

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 May 2002

The SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis) took the chair at 10.32 a.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 8 May. Page 73.)

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Mr Speaker, before I commence my Address in Reply speech allow me to congratulate you on your election to this house and your election as Speaker. Let me also congratulate the Chairman of Committees on his election to the house and as Chairman of Committees, and to all the new members here, I wish you all very well and congratulations on your election. I would also like to congratulate the new Labor government and our ministry. Of course the Premier did an excellent job in the campaign and—

Mr Venning: You missed me out, Tom.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I'll get to you in a minute; but you are moving further and further back across the benches, and I'll talk about that in a minute.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Maybe you could put that in your stat dec.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens well knows that all remarks in the chamber must be addressed through the chair.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. Thank you for your guidance.

The SPEAKER: And the use of the second person pronoun is highly disorderly. It does nothing to establish better standards in this place, all of which the public expects from us.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You will be my guidance, sir. Thank you very much. Mr Speaker, during the election campaign we campaigned vigorously on a number of issues: health, education, law and order. We campaigned on these issues not because we thought they were popular, not because we thought they would win us votes but because they were right. We had justice on our side. We had right on our side. We knew that we fought for ordinary South Australians in the election campaign. We knew that we fought for ordinary battlers. We knew we were fighting for people who needed us to fight for them, those who could not stand up for themselves against the tyranny of the former government.

A new dawn has dawned in South Australia, there is a new sunrise in South Australia, and it is called the Rann Labor government. No more will we have the tyranny of the former education minister imposing unfair budgets on schools and not giving them the services they needed. Schools in my electorate were suffering for eight years under the tyranny of the former minister. Thankfully today we have a new minister, a minister who has compassion, a minister who cares about education, a minister who wants to do the right thing for South Australian schools, teachers and students, to make a better tomorrow for our students.

I am very pleased to note that the new minister has immediately given funds to schools which have not taken up Partnerships 21, those brave men and women in the schools

of South Australia who did not submit to your tyranny, who were not forced to take up Partnerships 21—

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: It was voluntary.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: There was immense pressure on them, and you know it. You can smile now, but we know that there was immense pressure on schools to take up P21, and those that did not were put under the pump by the former minister—phone calls by his staff, intimidation, promotions not granted. But that is all going to change under a fairer system now, under greater accountability and a new minister who will not punish schools for taking up P21 or for not taking up P21. It will be truly voluntary under the Labor government and we will make it work, unlike the former government. Our budgets will not blow out every year as they did under the former minister.

There are a few people from my electorate of West Torrens whom I would like to thank for their help during my campaign. The first is my former personal assistant, Paul Marcuccitti, who did an excellent job, working day and night in my electorate office, servicing constituents with me, working on the direct mail drafts and campaign pamphlets. I would also like to thank my campaign team made up of Betty and Harry Livaditis, and there were others such as Steve Hatzis who is a very good man and he did an excellent job for me.

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He did, he was a great asset; I hope he runs again. I also want to thank the Attorney-General and the Minister for Government Enterprises for the great assistance that they gave me during the campaign. I am sure that later in the debate they will thank me for the assistance that I gave to them. I also thank the member for Playford for his advice and assistance in the drafting of pamphlets: he is one of the greatest campaigners in the Labor Party, and I thank him for all his help. I also congratulate the new members on our side of the house, including the member for Colton, who did an excellent job in taking the seat for Labor. He achieved the largest swing in South Australia, and he has surpassed many of his colleagues who are already in the house, and he now holds a high position on the pendulum. I congratulate him on the enormous effort that he made in the western suburbs. The swing towards Labor in his electorate was much better than the one I achieved in my electorate.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, in a minute. So, I congratulate the member for Colton. It now seems that there is not a Liberal to be seen in the western suburbs. You cannot find them. There is only one Liberal member, a senator, who has parked his office on Henley Beach Road. I visit him sometimes when I am on the way to the beach or to the airport.

I also congratulate the member for Enfield, who fought a marvellous campaign against all odds and who was well aided by the Liberal Party. The great tacticians opposite: the likes of Senator Minchin and Graham Jaenschke—great tacticians—with their tactics—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: A great offer. We cannot thank you enough for your efforts. I refer to the foolishness of the great Liberal tactician Mr Minchin when he said, 'No, we will preference straight to Ralph Clarke'. What of their own members? What do their own voters think about the Liberal Party preferencing someone such as Ralph Clarke? What did they do? They revolted: they did not follow the Liberal ticket—their own ticket. So, what does that mean today? It

means that we are over here and you are over there. So, you can thank Nick Minchin for your predicament today.

Of course, the other member I want to congratulate is the member for Adelaide, who fought an outstanding campaign against the Reserve Bank in South Australia. She fought a great campaign up against money, influence, wealth, position and privilege. She took it to the streets—house by house. She did not try to buy the election campaign: she went out there and won the hearts and minds of Adelaide—a seat that the Labor Party should not hold. It is a seat with demographics that mean we would not hold it if it was not for the spirit, integrity and hard work of our new member and minister, Jane Lomax-Smith.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It is interesting that not one incumbent, apