public buses (required under law);
- a \$66 million blow-out in targeted voluntary separation packages; and
- a large range of other cost pressures such as the 'real' cost of increasing the school leaving age, employment programs, transport concessions, tourism programs and disability services.

In addition to those cost pressures further deterioration in the budget occurred recently due to the following factors: a reduction in grants from the commonwealth; and errors in pay

calculations to the tune of \$14.4 million in the human services portfolio. These impacts will see the starting point for the 2002-03 cash-based budget position being close to a \$100 million deficit. The government does not intend to use the poor and deceitful financial management practices of the former Liberal Government as an excuse not to meet our election promises. We intend to deliver on our election commitments. The unfortunate situation is that the Liberals, and the way they have left the state's finances, will make the job that much harder.

The government will deliver its first budget on 11 July this year. The budget will aim to bring the cash-based budget back into balance in 2002-03 and begin the difficult process of correcting the structural shortfalls in the general government sector, brought about by the dishonest fiscal management practices of the former government. You should be ashamed!

Members interjecting:

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

BEVERLEY URANIUM MINE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The government, along with most South Australians, has been increasingly concerned about the number of spills at the Beverley uranium mine in the state's Far North. Beverley has a history of repeated spills, with more than 30 spills reported there in the last four years, the largest one of 61 000 litres reported in January of this year. Our concerns have, unfortunately, been magnified by the two most recent spills at Beverley in the last week. During the election campaign the Labor Party made a commitment to conduct a review into the spills reporting procedures because of our concern about an apparent lack of public accountability, which seemed to be sanctioned by the previous Government.

In fact at this time a series of spills was made public only by a whistleblower to the media. It appeared that Rob Kerin's government did not have appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure the transparency and clarity expected on this matter of public safety. To tackle this problem head on, earlier this week the government announced the details of a review into reporting procedures. The terms of reference for this public inquiry include consideration and assessment of the severity of the consequences of spill incidents; transparency of disclosure of the details of spills; consistency of reporting mechanisms; and directions given by former ministers and to public servants. The former minister is still in the chamber.

The review will be conducted by Mr Hedley Bachmann, a retired senior public servant, with the findings to be made public in August. In addition to this action, last December the Labor Party announced its commitment to conduct a full review into the environmental impacts of the in situ leach mining process used at both Beverley and Honeymoon uranium mines. This inquiry will be conducted by the EPA after its current restructuring process is completed mid-year and I expect the results by the end of this year. It is clear that our concerns with the operations of Beverley are long-standing and publicly documented. However, after the second spill of uranium contaminated solution at Beverley in less than a week, the government has decided it is time to take more immediate action.

In the interests of public safety, the government has gathered together a top level investigative team of government experts to inspect the mine. As a matter of urgency, this team will provide an immediate assessment of the mine's operating procedures, its environmental integrity and public safety. To underline the seriousness of this matter we have put together this top level investigative team, which includes: Mr Nicholas Newland, Executive Director, EPA; Mr Peter Riley, Senior Engineer Chemical Processes EPA; Dr David Blight, Executive Director Minerals and Energy Resources, PIRSA; Mr Greg Marshall, Chief Inspector of Mines, PIRSA; Dr Kevin Buckett, Director Environmental Health, DHS; and Mr Bill Loizides, Acting Assistant Director Workplace Services. This team will inspect the mine on Friday 10 May.

I am not able to pre-empt the findings of this highly experienced team. However, we thoroughly understand the concerns of South Australians and the concerns they hold about the potential long-term impacts caused by radioactive substances. I am able to assure South Australians that we will do whatever it takes to ensure public safety.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—
Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Report
2000-2001

PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE

The SPEAKER: Following the precedent set by the Speaker of the 48th Parliament on the interpretation of standing orders, which is to be found in *Hansard* on page 563, in the Third Session of that parliament, on Thursday 16 November 1995, and on subsequent occasions, I make the following observations. The Speaker said:

The honourable member knows he will be dealt with in accordance with standing order 137.

For brevity, I go on and paraphrase:

He has reflected on (the) Speaker. . . the dignity of the house and the impartiality of the chair. Our system operates effectively only if there is respect for the chair by all members. I refer to Erskine May: 'Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punishable as a breach of privilege.'

This unprecedented attack brings the whole parliamentary institution into disrepute and, as Speaker, I do not intend to tolerate this behaviour.

The second quotation I give, again from the rulings of the Speaker of the 48th Parliament, is from Tuesday 22 May 1997 at page 1404 of *Hansard* and, for brevity, I again paraphrase:

In relation to the recent press reports about the contents and correspondence to me concerning the member for Ridley which have caused embarrassment. . . I believe the member for Ridley has seriously reflected on me as Speaker and I have no option but to name the member for Ridley.

The following remarks were attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in the electronic media, as well as in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 12 March 2002, where on page 2 he is quoted as saying:

Opposition Leader Rob Kerin criticised the Speaker's move, saying that there were not enough offices for members of parliament. 'I think Peter should reconsider that,' Mr Kerin said.

Now, I warn the Leader of the Opposition and I warn the member for Mount Gambier and I warn the member for Stuart, and I emphatically warn the member for Schubert for

his grossly intemperate remarks and criticisms of the Speaker, not just on this occasion in his case but on subsequent occasions on this and other matters since that time. I let the house know that there will be less tolerance and magnanimity from now on.

QUESTION TIME

WALKER AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Why did the minister not bring the parties together quickly to broker a resolution to the recent industrial dispute at Walker Australia which threatened the viability of South Australia's multimillion dollar automobile industry? The automotive industry is the state's largest single manufacturing industry, directly employing more than 15 000 South Australians. The recent industrial dispute at Walker Exhaust resulted in widespread disruption across the state's multimillion dollar automotive industry, resulting in losses totalling tens of millions of dollars and lay-offs of thousands of our automotive workers.

In 2001, a similar dispute at Walker Australia was resolved through direct state government involvement when I facilitated a meeting between the AMWU and representatives from Walker Australia and myself. At the time, the AMWU State President praised the then state government's efforts, hailing them as constructive and timely. The precedent to find a solution had been set.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The Leader of the Opposition knows full well that this dispute was in the federal industrial relations system. Beyond that, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that this is John Howard's industrial relations system—and aren't they very proud of it, because what John Howard's industrial relations system has done is disempower the major players. The federal industrial relations system—all set up by John Howard, all set up by Peter Reith, all set up by Abbott—has been to decentralise the system and to put in place a system that has been wanted by the business sector, and the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that that is the case. This dispute could only be solved in the federal industrial relations system, and the Leader of the Opposition knows that full well.

Members interjecting:

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

STATE BUDGET

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I direct my question to the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will be quiet.

Ms BEDFORD: Is the Treasurer aware of any misreporting of the budget position over the course of the last year and what could the possible causes of this misreporting be? On 14 March this year, the Treasurer outlined the failure of the then government to reveal underlying cost pressures on the budget. The Treasurer outlined some elements of this in his ministerial statement earlier today, and I ask him to elaborate further as this deception has significant ramifications not only for the state but also for my electorate of Florey.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the member for Florey for my first question from this side of the house. I can understand why the honourable member is very concerned about the deceit and financial mismanagement of the former Liberal government. During the election campaign we know that election promises and costings were an extremely topical issue, and there was a lot of heat on the opposition to deliver costed policies—policies that were correctly costed and could be delivered. We did that. We engaged Ernst & Young, an international and highly regarded accountancy firm. But what did the government do?

At about the midway point of the election campaign, or perhaps a little earlier, treasurer Rob Lucas released the mid-year budget review, a document that was brought to the attention of the public midway through the budget year, hence the name of it: the mid-year budget review. The then treasurer decided to release it during the election campaign, and it showed that the Liberal government could argue that it could pay for its election promises, that it had enough money in the budget to pay for all its promises and that, indeed, it could balance the budget. The government said that the budget was due for a \$2 million cash surplus this year, a \$2 million cash surplus next year, a \$2 million cash surplus the year after and a \$2 million cash surplus the year after that. It made very little mention of the fact that there was a substantial accruals deficit counted in the many hundreds. This document talked about a balanced budget.

When I got into office, the very first thing I said to the Under Treasurer was, 'Can you please tell me the state of the budget because I am pleased to be coming into office with a budget in balance?' At least it meant we had a good starting point. The Under Treasurer said to me, 'Well, Treasurer, I cannot give you that advice,' and I was stunned. I fell back in my chair and I said, 'You aren't suggesting that the budget is not in balance.' He said words to the effect, 'That is exactly what I'm suggesting.' I said, 'You had better give me something in writing because this is a very serious matter if what you are telling me is correct.' Then I had some information pulled together and I was shown that we were not \$2 million in deficit for the next budget year—

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, sir. I know this is embarrassing for the Treasurer but he should be addressing his remarks through you, sir, and not to the gallery.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: May I remind the Deputy Premier that as Treasurer he has been asked the question, and reliance upon factual information will help him better in getting the house to understand it rather than attempting to debate it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir; your guidance is appreciated. There is a \$77 million deficit for the next financial year; the following year there is an \$88 million deficit; and the year after that there is a \$152 million cash deficit. That is what the Under Treasurer told me when I became Treasurer. I then said, 'Surely the former Treasurer, Rob Lucas, would have known that.' The Under Treasurer said, 'The former Treasurer was made aware of cost pressures that meant that his cash balance was unlikely to be achieved.' A document from the Under Treasurer dated 15 January states:

Treasurer, We can deliver your balanced budget [\$2 million, \$2 million, \$2 million, \$2 million] by playing around with some timings—

by shifting a bit of money around and by making timing adjustments. The document then goes on to state:

As you know, there are a number of cost pressures that mean that this set of outcomes is unlikely to occur.

This is then what was said—this is the cost pressures that the Under Treasurer told the former Treasurer meant his budget could not be balanced:

The cost of Department of Education and Training enterprise bargaining is certain to exceed the contingency allowance currently in budget funding.

They made no allowance for the teachers' wage increase.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson and the member for Bright will not interject in such an inane way during the course of answers from ministers unless they expect to spend a little more time at home today.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. They made very little contingency or allowance for the teachers' wage increase. They were not going to pay the teachers. Then it was found that the Department of Education and Training is forecasting over-expenditure—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You should be quiet: I have some stuff for you. The document states:

The Department of Education and Training is forecasting over-expenditure by \$25 million in 2001-02 and there is a possibility that they have a structural problem and with their budget, given their recent record, this cannot be achieved. The Department of Human Services is expecting to overspend by \$7.5 million in 2001-02.

Members opposite knew about that. The document continues:

The current numbers assume that the Department of Human Services will claw back the \$21.5 million expenditure over the out years. However, there is a possibility that this will not eventuate.

Then they said that they have not allowed for the cost of the firefighters' enterprise bargaining agreement. Then the Under Treasurer said:

In our view it would be prudent to increase head room for these amounts. . . This would produce the following budget bottom line in the mid-year review.

However, they did not do it. They did not put these numbers into their mid-year budget review. They knew all along that they had a budget deficit. Do you know what the then Treasurer said in response to this? He gave a whole lot of excuses as to why he did not want to include all these figures in the mid-year budget review. He wanted to put in there all the reasons. One of the reasons put in there by Rob Lucas for the over-expenditure by the Department of Education was:

As you are aware, I have strong views agency overspending should not be rewarded by writing it off, so I do not believe we should provision for it.

He said that Malcolm Buckby had overspent by more than \$25 million. There would be no cheques to pay for teachers' salaries or items in schools, but Rob Lucas was not going to provision for it because he said he would not reward overspending.

Do you know what Rob Lucas did for the four years before that? In 1999-2000, education overspent by \$47 million; in 2000-01, it overspent by \$20 million; and in 2001-02, the amount will be \$37 million. The reality is that the former minister's department overspent every year. The department knew that it had to provision for it, but it did not do so. The reality is that, whatever excuses Rob Lucas puts forward, he cannot escape this fact: he was told to include cost pressures but he did not do so. He knew the budget was in deficit, but he would not tell the public. The whole financial and fiscal framework of the former Liberal government was built on

deceit in the end, and this government will take appropriate action to correct the budget imbalance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport.

WALKER AUSTRALIA

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Given the precedent that has been set for state government involvement, was the minister's and government's inaction during the recent industrial dispute at Walker Australia due to the AMWU's recent decision in Victoria to suspend its affiliation with the Victorian branch of the ALP? Early this year, the Victorian branch of the AMWU announced its intention to suspend its affiliation with the Victorian branch of the ALP.

As part of this decision, the AMWU's annual financial contribution of some \$250 000 to the Victorian ALP was also suspended. In South Australia, last year the AMWU contributed some \$73 000 to the state ALP. Was the government's inaction during the recent dispute at Walker Australia an attempt to avoid a similar disaffiliation in this state by that union and the loss of some \$73 000 to the state ALP?

The SPEAKER: The honourable minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I want to hear the answer, too.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the honourable member for his question. The answer is no.

McLAREN VALE AMBULANCE STATION

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the house whether the McLaren Vale ambulance station announced by the previous minister had funding for recurrent expenditure in the government's budget and, if it did not, how was it then proposed to fund the station?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I thank the member for Napier for his question. He has a keen interest in financial responsibility, and I am keen to answer this question because it does provide a snapshot, a clear illustration, of one of the problems that the Treasurer was just talking about. It is important that we understand what happened because we will come back to more of this in due course.

The former emergency services minister at some point asked the ambulance service whether there was a need for new services in the south. By some stroke of serendipity, the ambulance service responded by saying that it would be useful to build an ambulance station in McLaren Vale, which just happens to be in the former minister's electorate.

The Ambulance Service also said that while it was prepared to pay for building an ambulance station it would expect the former government (of which the former minister was a member) to pay for some substantial recurrent funding. I can advise the house that, despite the fact that no recurrent funding was provided for the ambulance station, the former minister went ahead and announced it. He decided that, without any recurrent funding, there would be an ambulance station in his electorate. He could not get the funding from the former treasurer, and one reason for that was that the former treasurer was already very unhappy with him because he had

wrecked the emergency services budget, a matter to which I will return in due course—and I promise that the former minister will not be laughing when we take the time to go through that in detail.

But let me say this: there was formerly—and this is a relevant point—a very entertaining television program called *Yes, Minister*, and one episode I recall referred to a hospital. The Minister for Administrative Services was surprised to find that he owned a hospital that had no nurses and no patients. That was because the hospital was built but there was no recurrent funding. What this former minister committed to was the '*Yes, Minister* ambulance station'. He was going to build an ambulance station in his electorate, he had no funding and he was going to try to bludgeon it out of the former treasurer who had refused it.

But that is not the end of what this former minister did. When he found that he had no recurrent funding he decided that he had better keep the Ambulance Service on-side, he had better give it something, so it was sent \$170 000 in sponsorship money connected with the rescue helicopter and the Adelaide Bank. That money should have gone to Treasury. It did not: it was sent to the Ambulance Service. If the former minister wants to shake his head I will produce the paper trail. Does the former minister want to shake his head? The former minister took the rescue helicopter's money and sent it to the Ambulance Service to pay for that facility in his electorate.

But what was he going to do when that money ran out? Perhaps there were other areas of sponsorship he could find; perhaps he could take some housing money or something else. We now know why this government managed to run over its budget consistently and have to be deceitful about it: because it did completely inexplicably reckless things. I can report to the house that since that time I have directed the Ambulance Service to return to Treasury the \$170 000 because it is appropriate, and I will be returning to other misadventures of this former minister in due course.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

WORKCOVER

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Industrial Relations give a commitment that the cost of WorkCover for businesses in South Australia will not increase? When the Liberal government came to office in 1993 it inherited a substantial debt with respect to unfunded WorkCover liabilities. The then government made significant inroads in reducing this deficit and, in the process, lowered WorkCover levies for businesses at a time when other states were increasing their levies. These reductions amounted to savings of some \$83 million per annum for the businesses in South Australia, which was on top of the \$20 million in WorkCover rebates paid to businesses in the year 2000.

By contrast, in Victoria the Bracks Labor Government has increased premiums by an average of at least 17 per cent, with some businesses reporting rate rises of over 40 per cent while others have had rate rises of over 100 per cent. The new average premium rates in Victoria are forecast to cost its business community some \$1.5 billion extra per year. Will the minister guarantee that WorkCover costs will not be increased to South Australian businesses?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I look forward to receiving the advice from WorkCover with respect to its financial position and, once I have received that advice, I will move from that point forward.

BEVERLEY URANIUM MINE

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport will come to order and listen to the question from the member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: My question is directed to the Treasurer. Yesterday in question time the member for Bright asked a question about the review of the Beverley uranium mine. Can the Treasurer provide any further details to the house? Yesterday, the member for Bright claimed in the house:

In response to earlier spills at the uranium mine, on 24 January this year the Liberal government announced a review and government staff were advised to report any future spill (no matter how small) immediately to the minister. The review was to report to the minister by 31 March this year. At the time of the recent change in government, the review was almost completed.

Was the member for Bright's statement correct or misleading?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the member for West Torrens for this very important question. I might say that, when I heard the former minister yesterday say that this inquiry had completed its work—and I understand his words were to the effect that it was—

An honourable member: No, 'almost'.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Almost completed. Again today the former minister repeated on a number of occasions that the work had almost been completed, that the report should have been done. It would really be a matter for the Leader of the Opposition as to whether he wants to take any action against any of his shadow ministers who may appear to be misleading the house. I will leave that as a test of leadership for the new leader. But I thought 'Well, I had best ask.' So, last night I asked the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and Minister for Mineral Resources Development whether he could provide some advice on this matter. Now, guess what? I received a minute that was sent to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries from Mr David Blight, the Executive Director, Office of Minerals and Energy Resources, re the 'status of previously announced inquiry into incident reporting procedures in the uranium mining industry' through Jim Hallion, Chief Executive. This is what it said.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: 'Almost.'

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I can't believe that even Wayne would have been this silly. The minute states:

The inquiry into incident reporting procedures previously announced by the Hon. Wayne Matthew, Minister for—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the Deputy Premier that, if he is quoting from a copy of a paper on a docket, then to do so is to be seen to be quoting from a paper from that docket and may require the tabling of that docket in this house.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Having been a member of this house when in fact such a docket has been quoted from, I ask that the entire docket now be tabled.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the minister is quoting from such a paper, he will have to table it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I am very happy to table this minute—very happy.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, the point of order I take is that I have been a member of this house long enough to know—and I have seen it occur and have to be done by a Labor government within this house—that the entire docket has to be tabled forthwith.

An honourable member: The document.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Not the document; the entire docket.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier whether or not the paper from which he quotes is a direct copy of an original on a docket?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I know that the former Deputy Premier is a highly skilled and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is a minute. It is not even a docket. It is not a docket: it is a minute sent to me, a minute faxed to me, and you can have it. I will give it to you at the end of question time. It is a minute written to me today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You can have it. The media can have it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Let me make it plain. If that forms part of the record on a docket, I order the Deputy Premier at the earliest possible moment to table it in this place today.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, if this is part of a docket, I am happy to give it to you. It was faxed to me as a minute. What else there is I will table, should it be part of a docket. But let me read it to you, sir. Now, listen to this. I am glad that the Deputy Leader has made such an issue of this. I am glad that he has drawn everyone's attention to it, because this is what it says:

The inquiry into incident reporting procedures previously announced by the Hon. Wayne Matthew, Minister for Minerals and Energy, was to be headed by an eminent person. The honourable minister had not appointed such a chair by the time that government changed hands and thus the inquiry never commenced.

It is signed 'David Blight'. You did not appoint a chairman. You did not start the inquiry. So, the member for Bright, before he comes in here throwing his weight around, trying to be clever should get his facts right—because, as we know, the member for Bright ain't so bright.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Government Enterprises and the member for Bright will come to order. I draw the Deputy Premier's attention to the fact that he must not reflect upon the more than 22 000 constituents of the member for Bright by making comments about either the name of the electorate or his belief about the status of that member's intellectual capacity.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: I thank the Deputy Premier for that. All honourable members need to recognise that reflections upon any one of them is a reflection upon the entire chamber and brings no credit to the chamber or the way it conducts business. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. In which year does the Department of Human Services have to make an extra salary payment or so-called 27th payment for the year? It is a fact that every six or so years an extra salary payment period is required. Official documents show that in 1999-2000, just two years ago, there was an extra pay period, the 27th pay, for the Department of Human Services. Counting the number of weeks this financial year and next shows that the extra pay period does not fall in either of those years. Will the minister confirm that?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): From my recollection, the year concerned is 2003-04, and the amount not accounted for was about \$13.5 million. The Department of Human Services acknowledged a 27th pay but has not accounted for it in its forward estimates.

SELF-DEFENCE LAWS

Mr RAU (Enfield): Has the Attorney-General seen or heard criticisms of the government's proposed new self-defence laws? Have the criticisms been well founded, and does the government intend to review its position in the light of that criticism? The shadow Attorney-General (Hon. Robert Lawson) and the Hon. Ian Gilfillan apparently were on the radio this morning criticising the government, and specifically the Attorney, for the proposed changes to the law relating to self-defence. They are apparently responding to the Governor's speech, which included a reference to the fact that the government intends to give back to South Australians the right to defend themselves in their own homes and backyards. It will legislate to return to South Australians the right to defend their homes, their families and their backyards with such force as they genuinely believe necessary at the time of a burglary or similar intrusion. This will be a self-defence law that seeks to protect the householder and not the criminal.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Enfield on his smashing victory at the recent state election. It was a superb victory, done with preferences directed against him by members opposite to Mr Ralph Clarke. I hope they can look themselves in the mirror of a morning, having made that decision. On the question of self-defence, the Government will be changing the self-defence law in South Australia. We promised to do this from 1997 onwards, so it was the second general election where Labor had gone to an election promising to change the law of self-defence. It is a matter of great regret that we had to change the law of self-defence because South Australia had a good self-defence law, which was inaugurated in the last term of the Bannon government.

It was inaugurated after a select committee of the parliament, which included the father of the current member for Kavel, had looked into the whole question of self-defence and had advocated a change to the law of self-defence, to give householders the right to use such magnitude of force as they genuinely believed was necessary to defend themselves against a burglar or other intruder. The recommendation of that select committee was unanimous. It was of some surprise to me that the Hon. Trevor Griffin decided in 1997 to water down the rights of South Australians to defend themselves against burglars or other intruders in their own home. As an opposition, it was a matter on which we campaigned strongly for a long time.

I have heard comments today on radio by the shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Robert Lawson, and also the comments of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan. I am surprised by their disapproval of the government's proposals to reform the law of self-defence. It appears that the malaise which infected the parliamentary Liberal Party on questions of criminal justice during the term of the Hon. Trevor Griffin as Attorney-General continues. I had hoped that, with the departure of the Hon. Trevor Griffin as Attorney-General, the Liberal Party would return to its traditional criminal justice policies but, alas, it seems that is not so.

The criticisms are not well-founded. On Leon Byner's program this morning the shadow attorney-general, on behalf of the opposition, had this to say:

This is part of really a PR exercise by the government to suggest to the community a toughening up and also to suggest that under the existing laws you cannot use such force as you genuinely believe to be necessary. . . in fact, you can so. . . I don't believe there will be any significant change because you can, at the moment, use such force as you genuinely believe to be necessary to defend your property. . .

The Hon. Robert Lawson is not correct, just as he was not correct when he told the *Advertiser* that the Liberal government would have made the same decision about the parole applications. We have been in government long enough to know that that was a false remark.

On the question of the substance of the self-defence law, I refer to a case before the Supreme Court a few years back where the differences in the two approaches can be made manifest. I refer to the case of Joseph Nashar of Clearview. The facts are these: at 50 minutes past midnight on a night in 1997, Joseph Nashar, his wife and his four children were watching a hired video called, appropriately, *Fear* at their Clearview home. At that moment, 21-year-old Trevor Carbine, a man with a long criminal history stretching back to his childhood, led a group of between 12 and 20 youths on to the Nashar property with a view to looting it. The youths shouted in reference to a previous confrontation with Joseph Nashar: 'You are dead, you bastard.'

Mr Nashar said he fired warning shots at the group. Trevor Carbine then jumped on to the roof of one of Mr Nashar's sheds, looking for the items that were the purpose of the gang's visit. Trevor Carbine was struck in the head and killed. Mr Nashar was charged with murder. Afterwards he was charged with other offences and convicted of them.

We may ask ourselves why Mr Nashar was charged with murder. He was charged with murder because of the changes to the self-defence law made by the parliamentary Liberal Party when it was in government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, the parliament did change the law with a heroic resistance to the change by the parliamentary Labor Party then in opposition. Not all members opposite are guilty of this change. The member for Morphett, for instance, is innocent; the member for MacKillop is innocent (I am sure he would not have voted for the change) and the members for Heysen, Kavel and Bragg are all innocent, but the rest of the opposition are guilty of bringing in this change which necessitated a charge of murder being brought against Mr Nashar when it was clearly undesirable on policy grounds: for defending his home and his family.

When Mr Rofe, the Director of Public Prosecutions, opened the case against Mr Nashar, he said to the jury that they would use their commonsense, community values and

knowledge of human nature in deciding whether Mr Nashar's actions were reasonable. In the view of the government, the magnitude of force used in defending one's home against a burglar or other intruder in the middle of the night does not have to be reasonable. What is required is a genuine belief that the magnitude of force is necessary in the circumstances. That is the formulation to which we will return, and we hope that we will have the support of the opposition in doing so.

One of the reasons that Mr Nashar and others have been brought to trial was because of the objective element regulating the use of force in self-defence. That is the issue that is going to be before the parliament. Mr Nashar was exercising his right to self-defence as found by a jury, and he was unnecessarily put through the agony and expense of a murder trial by the parliamentary Liberal Party. Our proposal will extend the rights of people to defend themselves from attackers to the extent that they genuinely think it necessary. We are still working out the details of our proposal.

The Hon. Mr Gilfillan's comments are a little hard to understand. Mr Gilfillan takes the point of view that (a) the legislation will be a licence to kill and maim, or (b) that it will just be window-dressing. It seems that Mr Gilfillan is having a bob each way.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: That's unlike the Democrats.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Quite unlike the Democrats, as the member for Davenport rightly interjects. So, the government's proposal to extend the right to defend oneself in one's home is not a PR stunt. We will make substantive changes to the law and we hope to have the support of the opposition.

HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I address a further question to the Minister for Health. What action did the minister take to publicly correct the facts following the grossly misleading front page story in the *Advertiser* last Thursday, 2 May, where it was claimed that the incoming health budget would have to pay for the \$13 million blunder by the Health Commission in not providing for 27 pays in the current financial year?

Last Thursday, the *Advertiser* reported a story on the front page talking of a \$13 million blunder this year due to the need for an extra pay. The Minister for Health, in answer to my earlier question, acknowledged that there was no extra pay this year, nor next year. There was the opportunity yesterday for the health minister or for the Treasurer to stand in this parliament and correct the inaccurate story attributed to the Treasurer. Neither did so, even though they knew it was grossly wrong.

The SPEAKER: Who said that?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I did. The facts show, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—in answer to the previous question—

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will not continue to talk me down. I am telling the deputy leader that he cannot make comment of that kind in the course of making an explanation. If he does not have any facts against which the question's clarity can be improved by further explanation, then I suggest that he not transgress standing orders.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yesterday, in answer to a question from me, the Minister for Health revealed also that she had given an inaccurate answer to a question concerning

the proposed merger of the Flinders Medical Centre and the Repatriation Hospital.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. Immediately upon being corrected by you for offering an opinion, the deputy leader offers a further opinion that it was an inaccurate answer. That has not been determined by anyone except him.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I think that is wide of the mark of the question. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): Actually, sir, if you do not mind—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Haven't you finished yet? How much longer do you need, Dean?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, in the Governor's speech yesterday, the government promised honesty from the ministers. The Minister for Health has failed twice in one week and the Treasurer has failed by omission in correcting a story in the *Advertiser*—

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—which he knew was wrong.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on another point of order. My point of order is obvious. I have respect for the venerability of the member in this place, but he simply cannot continue to ignore your rulings, sir.

The SPEAKER: I understand the remark on the appropriate standing orders, and the matter is behind us now. I understand that the Treasurer has an answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I am happy to answer this, because the article that appeared in the *Advertiser*—

The Hon. Dean Brown: The story is wrong and you know it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, why didn't you ask me the question? Because the story was from me!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: But you had to ask the Minister for Health. If there was an error in the year that was in the paper, I take responsibility for that, but I will say this: what is not in error is that your department when you were minister made the blunder of all blunders: you forgot to calculate the 27th pay period across the four-year budget estimate period, which is costing the budget near enough to \$14 million. Whether the error is in this budget year or next budget year, it is in the four-year budget estimate, and I can say this—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If there is an error in that date, I accept responsibility, but ask me the question. What I do know is that, when we came into office—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not know what is deliberate but, if the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that the former minister knew of this and he deliberately withheld this, that is a matter for the former minister for health. I will say this: if an error has occurred about a year, that is of little consequence. What is not of little consequence is that, when we became government, the Minister for Health was advised, and I was advised as Treasurer, that we had a nearly \$14 million budget blow-out because Dean Brown's former department made the blunder of all blunders in the current budget cycle. That is going to make it all the more difficult to

balance the budget. If that is the best you can do, Dean, ask me the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order. The member for Wright has the call.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

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

HOSPITALS, INFECTION

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Following the recent closure of the cardiothoracic unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital due to methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus, what action has the government taken to ensure that South Australian hospitals have the best possible standards of safety and quality in our public hospitals?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for her question as this government is committed to improving the quality and safety of care and standards in our public hospitals. The recent closure of the cardiothoracic unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order. Previous Speakers have ruled that the cameras are only to be on the member speaking, not on other members of the house.

The SPEAKER: I have difficulty seeing where the cameras are; it is too noisy. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The recent closure of the cardiothoracic unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital followed closures at the Women's and Children's Hospital's neo-natal intensive care unit and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's intensive care unit late last year, and was ordered after seven patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital acquired serious post-operative MRSA infections.

As a result of these events I have ordered an urgent review to be undertaken into infection control in our major hospitals. This will be conducted by Dr Peter Brennan, who has wide experience in health services management across Australia and New Zealand. Dr Brennan will be assisted by Dr Clifford Hughes, a cardiothoracic surgeon from the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Chair of the Therapeutic Devices Evaluation Committee of Australia and a member of the National Safety and Quality Council, and Dr Dennis Spellman head of microbiology at the Alfred Hospital, the Deputy Director of Infectious Disease, Melbourne, and an expert in hospital acquired infections. The report will be made public.

A recent Productivity Commission report found that South Australia had a higher rate of hospital acquired infections than other states. Between 5 and 10 per cent of patients admitted to hospital acquired an infection during their admission, more often in larger hospitals performing complex procedures. Immediate action is required to minimise the extent of this problem and this should have been initiated by the previous government after the incidents at the Queen Elizabeth and the Women's and Children's hospitals. This is another example where the former minister was either asleep at the wheel or concentrating on Liberal Party political agendas rather than on the health needs of South Australia.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: You should have done it, but we are doing it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

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

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Can I suggest to the member for Mawson that he will get the call in due course and he can ask his question then. In the meantime I would appreciate it if the house would come to order so that I can call the member for Waite.

TOURISM PROGRAMS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Can the Minister for Tourism confirm which programs she has already decided to cut from the tourism portfolio?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): Members opposite must realise that we are in the process of deliberating on our budget, and those items are under discussion. It all depends, of course, on how big the black hole is and what has to be cut.

SCHOOLS, LOCAL MANAGEMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services please tell the house about initiatives taken by the new government to ensure that local school management is improved and implemented in a fair and equitable manner?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Not only has the honourable member a great interest in the schools and preschools and other educational institutions in her electorate, but as a member of the government's caucus subcommittee on education she will be playing a vital role in the work of the government in addressing our educational goals into the future.

This government is committed to improving outcomes for students in schools and preschools, but in a very inclusive way, a fair manner and, most importantly, with a very clear focus on delivering what is in the best interests of students. We do believe in parent participation in schooling. That is crucial to achieving better outcomes for students and we do see value in giving school communities a real say in their educational affairs.

However, we share the concerns of many teachers, school communities, students and professional organisations about the problems and inequities that have accompanied the former government's Partnerships 21 scheme. There has been an environment of all sorts of inducements offered to schools to sign onto the former government's scheme and it has led to quite some divisiveness among a number of school communities that this government intends to address.

One of the first actions that I took as Minister for Education was to redress some of the imbalance in discrimination in funding to schools that had, for whatever reason, decided not to join onto the former government's Partnerships 21 scheme. In relation to schools that had been denied access to a range of grant moneys, I took the immediate decision to overturn those policy commitments of the former Liberal government, and all schools now have access to grant schemes, such as the environmental projects scheme to which non-Partnerships 21 schools were denied access under the former Liberal government.

I also took immediate action to release some money to provide for grants to non-P21 schools for student top-up grants. These are the grants whereby the former Liberal

government was only giving to Partnerships 21 schools the difference between the School Card amount of funding and the maximum that they could achieve. That has been overturned and those grants have been awarded to all schools. That was not budgeted by the former government and those schools were to be denied. I have also released \$1.6 million so that schools that were to be denied access to maintenance moneys this year have had those awarded. There were no moneys budgeted for the 2002 school year for non-P21 schools to obtain funds under that scheme. I have reinstated those moneys and that has been allocated to schools on the same basis as with Partnerships 21 schools.

Around 90 per cent of schools have signed up to Partnerships 21, and three years down the track since the scheme was first put into place it is time that we had a fresh look at the scheme. This new government has implemented an independent review headed by retired Professor Ian Cox to look at the Partnerships 21 local management scheme with some fairly simple and straightforward terms of reference—essentially to look at what is working or working well and what should be enhanced; what is not working well or needs to be scrapped and to take measures to implement change there; importantly, also, to look at the relationship between schools and the agency, the Department of Education, to see whether that relationship is appropriate; whether the department is supporting schools in the way it should; and to recommend changes.

Another fairly essential term of reference is to examine the way in which participation in decision making is taking place on the ground in schools. That committee will be reporting around mid-August with recommendations well in time for implementation in the new school year. We owe it to the young people of South Australia to get this matter right as we move forward.

In the past, it has been a fairly divisive process. The environment has been created for a fairer way forward in terms of addressing blatantly discriminatory inequities in funding which were put in place by the former Liberal government. I expect at the end of this process to see a better system of local school management moving into the future for the benefit of all school students. This government will be an inclusive government; the start that we have made in reviewing Partnerships 21 is evidence of that.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I move:

That question time be extended by 10 minutes.

Motion carried.

TEACHERS, CONTRACT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Does the Minister for Education and Children's Services stand by the ALP pre-election commitment to reduce the number of contract teachers by half?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for her question and I take this opportunity to welcome her to her portfolio. Having performed the role of shadow minister, I would say that it is a very rewarding portfolio. We have some really great educationalists in this town and some very motivated people who are doing much to promote the interests of students in this state. I have enjoyed my time as shadow minister, so I welcome the honourable member and I hope that her time in the position is equally enjoyable.

The Premier and I have stated that we will meet our election commitments. We have already taken action on a number of fronts. We have set up working parties to implement some of our election commitments, and I look forward to being able to provide more information in the budget. I assure the honourable member that there should be no doubt that all of our election commitments will be honoured.

BARTON ROAD

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Minister for Local Government advise the house of the process by which Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, will be reopened to traffic and how this government will justify the consequent encroachment upon the parklands? The Premier has publicly committed to openness and accountability in his government. That should ensure that there is a full and open consultation process before any decision is made on the future of Barton Road. I was therefore concerned to read in today's *City Messenger* that the Minister for Local Government and the Attorney-General—and this was confirmed by a member of the Attorney-General's staff—have been involved in private consultations regarding the future of Barton Road. As the Attorney-General has been a long time vocal critic in favour of the reopening of Barton Road and as he also promised that one of the very first actions of a Labor government would be to reopen Barton Road I ask what the process will be.

The SPEAKER: Before the minister answers, I point out to the member for Unley that, as he well knows, explanations are not really intended to be second reading speeches.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Local Government): I thank the honourable member for his question about Barton Road as to what sort of process will be directed to this important policy objective of the Labor Party. The first thing to say is that it will be an intelligent process. That means that it will be one—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, it may differ from some of the processes adopted by the previous regime because it will be a consultative one and it will involve my speaking to my cabinet colleagues, something which we on this side of the house still do. It will involve discussions with the Attorney and it will no doubt involve discussions with the Minister for Transport. We will consult with all the relevant stakeholders and implement Labor Party policy.

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): Will the Premier accede to the request from the ATSIC Commissioner for South Australia, Mr Brian Butler, to intervene in the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation's decision to stop funding to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council, the statutorily appointed traditional owners and managers of the AP lands? On 29 April, a letter was written by the AP Council to ATSIC stating its concerns. The letter states:

The purpose of this letter is to express the serious concern of AP about the actions of the state Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Terry Roberts, in instructing DOSAA to withhold a significant release of funding to AP. . . We now understand that the minister intends to withhold part of the funding to which AP is entitled and to arbitrarily provide it directly to the Pitjantjatjara Council. Such an action is not only. . . inappropriate, for several reasons, but it will also create significant difficulties for AP. . . AP will be seriously disadvantaged by any reduction of its funding. It has engaged its own legal and anthropological staff and has incurred significant costs through having to respond to the desperate and destructive campaign waged

against it in recent months by a small group at the Pitjantjatjara Council.

The letter concludes—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I am quoting the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council. The letter concludes:

The minister has completely failed to consult with AP about its intentions—in particular, with regard to these funding issues.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Under standing orders and according to tradition in this place, explanations should be brief. We are allowing 10 questions to the opposition, something which was never afforded to us, but we should not do so if the opposition is going to make a second reading speech every time it asks a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I am listening very closely to what the member is saying. I am alert to what the Minister for Government Enterprises is alluding to. The member for Newland.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The letter continues:

We find it extraordinary that he has apparently written to the Pitjantjatjara Council assuring them that he will provide them with funding, while the statutory body, AP, has received no written advice from him whatsoever.

On receipt of that letter—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: This is ATSIC. On receipt of that letter, I took up the issue and wrote to the Premier. I now refer to the letter from ATSIC signed by the Commissioner, Mr Brian Butler, to the Premier of this state, as follows:

I write to request your urgent intervention in the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation's apparent decision to stop funding to Anangu Pitjantjatjara. ATSIC officials have today received information that there has been a last minute cancellation of an order to release funds for the amount of \$365 000. . . . Further, I have been informed in a telephone call from an adviser to minister Roberts that the minister intends to transfer funds from DOSAA to the Pitjantjatjara Council for the duration of the review he has announced into funding and governance matters on the lands.

He concludes by saying:

As it currently stands, ATSIC provides in excess of three quarters of a million dollars in funds dedicated to assisting your government's state land rights legislation. I request that you intervene to restore these funds without delay.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted to be asked this question and to answer it. Let me give a little bit of background for members who might be entirely ignorant of matters to do with land rights, as I imagine many are.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Better get it right. Okay. I will explain it to you, because as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs I sat in cabinet and did not go off for a wander around as a junior minister. Let me just explain this to members opposite: in 1981 the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill was passed under David Tonkin's premiership, and I think that is something that we want to honour him for today.

As members would be well aware, later, I think in 1984, the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Bill was passed by the Bannon government with Greg Crafter, as I remember, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs at the time. What happened, of course, is that, in terms of the Pitjantjatjara land rights situation, there were two groups: the Pitjantjatjara Council, which covers, of course, the fact that the Pitjantjatjara people do not just reside in South Australia, but also (as I would

hope that the former minister would know) reside in Western Australia and the Northern Territory.

This was the governance body going across the Pitjantjatjara lands. But, of course, we do not have purview or, indeed, governance in terms of South Australian legislation. So the land rights bill passed in this state—one of the most significant land rights bills in Australian history—was designated in the AP (Anangu Pitjantjatjara). What happened, of course, is that in recent times there has been a major dispute between these two bodies—everyone knows that. A blue has been going on for a long time, and obviously the previous minister was unable to help resolve that dispute. I understand that it is a difficult one, but the point of the matter is this: a parliamentary Aboriginal lands committee, of which I was a member, was established. In fact, that committee covered and provided for members from both sides. At one stage I think that the member for Stuart was a very active and enthusiastic member. That land rights committee of this parliament, I believe, played a crucial and bipartisan role in ensuring that South Australia led the nation on land rights issues.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay. That parliamentary committee covered both the Pitjantjatjara lands and our land rights act to ensure that the act was being enforced. It also dealt with a range of others matters, including education and health, as well as the Maralinga issue. We would visit Umuwa, Ernabella, Amata, Oak Valley, Maralinga and Ooldea. I think the member for Stuart was also involved in this because he was an enthusiastic supporter. However, this parliament resolves to extend it—because of the tremendous success of that bipartisan committee in educating the parliament and the government on the issues that needed to be focused on in the Aboriginal lands—to the Aboriginal Lands Trust lands.

Every member of this parliament recognised the importance of that committee in helping to resolve blues between different groups, but the former minister decided that it would not sit. The former minister was so inadequate in her own confidence that, apparently, she would not allow this committee to do its job to help resolve the kinds of disputes that are now afflicting the delivery of services in the Pitjantjatjara lands and this blue between the Pitjantjatjara Council and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara.

Let me just say this to members: this matter needs to be resolved. It will not be resolved by doing what the former minister did, which was to sit on her hands and not allow that land rights committee to do the job it was intended to do. I therefore have great confidence in our minister and what he is doing in taking some decisive action to knock a few heads together to get this matter resolved.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. What staff appointments have been made to work on the proposed Constitutional Convention and what budget has been allocated? Yesterday, in answer to a question from me on the Constitutional Convention, you stated:

Work is proceeding as quickly as possible.

My party is committed to full participation in the convention, as are many in the community, and that is why I seek the information about the level of staffing and resources which

have already gone into this work, which you say is proceeding.

The SPEAKER: The answers to the questions are none and none.

BEVERLEY URANIUM MINE

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that his explanation must be factual and must simply explain where he has been misrepresented. The member for Bright.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Earlier today in question time the member for Peake asked a question in relation to the review of reporting procedures for spills—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: —the member for West Torrens—at uranium mines. I am offended by the response of the Deputy Premier.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member may simply stick to the facts and state where he has been misrepresented.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The facts are these: on 4 January 2002, as Minister for Minerals and Energy, I announced a review into reporting procedures for spills at uranium mines. At the same time, I publicly released the terms of reference for the review. The review was to be headed by an eminent person to be later appointed. This was clearly pointed out in the press statement. I determined that this would occur after the caretaker period as it would not prevent the majority of the work from being completed, that being the collection of information. The departmental collection of information within the Environment Protection Authority, the Office of Minerals and Energy Resources and the Health Commission Radiation Protection Branch commenced immediately.

It was anticipated that up to two weeks' work would be required by the eminent person after the collection of this information. Following the change of government the information collected has been sitting, waiting for the appointment of the eminent person—

The SPEAKER: Order! The former minister and member for Bright is now straying into the area of debate.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I point out that in his response to the house the Deputy Premier stated that as the eminent person had not been appointed the review could not be completed. This is incorrect because following the change of government the information collected has been waiting for the appointment of the eminent person, the finalisation of the report and its presentation to the minister. This information was conveyed by me to a number of media outlets over the past two days. I therefore stand by my claims. The review was almost completed at the change of government.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: It had not started.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Yes, it has. It is all done.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

RUSSELL, SERGEANT A.R.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to express my sorrow at the death on 16 February 2002 of South Australian Sergeant Andrew Robert Russell who was killed on active duty fighting the war on terrorism and to convey on behalf of the parliament of South Australia and all South Australians sincere sympathy and condolence to his family (nine of whom are present in the chamber today) at their tragic loss.

Sergeant Russell was killed in action while serving with the Special Air Service regiment deep behind enemy lines in a remote and barren part of distant Afghanistan. The 33 year old soldier was the first Australian military death in action since the Vietnam War, more than 30 years ago. Sergeant Russell suffered fatal injuries when his long-range patrol vehicle in which he was travelling struck a suspected anti-vehicle mine. He was one of five Australian personnel travelling in the vehicle but he was the only person injured in the explosion.

Combat search and rescue helicopters were launched from Kandahar 13 minutes after the task group headquarters was notified of the incident at 11.58 p.m. Australian time. Despite the efforts of the three member military rescue team which parachuted into the scene to stabilise him in preparation for evacuation by helicopter, he was pronounced dead after arriving at a United States medical facility in Kandahar. His death came a month after another mine incident in the region injured another Australian soldier. Chief of Army, Lieutenant-General Peter Cosgrove, who announced the loss of Sergeant Russell on Sunday 17 February, said the incident was a tragic loss of life. He said:

It's a very sad day. Our hearts go out to his loved ones. We all mourn the death of a good and brave soldier.

Andrew grew up in Adelaide at Ingle Farm. He attended Ingle Farm Central School and Nailsworth High School. His military service commenced in 1986, when he joined the general reserve here in Adelaide and was posted to the 3/9th South Australian Mounted Rifles. He subsequently served in the Australian regular army with 1 Field Squadron engineers and was posted to the SAS in 1991 to A Troop 1 SAS Squadron. He was later promoted to sergeant. Sergeant Russell's overseas operation experience included United Nations service in Iraq in 1997-98, Operation Desert Thunder in Kuwait in 1998, service with Interfet in East Timor in 2000, UNTAET in East Timor in 2000 and Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. He was already a veteran.

Andrew's wife, Kylie, who resides in Perth, gave birth to a daughter, Leisa, while her husband was away on active duty. Andrew never saw his daughter. His wife in a message has described Andrew as a wonderful, private and unassuming person. He was a loving husband and was so much looking forward to being a father: he had a great if wicked sense of humour and total loyalty to his immediate and extended family, his friends, his work mates and his country. His wife went on to express her heartfelt appreciation of all her family and friends for the support and assistance provided by his comrades during his horrific injuries.

Andrew's family can be assured that the people of South Australia take great pride in the efforts of the men and women of the Australian Defence Force who risk their lives in the war on terror. September 11, a day of infamy, challenged all the civilised peoples of the world. Brave men such

as Andrew have risen to the call. The light of democracy and freedom will prevail over the darkness of terror and ignorance. Andrew paid the ultimate sacrifice in laying down his life for his country. To his family here today—to Bob and Jan, his parents; to his brother Ian and Julia; to grandparents Bob, Joan and Mavis; to brother-in-law Tony and Bev; and to Kerry Lampard from the SAS Association, we thank you. We honour your son and we will remember him.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

MORPHETT VALE WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): On behalf of members on this side of the house, I would like to extend my sympathies to Sergeant Russell's family and express our thanks for the work he has done on behalf of the people of this state.

I now turn to matters closer to home—very close to my home: the Morphett Vale West Primary School. Morphett Vale West was built 29 years ago. Unfortunately, since it was built there has been no refurbishment of this school. As a result, 29 years later, it is still afflicted with dust-collecting hessian ceilings covering fibreglass insulation, which is now deteriorating. Fortunately, some work was carried out at the beginning of this year to remove those hessian ceilings from one of the major classrooms. I visited that classroom in February before school resumed, and teachers were appalled at the thought of both themselves and the children coming back to work in this classroom.

They were appalled because when the wind blows the dust comes down from the ceiling and covers the desks. The carpets are filthy and mouldy. They do not like to ask the children to sit on the carpets, because they are in such a disgusting state. The teachers had had the room opened for two days when I visited, in an attempt to air it, and yet within three minutes of my being there my nose was tight, my throat was tight and my chest was tight. People will not be surprised to know that many staff and students in this area have respiratory problems and have to carry inhalers.

The previous government promised for years that this problem would be fixed. It was making its way to the top of the priority list before P21, then the school was told that P21 would fix it. Lo and behold, when they tried to get this disgusting classroom fixed, they were told, 'There are no funds. You need to come up with the money.' Morphett Vale West is a poor school. About 40 per cent of its students are on School Card. It is also a small school. As a small school, with just over 200 students, it provides a really important role in our community. It provides a way of developing a sense of ownership and belonging among the children, the families and the neighbours of that school. However, it does not have the resources to just go around and find the money to fix up ceilings that should have been fixed up years ago. At the beginning of this year, funds were found to fix the classroom, but the hessian ceilings remain in the resource room and in the activity room. So, children are asked to go and exercise in an area where one cannot really breathe comfortably.

In response to complaints about the classroom that recently has been fixed, the previous administration simply told them to leave the doors open. They did that, and on a hot day the smell of stuffiness was overcome by the reek of urine from the boys' toilets next door. This is simply not a good enough standard for schools in this day and age, and this is a really good indicator of why this government in its election campaign pledged extra maintenance for schools. My concern is that we will discover so many schools with problems such

as this in the outer metropolitan area that there will be difficulty meeting all the maintenance requirements.

Fixing up the hessian ceilings and the carpets is just one part of what needs to be done at Morphett Vale West. The school reception area is totally non-functional. It does not allow privacy for parents or for anyone else visiting the school. It does not allow effective supervision for children who have been referred to the principal's office, and it does not really allow much privacy for meetings between the principal and students or other staff and students. The staff withdrawing area is minimally functional and, again, has the hessian ceilings and the mouldy carpet. This is why we urgently need extra maintenance carried out for schools.

Time expired.

MINISTERS, HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Today I want to take up the issue of accountability and honesty by ministers in this parliament and outside this parliament, because the honesty of ministers outside this parliament, even though they have been in government for just over seven or eight weeks now, has already been called into very serious question indeed. In a speech yesterday, the Governor said (and this is obviously put down for her by the Premier):

The government hopes that, by setting high standards and meeting them, it will contribute to a renewed public confidence in government.

Then, in a ministerial statement in this parliament, following comments he made during the recent election campaign, the Premier said that it was a pledge to introduce the toughest and most comprehensive honesty and accountability measures.

Let us look at how a couple of the ministers have shaped up against that in the first eight weeks. First, I refer to the Minister for Health, on the issue of the merger or proposed merger of the Repatriation Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. At about midday last Thursday, when asked questions about this issue, the Minister for Health said to the media—and they have this on tape:

I have spoken to the chairs of the two appropriate hospitals and I can indicate 'any suggestion that the hospitals will merge is completely false'.

I repeat:

Any suggestion that the hospitals will merge is completely false.

About an hour after that I happened to release part of a board paper for the Repatriation Hospital, and I quote that paper as follows:

... the amalgamation of the RGH and the Flinders Medical Centre and recommends that the RGH board of directors supports in principle the proposal to amalgamate the RGH and the Flinders Medical Centre as set out in the preliminary business case.

Clearly the minister got caught out. She had spoken to the chairs of the two hospitals and then came out and claimed that there was absolutely no substance in it and that any suggestion that the hospitals would merge was completely false. She got caught out red-handed as being dishonest to the media in her answers last Thursday. How does that match up against what the Premier put down yesterday as maintaining the highest and toughest standards of honesty within government?

The second issue was on the same day. A headline in the *Advertiser* last Thursday said 'Oops, there goes \$13 million more.' The article stated:

A \$13 million pay blunder in the provision of health services will force extra cuts in the coming state budget.

I repeat 'the coming state budget'. The report continues:

The Health Commission mistake, in a department already under great budgetary stress, has been found by a team of Treasury officials examining Government expenditure. The Treasurer, Kevin Foley, said yesterday it had been found that the commission had calculated its budget based on 26 fortnightly payments for the current financial year when there are 27.

The Minister for Health today acknowledged that there will be only 26 pays this year. There will be only 26 pays next year, so how in the world could any minister who has any integrity or honesty at all come out and make a claim that, oops, there has been a \$13 million mistake this year and the health budget will have to suffer next financial year as a result of that because there should have been 27 pays this current financial year?

The facts are that, even if the *Advertiser* got it wrong, the Treasurer and Minister for Health knew that it was wrong, and they knew that they had a chance in parliament yesterday to stand up and correct that front page story. This is not something buried at the back of the paper but was on the front page of the *Advertiser*. They knew it was a wrong story from the *Advertiser*—perhaps a misunderstanding or was it deliberate?—and therefore they had a chance to correct it and did not.

The third point I highlight is the fact that the Treasurer was given a confidential briefing from the Under Treasurer on 16 January of this year and he failed to reveal that—

Time expired.

DUNCAN, Dr G.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): On Friday this week a significant ceremony will take place by the River Torrens. A plaque will be unveiled, located at the top of the upper left pillar of the stair balustrade directly adjacent to the end of the university footbridge near Victoria Drive. The bronze triangular plaque will bear the following inscription:

In memory of Dr George Duncan, whose death by drowning on 10th May, 1972 near here, at the hands of persons unconvicted, precipitated homosexual law reform in South Australia, making it the first state in Australia in 1973 to decriminalise homosexual relations between consenting adults. We will remember him.

I commend the Adelaide City Council for its role in the approval of this memorial. The George Duncan Memorial Committee formed and met regularly to ensure that Dr Duncan's memory would be perpetuated. This year, 30 years on, the circumstances of his life and death have special significance as the gay and lesbian community continue their struggle against discrimination. Unfortunately, in excess of 50 pieces of legislation still exist to that end.

How did this tragedy transpire and who was Dr George Duncan? He was born in the United Kingdom in 1930 and migrated with his parents and family to Victoria in 1937. An outstanding student, he withdrew from the University of Melbourne because of ill health. Subsequently he returned to the United Kingdom and in 1957 graduated with a doctorate in law from the University of Cambridge. Little is known of his life in the UK, where he taught at the University of Bristol.

In 1971 Dr Duncan was recruited to teach law at the University of Adelaide. Arriving at the beginning of 1972, he took up residence at Lincoln College, although his high Anglican faith meant that he was a frequent visitor to St Peter's Cathedral.

A shy and retiring specialist in medieval and Tudor English law, he had little time to settle into his duties at the School of Law at the University of Adelaide, for little more than five months after his arrival, on 10 May, he was thrown into the River Torrens between the university footbridge and the King William Road bridge and drowned. It is believed that the recovered body was returned to the river and hauled out again to oblige late arriving television news crews.

Sadly, there were no relatives to attend to Mr Duncan's affairs. Equally sadly it was in death that George Duncan achieved lasting significance. He has become Australia's most well-known victim of homophobia: he became known because of the scandal of his death and unsolved murder and because his drowning became a catalyst for homosexual law reform.

Rumours spread at the time that some members of the police habitually harassed homosexuals and had killed Dr Duncan. Vice Squad officers had certainly been in the area at the time of his death and, when it was revealed that witnesses would not come forward because they feared for their lives, the then Premier, Don Dunstan, promised government protection. At a subsequent inquest three constables refused to answer questions and were suspended from the Police Force and soon resigned. Two were subsequently brought to trial but were acquitted.

A police task force finally reported to parliament in 1990 that there was insufficient evidence to charge any other person. Repeated calls for a royal commission have been ignored, and the mystery of who drowned George Duncan remains.

The murder received extensive national media coverage and was revolutionary in changing Australian society's attitude towards homosexuality. In 1972, a private member's bill was introduced into the South Australian Legislative Council to decriminalise homosexual acts between consenting males over 21 years of age. The bill succeeded, but amendments rendered it almost worthless.

A bill then introduced by the Attorney-General at the time, Mr Peter Duncan, became law soon after the Labor Party was returned to government in 1975, so South Australia became the first state or territory to achieve full decriminalisation through the code of sexual conduct applicable to all citizens.

Annual commemorations have been held for Dr Duncan's death. Members of the Adelaide University faculty of law, the student body and gay and lesbian people from around Australia have gathered to commemorate his life. Adelaide Uni Pride hold a ritual each year on 10 May which usually includes a riverside ritual where flowers are cast into the water. On the 25th anniversary of George Duncan's death the Gay and Lesbian Counselling Service raised money to take out a full column advertisement in the local paper. On this occasion and others a 'walk in memory' has taken place by the river.

As part of the 30th anniversary commemorations, the plaque will be unveiled on Friday. Also, a play based on the drowning is to have his premier draft reading here in Old Parliament House. Gay community historian Dr Gertrude Glossip, also known as Will Sargeant, a performance artist, will be taking part in the reading. Dr Glossip has said that George Duncan's death galvanised the gay and lesbian movement and that the memorial plaque was important for them as so often their history is hidden or misrepresented. Sadly, society still needs to be reminded about homophobia.

Time expired.

MEDIA

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I am pleased to participate for the first occasion in this 50th parliament. Having been elected to the 39th parliament, I am pleased to be here, and on this occasion I would like to address one or two comments to the media. It is time that certain sections of the media of this state went beyond their own personal agenda and started to perform the very important role the media should play in the state without fear or favour or without promoting their own personal agendas.

The reporting of events in the house yesterday was nothing short of a disgrace. We have seen claims that the opposition ran out of questions in question time. As all members on this side of the house know, that is inaccurate, untrue and has no basis in fact. One single phone call to any member on this side of the house could have verified that that was not correct, but of course the media would not let the facts ruin a good story. In the chamber yesterday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition allegedly asked the Minister for Health a question which, according to a highly regarded media source, was consequently answered by the Treasurer. Of course, that is not correct. All members know that did not happen. The media reported today that it did; yet they do not feel accountable or responsible for this blatant mistake. They should stop this inaccurate reporting and report correctly and accurately, and they should do so in a positive manner that will inform the public of South Australia correctly.

The simple fact is that the only question that was redirected from the minister to the Treasurer came from the member for Waite, not the deputy leader, and was directed to the Minister for Tourism, not the Minister for Health. We can understand why they want to run the story—we know the ministers cannot answer the questions, but that is not our fault, and we are looking forward to asking lots of questions of these people.

In a democracy, there are a number of important players. The community cannot be properly informed if the media does not accurately, fairly and impartially report the facts. We know that the Editor of the *Advertiser*, that esteemed, august and well-intentioned character who sets himself up as judge and jury of what should take place in South Australia, has a biased and twisted point of view. We know that, he cannot help it, but at least the rest of the journalists should carry out their duties in a fair and reasonable manner. I know how he distorts things because the member who represents the Barossa Valley and myself were the victims of his inaccurate reporting. Notwithstanding that, we still got re-elected, but we will talk about members' travel on another occasion and I will make sure that everyone's travel is put on the public record so there can be no misunderstanding.

I believe that, if members do not travel, they are not properly doing their job as members of parliament, because they should be well informed, and the only person who does not believe that is the ill-informed Editor of the *Advertiser* and his little group. It might not suit Rupert Murdoch but I would like the Editor of the *Advertiser* to table in this house his travel arrangements and those of his journalists, and, in particular, the travel arrangements of Lachlan Murdoch. I would like to table in this chamber the travel expenses of Lachlan Murdoch. That would be an interesting thing.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He is a businessman; you were a tourist going to the cricket. You were just wasting taxpayers' money. That was the difference.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We will talk about the Attorney-General's friends in the SDA and wasting money in the near future. We understand that he has been done over by the left; he is not getting on too well. In the very near future we will talk about wasting people's money, some \$200 000-odd, and about the little shop assistants being conscripted to pay for the campaign of the SDA. We will certainly talk about wasting money. It will be an interesting challenge and I look forward to the honourable member responding, because there are a lot of questions to be asked. We will also talk about members' superannuation, because we know that he went to the Parliamentary Library and sought out and got inaccurate information, and we will deal with the Parliamentary Librarian, too, that ill-informed character. I am looking forward to the next few weeks in this chamber.

Time expired.

MITSUBISHI MOTORS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I have about two minutes to speak about the magnificent decision taken recently for the continuation of the operations at Mitsubishi in Adelaide. The details of the deal put together by Mike Rann and Kevin Foley and representatives from the commonwealth government and Mitsubishi have been presented to parliament this week.

I want to add a human element to the story and I can do that because Mitsubishi's Tonsley plant is situated in the electorate of Mitchell. I have been right through the plant three times and in the course of that met hundreds of workers. I have also stood outside the plant early in the morning as the morning shift comes to work. Most recently I did that during the state election campaign earlier this year. I can tell the parliament that it was hard work greeting the workers as they came in to clock on as dawn was breaking. I was handing out leaflets which portrayed the Premier, Mike Rann, myself and the Labor Party as strong supporters of manufacturing in South Australia and Australia and supporters of Mitsubishi in particular.

The sentiments expressed in the leaflet were entirely sincere. People like me, who know Mitsubishi, know how important it is, not only for that particular company but for the livelihoods of many thousands of workers in the south-western region of Adelaide. The fact is that we cannot do without manufacturing and we cannot do without Mitsubishi continuing to operate. That is why this decision to not only continue with local operations but expand them with two new models is such a fantastic result.

I say it was hard work because many of the workers were understandably cynical about a local politician handing out leaflets to them as they came to work. I think they were mainly cynical because they have had such rough treatment by the media over the last few years. At any possible sniff of blood or speculation about the demise of Mitsubishi, there were damaging stories which, in turn, affected Mitsubishi's sales and consumer confidence and therefore there was some element of self-fulfilling prophecy with those damaging stories about Mitsubishi. Each time, supportive politicians like Mike Rann and other members of parliament in South Australia came to the rescue and spoke out in favour of Mitsubishi. Tom Phillips and his predecessors also spoke out strongly in favour of the good work that was being done at the plant.

The workers, understandably, were feeling a bit jaded. They had been asked to work harder and smarter. They were

doing that, they were achieving every target that was set them, but still there were negative stories about Mitsubishi. So it was a real pleasure for me to go to the factory just a week ago and see literally thousands of workers jubilant at the decision for the expansion of Mitsubishi's operations in South Australia. That made my job a real pleasure.

I turn to the subject of dog playgrounds. In the electorate of Mitchell, there is a reserve called the George Street Reserve. It is shaped such that there is an ideal corner for a dog playground. What I mean by that is an area that could be fenced off inside which dogs could run free. We all know that dogs need exercise, they need to be let off the leash sometimes—I suppose that is true of politicians as well. In this case, the local residents, of whom many are dog owners, approached myself and the Marion council to see if something could be done. The Marion council took a cautious approach and decided to make no decision on the matter at this stage, pending a review by the state government.

I am prepared to stick out my neck publicly and advocate for dog playgrounds. I think that we need one in Marion and we probably need one or more in the City of Adelaide as well. I think we need 'go' zones for dogs. We need dog playgrounds where dogs can run free. Inside those areas the dogs can take their pleasures and everyone will know that to go inside those areas will not necessarily be safe for children.

Time expired.

SESSIONAL AND STANDING COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional and standing committees.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The SPEAKER: A short time ago a question was asked of me by the Leader of the Opposition and, by way of clarification of my answer to that question, I remind the house of the question in the first instance:

What staff appointments have been made to work on the proposed Constitutional Convention and what budget has been allocated? Yesterday, in answer to a question from me on the Constitutional Convention, you stated:

'Work is proceeding as quickly as possible.'

My party is committed to full participation in the convention, as are many in the community, and that is why I seek the information about the level of staffing and resources which have already gone into work and which you say is proceeding.

In answer to that question from the Leader of the Opposition about whether any resources or a budget have been made available for the proposed convention I responded by saying, 'None' and 'None', which is, strictly speaking, correct. As the house is aware, however, the government pledged several weeks ago not to make any significant changes to the state budget already in place. The specific arrangements for the Constitutional Convention will therefore need to wait for the 2002-03 budget year. However, in the brief period between now and the end of June, an officer seconded from the justice portfolio has been made available to me to prepare preliminary work on the convention, and other outstanding professional volunteers are likewise working on the preparation of the convention. This is the only resource made available to me for the purposes of the convention at this stage.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

It is vital to have a plan to manage the state's finances so that we can provide for the things the community expects.

The sound and responsible management of South Australia's budget and public finances is critical to our state's future.

Financial responsibility and effective budget management are crucial.

The 10-point Plan for Honesty and Accountability represents a major piece of this government's reform process. Most of the initiatives proposed in the 10-point Plan involve a process of legislative review.

We are committed to accountability and providing taxpayers with clear information about how money is being spent.

As part of the plan we propose to introduce a Charter of Budget Honesty which will require this and future governments to set out key commitments to deliver financially and socially responsible government to South Australia.

These legislative amendments give backing to the Charter of Budget Honesty required to implement a new Fiscal Responsibility Framework.

The primary objective of the Charter of Budget Honesty is to improve the transparency of the Government's fiscal management thereby improving the accountability of the Government to the public and to Parliament.

The legislative amendments will require—

- The Government to produce a charter.
- Give direction to the contents of such a charter.
- Give direction to the preparation and release of a pre-election report.

The preferred means to implement such legislation is to make changes to the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987*, as envisaged by this bill.

A Charter of Budget Honesty will be required to be produced within three months of a government being elected. It will be tabled in Parliament and commit the Government to the fiscal responsibility obligations set out in it.

The first Charter will be required within three months of this bill coming into operation.

The key principles on which the charter must be based are to be set out in the legislation and will include the following:

- There must be transparency and accountability in stating, implementing and reporting on the Government's fiscal objectives based on its fiscal strategies.
- The Government's fiscal objectives must take into account a range of issues including tax policy and burdens, risk and service delivery requirements.
- Consideration must be given to the whole range of government activities.
- Both short term and long term objectives must be taken into account in order to ensure equity between present and future generations.

The legislation will also include the following matters to be included in the Charter:

- The government's financial objectives and the principles on which it will base its decisions with respect to the receipt and expenditure of public money.
 - A statement on how the government's financial objectives and principles will be translated into measures against which targets can be set and outcomes assessed.
 - The arrangements that will be in place to provide regular reports to the community about the government's progress and the outcomes that have been achieved in relation to the government's financial objectives.

In recognition of the seriousness of the Government in implementing the Charter, the Treasurer will be able to issue Instructions

under the Act in order to ensure compliance with the Charter. The Treasurer's Instructions give directions about financial management and reporting, and financial procedures to be complied with by agencies. The penalty for a breach of an Instruction is to be increased from \$1 000 to \$10 000.

As part of the 10-point Plan we also propose to widen the powers of the Auditor-General.

The Auditor-General has been consulted and asked to provide his views on changes required to legislation to increase his powers and independence in accordance with our objectives for honesty and accountability in Government. These reforms will be the subject of further legislative proposals in due course.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

It is necessary to include a definition of "general election" in the principal Act for the purposes of new provisions that are to be inserted into the Act by this measure.

Clause 4: Insertion of Part 1A

The Treasurer will be required to prepare from time to time a Charter of Budget Honesty. The first Charter will be prepared within three months after the commencement of this clause. A new Charter must be prepared after each general election. Copies of any Charter will be laid before both Houses of Parliament. A Charter will set out the broad fiscal objectives of the Government and establish a framework for assessing the Government's performance against those objectives. The legislation will set out various principles to which the Treasurer must have regard in preparing a Charter. The Charter will be required to incorporate the arrangements that will be put into place to provide regular reports to the community about the Government's financial position and how its goals are progressing. The Treasurer will be able to amend or replace a Charter from time to time.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 41—Treasurer's instructions

The Treasurer will be able to issue instructions in order to ensure compliance with a Charter of Budget Honesty. It has also been decided to make a significant increase to the penalty that may apply if a person fails to comply with a Treasurer's instruction under the Act.

Clause 6: Insertion of s. 41B

It is proposed that the Under-Treasurer prepare and publicly release a pre-election budget up-date report within 14 days after the issue of writs for a general election. The report is intended to provide an updated statement of the current and prospective fiscal position of the Government. The report will be required to take into account all material Government decisions and announcements. The report will be prepared according to the financial standards that apply to a

State budget and on the basis of the best professional judgment of officers of the Treasurer's department without political interference or direction. The Under-Treasurer will be able to exclude from the report information that the Under-Treasurer considers should be kept confidential because of commercial confidentiality requirements or the interests of the state.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 43—Regulations

The opportunity is being taken to increase the penalty under section 43 of the Act (in line with the increase to the penalty under section 41).

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT) BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Public Corporations Act 1993 and the Public Sector Management Act 1995. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This bill forms part of the 10-point plan for *Honesty and Accountability in Government*. The Government is committed to ensuring more open, honest and accountable government in the future.

The bill brings together amendments to the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*, the *Public Corporations Act 1993* and the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* that address the duties of agencies and the conduct of public sector chief executives and other employees, members of government boards, and public officers generally.

The bill ensures that all people working in the public sector—whether as members of public sector agencies, as senior officials, as employees or as or through contractors—are subject to duties of honesty and accountability. The Government believes that similar duties should apply to members, senior executives and employees of all public sector corporate bodies whether or not the bodies are subject to the Public Corporations Act.

The Government is also determined to improve the standard of annual reporting by public sector agencies and the bill includes amendments to the Public Sector Management Act to that end.

Amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Section 237 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act* will be amended to broaden the definition of *public officer*. The definition of *public officer* already includes members of Parliament, judicial officers, councillors and local government employees, police officers, public sector employees and directors of government boards.

The amendment proposed will ensure that offences relating to public officers such as *bribery of a public officer* and *abuse of public office*, also apply to contractors and employees of contractors who perform public sector work.

Section 251 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act* will also be amended to make it an offence for a *former* public officer to improperly use information gained whilst a public officer. Currently it is only an offence to improperly use information *whilst* a public officer.

Amendments to the Public Corporations Act

The *Public Corporations Act* already contains provisions about honesty, unauthorised transactions and interests, conflict of interest and duty of care for directors, as well as provisions outlining management duties for boards in Part 4, and the Schedule of the Act which relates to subsidiaries. Part 4 (as with other parts of the Act) only applies where it is declared to do so. The bill amends the Act so that the provisions in Part 4 will automatically apply to all public corporations.

The Government is dedicated to progressing a culture of honesty and accountability at all levels within government.

Consistent with this, the amendments to the *Public Corporations Act* will also introduce provisions requiring senior executives of public corporations or subsidiaries to disclose pecuniary interests, and all employees including senior executives, to declare conflicts of interest and to act honestly in performing their duties.

Non compliance with the duty to act honestly in the performance of duties will be an offence and in the event of conviction, the court will be empowered (in addition to imposing a penalty), to order payment of an amount equal to any profit, loss or damage arising from non compliance.

Again, the provisions imposing obligations upon senior executives and other employees of public corporations will automatically apply to a public corporation or a subsidiary, and will result in uniform obligations respectively, for senior executives and other employees of public corporations and subsidiaries.

A definition of *employee* will be introduced in the Act that includes those who are not employed by a public corporation or subsidiary but perform work for them. This will enable those provisions in the Act requiring employees to disclose pecuniary interests, declare conflict of interest and act honestly in the performance of their duties, to apply to all those that perform government work.

Amendments to the Public Sector Management Act

The *Public Sector Management Act* will be amended to give explicit legislative backing to Codes of Conduct issued by the Commissioner for Public Employment. A Code will be binding according to its terms on all public sector employees including by definition, all chief executives, ministerial staff and those employed by a public corporation or subsidiary.

The *Public Sector Management Act* will also be amended to introduce uniform provisions imposing obligations about honesty,

unauthorised transactions and interests, and conflict of interest on corporate agency members of all non public corporation statutory corporations and their subsidiaries.

Corporate agency members are directors of a body corporate, or members of a body corporate where there is no governing body.

The provisions in essence replicate the existing provisions in the *Public Corporations Act* about honesty, unauthorised transactions and interests, and conflict of interest so that all directors on government boards, whether public corporations or not, will be subject to the same stringent obligations.

The amendments will repeal the existing provisions in the Act about disclosure of pecuniary interest and conflict of interest for public service chief executives and the Commissioner of Public Employment, and replace them with more comprehensive provisions that impose obligations regarding disclosure of interest and conflict of interest on senior officials in the public sector. Non compliance will for the first time, be an offence, and depending on the senior official, render them liable to termination of employment or disciplinary action (which could in turn result in termination of employment).

Senior official is defined to include all public sector chief executives, statutory office holders with the powers of chief executives, the Commissioner for Public Employment and Deputy, and a person declared to be so by the Minister.

The amendments will repeal the provision in the Act concerning conflict of interest for public service employees, and replace it with a more comprehensive provision that imposes an obligation to disclose conflict of interest on public sector employees, which includes by definition ministerial staff. Where a public servant fails to comply with the obligations it will be grounds for disciplinary action. Other employees will be liable to dismissal.

The amendments will introduce a provision that will for the first time impose a general obligation upon all employees covered by the Act including ministerial staff and senior officials, to act honestly in the performance of their duties. Non compliance will be an offence.

The definition of *employee* will be amended in the Act to include those who perform public sector work as or through contractors. In this way, the Code of Conduct issued by the Commissioner for Public Employment and the provisions in the Act requiring employees to disclose pecuniary interests, declare conflict of interest and to act honestly, will also apply to them.

The amendments in respect of disclosure of pecuniary interest, conflict of interest and duty to act honestly for senior officials and other public sector employees in essence replicate the provisions to be introduced in the *Public Corporations Act* for senior executives and employees and will ensure consistency across the whole public sector.

A new provision will be inserted that specifically requires public sector agencies, (including by definition, a public corporation or subsidiary), to ensure that annual reports are accurate, comprehensive, deal with all significant issues affecting the agency and written and presented in a manner that aids ready comprehension.

A provision will also be inserted that requires a written statement of the reasons for delay in the event that an annual report is presented late to a Minister. The statement must be tabled with the report.

The provisions already in the Act imposing obligations on agencies to prepare annual reports and specifying the contents, are currently situated towards the end of the Act. They will be repealed and reproduced with the new provisions, under Part 2—to be renamed *General Public Sector Aims, Standards and Duties*.

I commend the bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 3: Interpretation

These clauses are formal.

PART 2

AMENDMENT OF CRIMINAL LAW

CONSOLIDATION ACT 1935

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 237—Definitions

This amendment extends the meaning of public officer to include natural persons who work for the Crown, a state instrumentality or a local government body as contractors or as employees of contractors or otherwise directly or indirectly on behalf of a contractor. This means that the serious offences relating to conduct of public officers and bribery or corruption of public officers apply regardless of how an officer is engaged in public office.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 251—Abuse of public office

The amendment extends the application of the offence of abuse of public office to a person who gained information by virtue of a public office that the person no longer holds.

PART 3

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC CORPORATIONS

ACT 1993

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

The amendments in this clause—

- update references related to changes in the law applying to corporations (the Corporations Act 2001 of the Commonwealth);
- insert a definition of employee similar to that included in the amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, with the consequence that the requirements to be complied with by employees must be complied with by natural persons who are contractors or employees of contractors undertaking work for a public corporation or subsidiary of a public corporation;
- insert a definition of senior executive for the purposes of imposing duties of honesty and disclosure on persons in this category. A senior executive is a chief executive or an employee holding or acting in a senior executive position as designated by the board of the corporation or, in the case of a subsidiary, by the board of the parent corporation.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 5—Application of Act

This clause ensures that if a statutory corporation is subject to any part of the Public Corporations Act, the duties of honesty and disclosure, etc., set out in Part 4 and sections 36A to 38A (as amended) will apply to the directors, senior executives, executives and employees of the corporation.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 16—Director's duty to act honestly
Subsections (2) and (3) of section 16 are struck out because improper use of information or position by a director of a public corporation is dealt with in provisions of broader application to public officers in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 18—Directors' and associates' interests in corporation or subsidiary

These amendments are consequential on changes to the law applying to corporations.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 19—Conflict of interest

These amendments require disclosures to be in writing.

Clause 11: Insertion of ss. 36A and 36B

36A. Duty of employees to act honestly

This section applies to all employees of a public corporation including senior executives and executives and mirrors the obligation of directors to act honestly in the performance of duties (see sections 16 and 21 of the Public Corporations Act).

36B. Duty of senior executives with respect to conflict of interest

This section imposes a duty on all senior executives to disclose pecuniary interests of a kind listed in regulations to the board on appointment and to keep that list of disclosed interests up to date. This requirement is imposed because of the nature of the management role of senior executives and it is an offence to fail to comply with the requirement.

The section also requires disclosure of all pecuniary or other personal interests of a senior executive or an associate of a senior executive that may conflict with a duty and prohibits a senior executive from taking action in relation to a matter where there is a conflict except as authorised in writing by the corporation's Minister.

As with directors, the corporation's Minister may give directions requiring resolution of a conflict of interest (cf. section 19(7)), the Minister or the corporation may avoid a contract entered into without the required disclosures having been made (cf. section 19(2)-(4)), the section does not apply if the person is unaware of the interest or conflict but the burden lies on the person to prove that he or she was unaware (cf. section 19(9)) and the person can be required to account for profit or pay compensation on conviction for an offence against the section or in separate proceedings taken by the corporation or the corporation's Minister (cf. section 21).

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 38—Executives' and associates' interests in corporation or subsidiary

These amendments are consequential on changes to the law applying to corporations.

Clause 13: Insertion of s. 38A

38A. Duty of employees with respect to conflict of interest

This section requires all employees of public corporations to disclose to the chief executive pecuniary or other personal inter-

ests held by the employee or an associate of the employee that may conflict with the employee's duties. Failure to comply is not an offence but is a ground for termination of the employee's employment. In other respects the duty and the consequences of failure to comply with the duty are similar to that applying to senior executives and directors.

Clause 14: Amendment of Sched.—Provisions applicable to subsidiaries

The Schedule sets out the provisions applicable to subsidiaries of public corporations. The provisions applying to subsidiaries are amended in the same way as the provisions applying to parent corporations.

PART 4 AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT ACT 1995

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 3

The amendments to the Public Sector Management Act in part apply provisions similar to those in the Public Corporations Act to persons and bodies not caught by the provisions applying to public corporations. Consequently, a number of definitions and interpretation provisions relevant to the mirrored provisions are introduced into the Public Sector Management Act, namely, definitions of beneficiary, debenture, relative, relevant interest, spouse and subsidiary and the interpretation provisions relating to associates and subsidiaries.

To ensure that subsidiaries are dealt with in the same way as parent public sector agencies (that are not public corporations) the definition of a public sector agency is expanded to include a subsidiary of a public sector agency.

The definition of public sector employee is expanded to ensure that obligations are imposed on natural persons working for the Crown or a public sector agency whether they are employees, contractors, employees of contractors or otherwise act directly or indirectly on behalf of a contractor.

A definition of relevant Minister is included in relation to public sector agency, senior official and employee.

A senior official is defined as the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, a Chief Executive, a statutory office holder having the powers of a Chief Executive, a chief executive of a public sector agency other than an administrative unit or a person holding or acting in a position declared by Ministerial notice in the Gazette.

Clause 16: Substitution of heading to Part 2

The new obligations are included in Part 2 and the heading to the Part adjusted accordingly. A Division 1 heading is inserted above the present contents of the Part.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 6—Employee conduct standards

The conduct standards for all public sector employees are expanded to require compliance with the code of conduct for employees issued from time to time by the Commissioner of Public Employment.

Clause 18: Insertion of Divisions

DIVISION 2—DUTY OF AGENCIES TO REPORT

6A. *Duty of agencies to report*

6B. *Contents of report*

The obligation of public sector agencies to prepare annual reports is relocated from its current position (section 66) to this Part dealing generally with the obligations of public sector agencies.

The new section requires a late report to be accompanied by an explanation of the reasons for the delay. It also requires the agency to ensure that the report is accurate, comprehensive, deals with all significant issues affecting the agency and written and presented in a manner that aids ready comprehension.

DIVISION 3—DUTIES OF CORPORATE AGENCY MEMBERS

6C. *Application of Division*

6D. *Duty of corporate agency members to act honestly*

6E. *Duty of corporate agency members not to be involved in unauthorised transactions with agency or subsidiary*

6F. *Duty of corporate agency members not to have unauthorised interest in agency or subsidiary*

6G. *Duty of corporate agency members with respect to conflict of interest*

6H. *Removal of corporate agency members*

6I. *Civil liability for contravention of Division*

These sections mirror, with relevant modifications, the provisions of the Public Corporations Act applying to directors of public corporations (ie sections 16 to 19 and 21 of the Public Corporations Act). The duties must be complied with by members of a public sector agency that is a body corporate or members of the governing body of a public

sector agency that is a body corporate (in circumstances where the Public Corporations Act does not apply).

DIVISION 4—DUTIES OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

6J. *Application of Division*

6K. *Duty of senior officials to act honestly*

6L. *Duty of senior officials with respect to conflict of interest*

6M. *Civil liability for contravention of Division*

These sections mirror, with relevant modifications, the provisions inserted into the Public Corporations Act imposing duties of honesty and disclosure of prescribed interests and all potential conflicts of interest on senior executives. The provisions expand the current duties imposed on the Commissioner for Public Employment and Chief Executives (see sections 18 and 27).

DIVISION 5—DUTIES OF EMPLOYEES

6N. *Application of Division*

6O. *Duty of employees to act honestly*

6P. *Duty of employees with respect to conflict of interest*

6Q. *Civil liability for contravention of Division*

These sections mirror, with relevant modifications, the provisions inserted into the Public Corporations Act imposing duties of honesty and disclosure of potential conflicts of interest on employees. The provisions expand the current duties imposed on employees (see section 56).

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 12—Termination of Chief Executive's appointment

This amendment makes sure that failure to comply with the new duties can result in removal of a Chief Executive.

Clause 20: Repeal of s. 18

This section currently deals with disclosure of pecuniary interests by Chief Executives. The matter is covered by the new Division 4 of Part 2.

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 21—Termination of Commissioner's appointment

This amendment makes sure that failure to comply with the new duties can result in removal of the Commissioner.

Clause 22: Repeal of s. 27

This section currently deals with disclosure of pecuniary interests by the Commissioner. The matter is covered by the new Division 4 of Part 2.

Clause 23: Repeal of s. 56

This section currently deals with disclosure of interests that may conflict with duties by employees. The matter is covered by the new Division 5 of Part 2.

Clause 24: Repeal of s. 66

This section currently deals with annual reports of public sector agencies. The matter is covered by the new Division 2 of Part 2.

Clause 25: Amendment of s. 71—Extension of operation of certain provisions of Act

This amendment is required because of the expansion of the definition of public sector employees to cover contractors and employees of contractors. The amendment prevents the long service leave provisions of the Act applying to such persons.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

OMBUDSMAN (HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Ombudsman Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill is a part of the Government's package to implement its Ten Point plan on Honesty and Accountability in Government. The Government has committed to strengthening the powers of the State Ombudsman.

At the last election, Labor promised—

to investigate how complaints against areas of Government which have been privatised or contracted out can better be handled; and

to review the Ombudsman Act and broaden the powers of the Ombudsman to ensure that he can fully investigate claims made by the public against government agencies.

The Ombudsman Act, in its current form, applies to administrative acts of agencies—public service administrative units, other Government authorities and local government councils. Clause 3 of the Bill expands the definition of "administrative act" to clarify the Ombudsman's jurisdiction in relation to outsourced operations. The revised definition will ensure that the Ombudsman can investigate an act done in the performance of functions conferred under a contract for services with the Crown or an agency to which this Act applies.

The Bill also amends the definition of "agency to which this Act applies". The new definition is based on the recent amendments to the Freedom of Information Act. Paragraph (d) of the new definition is wider than the existing definition of 'authority' and will bring some bodies within the Ombudsman's jurisdiction without the need to refer to them specifically in the Act as is now the case with the Universities, the Sheriff and incorporated health centres and hospitals. The definition will allow a person or body to be declared by the regulations to be an agency to which the Act applies or an agency to which the Act does not apply.

The amendment will provide greater consistency within the jurisdictions exercised by the Ombudsman.

The Bill also amends the definition of "principal officer and "responsible Minister" so as to be consistent with the extended definition of agency.

Most matters dealt with by the Ombudsman are complaint driven. However, the Ombudsman does have an "own initiative" power under section 13(2) of the Act which can be used to deal with matters of administrative concern that become public knowledge without any specific complaint being lodged with the Ombudsman.

In his 2000/2001 Annual Report, the Ombudsman noted that there is currently little opportunity for the Ombudsman to audit administrative action generally. Firstly, the Ombudsman may institute an investigation at his own initiative. Such an investigation could be triggered by detection of a pattern of earlier complaints pointing to systemic issues requiring further investigation. Secondly, the Ombudsman can assist agencies in establishing improved systems of complaint-handling or provide some general advice based on his reported experience which may assist in the improvement of administrative action.

However, there is no general provision in the Act recognising an audit function. Therefore, the Act will be amended to allow the Ombudsman to have a general administrative "audit" role. Clause 5 of the Bill amends the Act to provide that, if the Ombudsman considers it to be in the public interest to do so, he may conduct a review of the administrative practices and procedures of an agency to which the Act applies.

The Act will also be amended to clarify the role of the Statutory Officers Committee. In 1996, the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991* was amended to establish the *Ombudsman Parliamentary Committee*. The duties of the Committee included to consider matters relating to the general operation of the Ombudsman Act and to make recommendations in relation to the appointment of the Ombudsman. The Committee was replaced by the *Statutory Officers Committee* in 1997.

As a result of the 1997 amendments, the Committee's duties were amended. For example, the Committee was no longer required to consider matters relating to the general operation of the Ombudsman Act. Clause 6 of the Bill will rectify this matter by reinstating the Committee's function to consider matters relating to the general operation of the Ombudsman Act. The Committee will also be required to produce an annual report on the work of the Committee relevant to the Ombudsman Act as was the case in the original 1996 provisions.

Clause 6 also contains two other amendments to the Act. The Ombudsman has noted that, in recent times some agencies within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman have expressed the desire to attach the title Ombudsman to their internal complaint handling system operation. This could create unnecessary confusion and could be misleading to a consumer. Therefore, new section 32 has been inserted to prohibit the use of the word 'Ombudsman' in relation to internal complaints handling systems of agencies within the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. New section 33 inserts a general regulation making power.

I commend this bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement of the measure by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause redefines "administrative act" so that it includes an act done in the performance of functions conferred under a contract for services with the Crown or an agency to which the Act applies. It also redefines "agency to which this Act applies", subsuming the existing definition of "authority". The proposed definition makes it unnecessary to mention the sheriff, the councils of universities, and health centres and hospitals incorporated under the South Australia Health Commission Act separately, as it includes persons holding an office established by an Act and bodies established for a public purpose by or under an Act. The new definition covers—

- a person who holds an office established by an Act;
- an administrative unit;
- any of the following incorporated or unincorporated bodies:
 - a body established for a public purpose by an Act;
 - a body established for a public purpose under an Act (other than an Act providing for the incorporation of companies or associations, co-operatives, societies or other voluntary organisations);
 - a body established or subject to control or direction by the Governor, a Minister of the Crown or any instrumentality or agency of the Crown or a council (whether or not established by or under an Act or an enactment);
- a person or body declared by the regulations to be an agency to which the Ombudsman Act applies.

However, it does not include a person or body declared by the regulations to be an agency to which the Act does not apply.

The clause also updates the definition of "council", defines "administrative unit" and "Statutory Officers Committee", removes obsolete definitions, redefines "principal officer" and "responsible Minister", and makes other changes consequential on the new definitions.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 6—Appointment of Ombudsman

This clause is consequential on the insertion of a definition of "Statutory Officers Committee".

Clause 5: Insertion of s. 14A

14A. Administrative audits

Proposed new section 14A empowers the Ombudsman, if he or she considers it to be in the public interest to do so, to conduct a review of the administrative practices and procedures of an agency to which the Act applies. The provisions of the Act will apply in relation to such a review as if it were an investigation of an administrative act under the Act, subject to such modifications as may be necessary, or as may be prescribed by the regulations.

Clause 6: Substitution of s. 31

This clause repeals section 31 of the principal Act which has been made obsolete by the *Summary Procedure Act 1921* and substitutes new provisions.

31. Conferral of certain functions on Statutory Officers Committee

Proposed new section 31 confers on the Statutory Officers Committee of the Parliament the additional functions of considering matters relating to the general operation of the Ombudsman Act and providing an annual report to Parliament by the end of December in each year on the work of the Committee relating to the Act during the preceding financial year. In considering matters relating to the general operation of the Act, the Committee will not be permitted to review any particular decision of the Ombudsman.

32. Use of word "Ombudsman" by agencies to which Act applies in describing internal reviews prohibited

Proposed new section 32 prohibits an agency to which the Act applies from using the word "Ombudsman" in describing a process or procedure by which the agency investigates and resolves complaints against the agency, or in describing a person responsible for carrying out such a process or procedure.

33. Regulations

Proposed new section 33 empowers the Governor to make regulations.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: In calling the member for Colton, I point out to members that he is making his first contribution to the house and that, therefore, they should accord him the usual courtesy and respect.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I move:

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

May it please Your Excellency—

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

2. We unite with Your Excellency in expressing our deep sorrow at the recent death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother and join with Your Excellency in conveying our sincere sympathy to Her Majesty the Queen and members of the Royal Family.

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

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

I wish to recognise the traditional owners of the land on which this house is built, the Kurna people, and to acknowledge that we meet here today on their lands. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to the important post that you shall hold during this term of parliament. I also congratulate the Deputy Speaker on his appointment. I also congratulate the other newly elected members—indeed, all members—on their election to this parliament.

Let me also congratulate our leader, Premier Mike Rann, who, along with his fellow cabinet members, has in the short time since we formed government displayed a leadership based on conviction and honesty, something which quite frankly was conspicuous by its absence during the previous parliamentary term. This is the very reason why we have been provided with the privilege of forming government.

I am particularly pleased that my first day in parliament was to be my only day in opposition during this the 50th parliament. On this my third day of sitting I can assure everyone present that the view is much better from this side of the house, and with a fair, just and able governance of our state, which will be the foundation stone of the Rann Labor government, I expect to be on this side of the house for some time to come, well beyond this 50th parliament.

It is unfortunate that many of my colleagues on the other side of the house are not present in the chamber, as I would like them to hear this. I understand that some of my colleagues on the other side have been on a fact-finding mission to find out what it is like to be in opposition. I trust that it was a good study tour and that they are able to impart the knowledge gained from it to their colleagues, because it is an aspect of parliamentary life with which I think they will need to become familiar. I hope you become a good opposition, as we on this side would like you to be, because a strong opposition is good for this house, good for us and good for all South Australians. After yesterday's and today's showing, I genuinely hope that you do improve in that regard.

I would not be here today if it were not for the support and assistance provided to me by so many people. In my first speech in this chamber, I wish to recognise my parents and the debt of gratitude that I owe them. Thank you very much. They have provided me with so much. By way of interest, my parents met in the electorate of Colton at the Ramsgate Hotel when they were both working there, and they still live not 50 metres from that hotel in the heart of the Colton electorate.

As working-class parents, they went without so much while I was growing up so that my brother and I could have more than the little they had. They instilled in me a belief that everyone on this planet is equal and that no one person is better than another.

I learnt from my parents that all people are to be treated with respect and dignity. I thank them for the lessons in life that they provided. As a Romanian who sought refuge and who arrived after the Second World War, I am glad that my father arrived then and not today. Otherwise, he would most likely be interned in one of the many camps concentrated around Australia. Today, he would be the subject of the mindless racial politics of division so actively being promoted by our federal government.

I wish to recognise the support and unconditional love freely given to me by my wife, Annabel, and our boys, James and Simon. As all sitting in this chamber are well aware, election campaigning takes its toll, particularly on those closest to you. My family was truly magnificent during that time and since.

There are many others whom I wish to recognise. I congratulate and thank my campaign team and the Colton sub-branch, as good a team as any—in fact, the best. Their support and commitment was unwavering throughout the almost two years of campaigning. I also thank my unions for their support: the staff and members of the UFU, the LHMU and the ASU. Some of my friends from those unions are behind me today as well. Despite the demonising of unions which occurs and of which members on the other side and their federal counterparts are guilty, the role played by trade unions is paramount and remains vital to the very wellbeing of workers, whether members of trade unions or not. As much as some of you may wish—and, indeed, actively work toward—the role of trade unions will grow, not diminish.

I wish to thank the electors of the Colton district for the confidence they have shown in me. I have heard of many before me who have spoken of the humbling experience of being elected to parliament. I am no different in this regard. However, more than humbled, I am excited by the prospect of being able to provide to the Colton electors a feature that has been missing from their lives for some time: decent and proper representation from a local member of a government that shall govern for all South Australians.

This is something that the Premier, his cabinet and all members of the parliamentary Labor Party is totally committed to providing: a government for all South Australians. No longer will the most disadvantaged be neglected; no longer will the ripest fruit go to the top end of town: we shall witness with the Rann Labor government a priority given to providing a quality education system for our children, improvements to our health care, advances in aged care that shall allow our ageing to enter and pass from their third age with dignity, and a seachange with respect to environmental management in our state.

The people of the western suburbs—indeed all South Australians—can now feel confident in the future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Not only is the hospital in which I and many others were born now safe, but its future and the range and quality of services provided is assured.

The people of my electorate—again, all South Australians—can now be satisfied that there will be no repetition of the environmental disasters typified by the former government's resolve to construct the Barcoo Outlet, a drain that was constructed for no reason other than to satisfy the top end of town which inhabits the Holdfast Shores

precinct, much of which is built on public land that was provided freely by the former government.

The sad irony is that the drain does not even work as was intended. The former government should have fixed the problems upstream but no, with a stroke of genius, it spent in excess of \$17 million to create a situation so that now when it rains you cannot even swim where it was intended that you could—the Patawalonga—and you cannot swim in the pristine waters that once were adjacent to the electorate of Colton. We shall safeguard our environment for future generations.

In Colton, a significant swing was achieved. I was often asked in the period immediately after the election questions such as, ‘How did you do it?’ and ‘What was your secret?’ It was fundamental. I doorknocked thousands of homes and listened to a great many people. It may come as a surprise to some of you in this house but, as a collective, politicians are not very well liked, let alone respected.

I have come straight to this house from a rewarding career as a firefighter—an occupation of great camaraderie, team effort and reliance on your peers; an occupation that is held in the highest public esteem—and into a job that is, from a public perspective, well down the rung from that of a football umpire, and I mean no disrespect to football umpires—I once was one. The fact is that politicians are ‘on the nose’. It is a point that has troubled me throughout the campaign and since, particularly when I know so many parliamentarians who are not only hardworking but who are committed to making South Australia and our world a better place in which to live.

There is no greater honour than being selected to represent the people. It is not now, as a member of parliament, that I expect to be immediately liked—on the contrary—but it is, at the very least, an occupation that ought to be respected. I am sorry to disappoint some members in this chamber but the reality is that it is not. Members should go and knock on a few doors if they do not believe me. As elected representatives of the people we live in a fish bowl, and for this and other reasons the manner in which we conduct our business and live our lives must set the standard we expect and, indeed, often demand from those we represent.

During this term and beyond, each of us has the responsibility of ensuring that, as elected representatives and citizens of this great state, it is we who set the standard by the example of how a professional and private business is conducted. I pledge to do exactly this and urge each honourable member to do the same. It will only be then that this institution and those who occupy positions in this chamber might improve its public standing. I tell members right now that after the two performances of the opposition during question time today and yesterday I will not bring my Findon High School or Henley High School year 11 legal studies students or, indeed, my primary school students to visit Parliament House during question time until we improve the manner in which it is conducted.

I said earlier that I had doorknocked thousands of households over the past two years. I intend to continue with this aspect of communication during this term in parliament. I think I know what is important, but what is really important is what the electors believe is important. The parliamentary Labor Party in government will not be so contemptuous as to tell South Australians and then impose upon them what it is we believe is important to them. This will be a consultative and inclusive government—a vital ingredient for a good government and an aspect in which we shall excel.

One of the issues that hit home during the campaign was a perception held by some that perhaps we, Labor, when in government might not possess the necessary financial skill and acumen required to keep the economy on track. What I did learn—again by listening to my electors—was that, while with us it may have been some vague perception, members on the other side have been seen as the true financial liability—the mismanagers of our economy. My electors in Colton constantly raised issues relating to wine centres, soccer stadiums, radio networks and the constant sale of public assets. And what about the sale of the TAB for an example of financial management at the cutting edge, as well as the squandering of public funds on consultants?

As a member of the Rann Labor government I am aware of the challenges that lie ahead. The opposition has not left things in good shape and it will be a difficult task to get things back on track; but with a Rann Labor government we have the drive and the capacity, along with the capability, to ensure that this state of ours—without doubt amongst the best places on this planet in which to live—is able to realise its full potential so that it shall become a place where the quality of life and the environment in which we live, for all South Australians, is second to none.

I am thankful to be a member of a Rann Labor government that over time shall make this happen. I congratulated earlier those who along with me have been elected to this parliament. I am indeed privileged. But I cannot reflect for too long on my good fortune without thinking of those who ought to be here and other places. To my fellow candidates who were not as fortunate as me, in particular Annette Hurley, Moira Deslandes and Justin Jarvis, you each ran fantastic campaigns and, if you choose to have another go (and I hope that you do), you will be here in four years. I also feel heartache when I think of the circumstance that prevented Steve Georganis from today being the federal member for Hindmarsh.

It would be difficult to meet a more caring and competent person, yet he, like many other Labor candidates across Australia, was the victim of a campaign based on misinformation and deceit. Although each Australian state is now in the care of a Labor Government, as governments we cannot let up until the current federal government is removed from office. This is a federal government that has no social or moral conscience; it is a government intent on playing the race card when it suits its political objectives and a government that is willing to promote a loathing of people who do not fit neatly into its mould.

I am sorry that, as a government, it will continue to undermine any real prospect of reconciliation with indigenous Australians and a government that simply does not care too much at all for the Australian people, let alone those it views as different. It is a government that wishes to turn our state into a nuclear waste repository and, obviously, the Prime Minister does not believe that South Australia is too lovely to litter. The Prime Minister will have a job on his hands if he and his colleagues really believe that this South Australian government shall allow the state to become Australia’s nuclear dumping ground.

The federal government is a government that has significantly lowered Australia’s international standing. It is a government that must and will be removed when Australia next goes to the polls. The Colton electorate is named after Mary Colton, who was President of the Women’s Suffrage League for a period in the late 1890s. She is credited for making women’s suffrage more widely acceptable. South

Australia led the world on the issue of women's suffrage. I look at the western electoral districts and proudly note that the electorates of Colton, Lee and formerly Spence are all named after women who played key roles in the campaigns for women's rights. Women's rights, like so many other aspects of equality and equity, are campaigns that still need to be won. The Rann Labor government shall significantly enhance equality and equity in this state.

The Colton electorate is one of diversity. We have people who are very well off and others who have very little. We have many others who are between the two ends of the social and economic spectrum. In Colton we have many Australians who come from rich and varied ethnic backgrounds. I celebrate the fact that it is an electorate of cultural, social and economic diversity. I often hear people refer to ordinary Australians. Those people I have met during and since the campaign have been far from ordinary: indeed, extraordinary is a more appropriate term.

We are a country of extraordinary people and I am both privileged and proud to be the representative of a group of these extraordinary Australians. I pledge to do all I can for each and every one of them as their local member and as a representative of their government.

The SPEAKER: As I call the member for Enfield, I draw the attention of members to the fact that this is his first contribution in this place and I trust that they will extend to him the usual courtesies. The member for Enfield

Mr RAU (Enfield): First, in seconding this motion I would like to thank Her Excellency the Governor for her speech, which set out very clearly the agenda for this government over the next four years. Secondly, I would like to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment and I also congratulate Mr Deputy Speaker on his appointment. Of course, members would not expect me to fail to congratulate the Premier and all those who sit in front of me on this side of the house. It has been a very long time—too long in fact—since there has been a Labor Government in South Australia, and it is a marvellous thing to see change.

I remember speaking to a taxi driver not so long ago and I asked him how he would be voting at the election. He said to me that he would be voting against them. I said 'Who?' He said, 'The people I voted for last time.' His philosophy seemed to be that you keep turning governments over and that way you get good government. Whether or not one subscribes to that view, I think it is fairly clear that we were well and truly in need of a change and now we have one, which is, I think, good for South Australia. I would like to congratulate all the new members (not all of whom are on this side), in particular the members for Bragg and Heysen, who join this parliament for the first time—

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr RAU: No, but they are from my same profession. I hope that we can do something to lift the tenor of question time in terms of the civilised background of the legal profession.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr RAU: The honourable member needs to speak to some of her colleagues. I would also like to thank the electors of Enfield who have given me the great privilege of representing them in this house. Choosing me as their member is especially significant because they had the option of selecting a so-called Labor Independent. They rejected that option decisively. They voted for a strong Labor government, a stable government. Their choice was also significant to all

those South Australians who longed for a change of government.

As things have transpired, the choice of the electors of Enfield may well have been a decisive difference between the formation of a Rann Labor government and four more years of Liberal rule. Labor voters throughout the state owe the electors of Enfield a great debt of gratitude, and I am sure that my representations to those of you who sit in front of me over the next four years will be met with the good hearing that the loyalty of the electors of Enfield deserves. The people of Enfield have the same concerns as most South Australians. They are concerned about the appalling state of public hospitals and schools. They also feel the shortages and inadequacies in the public housing sector very keenly.

Unlike some South Australians, many of my electors do not enjoy the luxury of being able to opt out of the public system. They are in a position of no choice at all, and the burden of inadequate public health, housing and education falls very heavily upon them. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a case in point. It has a great staff. My son was born there, and we have nothing but admiration for the way in which we were treated at that time. However, they are overworked. They are expected to do more with less, and, when they are inevitably unable to deliver, they have to face the anger and abuse of sick and desperate people who have nowhere else to go. This is unsatisfactory.

The Emergency Department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a disgraceful example of public health care. My wife (who is here today) recently was very ill. She was taken by ambulance to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Emergency Department at 2 a.m. I remained home to look after two agitated children. She was forced to lie by herself in a corridor amongst a throng of the walking wounded. She was left alone on a stretcher, surrounded by an ever-increasing number of bags containing her own vomit. For over seven hours she was left virtually unattended until seen by a doctor. This may be acceptable health care in Kabul but, in my view, it is not acceptable in South Australia. I must add that my experiences as a parent visiting the Emergency Department of the Women's and Children's Hospital are only marginally better. For people in the northern and western suburbs there is virtually no paediatric option, public or private.

The education picture is equally gloomy. For example, the only secondary school in The Parks area was closed by bean counters of the former government some years ago. The Parks area, I must tell this house, stands as a tragic monument to the failure of our society to include and engage all our citizens. It has been described in the newspapers as the poorest area in Australia. It was once a working community, but it has now been inundated over and over again by waves of new Housing Trust tenants—some 60 per cent of the occupants of housing in that area are Housing Trust tenants. People from Indochina were a huge wave a decade or two ago, and their influx has been overwhelmingly positive.

Since then, unfortunately, the sad trend has been increasingly to use Housing Trust stock in that area for emergency housing. For those who know anything about the Housing Trust that, in practice, means a euphemism for, in many cases, disruptive tenants. This in turn is often also a euphemism for people with mental illness, for whom society no longer cares, for people with drug problems, for single parent families, for Aboriginal families and for new arrivals from Bosnia, Somalia, Kurdistan or Afghanistan or some other culturally and linguistically remote spot on the globe.

There is a limit to how many emergency housing places any given area can absorb. When that limit is exceeded crime escalates, drugs proliferate and the community disintegrates. Students with an interest in learning vote with their feet and leave public schools in the area. Stripped of a critical mass of committed, stable students, school standards fall and the cycle spirals inwards and downwards.

Some thorny issues need to be grasped and dealt with. For example, where is the proper balance between the provision of public housing and social welfare to be struck? What credit is the state given by the commonwealth for the social welfare dimension of its public housing arrangements? Is there room for a concept of 'breaching', as is applied in the federal social welfare system? If there is, how is it to be formulated and what becomes of those in breach? If it is not, why should any government tolerate the wanton destruction of public property? Most importantly, who speaks for the host community? I will be devoting some energy to these problems during the course of this term.

I wish to thank all those who have supported me. First, I would like to thank my mother, Nan, my late father, Jack, and Clyde and Doris Cameron. They have been constant and unflinching in their support. From them I have learnt the most important lessons about life and acquired the value system that is my compass. My tuition in politics began quite a long time ago. It was essentially an immersion course that began when I came home from hospital. My home life revolved around political issues. My grandmother, in whose home I began life, was an activist. Dr Evatt, Arthur Calwell, Jim Cairns and others stayed in her home in the days before the federal travel allowance. My parents were active ALP members.

The central figure for me, though, was always Clyde Cameron. He was a frequent visitor to our home and he brought interesting people and debates to the kitchen table of what was in any other way an average working family. He always encouraged me in my studies—although not in the study of the law, as I had always wanted, but medicine. He said that medicine was a good profession and, to use his words, it would 'keep me away from politics'. A combination of my own determination and a miserable aptitude for mathematics saw me enter upon a career in the law in any event. Clyde has taught me a great deal. Perhaps the importance of determination and personal courage is his most enduring lesson.

I would like to also mention Jim Toohey who, for anyone who knew him, displayed the virtues of patience, diplomacy, tolerance and the persuasive powers of a humble man. I would also like to mention Mick Young. From Mick Young I learnt more about life in a few short years than I have learnt in any other period in my life, either before or since. Mick was a man whose personal charm and warmth carried all before him. Mick believed in the importance of people. Mick always employed humour, and I never recall his abusing anyone, even when provoked. His habit of employing humour was always much better received. As Brian Johns remarked at Mick's untimely funeral, 'All were welcome at Mick's table.' I know that the Treasurer and the Minister for Transport, in particular, share my great admiration for Mick Young.

I did not speak yesterday in relation to the passing of Ralph Jacobi, but I would like to say that his life was also a continuing lesson in the importance of listening to the voice of the man in the street. Ralph was the most committed MP I have ever known—and I have known a few. He refused

front bench opportunities to concentrate on his electorate. His electors loved him—a rare feat in political life, as was pointed out yesterday by many speakers, including the member for Unley. His personalised care was legendary. Long after he left the parliament he would ring me and ask if I could organise a will for an old lady or give some small advice. Such was the nature of his care for the electorate.

Ralph spent his political life campaigning on the River Murray and on the need for regulation of the insurance industry. What a man of vision recent times have shown him to have been. His recent death is a great personal and community loss.

Over the last two years my task as a campaigner has been a lonely and thankless one. I have enjoyed little of the camaraderie experienced by most members on both sides of this house. Very few people stuck with me throughout. The odd circumstances of my selection saw to that. Throughout it all, my wife Anna has been tireless in her support. For most of the last two years she was the only person upon whom I could totally rely. I thank her. Anna beat me to elected office at Charles Sturt Council by some two years. Her advice was a constant help. It may be her fault that I am here. Anna and our two children, Jack and Stella, have kept me in touch with what really matters.

To the member for West Torrens, the Treasurer and the Attorney-General I say, 'Thank you for your assistance and advice.' To Ken Davey, Sue Swan and Alex Gallacher, I say, 'Thank you.' They supported me when the smart money was elsewhere. They have the two most important virtues of Labor: courage in adversity and loyalty—not the ephemeral loyalty to this or that individual that, unfortunately, so characterises those opposite, but loyalty to the principles and rules of the Australian Labor Party.

Perhaps a surprising special thank you also goes to the big tactical thinkers in the Liberal Party. I am speaking of the unsung heroes of my campaign, the strategists who determined that the Independent candidate for Enfield should receive Liberal preferences ahead of me. Not only did their myopia confirm that there was only one way to vote Labor in Enfield but also it drove a wedge deep into their own support base. Over 35 per cent of their voters ignored their card and preferenced me against their ticket. Their help was, in fact, invaluable in electing me. Of course, that in turn will ensure four stable, strong years of Labor government. Thank you.

Thank you to all of those hundreds of individuals who gave so generously to me in my struggle. I will not name any of you because it would be unfair to name some but not others. Many of you are not Labor supporters but were prepared to support me nevertheless. A final thank you to Kate Ellis, my campaign director, and her team. Kate, you did a remarkable job: working in difficult circumstances and for long hours you retained good humour and never lost it, at least as far as I could tell. Your contribution to my victory can be best expressed as the difference between a good idea and a great campaign.

I come to this place as a proud South Australian. My father's family arrived in the colony of South Australia in 1838. The Raus came from Klemzig in what was then Eastern Germany. As German-speaking migrants they were outsiders in many respects. The turn of the century saw my grandfather and his family living in Gawler. My grandfather was the son of Australian-born parents. He worked as a boilermaker at Martin's locomotive workshops. My father and five of his siblings started life there.

At the start of the first world war my father's eldest brother Ern joined the AIF. He was a member of the first pioneers. He served in Gallipoli and France. At home in Australia children spat on my aunts and uncles as they went to school. Australians of German origin and ancestry were interned on Torrens Island. My uncle was killed during a German artillery barrage at Pozieres on 4 August 1916. He was 19 years of age. My father grew up to become a wheelwright, a trade that is now all but extinct. He served in the RAAF in the Second World War. He worked in a physically demanding job until he was nearly 70 to support me in enjoying a free university education instead of going out to work.

My mother's side of the family is of English stock and her forebears arrived in Australia between the 1860s and 1910. My great grandfather, whom I remember through the eyes of a small boy, started work at the age of six. His first job was that of a scarecrow. He never learned to read or write. He came to Queensland as a young man and cut cane. He earned enough money to return to England and marry. When his eldest daughter, my grandmother, was 21 years of age he brought the family back to Australia. They settled initially near Norseman near Esperance and eventually moved to South Australia. My parents grew up in typical working families. They had an education typical of their day and circumstances. Only my mother attended secondary school. She lasted less than a term before she found work.

My educational opportunities have made my life what it is. I attended Cowandilla Primary School and Henley High School. At Cowandilla I was in the minority of students whose parents were Australian born. I was possibly in a minority who spoke English at home. My father drank at the Hilton Hotel, quite a watering hole in those days, and mixed with Greek and Italian born families as much as any others. The Alexandriedies and Russo families, with whom we had frequent contact, blasted my tastebuds out of meat and three veg before I was even at school.

The Minister for Local Government, the members for Mitchell, Colton and, I believe, Bright are all Henley High School old scholars. If election to this place speaks anything about public education, we all did okay. Excellence in public education is critical to our future. It is a particular concern for me as a parent of young children. I would like to pay special tribute to Gough Whitlam's free university education reform. Education was still about scholarship then and not just a mad scramble to offer this or that course to attract fee paying students. I was given the chance that would otherwise have been denied me. I studied law at the Adelaide University and loved every minute of it. I have enjoyed the practice of the law. My time at the South Australian Bar has been a period of great personal satisfaction and professional growth. I place on record my appreciation of the support and camaraderie extended to me by members of the legal profession over many years. In particular I mention Eileen, Di and Luba and my fellow barristers at Murray Chambers, who have been great people to work with.

The reason for this long and perhaps turgid family history is to come to a point. The point is that my story is a typical Australian story—new migrants, new opportunities, hard knocks, but a focus always on the next generation. We all have to see here the great similarity between my story and that of the member for Colton and probably everyone here, and that of any other migrant family from any other place at any other time. What can and must bind us all together as Australians are the experiences and values we hold in

common. What I would regard often as platitudes and humbug incanted on the subject of diversity would best be retired in favour of a genuine celebration of our common values and a pride in our nation.

At the beginning of the 20th century the then six Australian colonies joined together to form this planet's only continental nation. Vast in scope and evolved through a constructive debate, this was an incredible achievement. At the core of the federation was a compact. This compact is in part to be found in the federal Constitution. It also has its echoes in the great convention debates of the 1890s, the spirit of the federal movement and even some old pages of the *Bulletin*. At the core of the federation was a compact. This compact is to be found today in the Australian character, a belief in the rule of law and democratic institutions, a belief in tolerance of others but an abhorrence of noisy mobs shoving their views down our throats, a belief in the good sense of the common man and a distrust of self-styled elite opinion, a belief in a fair go, quiet pride in our achievements and a capacity to laugh at ourselves. These are the qualities that define us as a people.

Federation was a grand scheme. It was to ensure equality of opportunity and to forgo the parochial when it conflicted with the national. There were gaps, of course. Our railways are one glaring example. Another, sadly, is the management of our environment, in particular the equitable distribution of our most precious natural resource—water. The Murray-Darling system runs from Queensland through New South Wales and Victoria to South Australia. This is one system, but it is being destroyed by uncoordinated decisions made in four jurisdictions, decisions made with scant regard for consequences across borders or downstream. Growing criminally unsuitable crops such as cotton and rice in Queensland and New South Wales is only able to occur because the full cost to the nation of the water is never charged to the growers. The profits are made in Queensland and New South Wales but the costs are borne downstream. Revenue in the form of absurdly cheap licence fees is collected upstream, while the burden of salinity and reduced flow is shouldered downstream. This is the equivalent of emptying the contents of your toilet over your neighbour's fence. Short-term private profits are dictating policy when long-term national interests are at stake.

Development of our nation needs to occur in a more coordinated way. Why should population centres in the east expand, placing increasing demands on infrastructure, resources and arable land when South Australia already has the infrastructure in place to absorb more people? Why are we so preoccupied with immigration policy when domestic population growth and distribution over the continent are ignored? We South Australians are numerical minnows in this federation, but we are constitutional equals. Our senators are there to balance the numerical weight of the eastern states in the House of Representatives. It is perhaps time for them to remember why the Constitution put them where they are and to expect of them more than blind obedience to the views of the more populous states. The future of the River Murray is an issue that warrants such an approach.

There is work to be done here, too. The executive arm of government in this state dominates the legislative arm by sheer weight of numbers, particularly when compared with the federal parliament. In a governing party room of 24 lower house members, as many as perhaps 10 may be ministers or parliamentary secretaries. Cabinet solidarity alone virtually delivers the numbers in caucus. The theoretical possibility of

executive accountability becomes almost mathematically impossible. We are left to trust the government. I am happy to report that in the case of this government the trust will be well deserved. In the case of the last government, sadly it was not.

The people need institutional safeguards not just good luck. The reforms announced by the Premier are a marvellous step forward. They are, however, based on the current constitutional arrangements and take them as far as they can go. Perhaps more fundamental changes can be considered at the forthcoming Constitutional Convention. This raises some issues for consideration, which may or may not find favour with those members in the House at the moment. First of all, why should all or indeed any ministers occupy seats in the parliament? Why should the parliament be the one pool of talent from which our ministers are drawn? Again, chance has made my case much harder to argue. This government has an embarrassment of talent. But this is good luck. Compare the last government as a test of my argument.

Rather than needing all ministers to be in the lower house, why should the parliament not truly be a chamber of legislators and powerful committees overseeing the activities of the executive? Queensland has survived with one chamber since the 1920s. Perhaps we can, too. A smaller bicameral parliament may not be a better one. In fact, it may even be worse. In any event, as my old friend Ralph Jacobi said, 'Sunlight is the best disinfectant.' A more transparent, accountable, executive government is required if the standing of this institution and the esteem of our citizens is ever to rise. I am pleased to say that this government has already made significant steps along that path.

I am a practical person and I call things as I see them. I have no time for political correctness or humbug. As I see it, my job is to bring an honest and critical mind to matters of a community nature and to let people make their own decision about their private affairs. I am not a devotee of the current economic orthodoxy. The mantras of competition, free trade and globalism, in my observation, are usually code for: get out of my way so I can gouge more for me and leave less for you. This is essentially economic Darwinism. It is increasingly leading to social Darwinism. This is anathema to the Australian character and a fair go. It is evil, mean, greedy and destructive of all social capital. We will pay an awful price in crime, drug abuse, suicide and lawlessness if we do not wake up to ourselves.

Let us look for example at what deregulation and competition policy promised to deliver: more competition and lower prices to consumers. But what has it delivered? In banking we have a massive cartel, increasing charges, fewer branches, massive profits and exploitation of consumers. In aviation we have a virtual monopoly. In the dairy industry, I am informed, there are lower profits for farmers and vendors, bigger profits to manufacturers and distributors and higher prices for consumers. In telecommunications, lots of humbug about competition but poor service, higher prices, incomprehensible alternative 'plans' offered by telcos and the scourge of multiple, ugly, largely useless cables, festooned up and down our streets. Meanwhile, the accrued savings of generations of Australians in the form of Telstra are sold to the people who already own it.

In electricity—perhaps the biggest rip-off of all—just sit back and watch as deregulation, national markets and competition put a vacuum cleaner into the pockets of consumers. Sir Thomas Playford would weep if he could see what was done to his legacy by the former government. This

government will fight to do what it can for the people, but the fact is that the horse has already bolted. Private monopolies or cartels always exploit. It is in the nature of things. How paradoxical that the mantra of competition has become midwife to monopolistic exploitation. Sooner or later the truth will out: the competition policy emperor isn't wearing any clothes. He never has been.

History is repeating itself. We seem intent on learning the lessons our forebears learned over and over again: the greedy and unscrupulous grow at the expense of the weak and the honest. It is the role of government to protect the public from excesses. Unchecked, the greedy keep on taking up more until they run out of rope. When they go down they take a lot of innocents with them. Extravagant wealth accumulation always precedes a crash. Spivs like Christopher Skase vanish, but we are all left with the wreckage and the debt. I seriously wonder how much the present insurance crisis, for example, can really be blamed on quadriplegics making claims. It is more likely an attempt by insurers to claw back profits in the wake of the HIH collapse.

The way forward for South Australia is not easy. It is our duty, all of us in this parliament, to try and assist in carving it out. We must work with business in a transparent, fair way, not in the behind-closed-doors fashion of the previous government. We must include the public in the process and we must restore confidence and pride in our state. Our future in South Australia, unlike some other states, is not guaranteed. We must have courage and vision to seize it. Let's do what we do well. Let's stop trying to be another Melbourne. Let's clean up our environment, educate our children, care for our sick and frail and let's be proud of who we are and what we can achieve.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Morphett, and I point out to the house that the honourable member is making his first speech to this chamber. I therefore trust that honourable members will accord him the usual courtesies.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is with great humility and pride that I rise to congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on the opening of this parliamentary session. I offer my personal congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to such high office in this house, some may say the most important position in parliament, vital to the survival of this government. As all members will be aware, the previous member for Morphett was the Speaker in the last parliament. I know that you, sir, will uphold the very high standards and traditions of the office with the dignity, fair-mindedness and impartiality that the Hon. John Oswald gave to the office of Speaker.

Morphett has a very long connection with the position of Speaker in the South Australian parliament. The seat of Morphett is named after Sir John Morphett. Sir John was the Speaker of the Legislative Council in 1851 and, later, he became President of the elected Legislative Council in 1865. The attributes that previous Speakers such as Sir John Morphett and the Hon. John Oswald gave to this high office are so essential for anyone holding the office of Speaker. These attributes are of great significance to the parliament and to the people of South Australia.

If we undermine the authority of the Speaker and the dispensation of justice in this house, we are in fact undermining and weakening the very core of democracy in South Australia. Having said that, I am certain that you, sir, and all members will administer this parliament in the traditions of

the Westminster system, traditions that have evolved over hundreds of years, traditions with one purpose in mind—to preserve and foster rule by the people.

As I mentioned, the Hon. John Oswald was the previous member for Morphet. I would like to acknowledge the roles of John Oswald, not only as Speaker of this house but also as a minister of the Crown, shadow minister, opposition whip and a very effective local member. John Oswald and his wife Carol both should be congratulated on the way they worked very hard—tirelessly—for the people of this state and for the people of Morphet. John was the elected member and Carol was his No. 1 supporter. John gave the people of South Australia and Morphet not just a first-class member of parliament but a man who has the intelligence, vision, wit and caring found only in a few men today. John served as member for Morphet for over 22 years. I consider it a privilege to know John and Carol. I am very aware that I have a lot to live up to in order to maintain the standards set by John.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate other new members on their election. I know from personal experience that the new members for Bragg, Heysen and Kavel will approach their tasks with integrity and diligence. Members will only have to listen to the quality and sincerity of their maiden speeches to be convinced of the high calibre of these new members. I hope that other new members opposite are as sincere and forthright in serving this parliament.

As a member of this parliament, I have been elected to represent all the people of Morphet. I stood as a Liberal candidate and did so with great pride. I have a profound belief in Liberal Party principles. One has only to read the Liberal Party platform to realise that only the Liberal Party can offer broad, socially inclusive policy, policy that recognises individual rights and achievements; policy that recognises the family as the prime building block of society; policy that expresses the profound belief in the individual's ability to prosper and be self-reliant; and policy that encourages self-reliance, yet recognises the need for social inclusion of those less fortunate, those unable to help themselves through no fault of their own. The Liberal Party is a broad church that offers encouragement to all, support and comfort to all. Without prosperity, there is no room for humanity.

While I find myself in opposition, I cannot betray those who elected me. I would rather be in opposition than sit with some of those whose philosophies I see represented opposite. Those opposite are perched precariously on the government benches. Members opposite can say what they like, but the fact is that this minority government clings to power by a very slender thread. Labor won a majority of first preference votes in only five of 23 seats. Labor won only 36.3 per cent of the primary vote. The Liberal Party was ahead in percentage of primary votes and the Liberals won on the two-party preferred vote. The Liberal Party gained 50.9 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. Labor does not have a mandate in any real sense of the term.

Recently dumped Labor Party State President Don Farrell said, 'With a bit of imagination and a bit of luck, you might just do the trick.' Did he really mean that, with a bit of luck, Labor might be able to trick South Australians into thinking they have a real government? I share an office on the second floor with the member for Kavel. When I first moved into our office, room 404, the previous occupant had left a calendar there. I flicked it over to the day for 14 March. Just as appear on most calendars, there was a little saying on the bottom of the page. For 14 March, it was a definition, as follows, 'A contract: an agreement that is binding on the weaker party.'

Sir, which part of the contract, of the agreement, is the Labor Party?

I know all members realise that politicians are the custodians of the values of society and disregard conventions at their own will. I sense that this government's ideology has been blurred by endocrinology. The grab for power at any cost may prove too costly for those opposite.

Before entering parliament, I was a veterinarian. One part of being a vet is having to euthanase animals. The injection we use is nicknamed the 'green dream'. I cannot help but see those green leather seats over there as being the Labor Party's green dream. Those benches will be the political death of members opposite, and on that occasion I will take a degree of pleasure in seeing their demise.

A new member or any re-elected member, for that matter, must on the commencement of a parliamentary term recognise and publicly acknowledge the fact that they would not be here if it were not for the efforts of their supporters, their campaign team and particularly their family. Some of my supporters and family are sitting in the gallery tonight. I give my heartfelt thanks to my supporters and particularly my large campaign team. I was continually flattered by the efforts put in by the volunteers who assisted during the campaign. They did not have the incentive of a place in parliament, yet they were as delighted as I when the results came in.

I particularly thank my brother Stewart. When you stand for parliament, you put your life on hold in many ways. Without the unwavering support of my wife Johanna, my son Lachlan, my daughter Sahra and my daughter-in-law Sonny, the task of getting here today would have been just about impossible. I know that they are just as proud of my achievements as I am.

My only regret about standing here today is that my father Malcolm could not be here. My dad died last October after a long fight with bowel cancer. Dad was always one of my strongest supporters and a sound source of advice. Dad started work in the steel mills of Glasgow at age 14. He retired from the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service as a Divisional Superintendent in 1983, not long after receiving a Governor's commendation for his role in the Ash Wednesday bushfires.

For the information of members, I will give a little bit of background about myself. I grew up and attended school in Elizabeth and Salisbury. I taught woodwork and metalwork in high school before going back to study veterinary science. I have lived in Housing Trust homes and owned my own home. Eighteen years ago I worked for an airline flying livestock. The airline went broke, owing me thousands. My family and I were forced to start again and we lived in a tin shed for 18 months. We now enjoy a fabulous lifestyle down at the Bay.

After nearly 20 years, I recently sold my veterinary practice. Vets and firemen are the most trusted of professionals. I was an active member of the Country Fire Service for over 13 years, and I would like to think that I have doubled up on the degree of public trust. Many people ask me why I would leave one of the most trusted professions to enter one of the most disliked. My life as a vet was very enjoyable and, when I look back at some of the things that happened to me as a vet, I see parallel situations in politics.

Members opposite fancy themselves as the pit bulls of parliament. Who is the alpha dog? Sir, I pray for your protection from the predations of the pit bulls of parliament. I ask that you do not—what were your words—unleash the pit bulls of the Labor Party. Mind you, I have castrated and

ethanased a number of pit bulls in my time. I do not see a pack of pit bulls (although there are a few yapping Jack Russells over there). What I see is a litter of two day old crossbred mongrels. If one takes them out of the safety of their whelping box, what does one see: eyes closed, ears closed, no vision, not listening. They crawl off in all directions with no sense of direction. I know my colleagues on this side will not be intimidated. Rather than being mauled, I think our biggest fear is getting wet shoelaces from the sucking of these toothless, blind, deaf puppies.

As a vet, one gets into very many dangerous situations. I remember, vividly, going to look at a heifer—and for the chardonnay socialists in the non-farming sector that is a cow that has not yet calved. The heifer was having problems calving and, as usual, the phone call came through at about 6 o'clock Sunday night. I arrived at the property and was taken to an old chook shed. There she was: a wild-eyed, crossbred Red Poll—the sort of thing you might see up in the Mid North or perhaps out Hammond way. I did not see any hope of getting this beast to cooperate without tying her up.

I suggested to the farmer that we lasso her and tie her to a post. After lots of dodging and weaving we had her roped and we tied her up. The only problem was that she saw an opening and off she went. We went along for the ride outside across the paddock. I saw that discretion was the better part of valour. But not the farmer; he may have had only a tenuous grasp but he was not going to let go. Desperate to hang on he was dragged flat out across the paddock through piles of warm, green, sloppy you-know-what. Covered in this he finally realised that he had to let go: she was the one in control and off she went. She set the rules. Some of this sounds very familiar.

Mr Speaker, to represent the people of Morphett is indeed a privilege. In order to get here today I doorknocked over 17 000 homes. I was able to demonstrate my empathy with the electors of Morphett. I listened to people and I heard what they had to say. I would like to put on the record my commitment to the people of Morphett to represent them with commonsense, humility, honesty and compassion. I will work to continue the accomplishments of the previous Liberal government. I hope we will see continued economic growth—growth that was so evident under the Olsen-Kerin governments. This growth should be achieved if for no other reason than that this government has chosen to take advice from former Liberal advisers and former Liberal politicians.

Morphett is currently the largest electorate in this state—not in area, but in the number of electors, some 23 569. There is a complete spectrum of socioeconomic profile in the electorate, all compressed into less than 13 square kilometres. As all members will be aware, the homes in Morphett range from multimillion dollar homes on the beachfront to old multistorey Housing Trust flats. The real estate development boom that has gone on over the past five years has had a ripple effect centred around Glenelg. We now see those ripples moving back through the whole of Morphett and, I should say, far up and down the coast.

Morphett contains areas of great cultural and historical significance. The Old Gum Tree at Glenelg is a founding location of this state. It was on 28 December 1836 at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon when one of the crew of the ship *Buffalo*—a John Hill—unfurled the flag. A cold collation was laid out and settlers did as many do today in Glenelg—they dined al fresco. Many historic homes and buildings are recognised as treasures. The Glenelg tram, the beautiful beaches, the cosmopolitan lifestyle, the tree-lined streets and

the numerous parks and ovals all contribute to a quality of life that is the envy of many. Indeed, I have had interstate and overseas tourists stop to tell me that we do not know how lucky we are in South Australia—and I know certainly in Morphett.

The whole electorate of Morphett is a tourism mecca. I hope the new Minister for Tourism has rethought her comments, which were published in the *Advertiser*, when she said that tourism was a very important portfolio but the bottom line was that her role was all about jobs and economic development. As for jobs and economic development, does the new minister not realise that tourism rivals mining and motor vehicles as a huge employer and economic powerhouse? Tourism is currently worth \$3.1 billion each year to South Australia.

When talking about underestimating industry input, I need to remind one of my constituents (and I am sorry he is not in the house), the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing who lives in Glenelg, that the racing industry is one of the largest industries in South Australia. Morphettville Racecourse is on the boundary of Morphett. I was there for the opening of the new \$4.5 million upgrade. The minister could have walked from his home to the track, but he was nowhere to be seen.

South Australian racing employs over 17 000 people; over 11 000 people own racehorses. Racing will inject nearly \$550 million into South Australia over the next five years. A number of my constituents are owners, trainers, jockeys and others involved in the industry. The industry welcomed the sale of the TAB. As for the Treasurer saying that he will turn South Australia's economy around, I hope he realises that if he does that the economy will be going backwards. South Australia's economy is very healthy now: do not let it get a near fatal disease like last time.

The demographic profile of Morphett is changing. The average age is reducing and families are increasing. Morphett is no longer the electorate with the oldest age profile in Australia. It is almost impossible to get a child into local schools: you need to live in the school zones. Our schools and their staff are to be congratulated on their professionalism and dedication. Glenelg schools and others in Morphett performed exceptionally well in the recent skills testing. Nearly all schools in Morphett have freely opted to join Partnerships 21 and all those that have joined are glad to have done so. In the case of Brighton Secondary School it was due only to the persistence of the Principal and the Bursar that the school joined Partnerships 21. There was strong resistance from the education union representatives. Fortunately for the students and parents, sanity prevailed and the school has not looked back.

The mix of private and public schools in Morphett is to be commended. Sacred Heart, Immanuel College and St Peter's Woodlands are long established schools that consistently produce students with exceptional results. Brighton Secondary School is well known for talented students, particularly musicians and volleyball stars.

The population of Morphett is well served for both health and transport. There are numerous doctors and specialists in practice throughout the electorate. As well as the excellent Glenelg Community Hospital where my son Lachlan was born, Morphett is served by the nearby Flinders and Ashford hospitals. I congratulate the new Minister for Health on her appointment, but I might suggest that she speak to me if she wants some lessons in microbiology and pharmacology. It is not a few extra cleaners that will clean up the superbugs. I am

pleased to see that the government is continuing Liberal Party policy to upgrade our public hospitals.

Travel within Morphett is easy with good, wide roads and both community and TransAdelaide bus services, not to mention the historic Glenelg tram. It is worthy of mention that one of the first parliamentary accomplishments of John Oswald was to have tram stop platforms built along the tramline, the first being at Brighton Road tram stop.

I would like to continue Mr Oswald's efforts and those of the former Minister for Transport. I see a clear need for the upgrade of the trams. The old trams have heritage and tourist value. However, new trams with airconditioning, improved seating and modern suspension are vital if we wish to increase the patronage on the State's only electric railway. The whole tramline needs to be rebalanced and, hopefully, the line will be extended—not just to North Terrace but through to North Adelaide. I hope the government takes up the private partnership options to improve and extend the tramline.

As a result of extensive doorknocking in my electorate and my short time in parliament, I do acknowledge that there are issues in Morphett—issues I am already working to resolve. The problems are not major but they need to be addressed to ensure that the lifestyle we enjoy is not affected in any adverse way. There is some social dysfunction and a degree of low level crime. Community placement of people with mental illness is a concern for some.

Car parking is a perennial problem in the Bay and, while this is a council matter, I feel the state government may need to contribute to the development of extra parking in Glenelg. I should say, though, that parking problems are often the result of thousands recognising the Bay as a location of world famous events. The Tour Down Under attracted over 70 000 people to Glenelg earlier this year. Other events include the Jazz Festival, the Classic Adelaide car tour, the wonderful Christmas Pageant and the newly resurrected Milk Carton Regatta.

Perhaps we might even see a Glenelg football premiership soon. For those who have forgotten, Glenelg Football Club has won four premierships and has had eight Magarey Medallists and has had several All Australians. I would like to congratulate the Glenelg Football Club on its proud history and also on the nearly completed \$2.5 million redevelopment of the club facilities. Let us not forget that this is a great state, a vibrant state, a healthy state. Let us not keep dumping on South Australia. I am fed up with the media—particularly the print media—creating conflict and cynicism and using selective editing and censorship by omission. Remember: the most totalitarian despot is public opinion in a democracy. Do members opposite want me to say that again? The most totalitarian despot is public opinion in a democracy.

Every day we read and hear nothing but doom and gloom. Nobody tells the truth but the media—at least, that is what they would have you believe. Russia has two newspapers: *Pravda* and *Investia*. 'Pravda' means 'the truth'; 'Investia' means 'the news'. Russians say, 'Pravda is nyet Investia and Investia is nyet Pravda': 'the truth is not the news and the news is not the truth.' How true that is.

Talking about dumping things, I, for one, will be pleased to see the removal of low-level nuclear waste from numerous sites around the metropolitan area. There is radioactive waste stored not far from this place at the Adelaide University and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. What a great job the Nuclear Medicine Department does.

The establishment of a low level nuclear waste repository—it is not a dump; calling it a dump is downgrading the work that the workers do there—is something which I support. Let us remember that it was in the early 1990s that Labor state and federal governments made the decisions to store nuclear waste in South Australia. Let us remember that it was a Labor government which in 1994 moved 2 000 cubic metres of low level nuclear waste to Woomera without any public consultation. Let us remember that in 1995 the federal Labor government moved 35 cubic metres of intermediate level nuclear waste to Woomera without any public consultation. As late as November 1999, the former member for Elizabeth and now federal member for Bonython, Marty Evans, said that he agreed with the storage. He said:

It has to go somewhere and just because it's in South Australia we can't have a 'not in my backyard' view.

Liberal governments have at all times been open and frank on this issue. I strongly encourage this government to face reality, recognise their responsibilities and not stop progress by relying on outdated science, ideology and sociology.

I would like to take this opportunity to talk about two significant changes to the profile of Morphett and, dare I say, the catalyst for much of the boom in South Australia's coastal development, that is, the Holdfast Shores development and the Barcoo Outlet. The Barcoo Outlet is actually in the member for West Torrens' electorate—he might want to stay—but I will discuss the impact of this project on the electorate of Morphett.

As members are aware, the Barcoo Outlet has been in the news lately. I note that the new Minister for the Environment could only bag this fabulous, scientific, award-winning project. What does any reasonable person expect to happen to flows in the catchment after the longest dry spell for nearly 100 years and then a heavy downpour? He was at it again recently, this time joined by the ecozealots at Henley Beach. I have come to expect nothing more than the carping we get from them and some other members of the public with their own narrow agendas. When will they have the intellectual maturity not just to give opinions but to help by proposing real, practical solutions? When will they give credit for the fabulous work being done by the various catchment management boards and their dedicated staff? Get a grip on reality and have the courage to acknowledge the facts.

The minister insinuated in the press that Barcoo was a waste of money: money should have been spent on 'fixing up the river system and building wetlands'. Where has the Labor Party been for the past eight years? What does the Labor Party call the upgrade of the Heathfield Waste Water Treatment Plant—and Glenelg, for that matter? Does the Labor Party think the magnificent Warriparinga and Urrbrae wetlands and the Morphettville wetlands are a waste of money? Liberal plans for wetlands at Oaklands Park, Glenelg North and other areas are in the pipeline, so to speak.

We all know that education is vital to get people to stop polluting our water catchments. At least the Minister realises that the Patawalonga Basin is part of the problem, not *the* problem. According to the Public Works Committee report of May 2001, in 1999 1 240 tonnes of sediment were generated in the catchment, of which 706 tonnes were captured. If that is correct, then over 1 000 tonnes per annum are being captured now. With public education and continued catchment improvements, the preload should decrease and the afterload should reduce dramatically.

The discharge out of the Barcoo and the quality of the discharge is no worse than that of any other urban stormwater. The system is working better than expected and will continue to improve, provided that this government maintains the efforts started by the former Liberal government. The Barcoo Outlet is not, as many detractors would say, a stormwater diversion to clean up the Pat for the rich residents of Holdfast Shores. I can safely say that some of the engineers and builders who did such a magnificent job on building the Barcoo Outlet and Holdfast Shores were not even born when the first plans for stormwater diversion were announced. It was on 24 June 1954 that the *Advertiser* had on its front page a story about the new channel to the sea diverting stormwater away from a new 'inland sea water lake. . . a thing of tremendous beauty and of great attraction to tourist trade'. That was not 1994 but 1954—48 years ago. So much for the conspiracy theorists!

The whingers, knockers and ecozealots are wrong, wrong, wrong when they talk about the Barcoo. Their arguments are as high and dry as the naval ship *Barcoo* was on that stormy day in 1948. We know now that the authorities at the time did not proceed with the construction of the seawater lake with its fully circulating sea water system. Instead, the Pat was constructed more as a primary sedimentation tank and operated in that way for most of the second half of the last century.

During the 1980s the poor condition of the waters in the Patawalonga Basin became obvious. The smell alone was enough, and all water-based activities were banned. In 1987, following several years of investigation and the preparation of an EIS and an SAR, the Bannon government rejected the first major development proposed in this state for many years: the Jubilee Point development. Mr Bannon did comment on the problems of sand management and water quality in the Pat, but it was not until October 1994 that the State Liberal government took the initiative and obtained federal funding to achieve, amongst other things, improved water quality in the Pat to allow for primary contact recreational and leisure activities.

It was John Oswald who organised the transfer of money to the Building Better Cities program from the abandoned multifunction polis at Gillman. This allowed the environmental clean-up to commence. According to the Public Works Committee report of February 1995:

In its present condition, the Patawalonga Basin represents one of the worst cases of environmental degradation of a waterway in a densely populated, urban recreational area. . . its waters are subject to the accumulation of the sediments of polluted stormwater run-off from a third of Adelaide's households in addition to many commercial activities. It is unfit for human recreation. . . produces foul odours. . . does not adequately serve boat owners who use it. . . is generally littered and unsightly. . . and poses danger to marine and birdlife in the vicinity.

Even the ducks got bogged. The report continues:

The periodic release of stormwater from the Patawalonga Basin discharges polluted water into the marine environment. . . resulting in at times closure of beaches to the north. . . and producing unacceptable health risks to the public.

The situation has certainly changed now. The committee conducted a site inspection in February 1995 and found the condition of the Pat appalling. The site inspection clearly demonstrated that action to restore the Pat was urgently required. One of the Public Works Committee members in February 1995 was the new Minister for Health. I can safely say that the Pat is now much healthier. I also note that the Minister for Health and you, Mr Speaker, were on the Public

Works Committee which in May 2001 was instrumental in allowing the construction of the Barcoo Outlet. After the Public Works Committee report in 1995, the Patawalonga was dredged and deepened, the water level was lowered to facilitate seawater tidal circulation, and the banks were rebuilt. The sediments and sands taken from the Pat were used to rehabilitate the old rubbish dump.

New holes were created on the golf course to compensate for those taken over by the diversion of Tapleys Hill Road for the Adelaide Airport runway extensions. I am sure that the member for West Torrens will agree that this is a magnificent improvement on what was there.

The Barcoo Outlet was started in late 2000, and what an achievement it is. It won an award for engineering innovation at the 2001 Australian Museum Eureka National Science Awards. The opening of the Pat as a recreational lake and the commissioning of the Barcoo Outlet by then Premier Kerin is a day I will long remember. As they said on the day, 'The Pat is back.'

At this point I would like to express my sympathies to the families of Malcolm Donne and Lee Alexander. Malcolm was tragically killed during the construction of the Barcoo Outlet. Lee was killed in a recent industrial accident at Holdfast Shores.

The Pat is back to what it could have been in 1954: a seawater lake where large bream and mullet are caught by anglers, rowers exercise and numerous boats are moored in the new marina. The first major event, the Milk Carton Regatta, attracted over 10 000 spectators and over 70 entrants. I believe that the Boating Industry Association is planning more community events on this wonderful lake. As well as the Pat, the beaches of Hove, Somerton, Glenelg and North Glenelg are a precious and delicate part of the coastal environment. The impact of development on the coast can be seen in the photographic records. Our early settlers did not realise the long-term impact on building or moving the sand dunes that made up the coast.

Unfortunately, we cannot turn back time and reconstitute this pristine environment. No-one, not even the Henley/Grange Residents Association, would agree that demolishing everything within 500 metres of the beach is a practical and acceptable way forward. We are the people saddled with the task of coastal and beach management; we are the people who need to rehabilitate the catchments; and we are the people who need to protect this environment for our children and our children's children. Millions of dollars have already been spent on sand management, and I am certain that millions more will be needed to be spent in the near future to maintain our beaches and coastal marine environment.

It is up to us and future governments to make sure that this money is spent wisely. As the local member, I will be vigilant in ensuring that money is made available and that it is carefully spent. Unlike many of our goods and services, the value of the metropolitan coast cannot be easily determined. Our beaches have value and worth but, unfortunately, nowadays always a cost. To watch a yacht sail by, to have a swim or to enjoy a glorious sunset, what is the value? What is the cost? What is it worth? This is not to say that we should stop any of the development no matter what it is worth. If that were the case then what a sorry state we would be in.

First, the Jubilee Point and then the Holdfast Quays projects were stopped by previous Labor governments. It took brave decisions on behalf of a Liberal government not only to know the costs but also to recognise the advantages of a

major development in Glenelg. In 1997 development and infrastructure agreements were signed between the Holdfast Shores consortium, the state government and the City of Holdfast Bay. Finally, this state would get what it deserved: a world-class coastal residential development—a project worth over \$350 million in development costs alone. I am sure that all members recall what was there.

The highway, which provided access to our main tourist beach, finished in a potholed car park which in itself was taken over by the hoon element after hours. Yes, you could glimpse the sea as you drove down one short section of Anzac Highway but only if there was no truck, van, ute or bus in front of you, and Anzac Highway is a very busy road. Adjacent to the car park were yesterday's amusements—a collection of 1950s entertainments which were in poor condition and which operated at best only a couple of months a year. This area was and still is presided over by Magic Mountain—one of the less attractive structures on our foreshore.

I have watched the building at Holdfast Shores, Light's Landing and Marina East. I have been to the new Adelaide Sailing Club. I have seen boats launched and retrieved at the all-weather boat ramp at West Beach. To see the millions of dollars worth of boats in the tidal and Patawalonga marina is a joy to behold. Ask anyone who is living in this new area and they will tell you how happy they are. Look at the tremendous demand for property, not just in Holdfast Shores but anywhere along the extensive coastline of our state. The members for West Torrens, Colton and Lee must be very pleased for their constituents to see the huge leap in property values.

What about the Treasurer, the member for Port Adelaide? The fabulous \$700 million development of the Port Adelaide area will no doubt be strongly supported by him. The downside of this housing value boom is that the rental market is being constricted. Long-term residents are now paying high water and sewerage rates. Investors and businesses are paying very high land tax and stamp duty is considered excessive by many in the real estate industry. Many of my constituents are now asset rich but income poor. They and tenants of rental properties should not be forced to leave their homes due to circumstances beyond their control. A humanitarian approach is needed.

When I was doorknocking I was continually amazed at the prosperity, the rebuilding, the home extensions and the urban infill throughout the whole of Morphett. As I said, on a population basis I have the largest electorate in the state. In one street in Warradale every home bar one had sold in the previous 12 months. There are over 80 restaurants and cafes within the Jetty Road precinct. This prosperity, in many ways, is due to the sound economic management of the economy by both federal and state Liberal governments. The state Liberal government was the chemist: all the elements were there and it put them together. Holdfast Shores was the catalyst.

We now see a reaction that is amazing in its spontaneity. The benefits of these new developments to the local and broader community and to the state generally are huge. The financial benefit that is generated by the increased economic activity is huge. This state is a great state from the beachside developments to the Convention Centre, the Wine Centre, the V8 races, the booming primary industries (aquaculture, wine, cereals, beef, sheep and wool), the IT and defence industries and our first-class submarines, not to forget a work force the envy of most. All this contributes to make South Australia a

great place in which to live, work and play. The triple bottom line—a financial, social and environmental bottom line—is all in the black.

I urge this government to keep positive and to give this state what it has had for the past eight years. Give this state the chance it deserves. Last time the Labor Party failed this state; let us see what it can do this time. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I am very pleased to be here today to deliver my first Address in Reply speech in this new parliament. It does not seem like 4½ years since I very nervously stood here to deliver my first speech in this house. What a learning experience it has been in the last 4½ years and how much wiser I have become in many ways, none the least of which in terms of political processes. It has been a rewarding four years in many ways but it has also been frustrating in others. It is true, as Bob Carr once said to us, that your best day in opposition is never as good as your worst day in government. I have already found that to be quite true.

How different it is being in government. Finally I might be able to deliver some promises to the people of my electorate and truly do something for them. I want to thank all those people who helped me to be here again today. First, I thank my dear staff: Eddie Hughes has been with me since the previous election and has been a mainstay in my office. Eddie Hughes is a person people love to hate in Whyalla. Certainly, he has been a very active member of the community and he has assisted me greatly in my electorate work. I thank Tracy Robinson, who works as one of my electorate staff. She has helped me greatly not only over the election period but also over the last two years she has been working for me.

She also helps with my finances, which is a very important role in my office. I thank Pat Toomer, who comes from a social work background. Pat has been able to handle those inquiries coming into our office that seem impossible at the time but Pat always manages to do something with them. Finally, I thank young Ryan Sutherland, who has certainly worked very hard in my office in the last 12 months and who has been a wonderful support to me. Ryan has been a trainee for the past 12 months. She will be leaving in a week or two. She has been a wonderful young trainee—a ray of sunshine in the office: hard working, cooperative and steeped in Labor Party background. Her aunty was a former state secretary of the Labor Party in South Australia, a person very dear to us on this side of the house, Kay Sutherland. I particularly want to wish Ryan well in her future. She is the sort of young woman who shows how much the youth of our future has to offer and how much we can be confident that the world is safe in these young people's hands. I thank all my staff very much for their loyalty and support, their caring for me and their hard work over the last four years.

Many people assisted in my election, particularly Wendy Shirley, who once again did a great job managing my campaign. I particularly want to mention my son Tim, who was certainly the mainstay of my campaign and who looked after me. He went out and put up and took down posters and drove around delivering and picking up things. Family support is so important when you are working as a member of parliament, and also during election campaigns. You really cannot manage without them. I think they sacrifice so much. I do not think that my children saw a hot meal in four or five weeks. They also often do not see a hot meal just in the

course of my electorate duties, unless they organise it themselves—although take-aways are pretty good; you work out where to get the best take-aways in town.

I think that our families are really important. My son certainly helped me, and also my daughter Kate, who is the light of my life—although she does know everything. She is 16 years old and she knows everything at this stage. I think in another 10 years, by the time she turns 25, she will probably be quite amazed at how much I have learnt. But at this stage she certainly knows a lot more than I. Just ask her! She is a wonderful child, and she has been a great support to me. She really has had to grow up as I have been a member of parliament. Often the children of MPs have a far more difficult role than perhaps do other children and, as I have said to her so often, ‘You will be judged much more harshly than your peers for everything you do because of the fact that you are a member of parliament’s daughter.’ Those children, and the children of other members, need our support as well as the support that they give us.

There are other people who have helped me in my campaign. In particular, Alex Glinski from Whyalla helped me so much in the things that I did. He helped to write pamphlets for me, he took photographs and made me look good. He made me look 10 years younger; he is almost a miracle worker! I certainly appreciate the support that Alex gave me, which was very much on a voluntary basis. I am thankful to all the other people who helped. We had to keep an electorate office running, so there were many others who were doing things on the side that helped us out.

It will be very different being in government, and there are certainly many new faces here. I congratulate all the other candidates who took part in the Giles election for a clean and well fought campaign, but I am just very glad that I am here and that I was able to increase my majority. I am very thankful for that. I welcome all my new colleagues here in parliament. It is good to see them here. I congratulate members on both sides of the house on their election but, in particular, I congratulate my newly elected colleagues on this side of the house. I understand how they feel in making their maiden speeches because, as I said, I was very nervous when I made my first one. But it does get easier.

I also want to particularly mention the former member for Napier, Annette Hurley. I am sorry that she is not back with us. I certainly hope that she makes a success of her life. I am sure that she will. She gave us much assistance and was a great deputy leader for us here in this house. I also want to particularly congratulate the member for Napier who is here today. I am very pleased to see him, because he attended Whyalla High School with me and was a graduate of the same matriculation class—I will not tell members what year it was, but it was a long time ago. I did my matriculation when I was three years old! I am pleased that he is here. I think it is also a very good recommendation for Whyalla High School, which it is currently fighting for its survival, because a recommendation was made to the previous government to close the school after 60 years. So, certainly, the school community is on tenterhooks. I think that, when you realise that Michael and I are both sitting here in government at this time, it is a good recommendation for the state school system and particularly for that school.

We also have another colleague in the other house, one of the new Legislative Councillors—Terry Stephens. Can I refer to him by name? He also attended Whyalla High School and, although he is an opposition member, I am very pleased to see that he is here.

The SPEAKER: It is appropriate to refer to him as ‘the honourable’.

Ms BREUER: Yes, the Hon. Terry Stephens. I am sorry, I keep forgetting. I will never be an ‘honourable’, but legislative councillors are right from the start. Although he is in opposition, well done to him, and congratulations again to Whyalla High School. Certainly, I will be making known to my school the fact that presently there are three of us here in the parliament. So, we have a new government and a new parliament.

I cannot speak today without mentioning two of my former colleagues. I know that I may not be popular for mentioning this, but I want to mention Ralph Clarke and Murray De Laine. They were friends to me, and it is with great sadness that I reflect on the nature of their departure from parliament. They were both loyal, true members of the Labor Party for most of their lives and I know that both were heartbroken when those ties had to be severed. But such is the nature of politics. I was told many years ago that it was a dirty game, but I did not realise how dirty politics can get. This is all in the past and I am certainly moving forward, but I want to thank them for their friendship, support and help over the last four years in my first parliamentary term. I did not like what happened, but it happened. I think that there was probably a better way. But that is in the past. Two better mates I could not have had. My best wishes go to both of them in their new lives and to their families—to Maryanne De Laine, to John, Murray’s son and to Mary and Kathryn Clarke and Sue Green, who I know were wonderful supports for Murray and Ralph in their worst times. So, good luck, and my best wishes go to all those people.

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

Ms BREUER: The main matter I want to continue with tonight may be considered a federal issue, but it relates to so many areas covered in the Governor’s speech that it is important for me to talk about it. What I am about to say will not win me many votes, and I have no doubt that it will antagonise many of my constituents, who will tell me in no uncertain terms, but I must say it: I cannot remain silent any longer. Under Australian law, refugee children and their parents must be kept in detention until their status has been determined and a possible claim for asylum assessed. In the past three years 2 500 children have been locked up behind razor wire in Australia. They have not been convicted of any crime, but many are detained for up to 2½ years. They are deprived of their freedom and daily witness violence, stress and suicide attempts.

The Minister for Immigration, Phillip Ruddock, said on the *Sunday* program on channel 9 last weekend that the situation distressed him, but he said that responsible parents remove their children away from that environment and away from witnessing those sorts of events when they occurred, and that even in a detention environment parents have particular responsibilities in relation to what their children see and what they are exposed to. So, where in the hell do they go, Mr Ruddock? They are in a detention centre, for God’s sake, and are surrounded by razor wire. Do they just slip out for the day to the zoo? When they slit their wrists, jump on to razor wire or sew up their lips, they are seen as attention seekers who try to do their thing.

So, why don’t they slip out to Hungry Jack’s for the day and let the kids play on the equipment while mum and dad have a bit of a break from the rigours of hunger striking,

suffering mental breakdowns or swallowing shampoo and disinfectant just to get some attention? So, remove your children, you poor miserable mothers and fathers. Keep them in their little cells day and night so that they do not see any of this. I am sorry, but there is no where else for them to go. It is too bad about meal times—they would have to miss out because you should not take your children to the dining area in case they see violence or injury occurring there.

I visited the Woomera detention centre in March for the second time in three years. I have only twice been allowed into the place. In fairness, it is not primitive and conditions are quite adequate for people to live in. At the front it is interesting as there is a very big welcome sign, which is nice for the new detainees when they arrive from overseas. But it is surrendered by huge fences and topped by razor wire. Last weekend on the *Sunday* program I saw a little boy called Asghar who said of his time in the detention centre, 'I felt like I was in a gaol, that's all.'

On Monday, when driving to Adelaide, I drove past the Port Augusta prison. There are huge fences surrounding it and they are topped by razor wire. No wonder this poor little boy felt like he was in gaol, because he was. The difference between the Port Augusta prison and the detention centre at Woomera, however, is that the Port Augusta prison has lawn, trees, attractive buildings and is facing the sea; apart from the fence it is quite attractive. However, the Woomera centre is bleak and barren, there is no grass or trees, it is dusty and hot and it is away from everywhere; and a 360 degree view of the gibber plain is obvious.

Another little boy on the same program said, 'I felt same animals.' Of course he felt like an animal, poor little boy—they are treated like animals. In the new Baxter centre they are dispensing with the razor wire—they are taking it down: it will not surround the camp at all. They are going to electrify the fences. How much like an animal is that?

In this Woomera camp I visited one of the accommodation units. On the way one of the guards said, 'I would not mind living like these people.' Well, he is welcome to do so, because it was a small Atco hut about the size of the strangers' dining room here at Parliament House. There were four rooms, separated by blankets on the doors. In it was a family of mum, dad, a little boy and girl about five and seven years old and a new baby. There was also a young boy of about 14 years and two adult males living there also. There was no en suite. You walked across the compound in the middle of the night to go to the communal bathroom. It was warm and adequate, but hardly dignified or appropriate.

One of the saddest sights I have ever seen, especially as a mother, was a 14 year old boy lying on the bed, with absolutely no life in his eyes. He was lethargic and listless—his life was hopeless. Why was he not out playing footy or chasing girls like other 14 year old boys?

I have had enough and cannot stay silent on this matter any longer. It is happening in my electorate. It is absolute child abuse. It is subjecting babies, toddlers, young children and teenagers to abuse, to mental torture and to conditions that I would not let my dog live in. But, I am suppose to shut up, condone it and let it happen. Well, I will not do so because I am a mother. Stuff all those people out there who try to tell me that we have to do this, that we cannot let them go free, that we have to control this immigration and that we have to shoot them out of the water. If they were Australian children, we as a country would be screaming about this sort of abuse, but because these poor little kids have come here

with their parents or been sent out alone, we say to them, 'Serve you right'. I am ashamed to be an Australian.

The *Advertiser* of Saturday 4 May quotes the Mayor of Port Augusta, Joy Baluch. She stated that she attended a meeting in Woomera last week to discuss whether the children from the Woomera centre should be allowed to attend the Woomera school. She sees it as a forerunner for children from the Baxter Centre at Port Augusta being allowed into the Port Augusta school. She says, 'We don't want them. These bloody kids are not like our kids. They walk up and down in the detention centre slashing their arms with razor blades, emulating their parents. Their ways are not our ways. We have enough trouble in our schools as it is.'

This is the most appalling statement I have ever heard from a well-known civic leader. Public office carries responsibilities. I will not stand by and allow this blatant peddling of prejudice and misinformation to occur. I find it abhorrent. 'These bloody kids are not like our kids,' she said. How can a mother and a grandmother say such awful things?

I have talked to the children in these camps, and kids are kids, wherever they are. They laugh, they cry, they love and act like any other children. If they are doing the things that she accuses them of doing, it is because they are desperate and because of our condoning this cruel, harsh inhumane system. This system allows the children to leave the camp for about four hours a day to go to a school that is set up in the Woomera township at the old Catholic St Michael's school. I went there and, like any school in any town or city in Australia, there was a little boy outside the classroom in time out. What is different? But there the teachers, who are qualified, nice teachers, wore uniforms. How much confidence, how much trust and how much rapport does that establish in those children? In Baxter, the new camp, a special area is set aside for the school with nice area classrooms, trees and lawns and playgrounds. But there is a big wire fence around it, and the children are brought in each day, having been collected from their compound in a bus; the big gates will be opened and slammed shut again once the children are in there.

I cannot allow the Mayor of Port Augusta to go unchallenged on her statements. That would be to allow institutionalised peddling of the untruths and the myths that the federal government anxiously wants promoted. I know that many people out there will criticise me for saying what I am saying today, but so be it. I cannot in my conscience allow children in my electorate to be treated so harshly.

The new government and the Minister for Family and Youth Services responded quickly to criticisms of the camp and sent in a team to investigate. What did the federal minister say in response to their findings? He said that the minister responded too quickly and should have substantiated the claims and the information. That was on a report that was prepared on the minister's instructions.

I am going to go a step further in antagonising people in my electorate and the wider community. A very good pilot study has been happening in Woomera and I want to explain it. Alternative detention arrangements for some women and children detained at the Woomera Immigration Reception and Processing Centre have been established by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs. The project enables some women and their children to live in family-style accommodation away from the centre while remaining in immigration detention.

The first volunteers moved into it on 7 August 2001. The project is limited to a maximum of 25 women and children,

and a selection committee comprising the centre's business manager, ACM manager, a welfare officer and a Woomera resident assesses the eligible volunteers against the criteria. Those who may go in include women with children who have a family member remaining at the detention centre, female children of any age and male children 12 years of age and under, for cultural and practical reasons. The women and children reside in a cluster of four three-bedroom houses leased from the Department of Defence which formerly housed defence families.

Their day-to-day needs such as groceries and other household items are provided but they can go shopping for them and the families manage the day-to-day running of the households including cooking and cleaning. The participants are free to visit each other in the centre. The project is voluntary and people are selected once they volunteer as participants. If they abscond or behave in an inappropriate manner, they are taken back to the centre. Children taking part in the program continue to participate in the school program provided by the centre.

Why not let all the families go into the community under an arrangement where they can stay until their applications are processed? I believe that something like 84 per cent of all asylum seekers are found to be legitimate refugees and are allowed to stay in Australia. In Whyalla, we have lost approximately 10 000 people since 1978. Over 500 Housing Trust homes in Whyalla are empty. I am told that a lot are not ready for families to move into, but, looking at the money that has been spent on the Baxter centre and the Woomera centre, I do not see that as a problem. Perhaps we could have a trial in Whyalla of letting families move there while waiting for their visas. Our schools need children and our economy could benefit greatly from extra people.

We have had waves of refugees in the last 50 years. We had Europeans after World War II. We have had Vietnamese migrants and refugees, Polish refugees, South American refugees and, in recent years, refugees from Bosnia and Yugoslavia. We have always been able to make it work because we have a very strong multicultural community. It costs \$104 a day to keep detainees in camp. Community detention would have to be cheaper. I might get run out of Whyalla for this suggestion, but why can't we think about it? Refugees would stimulate our local economy, creating demand for goods and services.

Approximately 17 000 asylum seekers live in Sweden and, currently, more than 10 000 of them live outside detention centres. Compare that with our numbers—we are talking of hundreds. Children are only detained for a minimum time and a maximum of six days. We could give new life to our schools in Whyalla. Mayor Baluch, in her outrageous statements, said that she was speaking on behalf of detention centre employees who could not speak out or they would lose their job. They do not want their children mixing with detainee children in their schools. Maybe it should be written into their contracts that this will happen. After all, these guards earn something like \$80 000 per year. They do not come in with their eyes closed.

I intended to go to that meeting in Woomera but I had an important meeting in Adelaide, so I would have needed to charter a plane at a cost of between \$4 000 and \$5 000 to attend. I was contacted by a parent who said that their primary school child had come home saying that they were going to form gangs to protect themselves from the violence they were expecting from the camp children. That was when I decided not to go, because where would primary school

children come up with that sort of reasoning if they had not heard it in their homes?

If people thought about the countries that these people have come from, the trauma they have gone through to get here and the inhumane way in which we treat them when they arrive, surely some compassion must be felt. Surely we are not that heartless in Australia that we cannot share our country with them. There is no legal way for these people to get here. They are not illegal immigrants because there is nothing that they can do legally to apply to come here. Most of them are not terrorists. No doubt there are some trouble-makers and criminals, but five, six and seven year old children are not criminals, and neither are their parents or the vast majority of asylum seekers.

I must say how disgusted I was at the performance of the recent protesters at Woomera. I have no problem with protesters and fights for the rights of gay whales or against uranium mining or whatever, but this was the most irresponsible display I have ever seen, and what incredible damage it has done to the lives of many of those detainees, most of whom are now in Port Hedland, never to be allowed to stay in Australia. Some of these people were about to get their visas. I know of at least two whose visas had already been granted. They now have no hope of staying here. I hope those protesters are having trouble sleeping at night, because you cannot play with people's lives like they did. If you want to protest, do so in the city, not at these camps.

I know that the detainees were warned because I was there the day before the protests happened. They were warned not to escape, not to encourage the protesters, but if you have 700 people urging you from the other side of the fence, which they have managed to knock down, screaming out to you, offering their hands to you, offering escape packs, and you are absolutely desperate, of course you will try to escape. It was a dreadful, unnecessary incident and I hope that it will never happen again. I hope these protesters will think very carefully about what they did and the damage they have created in these people's lives. There are many other ways that they can help detainees, but not by doing something like that.

I now want to quote from the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The 1990 Convention on the Rights of the Child, ratified by Australia in 1990, requires Australia to provide protection and humanitarian assistance to all children seeking refuge, with the child's best interests as a primary consideration. According to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, detention should only be used as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time.

The policy of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is that children seeking asylum, especially unaccompanied children, should not be detained. Uniting children with family members who are already in the country should be the government's priority. Appropriate foster care is another option, but the Australian government must ensure that all children seeking asylum receive education, medical care and quick determinations of their refugee claims. That is not happening at Woomera. It is taking months and years for their claims to be assessed. They are not receiving adequate schooling; they are getting basic schooling. They are doing a bit of maths, a bit of English and some Australian culture, but basically their education is poor, and all of their teachers wear uniforms and are identified by these children as guards from the camp. That is not fair and those children have no future with that sort of education.

Lastly, I want to talk about the terrorist aspect. The people in camps are described as terrorists. I know of one or two who might be. There is a guard of Saddam Hussein in one camp and there are some terrorists and we have serious doubts about their eligibility, but the majority of these people have come here because they want the best for their children. They are middle-class people who could afford to come here or who have sacrificed everything to get their families here. They are the sort of people who have done what we would have done. We would have tried the same thing to make a future for our children in Australia, but we brand them as terrorists.

I want to read a letter from a little boy that was handed to me when I was in the Woomera camp three or four weeks ago. He was a beautiful little brown-eyed boy, like so many of the children I met. They were beautiful children, like my children were, and like so many other little children I have met. My heart broke to see them, my eyes filled with tears. They are someone's children and someone's grandchildren. They are loved as much as my children were—and still are. How can we treat these babies like this? How can we condone this sort of start in their chosen country? How can we brand them as terrorists? The letter was written by his mother, but the little boy handed it to me. It states:

Dear Minister, Thank you very much for your housing project, and we are grateful about it.

He is talking about the project where the detainees live away from the centre. The letter continued:

I'm detainee at the housing project. I have been at the detention for one year. I was with the first persons who came to the project and all the other families who came to the project got (visa) and the only person remaining is me in this seven months that I have been in the project. So many people have got (visa). I have tried so much to become an Australian (I mean have Australian lifestyle). I have one son and every time someone gets visa he becomes really upset me and my husband we haven't made any problem since I've been here. I have worked so hard. I have done gardening, I have washed bins, I have babysat (children without parents) and etc.

And my husband has work in the kitchen of the centre for so long and all this time he was alone at the centre and I was in here. I have become sick and I don't know what to do to stop my son suffering and at these stage I have got bleeding and vomiting and bad headache and I am going to hospital every two weeks, and all the doctors say that its from the stress and I have finished patient. Please help and try to understand my situation I think may be I have passed my exams because you can ask the officers about my behaviour and I am living almost an Australian life and no-one at the project has any complaints about me (I am going to church every Sunday and my son is going to school). Please help thank you for reading my letter. Mary.

Mr Speaker, I cannot see that this person is a terrorist.

An honourable member: Well done!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind members that it is not appropriate to clap in the chamber. Before calling the member for Bragg, I point out to members that this is the member's first speech, and I ask the house to extend the courtesy of listening in silence to the member for Bragg. I call the member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): On 5 March 2002, I entered this chamber for the first time as a member of parliament. It was more than just a personal milestone for me and other new members. Of more historical significance, the first day of the 50th parliament will not be forgotten. On that day, sir, you became the Speaker of the House. And I duly acknowledge your appointment as Deputy Speaker; I am sure you will convey that.

Indeed, it has served to remind me of the timeless words of Sir Thomas Playford when he remarked, 'Just remember that in politics you will have different friends at different times for different reasons.' I consider it of paramount importance that the work of this house is not only constructive but that it is conducted with civility and dignity. We are here to produce better outcomes for all South Australians. To this extent you can expect a standard of presentation and behaviour that befits this responsibility. You have that undertaking from me, and I expect no less from you. I may seek your indulgence from time to time, sir, if I were to refer to you as 'your honour'. Old habits die hard, but I assure you that it will not be done with the intention of elevating your status.

Mr Speaker, may I record my thanks to the Clerk of the house and his staff for their instruction and tuition. I am pleased to say that all the new members have graduated and are now expert in filling out forms and operating security passes. Some of us may be a bit green on the standing orders, but that may not be such a problem since it seems there are more rules outside that document than within—but we will learn.

I am sorry that my late husband David is not here today, but I say that his love and support never wavered. My children are 7th generation South Australians and they, like me, are very proud of our state. William and Alex are my joy and inspiration and I hope that I am, and will be, as supportive of them in their careers as they have been of me in mine.

Each one of us has entered parliament through a different path. For me that path began on Kangaroo Island. I have been joined on that journey by family and friends, and it is thanks to their support that I stand in this chamber today. Whatever skills and attributes I bring to this chamber I owe to them.

The first great influences on my life were my parents. My mother, like so many women of her generation, sacrificed her career to start a family. Her selflessness not only inspired her children but also has continued to touch the lives of many people around her. Dad worked hard to give us a home at Gum Valley and to ensure his children were given the opportunities he never had. He is a study of determination and generosity. Although neither of them were thrilled at my decision to enter politics, I have always enjoyed their love and support.

But our home was not always a happy one. When I was five we lost my elder brother Billy in a tragic accident. Seven years later my parents separated. As a child these could be seen as soul destroying experiences. Instead, these events have taught me the importance of responsibility and self-sufficiency. As the oldest of the remaining four children, I stepped into the role of de facto mother to my sisters and brother. They were not easy times. But our circumstances brought us closer together. In the background there was the guiding influence of my great grandmother, who raised 14 children, and my grandmother who, today, at the age of 85, still runs her own small business in the heart of Alice Springs. These great women have shown me the value of endurance and strength.

My schooling was with the children of soldier settlers at Parndana Area School. Life, we were taught, was more than marrying the boy next door. My real education came from people across the community. A woolclasser once said to me, 'You have two ears and one mouth and if you use them in that proportion you will do well.'

I left Kangaroo Island with a sewing machine and a foundation for life. Moving to Adelaide I was determined to

make the most of the opportunity to benefit from further education, but we never forgot the importance of family. Chapman & Associates was a family affair employing me and my three sisters. I am indebted to all those who worked with me for their friendship, support and loyalty. I would like to pay particular tribute to Brigitte who, after seven years of terrific service at Chapman & Associates, has accepted my offer to join me in my political career. My former legal colleagues are owed a great deal. They taught me the value of reasoned argument without personal insult. Their influences will be embodied in my new career.

Standing here today would not have been possible without the Liberal Party. When I first started working for the Liberal cause I was too young to vote, but I was old enough to join my father on the campaign trail, culminating in his election as the member for Alexandra. I remember sitting in the galleries of this parliament watching the fiery debates of the Dunstan era. The member for Finnis had long hair then; more importantly, the member for Stuart had hair. They have each served our state with distinction in the highest of office and the harshest of regions respectively. I now have the pleasure of being seated with them and of having the benefit of their wise counsel.

Thirty years with the organisational wing of the Liberal Party has given me the privilege of working with people from branch level to the secretariat in almost every position the party has to offer, from Secretary to State President. Their professionalism, energy and dedication have always set us apart from our opponents.

The Liberal Party has always been at the forefront of recognising the contribution women can make in politics. Joyce Steele was the first woman member of the House of Assembly, representing Burnside. The Liberal Party also chose the state's first woman minister, again Joyce Steele. It is the Liberal Party that has done what our opponents can only talk about. It is the Liberal Party which preselected women in the safest liberal seats in the state. As the member for Bragg, I join the member for Flinders in sharing that honour. When the Labor Party have women members for Port Adelaide and Ramsay they will have my sincere congratulations, but in the meantime they have a long way to catch up.

When Joyce Steele left the parliament in 1970, her seat was absorbed into the new seat of Bragg. Its first member was the former Premier, Dr David Tonkin, who, among other achievements, introduced the Sex Discrimination Bill in 1973—the first of its kind in Australia. Dr Tonkin was well supported by the tireless efforts of the Liberal Party members in Bragg. Some of those members and many new ones have given me the same support. I thank all members of the Liberal family in Bragg for their friendship, advice and hard work. These members have made a determined contribution to good governance, and I am determined that with them, together, we will restore respect to our institutions in this state—a state that, despite its size, is a national leader in so many fields: IT; wine; defence industries; car manufacturing; agriculture; education and so many others.

Bragg is an often misunderstood seat. The media like to wax lyrical about the leafy eastern suburbs, but the reality is that so many Bragg residents have worked hard and contributed to the community. They have educated their children, paid off their homes and saved hard for retirement. The truth is that, having spent their lives building their assets to provide for their retirement, they now find that those assets do not necessarily produce a high income.

When the business community cheers low interest rates, self-funded retirees suffer a loss of income. Our people in the seat of Bragg have a long history of being a strong and vibrant community. It is a tradition that continues today with projects such as the extension of the Burnside War Memorial Hospital to ensure that it remains at the forefront of health care.

I have made a commitment to the people of Bragg that I will be the member who listens and acts with their interests front and centre. I will not let them down. They deserve nothing less than the commitment I give. I embrace the principle unique to the Liberal Party, that we represent the whole of the electorate and not just party members. This is an opportunity to celebrate being a Liberal. Electoral defeat tests our resolve in what we stand for but, despite our loss at the last state election, I am as strongly a Liberal today as ever. I am firmly committed to ensuring that we sell liberalism in a way that will win the hearts and minds of South Australians at the next electoral opportunity. No election loss will shake my belief that liberalism provides people with more control over their lives and more opportunities to shape their own destiny.

I was brought up to understand that the Liberal principles of equal opportunity, of basic freedoms (of speech, to own property and worship, freedom from want) and, most of all, of treating people on merit as opposed to relating to them on the basis of fear and prejudice were the foundations on which a community was built. However, as a child on Kangaroo Island, politics and the legislature were as remote to me as the Althorpes Lighthouse on the horizon. I was cocooned in a world that revolved around school, fishing and milking cows. I was more excited when our house was connected to mains power in 1970 than when Neil Armstrong walked on the moon six months earlier. People worked hard on their properties. We endlessly prayed for rain to come and then we would pray for it to stop. We played sport, went to local dances and were oblivious to the hardships of the rest of the world.

But then something happened. The adults were all talking about two local boys who were working for the Woolleys on the farm next to ours. Mr Woolley was a sheep farmer like most others in the district. Mrs Woolley taught at the Parndana Area School. We were told that the Bell boys didn't have a ticket, and all hell was breaking loose. The wool from the property, the whole year's work, had been black-banned. There were meetings and telephone calls, with the whole community listening in on the party line, and before we knew it the whole island (our home) had been black-banned by Jim Dunford, the then Secretary of the AWU. After sharing in the development of our state for over 160 years, Kangaroo Island had been callously shut down—all because two boys would not join the union.

Of course, as children, all that meant to us was that someone in Adelaide said that no food could be brought into Kangaroo Island and no wool could leave, but we knew that something had gone terribly wrong. Our community distress turned to anger and there was even talk of secession. Our fate was ultimately decided in the Supreme Court of South Australia. Years later I read the Woolley v. Dunford case. Jim Dunford lost the court case and was ordered to pay nearly \$10 000—back then you could buy a house in Adelaide for that—but when he said he would not pay something extraordinary happened. Don Dunstan, the then Premier and Treasurer, authorised the government to pay Jim Dunford's court order to save him from incarceration. As taxpayers, Don

Dunstan made our community pay for the case that it had won. I will never forget the cruel dismissal of our community by his hand.

Much has been written and said of the Dunstan government—and I acknowledge that there have been some achievements—but many of the things Dunstan has been credited with were the achievements of others. Rewriting history by renaming the Playhouse in the Festival Theatre will not change the truth about how the Festival Theatre came into being. It was under the Hall Liberal government of 1968-1970. The Premier's making his first act the renaming of the theatre—the rewriting of history—speaks volumes about the flawed priorities of the Labor Party. There is a lot of eulogising of Don Dunstan by Labor. Every party has its heroes, but heroism should be based on fact, not sentiment.

Understand this: until the Labor Party reconciles with its past and accepts the tremendous faults of the Dunstan era it will continue to fail the people of South Australia. It cannot build our state's future on a lie, the lie that the Dunstan era was all good for this state. Early on I understood that the Labor Party represented not working people but people who belonged to a union—and nothing has changed. The Labor Party still advocates that it is the party to represent working people. The fact that its structure provides for union membership, union participation, union voting on preselections and union funding and dominates its operations makes that claim a farce.

The truth is that across Australia under a federal Liberal government the real wages of working people have increased and under the previous federal Labor government the real wages of working people fell. Just as a major shareholder in any company dictates the rules, so too is the Labor Party trapped by the unions. Doubtless the Premier—or his deputy on his behalf—will cry: not so, we are beholden to no-one. However, I look across the chamber and see that at least in name they are all still there. The Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union owns the members for Cheltenham and Reynell. The Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Union owns the members for Croydon, West Torrens, Playford and Napier. The United Firefighters Union owns the member for Colton.

The Australian Workers Union owns the members for Lee and Taylor. The Australian Education Union owns the member for Giles. The Australian Services Union owns the members for Port Adelaide and Kaurana. The member for Ashford is partly owned by the Transport Workers Union, the Australian Services Union and the Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union. The member for Elder is shared by the Australian Services Union, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Union and the Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union. The Member for Ramsay is answerable to the Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union and the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance Union. That union also owns the member for Florey.

Rest assured that we are about to see a union government, and as this government rolls out its policies in education, health and community safety we ask: will our children, our elderly and our sick be the beneficiaries? The answer simply is no. It will be the unions. So, watch for it, it is coming. This Labor government will attempt to camouflage it with all kinds of window dressing and other cosmetic measures. Labor's union driven, 'one size fits all' approach to policy-making threatens the very core of liberalism: education and training.

Liberals are passionate about education. That is why our last government spent \$85.6 million to ensure that there was a computer for every five students in our classrooms. The annual IT budget for education for the last Labor government was only \$360 000. We believe that through study and learning every individual can grow, develop new skills and move their lives in the direction that they choose. It is education that creates opportunities for all South Australians to make a better life for themselves.

That is why Partnerships 21 is so important. Partnerships 21 gives parents and schools the chance to share the decisions affecting their children's future. It recognises that all individual learning needs are not uniform nor one-dimensional. It is an initiative that helps build stronger communities. Individuals with a sense of social responsibility, a shared experience and a commitment beyond themselves build a community. But we cannot afford to stand still. We must continue moving forward to make sure education meets the demands of our children and the challenges of the new century.

To do that we must recognise that our traditional concept of family has changed. Single working parents and families where both parents work have become part of the mainstream. Our education policies need to be viewed through that prism. We can no longer assume that schoolchildren have a supervised home to go back to at the end of each school day. It is time to reassess the conventional wisdom of the school day regime of 8.30 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. and to consider how we might maximise family time together outside of the school and working day. A first-class education system that is accessible only to certain sections of the community due to financial or geographic factors undermines the doctrine of liberalism.

We need to bring everyone with us. Nowhere is disadvantage in education greater in South Australia than in indigenous communities. Indigenous communities are being held back primarily because of isolation geographically and the opportunity for employment. When the opportunity for a job seems extremely remote, so then the enthusiasm for education wanes. So let us take a fresh look at everything we do with Aboriginal communities. We still close their schools during the hottest months of the year. There is no plausible explanation for this practice when these communities already have access to airconditioned classrooms.

They may prefer keeping them open during the summer and enjoying a much longer winter break. It is time to recognise that the school calendar needs to be flexible with individual communities. Liberalism extends beyond individual empowerment. It is also about building communities that care. We must extend the previous government's initiative in encouraging school students to participate in community and volunteer organisations, including sporting clubs. When people feel they are making a contribution it builds a sense of community—a realisation that they are part of a shared experience.

Educators have had to assume the burden alone in preparing our children for the future when families have fractured or community support disintegrates. We owe it to our teachers to recognise their efforts and to ensure that their load is shared. Giving our children the best possible education and access to lifelong learning is liberalism in practice. Underpinning liberalism is the notion of liberty. Liberalism clearly means that you should not be constrained by the state unless what you want to do could inhibit the freedom of

others. The ultimate goal of being a Liberal is to see every citizen empowered to take control of their own life.

For governments, liberalism is about empowering people and then having faith in them to make their own decisions, and if you have faith in people they will build communities and they will support each other. That is the fundamental difference between Liberal and Labor. The Labor Party perpetuates the myth that governments can and should solve all of society's problems. Labor tries to manufacture communities. Governments can deliver services and build infrastructure but they cannot build communities. Governments cannot solve those problems where the solution more properly lies in the hands of the individual.

Labor's philosophy is to legislate and regulate every facet of our life because they do not have faith in people to make their own decisions. Labor rejects liberalism because they distrust people. The Premier's announcement that he intends to make his government accountable is interesting to say the least. Given that he was part of the Bannon government that concealed \$3.5 billion in State Bank debt in off balance sheet companies, this is a refreshing turnaround. We will wait to see whether he delivers. May I remind the Premier that when he introduces the new code of conduct it is debt, not assets, that makes people vulnerable to corruption. That is what he should be looking for, not who has shares in soccer clubs.

As today's parliamentarians we face a critical choice: will we confront the vast opportunities and difficult challenges ahead of us with a sense of purpose or will we simply warm these seats? We have all the power as members of parliament to do the things that need to be done. What we do not always have is the courage to use it. There is for all of us in this chamber an opportunity to meet the new challenges of the next century while protecting the values that have kept us on course for more than 200 years.

The Premier and his team have been given the privilege of government. While some have the capacity to change that before the next election, I am not one of them. I respect the choice of South Australians and I will undertake my duties as the member for Bragg and as a member of the opposition team to the best of my ability. I thank our leader for giving me the privilege of being the voice of children, students and women in our state. I place on record my commitment to the education and care of children and to the advancement of women. I will be noting every promise, every statement, every act, every omission of this government on those issues.

I know that I am part of a team which recognises that we must earn the privilege of government. In the meantime, I have marked in my diary the third Saturday in March 2006.

There being a disturbance in the Speaker's gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is not appropriate to clap in the chamber. Before calling the next speaker, I point out to members—and I am not just referring to the previous speaker—that several phrases have been used today in this chamber by new members that normally would not be tolerated because they reflect on other members. I now call the member for Napier but, before he speaks, I point out that this is his first speech and I ask members to extend him the courtesy of hearing him in silence.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Having read the maiden speeches of a number of former and current members of this house, I note that many have used it as a load stone, or what Ben Chifley described as a light on the hill—a point of reference for their subsequent political career. I have chosen to do likewise. My point of reference must be the electorate

of Napier, a community classified as Australia's most vulnerable by a joint University of Queensland and Monash University study into welfare dependency. I will return to this subject a little later in the speech.

The electorate of Napier comprises seven of the 10 suburbs of what was in the 1950s and 1960's the satellite city of Elizabeth, as well as the newer suburbs of Blakeview and Craigmore. It also includes the very old township of One Tree Hill and the equally early Smithfield, which has now grown into a fully-fledged suburb. It is the suburbs of Elizabeth, Elizabeth East, Elizabeth South, Elizabeth Park, Elizabeth Downs, Elizabeth North, Elizabeth West and Davoren Park (formerly Elizabeth Field) that broadly define the electorate of Napier and the challenges it faces. The genesis for Elizabeth is to be found in the British New Town Movement, in the Playford plan for the industrialisation of South Australia and in the dynamism of the South Australian Housing Trust.

In Britain the industrial revolution not only blighted the lives of those forced to work in what Charles Dickens described as the 'satanic mills' but it also blighted the nation's towns and cities with the mills' attendant industrial slums.

British reformers and town planners sought, in the early 20th century, to curtail the further growth of slum type housing, with a new concept described as 'the garden suburb'. Rather than entrust the further development of British towns and cities to rapacious developers determined to maximise their financial returns with construction of more cheek by jowl workers' tenements, the reformers intervened. New suburbs—the garden suburbs—would have wide streets in place of the narrow lanes of the slums. There would be public gardens and playing areas for children, where in the slums there were none. Housing allotments would be sufficiently large to allow working people the amenity of their own garden, a pleasure denied them in the slum.

A South Australian manifestation of the British garden suburb movement is Colonel Light Gardens, a Labor government initiative of the 1920s. The scope of the garden suburb to significantly better the lot of British working men and women was, however, limited by the relatively slow organic growth of British cities after the appalling loss of life on the battlefields of the Great War. Conservative opposition to any significant expenditures that would improve the lot of working people in the immediate post-war decade also meant the slow growth of the garden suburbs. As in Australia, though the war was won, Tory governments ensured that the peace was lost.

With the widespread destruction of British towns and cities by the Luftwaffe during the Second World War, the possibility of embarking on a program far more ambitious than that of the garden suburbs now became possible. There was also an intense determination within the British Labor movement that, unlike the first war, this time the peace would be won. The opportunity, the determination and the election of the Labor Atlee government saw the commencement of a British new town program in 1947 along the lines suggested by the Reith committee of 1946. Unlike the earlier garden suburb movement, which tacked on new workers' suburbs to existing towns and cities, the new town program would bring into being over the next decade 17 entirely new towns. One of these, Stevenage, would be later replicated on the plains of northern Adelaide.

In Australia, the British new town concept was eagerly picked up by members of the town planning profession. At

the 1952 Federal Congress on Regional and Town Planning, A.J. Brown called on the congress to embrace a national new town policy. His argument—that new towns would relieve congestion in the larger cities, and so aid in their reconstruction—followed the British line very closely, and he proposed that, ‘these measures must be on a heroic scale, comparable with the British plans’.

Earlier in 1951, A.A. Heath and R.N. Hewison launched their First Six New Cities Australia Movement, announcing it in the British Journal *Town and Country Planning*. They proposed a direct link with migration schemes that would transfer people from the overcrowded areas of the United Kingdom to suitable sites in the dominion. Only one state—South Australia—was to take up this call.

As I said earlier, the genesis for Elizabeth is to be found in the British new town movement, in the Playford plan for the industrialisation of South Australia and in the dynamism of the South Australian Housing Trust. It is generally agreed that South Australia suffered more than any other state during the Great Depression because of its dependence on primary industry. A broad consensus at the time was that the state had to develop a more diversified industrial economy to reduce its vulnerability in times of economic downturn. An immediate spur was the threat by General Motors-Holden’s, product of a 1931 buy-out of local vehicle body builder Holden by the US auto giant General Motors, to move its production facilities to Victoria unless ‘disabilities’, in the form of wharfage rates and company tax, were reduced. J.W. Wainright, the state’s Auditor-General, estimated in a 1935 report that the move would cost at least a quarter of a million dollars in yearly revenue and nearly 10 000 jobs.

The Playford plan for South Australia’s industrialisation that emerged from these twin imperatives sought to attract new industries and hold onto the established ones by magnifying the state’s competitive advantage. The basic tools included providing some development capital and services, reducing power and transport costs and state charges as well as maintaining a cost of wages competitive advantage over the eastern states through maintaining lower living costs.

Through the 1940s and 1950s, the Playford government continued to protect the cost advantage of the state, working flexibly within fiscal and regulatory constraints and securing support from industrialists, unions and other economic and political interests. Central to the protection of South Australia’s cost advantage was the role of the South Australian Housing Trust. The trust was created as a statutory authority in 1936 to provide the housing arm for the low wage/low cost industrialisation policies of J.W. Wainright and Premiers Butler and Playford. The initial role of the Housing Trust was simply to hold down housing costs to help perpetuate Australia’s lower living costs and wage differential under the Commonwealth Arbitration Court’s basic wage adjustment decisions.

However, under the leadership of Alex Ramsay, General Manager of the Housing Trust, and Chairman J.P. Cartledge, and with the support of incoming Premier Playford, the trust seized the initiative in 1938, becoming Adelaide’s most important town planner, a de facto state development authority as well as a migration agency. Cartledge and Ramsay, in tandem with Playford, forged the trust into the nation’s most powerful housing authority. Within two years they then moved to transform the trust into a large-scale development agency. This was done through two pieces of legislation. The first, the 1940 Housing Improvement Act, allowed the trust to build, sell, buy or repair any kind of building and to

purchase large amounts of land in anticipation of future housing needs. The second, the 1941 Homes Act, provided State Bank loans to wage earners for purchasing new homes from the trust.

In 1950, the 1940 Housing Improvement Act was amended to widen the scope of activity of the trust, allowing it to purchase and develop land for uses other than housing. The trust could now act like a British new town development corporation, able to provide factories, open space, shops and civic buildings as well as homes. And this it did.

The decision to build Elizabeth was taken in 1950 at a meeting between Playford, Cartledge and Ramsay. The new town was to constitute the sociological planning base for the new town of Elizabeth—the Playford plan the economic rationale, and the South Australian Housing Trust the administrative and creative driver. In 1954, construction of flats and houses commenced, with the first houses occupied in late 1955. By 1959, when the Lyell McEwin Hospital opened at Elizabeth Vale, there were already 4 000 homes, about a dozen factories and almost 15 000 residents. A year later, 1960, the first shops at the town centre opened for business, another 5 000 people had arrived and Elizabeth was the largest city outside Adelaide.

It was also in this year that Elizabeth began to fulfil its role in the Playford plan as a city for industry and one of the generators of South Australia’s economic future. Described as ‘The city for tomorrow’ in Housing Trust promotional material, the new town was living up to its promise as a provider of economic growth for the state, and plentiful work combined with an enviable lifestyle for its town folk. By 1960, the new General Motors-Holden’s plant was fully operational and providing employment for nearly 2 000 men and women. Total employment in manufacturing in Elizabeth exceeded 5 000 persons. The securing of the new General Motors-Holden’s plant for South Australia was a major coup for Playford, and one which would probably not have been pulled off if it were not for the existence of Elizabeth.

As Thomas Playford pointed out in an interview he gave Hugh Stretton, when asked by senior US executives where they should site their new Australian plant, Thomas Playford replied:

Go to Elizabeth, because you’ll get a satisfied source of labour at Elizabeth. You will be an industry that will be able to draw on an assured area of labour.

So rapid and successful was Playford’s Elizabeth based industrialisation plan that by the early 1960s the Housing Trust was offering significant migration services through its office in South Australia House in London and the final population size of Elizabeth was revised up from 25,000 to 50,000. In his last policy speech, Thomas Playford had the following to say:

When my government first took office South Australia was a rurally based economy. We saw the need to develop secondary industries which would provide plenty of jobs and export earnings during seasonal downturns in the agricultural and pastoral industries. Our policy has been to keep taxation and other costs well below those in the eastern states.

We succeeded so well that we have turned South Australia from the mainland state with proportionally the lowest number of factory workers to one with the second highest number. Great industries were attracted here, thrived and have remained root and branch of our wellbeing ever since.

Much of the success to which Playford referred had been achieved through Elizabeth, yet what has become of that wellbeing? I referred earlier in my speech to the study that defined Elizabeth as Australia’s most vulnerable community.

I will discuss at some length the substance of the study because it highlights the challenges facing not only the electorate of Napier but the state as a whole. The study, titled 'Welfare dependency in communities within Australia's metropolitan regions', was conducted by the University of Queensland and Monash University and was published 18 months ago. The study found that Australia's big cities can be considered to be made up of nine different types of clusters or subregions.

These clusters are characterised by varying degrees of economic and social advantage and disadvantage. Four clusters were labelled as being places of opportunity. The first cluster associated with advantaged global economies corresponds to areas with highly skilled, high status jobs in new economic sectors and where levels of disadvantage are low. Residents are highly educated, and unemployment rates are low. These communities are found in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth but are absent from Hobart and Adelaide.

A second cluster of communities, termed 'advantaged suburban economies', house people whose jobs are connected to the new knowledge, intensive manufacturing and service work in manufacturing. Incomes are high and levels of disadvantage are low. These communities are also found in Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and Canberra, but are absent from Adelaide and Hobart.

The third cluster of opportunity is a group of transitional gentrifying communities located in the inner cities of all mega metropolitan areas. The final cluster of opportunity communities reflects concentrations of Public Service employment and, not surprisingly, these were concentrated in Canberra.

Not one Adelaide community fell into the first two categories, illustrating the state's lack of linkage with the new global economic sectors and new knowledge intensive manufacturing and service work. Three clusters of disadvantaged or vulnerable communities were identified by the study.

Two clusters, described as vulnerable, old manufacturing economies and vulnerable suburban economies, are those areas that developed around a boom in manufacturing that took place in the late 1950s to early 1970s. As a result of tariff reductions and greater trade with low cost Asian producers, residents in both clusters have suffered declining job opportunities and increases in unemployment. These communities are found in all metropolitan regions, but are highly concentrated in Adelaide and Melbourne.

The electorate of Napier falls into this cluster group. Within these clusters of advantage and disadvantage the study's authors were able to apply rankings of welfare dependency using measures of the ratio of income tax paid to welfare payments received by a community.

Elizabeth was ranked at the bottom as Australia's most vulnerable community, with a tax transfer payment ratio of .40, meaning that for every dollar received in welfare benefits only 40 cents was paid in income tax. Communities comprising vulnerable old manufacturing economy clusters on average had a ratio of tax transfer payments of .81, meaning that for every dollar of transfer payments only 81 cents of income tax is paid. Tax paid in Elizabeth was half the average for similar communities, indicating the depth of unemployment, lack of employment and reliance on income support.

In contrast, the 31 statistical local areas or SLAs identified as having close links to opportunities in the global economy had an average tax transfer ratio of .20, meaning that, for every dollar of transfer payments received, \$5 was paid in tax. Not one of these SLAs of advantage was located in

Adelaide, whereas the SLA of greatest disadvantage was in the electorate of Napier.

In broad terms, the author of the study of disadvantage attributed the decline in the nation's traditional manufacturing base, the rust belting of South Australia and Victoria, as the reason for Elizabeth's decline from the position of relatively high prosperity it enjoyed during the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s.

What have been the consequences for the electorate of Napier in this reversal of fortune for Elizabeth—the Playford government creation, once proudly described as the city of tomorrow? According to the second edition of the *Social Health Atlas of Australia*, Napier has the highest proportion in the state of people who left school at 15 years or less or did not attend school. Using a standardised ratio, the atlas has determined an SR for Munno Para of 135 and Elizabeth 134. Munno Para has 35 per cent more early school leavers than should be expected and Elizabeth 34 per cent.

The SR for Adelaide was 98 per cent, meaning that all Adelaide had 2 per cent less early leavers than expected. In the eastern suburbs early school leaving is the exact reverse of that in Napier, where standardised ratios are more than 30 per cent below those expected. That the Napier electorate lags the state in this benchmark of educational performance is of concern. That it lags Australia in another benchmark—that of TAFE and university participation—is more than concerning: it is a cause for alarm.

According to a study carried out by S. Stevenson, titled 'Regional participation in higher education and distribution of higher educational resources across regions', the national university participation rate was 24.2 per cent and for Elizabeth it was 7.6 per cent. Of the 290 regions used in the analysis, Elizabeth was ranked 288 of the 290. The two lowest regions in terms of university participation were located in the Northern Territory and in the Kimberley region in Western Australia. Elizabeth has the lowest rank of any metropolitan region in Australia.

In terms of TAFE participation, Elizabeth was the lowest in South Australia, and on a national scale it was ranked 270 of 290, with most of the lower 20 instances relating to non-metropolitan regions in rural Queensland. When university and TAFE participation rates were combined and plotted on the same scale of 290 regions Australia wide, Elizabeth was ranked at 287. Elizabeth stands as the metropolitan region with the lowest combined TAFE and university participation rate in Australia.

A further study conducted by Stevenson in the year 2000 and titled, 'Access effects on campus proximity and socioeconomic status on university participation rates', focused on the relative effects of proximity to university campus and socioeconomic characteristics in determining university participation. The study employed two socioeconomic indices. The first was an index of economic resources, which focused on the economic resources of households in regions, and the second was an index of education and occupation which examined the level of occupational skill and educational attainment of a region. High index values indicate that a region would have a high concentration of persons with higher education or undergoing further education and people being employed in the higher skill occupations.

The study revealed that the second of these indices—index of education and occupation—has the greatest impact on university participation rates. That was something that was discovered with the abolition of university fees during the Whitlam period. There was absolutely no increase in uptake

in working-class families. It was anecdotal but we realised that the major influence to participation in university really came from the home. This study confirmed it.

The study also found that Elizabeth had the lowest index of education and occupational value in the nation. I will return to this matter in several minutes. Low post secondary participation rates in working-class communities were often explained during the 1950s and 1960s by the necessity of young family members having to enter the work force as soon as practicable to bolster household finances. Could this be the explanation and could it still hold true for the electorate of Napier? Unfortunately not.

Unemployment statistics for September last year rank those of Elizabeth as the fourth highest in Australia. Only three suburbs in Australia—Wacol, Kingston and Woodbridge in Brisbane's outer southern suburbs—recorded higher unemployment than Elizabeth. As noted earlier, these southern suburbs of Brisbane fall into outer metropolitan growth clusters and their unemployment can be largely explained by internal migration from other states. Unemployment in September for Elizabeth was 21.6 per cent, exactly three times the state average of 7.2 per cent.

It is apparent from these unemployment statistics that young people in Napier are not forsaking the opportunity of tertiary study for the world of work. Too large a number are simply drifting from school into that nether region of long-term welfare dependency with its attendant poverty. The arrival of the electorate of Napier to this position of being probably the most deprived community in Australia is part of an interesting, government-initiated journey.

We begin with the economic development plan of a conservative government—the Playford plan—and the construction of an entire new city by a state government instrumentality as part of that plan. We have that conservative government, through its activities at South Australia House in London, populate this new city through a program of mass migration. The plan works, achieving its objective of creating a manufacturing base for the state and in the process lifting the standard of living of all South Australians.

The state lives for several decades off this legacy of achievement. Then, in the early 1970s, in response to calls made in the Jackson committee report into the Australian manufacturing industry, the process of dismantling tariff barriers is commenced by a federal Labor government. That process is further accelerated by successive federal governments as developing nations pressure the United Nations for fairer trade as a means of developing their indigenous manufacturing sectors. With this process of government-directed national deindustrialisation, the electorate of Napier begins to experience high and sustained levels of unemployment.

The processes at work are inadequately understood at the national and state level and, while a massive transfer of wealth occurs in Australia, particularly into the advantaged global economy clusters of Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth, the electorate of Napier continues its slide into disadvantage. Second generation unemployment becomes commonplace and educational attainment becomes increasingly irrelevant in a job-barren environment. A community seemingly created by government at the state level appears to all intents and purposes to be subject to attack by government at the national level. Even today, the attack appears to have no end in sight, with a further debilitating 5 per cent reduction in tariffs on motor vehicles still hanging over the

employees of the Elizabeth car and components factories like the sword of Damocles.

While all that has been built up by state government is torn down by the federal, there appears to be an absolute indifference to the process and its consequences. The Brown, Olsen and Kerin Liberal governments commence no major rebuilding of the state's beleaguered economy. They make no attempt to rekindle Playford's vision, make no attempt to refire the northern Adelaide manufacturing sector so that it again becomes the engine room of state economic growth.

Public assets in Elizabeth are allowed to run down, schools are neglected and the Lyell McEwin hospital is allowed to deteriorate to the extent that many of its facilities are described in media reports as Third World. When work does finally commence on the upgrading of the hospital, the *News Review Messenger* runs the heading, 'Believe it or not, the Lyell McEwin hospital redevelopment is finally happening'. The *Advertiser* in turn runs a heading, 'We're upgrading and we mean it,' commenting on the fact that it was announced nearly five years previously in 1977. Hospital staff are sceptical, expecting the work to halt as quickly as it began. Robert Kelly, identity editor for the *News Review Messenger*, comments:

No wonder the hospital staff were initially cynical when the project finally got under way. They probably expected it to be stopped on some flimsy excuse after a couple of weeks, never to see the builders again.

In addition to having to endure the continual deferment of government spending and the accompanying deterioration in public facilities, the people of Napier have to endure probably the greatest number of research projects and surveys ever inflicted on one community in Australia. Whether it is due to the community's misfortune in having to bear the brunt of deindustrialisation and the subsequent plummet to the position of Australia's most vulnerable community or as a screen for government inaction, the electorate is researched and reported upon ad nauseam.

The mood of the community to the twin indignities of being ignored by government but being placed in a fishbowl by researchers is probably best summed up in a comment by American author Jules Feiffer. He said:

I used to think I was poor. Then they told me I wasn't poor; I was needy. Then they told me it was self-defeating to think of myself as needy; I was deprived. Then they told me deprived was a bad image; I was underprivileged. Then they told me underprivileged was overused; I was disadvantaged. I still don't have a dime but I sure have a great vocabulary.

The community may have a great sociological vocabulary, but many of its members are seeing scant evidence of any improvement in their circumstances.

Now that we have a change of government, there is a tangible expectation afoot within the electorate of Napier that the years of government indifference and neglect will be addressed. There is an expectation that a community that was brought into being by a state government and had its means of livelihood largely dismantled by a succession of federal governments should not have to endure further government neglect. There is also an expectation that neglect not be replaced by well-meaning acts that perpetuate welfarism, but instead the community be handed the tools necessary to commence the task of rebuilding.

It is a community that, despite its present difficulties, is by no means locked into a downward spiral of welfare dependency and despair; rather the contrary. If anything captures the burning desire of the people of Napier to rebuild

the fortunes of their community, it is the success of the Central District Football Club. I refer not only to the two premierships and the unbroken run of wins this season but also to the new clubrooms completed in January 2001. The clubrooms are the best in the SANFL and are a focal point for the entire community. If anything is testament to the enormous pride taken in the club by my electors and other Central District supporters, it was the turnout for last season's grand final match at Football Park. The ground was literally awash with red, white and blue.

In this speech I have referred to the University of Queensland-Monash University report titled, 'Welfare dependency in communities within Australia's metropolitan regions'. Besides defining Elizabeth as Australia's most vulnerable metropolitan community it also gave reasons for Elizabeth's current predicament, namely, that it sits in a vulnerable old manufacturing economy cluster as defined by the report. The chief issue for the electorate of Napier is jobs: the creation of jobs and the placement of my constituents in those jobs. The government has announced its plans for the development of a South Australian economic development strategy. This will, by necessity, impact positively on the electorate of Napier and other abutting electorates in northern Adelaide, and for no other reason than it is here that most of the fix has to occur.

No economic strategy will be deemed to have been a success if it leaves one community with still one of the nation's highest unemployment levels and the highest level of vulnerability. No economic development strategy will be deemed successful if it fails to recognise the continued role of manufacturing in advanced economies as a technological driver and, in turn, fails to maximise on the extent of manufacturing capacity, skill knowledge and innovative capacity in northern Adelaide.

The Australian Business Foundation in its 1977 report, 'The high road or the low road', highlighted this role of existing manufacturing structure in a region's technology trajectory. Professor Laura Tyson, chief economic adviser to President Clinton, reinforces this notion of 'work with what you have' with the following observation:

Studies of technological change demonstrate that technological capacity develops in conjunction with production. In other words, they cannot be acquired simply by purchasing a product. Rather, they are hands-on or tacit capacities that depend on active involvement in the production process itself.

Professor Tyson's observations are backed up by OECD finding that all modern, sophisticated economies have a strong manufacturing base because 65 per cent of all research and development is due to manufacturing. Many regions and communities around the world, like the electorate of Napier, have suffered the dire economic and social costs of deindustrialisation. The process has been assumed to be part of a rejigging of the international economy which was permitted by government action in developed worlds and which was welcomed in the developing world.

The name coined to describe this international realignment of economic activity is globalisation. The scale of consequence, not foreseen by government, has been the significant gravitating of manufacturing activity to developing worlds and, in especially fortunate regions of the developed world, a countervailing growth in technology based service industries. Some pundits described these service industries as the new economy and predicted that the new economy would ultimately replace the so-called old economy, which they characterised as 'economies reliant on manufacturing

activity'. As we now know, this scenario of old economy giving way to new economy did not occur. What did occur was the loss of technological, unsophisticated manufacturing processes and factories to developing nations. What we now know is that manufacturing is still centrally important to advanced economies and that we are experiencing a transition not from an industrial economy to a services economy but from one kind of industrial economy to another. A credible economic development strategy should be one that facilitates this transition. It should be one that assists industries created during and after the life of the Playford plan to move into an even more technologically oriented internationally competitive framework.

Employment will not come to the electorate of Napier by the creation of employment opportunities alone. The nexus between the act of leaving school and entering what I have described as the netherworld long-term welfare dependency has to be broken. School leavers in the electorate of Napier have the worst outcomes in metropolitan Australia in terms of transition to university and TAFE. Unemployment statistics for the electorate would suggest the same is true for direct transition from school to employment. High school students in the electorate of Napier are dropping out of high school at a rate well excess of the state average. They are forgoing the opportunity to attend university or TAFE or, for that matter, to gain employment. Participation rates in university and TAFE are the worst for any metropolitan region in Australia.

It is not my intention to talk on what the government may or may not do in relation to these problems in the electorate of Napier, other than to generally comment that more emphasis will have to be given in the high schools to focusing students on the world of work and higher study. I have broadly familiarised myself with the enterprise high school model and feel that it has much to offer the electorate in terms of presenting post school options to students well in advance of their leaving school. The University of South Australia through its Mawson Lakes campus is developing programs to assist in this process and I believe that they should become an integral part of enterprise education in Napier.

The university has also alerted me to a program employed in most Scandinavian countries of following up young people who leave school early. In Norway the follow-up youth service (FUS) established in 1994 registers every student who leaves school early and maintains contact through transition into part-time or full-time work and periods of employment. Young people have free right of return to education and the training system until they are 19, with the most disconnected being offered personal mentoring and individual learning training programs.

Since the introduction of FUS, the participation rate in upper secondary education in Norway has reached over 95 per cent. As I said at the commencement of this speech, my point of reference during my time in this parliament must be my electorate of Napier. It is an electorate facing great challenges but also exhibiting great resilience. With the right support I believe this community, particularly those living in the suburbs of Elizabeth, can again enjoy the benefits of prosperity which are currently denied to many.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Heysen, I point out that this is the member's first speech and I ask members to extend to her the courtesy of listening in silence. The member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech opening this session of the 50th Parliament. I extend my congratulations to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your elevation to the high office you hold in this house, and also to the Speaker. I also join with other members who have addressed the house today in congratulating the new members on both sides of this House who join me here.

I thank the people of Heysen and the people from the broader community who assisted in the campaign which saw me elected to this office. It is indeed a humbling experience to know that hundreds of people, some of whom have never met me in person, were prepared to devote their time and energy to assist me achieve election to this office. While I do not wish to name any for fear of missing out on just one, it would be remiss of me not to mention in this special case my secretary, now my PA, Gaynor O'Shaughnessy, who in coming to work for me in my new legal firm over eight years ago could never have realised that she would become everything from caterer and events organiser to fashion model. Her unwavering good humour has been a source of strength and her support has been truly invaluable.

I need also to thank especially my family. There is no doubt that many sacrifices are made by the families of all those who seek to enter public office, but as a wife and mother I am acutely aware of the particular sacrifices made by my husband Jim and our children, Matthew, Noah and Vanessa. Most of all I thank him for his calm acceptance of the sometimes rollercoaster life on which he has accompanied me. I am reminded of the comment by Shirley Abrahamson, a distinguished American judge, when accepting an award from the American Bar Association. In thanking her husband for his support she noted that he had managed to combine marriage and a career but no-one had ever asked him how he did it. In return to all the people who have helped me along the path to be here today, apart from a simple 'thank you', all I can do is promise to serve the people of Heysen and the state of South Australia with commitment and courage, honesty and dignity.

I come to be here by a very different path to that of my fellow members who have spoken before me in the Address in Reply. All of them referred to their long family roots in this state. By contrast, I came to this state by choice. My family home and upbringing on the outskirts of Sydney and my education at Heathcote High School led me to come here when, upon finishing my high school education, I first visited the Adelaide Hills and recognised that here was a place which offered the very best of city access and country living. Happily, when I subsequently met and married my husband Jim, he had already moved his life halfway across the world from North Dakota to Sydney and was more than happy to journey further so that we could begin our life here together and raise our family in the place we both decided was the best in the world—the Adelaide Hills.

Most members of the house know the former member for Heysen, the Hon. David Wotton, who served as a member of this house for some 27 years and, although the names and boundaries of the electorate which he represented varied from time to time, for the whole of the existence of the electorate of Heysen David Wotton has been its elected representative. His commitment to the people of the electorate and his understanding of the issues that were and are important to them and his willingness to fight for them have set a high standard for this new member to follow. His most significant

contributions were probably as Minister for the Environment, particularly in the management of water resources.

It is entirely appropriate that the member for Heysen should distinguish himself particularly in the area of the environment, as it is one of the most difficult, pressing but all-pervasive issues effecting that electorate. The electorate, named after the well-known and world-renowned artist, Sir Hans Heysen, covers an area of some 616 square kilometres in the Adelaide Hills.

The tribal Aboriginal culture of the region dwindled rapidly after white settlement and little information remains. It is known that the twin peaks of Mount Lofty and Mount Bonython were believed by the Aborigines to be the transformed ears of a giant mythical being. The Aboriginal name, from the language of the Kurna people, was something like Yureidla, meaning 'place of the ears', a name preserved today as Uraidla in the township near those peaks. The ears, according to Aboriginal mythology, belonged to a giant being that was an enemy of the Aborigines of the plains. They killed him and his body formed the ranges.

On 23 March 1802 Commander Matthew Flinders, sailing in the *Investigator*, climbed a small outcrop on Kangaroo Island and from there noted a high hill at the extremity of the apparently unconnected land to the eastward. It bore north 39 degrees and east 10 minutes and was named, by him, Mount Lofty. The french explorer, Baudin, who was exploring our southern coast at the same time, recorded the existence of the range of hills on the eastern side, but curiously made no mention of the tallest of the hills.

In mid-April 1931, Captain Collet Barker and his exploratory companions climbed Mount Lofty, and from there surveyed the country around it, judging it to be very promising. They took geological notes, judging the soil to be good right to the summit, noting one tree at the very peak with a girth of 43 feet. Colonel Light referred to the range as the 'enchanted hills' and after the commencement of the new colony it did not take long for the exploration of the hills to begin. On 23 April 1837, Magistrate Young Bingham Hutchinson ascended to the summit and wrote in his diary: 'Dined on Mount Lofty. Wood was so damp I could not light a fire'—something that continues today.

It also became very obvious from the outset that the ranges were well covered with timber and might therefore prove useful in the building of the new city of Adelaide. As the resident Commissioner, James Hurtle Fisher had claimed the trees of the plains as the property of the selectors of land there in the future, and it was not long before something of a timber rush commenced to harvest trees from the stringy bark forest of the range to provide timber for building and fencing on the plains. The popular name for the range became 'the Tiers' and those who were harvesting the timber as 'Tiersmen', and it was they who settled the area, first in the area from Crafers to Bridgewater and thereafter from Summertown to Carey Gully.

The electorate on its current boundary stretches from Ashton in the north to Kangarilla in the south and from Wistow in the east to Clarendon and Belair in the west. Although geographically close to the city, it is definitely not part of it. It has a uniqueness borne of its elevation, its climate (which is unique in South Australia), its aspects and land forms. It has a stunning natural heritage and includes many of our well-known parks such as Belair National Park and Cleland, as well as those less traversed, such as Mount George, Scott Creek and Mark Oliphant Park, formerly known as Loftia Park.

Whilst many of the near city townships, such as Stirling, Crafers, Aldgate and Bridgewater, now provide dormitory living for those who wish to enjoy the lifestyle of hills living, it would be a mistake to think that this typifies the whole of the hills in the electorate of Heysen. It does, however, create an inevitable tension between development and conservation. It is now, and will continue to be, one of the most vexing areas for all levels of government. On the one hand, there is pressure to allow development to enable the growth of business in the area; on the other hand, there is pressure to prevent it. Indeed, in the view of some, once they have moved into the hills it suddenly becomes sacred ground and no more development of any kind should be allowed.

It has been an ongoing tension throughout the almost 25 years that I have lived in the hills, and I have no doubt that it will continue to be whilst I am privileged to serve in this house. Striking the right balance between those competing interests—and they each have some merit—will be a difficult task. It remains true, however, as F.R. Nixon prophesied in 1846, that ‘the Mount Lofty Range in any age, whether in a state of nature or changed by the hand of man, will always be beautiful.’

Currently, the major issue is the development of wineries. There are some who simply object to all development, even the growing of grapes, whilst others maintain that developments can be achieved with sensitivity to the environment and still allow the economic benefits to flow into our communities. No doubt in future other activities, whether they be olives or something else, will produce similar arguments. However, there are innovative solutions to finding the right balance.

To cite just one example: many members would be aware of the significant problems which have faced the dairy industry in many parts of this state and, indeed, the nation over many years. At Paris Creek on the southern edge of my electorate, an innovative approach combined with perseverance has turned the problem into a plus. The b-d (biodynamic) Farm now established there recognised an increasing niche market for organic produce and some 10 years ago set about, first, making the dairy farm organic and then went on to value add to the property by producing organically certified products such as quark and yoghurt, which are now marketed nationally.

So successful has this venture been that not only are many locals from Meadows now able to obtain employment but many of the surrounding farms are working towards organic certification to help keep up the supply for the increasing demand for organic raw product. I am not one who believes in shutting the hills down. I believe that with innovative approaches and designs such as those to which I have just alluded we will be able to overcome the difficulties and allow appropriate development to occur whilst still protecting the beauty of the area and the lifestyle that it has to offer.

Of course, the environment is not the only issue which we need to address in Heysen. The electorate contains 14 primary schools and two high schools (one private and one public). These schools are generally situated in small picturesque settings and could all fit comfortably into the motto of the Mylor Primary School: Small School—Great Kids. A number of the primary schools have reason to expect that they should be high on any government’s agenda, notably three primary schools—Norton Summit, Uraidla and Basket Range, all of which have no reticulated water supply. The result is that, whenever we have a power failure, the schools must close down because it is unacceptable in terms of modern occupa-

tional health and safety regimes to require teachers to be flushing toilets with buckets of water.

This of course means that the parents—and, consequently, often their employers—are significantly inconvenienced if, having delivered the children to school and setting off for the office, they receive a telephone call advising that because of a power failure at the school the school will be closed for that day. The Heathfield High School is the only high school in my electorate which boasts a proud tradition in the sporting field as well as academically. It is a volleyball specialist school and it won the national championships on eight occasions without the benefit of even an indoor competition level court in spite of its being situated in the coldest and wettest place in the state.

The problem of water is not restricted to schools. A large number of hills townships from Crafers to Meadows do not yet have a reliable permanent reticulated water supply. Whilst the higher than state average rainfall certainly provides an excellent catchment for water from the plains and makes the use of rain water tanks sensible, it is nevertheless important to recognise the need for a more comprehensive water supply particularly in township areas. Waste disposal is also a key area of concern which needs to be addressed as a priority in the hills. At present, many areas, including those in relatively built-up areas of Stirling and its new surrounds, are not connected to sewerage. A recent survey of STEDS (Septic Tank Effluent Disposal System) installations found that 44 per cent were not operating efficiently, resulting in the effluent either seeping out of the property (and ultimately into drains and creeks) or, at the very least, in offensive odours being discharged. We need to be innovative in our management of these questions and endeavour not only to find a solution but to ensure that it is viable in the long term and preferably of benefit to the environment.

Another area of particular interest to me is the question of how we manage our aged care issues. Currently, we have a number of retirement villages but only one nursing home, containing 35 beds, at Heathfield. As nursing homes go, Hillside Lodge at Heathfield is as good as any I have seen—and I have visited nursing homes and been interested in the question of aged care since I was in my early teens—but the current licensing and assessment arrangements (undertaken in Canberra) categorise the hills with East Adelaide and assess that the area has more nursing home beds per head of population than many other areas in Australia.

Consequently, in spite of an ageing population who face particular difficulties because of larger allotments (houses or even farms which become too much to manage), it appears unlikely that further nursing home beds in the area will be approved. My own view is that we need to have a fresh look at how we manage the issues associated with ageing. I am sure that very few of us expect or want to end up in a nursing home, and the newer concept of ‘ageing in place’, which allows services to be delivered to the ageing person rather than requiring the ageing person to move to the next stage of accommodation, has much to recommend it.

We also need to look carefully at our retirement villages legislation. In the case of one of the retirement villages in Stirling, for instance, during the latter six months of the year 2000, 13 of the 19 disputes under the Retirement Villages Act statewide, which went before the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, arose from that one village. At that time in their lives when most people expect to feel financially secure and to have a settled, straightforward life with few worries beyond the normal health issues likely to confront us all,

many of the people in this village found themselves involved in stressful and often costly litigation against the village's private operators and administrators.

In my view, further work needs to be done by this parliament to develop a clearer regime for the control and management of retirement villages to ensure that those persons who choose to enter one have peace and quiet and the secure life which they deserve and have every reason to expect. There is more to living in the hills than simply the wonderful environment, whether built, rural or natural. The essence in my view and what makes the area unique is the sense of community: the invisible but ultimately cohesive force on which I believe all else rests. As educator William Damon wrote in 'Greater Expectations':

Even if our children were being raised to become the best informed, most artistic, and healthy children the world has ever seen, it would all come to nothing unless they found some things beyond themselves. . . they would still need to develop a sense of social responsibility. . . otherwise they could not live together in a decent society, nor pass along what is left of the culture to their own children.

Our strong sense of community in many of the little towns scattered throughout the hills is second to none. People are involved in their communities, in the CFS brigades, Meals-on-Wheels, even printing local newsletters like the *Kanga Noos* at Kangarilla and the *Echunga Community Times*, to keep all residents and families informed of what is happening in the area. So much important work happens through each and every one of these organisations that I am at a loss to contemplate what would happen without them. Each of our parks in the area, for instance, has a 'friends of parks' group—volunteers who, through their tireless efforts, do a remarkable job in the hands-on hard yacka of clearing these parks of weeds, restoring paths, recording species and generally just looking after the place. It is pleasing to note in passing that these 'friends of parks' groups were, I understand, initiated by my predecessor David Wotton during his time as environment minister.

There are many threats to the community: the age of many of the volunteers who currently serve who do not appear to be being succeeded by a new generation; law and order issues, whether it be graffiti and vandalism, gatecrashing parties or actual harm and the abuse of physical security; some individuals who are so busy in their ever more hectic lives that they do not have time or, for some other reason, choose not to commit to participate in community structures. Sadly, this is more so in the more populated areas such as Stirling where, increasingly, people use it as a dormitory suburb for sleeping but, in reality, the focus of their lives is downtown. All of these factors lead to difficulties in attracting people into volunteer organisations, whether it be Meals-on-Wheels, Rotary, the CFS or any other organisation.

Probably the single most important threat to the community at present is insurance. I do not want to sound as though I am jumping on a populist bandwagon, but I have been yelling about this issue for some considerable time. It is a complex issue and, as is often the case when complex issues arise, it is easy to look for a simple solution. Simplistic and extreme responses are often the ones which find favour when extreme circumstances arise. We need only to look around us at some of the current world events to recognise that this is so.

But the issue of insurance is one that must be addressed. It is too simplistic to blame the lawyers; it is too simplistic to blame the insurance companies; it is too simplistic to

blame those bringing the claims; and it is even too simplistic to blame us as the law makers. In any event, placing blame is not what matters: finding a solution is. We have reached a crossroad and it is clear that we need to change direction. Thinking people with courage to recognise that not all decisions can be based on the economic mandate and that sometimes the individual's interests must give way to those of the community must be prepared to ponder, debate and to reach a reasonable path.

It seems to me that our fear of being litigated against has led us in the opposite direction from that which commonsense and the community interest would have taken us. I give but one minor example: our new regulations governing such an innocent activity as a cake stall—making it mandatory to itemise ingredients, date of production and the like are clearly to protect the minority in the population who may have some allergic or adverse reaction. At the end of the day it is hoped to be a protection against litigation, but at what cost?

When one thinks of all the thousands of cake stalls held by volunteers over the years to make money for the thousands upon thousands of organisations around this country, which can survive only on community support, and compares it with the minuscule number of adverse events (so minuscule that no-one has even been able to quote me any numbers or percentages), it seems to me that we have the equation all wrong. What benefits the many must carry not just some weight but the most significant weight. I am not wanting to suggest that the majority simply ride roughshod over the minority groups: they deserve our attention and respect. However, we must be sure that we are not creating more injustice than we are preventing and, unless we stop this apparently inexorable progress towards a more and more litigious society, that is exactly what will happen.

How can we have a community if those who wish to participate, even as volunteers, become afraid to do so? At an RSL dinner in Stirling earlier this year one of the younger veterans made it clear that, whilst he was willing to work for the cause, he was not willing to put his family, home and financial security on the line to do so. It is a concern I hear from all sorts of community organisations throughout the electorate of Heysen. The previous Liberal government introduced two important pieces of legislation which went some way to addressing these concerns: the Volunteers Protection Act 2001 (an act to protect volunteers in the community from personal liability), and the Good Samaritan (Limitation of Liability) Bill, which similarly protects persons who come to another's aid in emergency situations from personal civil liability for their reasonable actions in so doing.

That bill, of course, will be reintroduced by the member for Davenport on 16 May 2002. But while these are necessary and important steps, we need to go much further. The fact is that many volunteer and community organisations will simply cease to exist unless we as a community address these big issues of liability, responsibility and insurance. The answer may be complex and require us to address many facets and competing factors, but its being complicated is no excuse for us as legislators or for the community at large to be pushed timidly into an attitude of 'It's all too hard.' I am reminded of Charles B. Darrow, the inventor of the game of Monopoly.

When he first approached Parker Brothers with his new game they did not want to know about it because it was too complicated. Of course, the game became one of the most successful ever, making its inventor the first millionaire toy

maker in the world and subsequently requiring Parker Brothers to pay a much higher price for its copyright.

The issue of insurance touches everyone of us and every community organisation. The issue has been forced upon us, perhaps by events beyond our control, but we should look at it as an opportunity to come up with inventive solutions that perhaps would be fairer for all in the longer term. For instance, it does not make much sense to me that, as a community, we do not simply accept the responsibility of taking care of those who cannot care for themselves. We do in a way, of course, but under our current complex compensation regimes I could suffer exactly the same injury in any number of circumstances and get completely differing sums of money by way of compensation. For instance, if I had the injury at work in the normal course of my employment I will receive certain money under the WorkCover scheme regardless of whether there was any negligence by my employer.

On the other hand, if I sustain the same injury in a road accident a different set of rules will apply and, of course, may well vary according to whether I am the driver or the passenger and therefore had any responsibility myself for the accident. Alternatively, if I sustain the same injury in my own home, a neighbour's home, in the street or in a public place a different set of rules again will apply to calculating my compensation, if indeed I am entitled to any. Most aggravating of all is that if my injury is caused not by another's negligence but by their deliberate criminal act against me then my compensation for the same injury will probably be the lowest of all.

It is an absurdity to me that the Stirling Hospital—a small 35 bed community hospital which has served its district for 75 years—has had to announce the closure of its maternity ward all because of insurance issues. In the last 20 years we have seen the change from GP and midwife delivery, and even home birthing (which was very much in vogue when I was having my babies in that hospital), to a situation where, in spite of having a modern, well-equipped birthing unit, with well trained knowledgeable midwives and local obstetricians who would gladly deliver babies there, expectant mothers who wish to can no longer deliver at the Stirling Hospital after the middle of this year. Why? It is because of insurance.

GPs, of course, were forced out of the market by insurance costs some years ago, but now even specialist obstetricians cannot deliver without a specialist anaesthetist being available, and the anaesthetists have declared, for very cogent and sensible reasons of their own, that they are not prepared to attend deliveries in other than their two nominated private hospitals in metropolitan Adelaide. And at the bottom of their decision is the fact that if anything is wrong with the new born they face a significant risk of litigation, even if there is no basis for liability against them.

Is it not time that we as a society set some new ground rules about accepting that life is full of risks, about acknowledging that sometimes people do make mistakes and that requiring perfection from all those with whom we interact at all times is just not reasonable and cannot be sustained if we are to succeed as a community? Until we address these fundamental issues, we will not be able to solve the insurance dilemma and our community structures will continue to face the threat of collapse. Insurance is, in my view, the most fundamental and difficult question we will face in this term of this government.

I urge the Premier and his ministers to recognise this and to address it with no excuses—and not with little changes but by tackling the big issues head-on. I look forward in this house to working towards solving many of the issues that confront both the electorate of Heysen and this great state of South Australia. In doing so I shall, in the first instance, take a leaf from the book of Mrs Joyce Steele, the first woman elected to this house. In her maiden speech on 21 July 1959, she said:

I am very much aware of the great responsibilities I bear. To be the representative of an electorate... is both a challenge and a responsibility, but in order that I may be a good member, Mr Speaker, I shall for some time at least be a listener and an observer so that in making myself well informed on all matters debated within this house I may serve my constituents to the best of my ability.

I shall also remember the words of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in his inaugural address in which he stated:

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness and sincerity is always subject to proof... let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belabouring those problems which divide us.

Mr Speaker, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): In the time allotted, I would like to briefly canvass the trip that I recently undertook on behalf of the government. That trip spanned 3½ weeks, which is quite a long time. I should point out that the reason for the trip (despite one media person asking me whether it was a sweetener) was that no minister was available to travel, because they were all doing their budget deliberations—and quite properly so. I was asked at short notice to attend the 2002 Global Wind Power Conference and Trade Expo in France, organised by the European Wind Energy Association.

The trade mission, which was organised by the Department of Industry and Trade, included two senior public servants and 10 business people from South Australia. I would like to mention those people and the companies they represented because, as a team, the whole group worked incredibly well to promote South Australia and the opportunities here not only to use wind power for generating electricity but also, importantly, to manufacture wind turbines and associated equipment.

The people who attended the trade mission—or part of it—were Mr Charles Wright, General Manager, Consolidated Power Projects; Mr John McVann, Managing Director, Noel P. Hunt; Mr Dennis Newell, Managing Director, the Newell Group; Mr John Nicholls, Business Development Manager, SDS Ausminco; Mr Owen Gallpen, General Manager, Cowell Electric; Mr Philip Tregenza, Director, Built Environs; Mr Roger Dedrick, Chief Executive Officer, Green Bros; Mr Mike Lewis, Business Development Manager, Air-Ride International; Mr Jonathan Nitschke, Manager, John Nitschke Drilling; and Mr Bill Green, Managing Director, Green Bros, also representing McKecknie Iron Foundry. So, there was a significant trade delegation from South Australia, and that group worked incredibly well and cooperated well together.

I spoke at the wind power conference in Paris, along with the British minister for energy, Brian Wilson, the French minister for energy, Christian Pierre, and the Indian minister. One of the sobering points made by the Indian minister for energy was that, in his country, 67 million people still do not have any electricity at all.

The trade expo and conference was attended by over 1 100 people from 51 countries, and it was under the patronage of Jacques Chirac, the President of the French republic (whom we all know now has been re-elected to that position). Amongst the exhibitors and participants at that conference was the Tasmanian government, which was represented by the Hydro-electric Commission, which is not only an active competitor against South Australia in building wind turbine projects, or encouraging and facilitating them, but is also particularly interested in establishing manufacturing facilities in Tasmania. Whilst we have no hard evidence, we suspect that some incentives have been offered to European manufacturers of wind turbine equipment to set up in Tasmania. The CSIRO was also in attendance, with its Wind Energy Research Unit. It is available as consultants to industry to tell people where to establish wind turbines.

As I said, the conference was particularly useful, as were the trade displays, and I will make reference to them in a detailed report that I am writing at the moment. Subsequently, the delegation travelled to Denmark to visit the two leading manufacturers of wind turbine equipment there, Vestas and E.G. Micon. Both companies produce similar types of wind turbines. The value of a complete package, including the tower (which is approximately 65 metres tall), the turbine and the blades which sit on top, is \$2 million for each unit. The two companies operate in different ways. Vestas makes everything itself: it does not allow anyone else to manufacture any of its components. However, E.G. Micon is the opposite: it subcontracts out virtually everything. So, there are two different approaches, but both companies are very keen to have a presence here in Australia and to have local manufacture.

The visit to their facilities was very productive, and the members of the trade delegation each undertook their own negotiations in respect of the possible establishment of manufacturing facilities here in South Australia.

Members may be interested to know that the projection for wind turbines in this state—and we are talking of the basic model that supplies electricity to satisfy the needs of approximately 1 000 homes—is for 2 100 of these machines. So at \$2 million each, that is a significant investment and for Australia the projection is 9 000 of these wind turbines at \$2 million each. These are land-based wind turbines but the trend—and we saw evidence of this—is to build even bigger turbines of 2 and 3 megawatt capacity offshore as is already happening in Europe. The trend to build wind turbines offshore is in addition to those built in their thousands on land in Europe and the United States.

We did not visit Germany but there is a significant manufacturer in Germany called Bonus and in Spain there is also a manufacturer, with other component manufacturers on the Isle of Wight, which makes blades and we visited the factory there. The blades for these machines are enormous and the tower itself is about 65 metres high. The blades are more than half that height in length and made of composites—epoxy, fibreglass, carbon-type materials. One of the companies on the Isle of Wight is SP Enterprises and it is a specialist in not only making the chemicals for the composites but also in formulating them into sheets, and many of

the Formula One motor cars, speed boats and so on, incorporate materials made by that organisation. We met with the managing director and founder of SP. He is keen not only to establish in the southern hemisphere but also to come and live here because he believes it is a better environment for his 12 year old son. We look forward to pursuing that issue and the possibility of local manufacture with him.

I, along with Andrew Scott, the infrastructure officer with the Department of Industry and Trade, met with Maurice de Rohan, the Agent-General in London. I was impressed with his professionalism and commitment. Andrew Scott and I went up to the Rutherford Laboratories in Oxford, which has the most sophisticated laser technology in the world and which is currently building the biggest synchrotron in the world, which will enable the close study of small particles. They are also advanced in developing hydrogen energy and, if you can combine hydrogen energy potential with wind energy, you can not only generate power but also store it. The researchers at the Rutherford laboratories are working on the potential for use in motor cars and other areas for that clean fuel—hydrogen. The laboratories up there are quite impressive, to say the least. They are working on a whole range of things, including nanotechnology, which is a particular interest of mine (small particle technology), and that will be the next technological revolution.

Time is against me, so I will only be able to cover part of the trip. The rest of the trip was a visit to the United States, which I will elaborate on at some future date. It involved a visit to Boeing, a briefing by Batelle on anti-terrorism and other matters. I attended the Microsoft government leaders conference, where I was enlightened about new technology, including video phones, which are soon to be available, and scanning for supermarket trolleys, which will enable all goods to be scanned whilst they remain in the trolley. A lot of exciting developments are happening. Boeing is creating a jumbo that is internet capable anywhere in the world at any time. They will be on the market shortly, and so will a new high speed jet carrying about 250 passengers, travelling just below the speed of sound, which will connect between airports. It will reduce the need for so-called hub airports.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to talk about an issue that has been of great concern to me for a long time. As members would be aware, a significant proportion of Hartley's population is in the older age group. Whilst that is not uncommon, Hartley has a particular concern in that sometimes people can be asset rich and income poor, as other members have pointed out. That is very much the case when members consider what has occurred with house prices and so on especially in the last five years. I know that the member for Norwood would agree with me when I say that there are still a lot of strugglers in Norwood even though house prices have increased significantly.

Today I wish to talk about private health cover for the elderly. I have had a commitment to this issue. I brought it to the attention of the house on 27 June 2000 and later in July that year, and I have raised it at all forums available to me. I commend the federal government, and I am sure that members from both sides would commend the Howard government for the 30 per cent rebate which has resulted in an increase in private health cover. Whilst some members opposite might say that that is just assistance to the well off, that is not the case, because for every person who has private health cover there is someone on the waiting list who cannot afford private health cover—especially the elderly and those

who through no fault of their own cannot afford it—who is able to receive the medical treatment that they deserve.

We know that the membership of private health insurance showed a steady decline from the introduction of Medicare in 1984. In 1999-2000, participation in private hospital cover increased dramatically to 43 per cent in June 2000 with the introduction of the 30 per cent rebate, and in fact it is now over 45 per cent. South Australia had 46.2 per cent as at 31 December 2001. Whilst that is far from the days when it used to be 70 per cent, it is still a significant improvement. Something had to be done and it was the federal Liberal government that had the courage to do it.

As I have said, we have an ageing population and life expectancy has increased dramatically. For example, life expectancy for males is 78 years of age compared with 53 years of age in 1900 and 38 years in 1800. It is about five years longer for women. Therefore, we have an increasing ageing population. In fact, 5.7 million Australians are over the age of 50. That is 29 per cent of the population. We must come to terms with an ageing population. We have to provide facilities and care, especially medical care, for this ageing population. Whilst the 30 per cent rebate is great, if people have private health cover from the age of 30 to the age of 60, for example, for top cover they will be paying \$2 400 a year, although there are plans to increase it by 8 per cent. With an income of \$50 000, \$60 000 or \$30 000, paying \$2 400 annually is affordable.

What happens when these people who have paid for 30 years hit retirement age and their real disposable income decreases from, say, \$50 000 to \$20 000 and from \$30 000 to the pension? How can they afford it? These are the people who come into my office and say, 'I would like to have private health cover, but I cannot afford it. I would like to have private health cover and not wait six months or 12 months on a waiting list, but I cannot afford it on my income of \$15 000 a year, or we cannot afford it on a pension.' I believe that private health insurance providers should have an obligation and work with governments at both state and federal level to make sure that, if someone pays \$2 400 a year for 30 years, and it is indexed, some money should be put away so that, when they retire, their contribution should not be a flat rate but a percentage of their real disposable income.

That is the only way that we will be able to care for our elderly in the future. That is the only way that we will have real insurance. It is unjust and unfair to take that flat rate from someone, regardless of their age, and regardless of their

economic circumstance, and I would urge governments at state and federal level to ensure that we deal with this problem of an ageing population—that we make sure that people are covered. We know that health costs are going to increase. We know, too, that technology is expensive and that new drugs will be expensive to provide.

We have one of the highest standards of living in the world and I commend the health authorities—the medical profession, hospitals, the nursing profession and those who are responsible for the care of the sick—for our excellent results, for example, in the treatment and prevention of breast cancer, heart disease, bowel cancer, diabetes—all the conditions that I can think of. I know that I would not be here if it were not for the excellent care that I received in my youth at the Royal Adelaide Hospital when I had Crohn's disease. To be able to stand here at the age of 50 and not have had serious health problems from the age of 30 is an indication of the great health system that we have in Australia, which is partly responsible for my good health.

It is of great concern to me that people should have a choice when they get old. I want them to have a choice, not only when they can afford it directly on a flat rate but also when they cannot afford it when their real disposable income comes down. As other speakers mentioned today, whilst interest rate decreases might be great for home ownership, low interest rates are not so great for people who have made sacrifices and who are living off their savings and earnings because, as I said, they are asset rich and income poor. It would be a cruel thing to say, 'Well, shift from your home where you have been for 40 or 50 years, where you brought up a family, where you are attached to the neighbours, just because your assets have increased.' That is cruel when one thinks of the charges that the elderly have to pay just to remain in the homes that they made sacrifices to pay off over the years.

I would urge the private health insurance companies to really think seriously about this issue, and not only in the short term. They have been subsidised by the taxpayer and the percentage has increased, which is great because it has enabled us to free up resources to help the needy and to help the hospital queues. However, we must put something in place for the long term, so that, if people have contributed for 30 years (perhaps it could be taken on the number of years), they should be looked after when they are in a position where their real disposable income has decreased.

Motion carried.

At 9.50 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 9 May at 10.30 a.m.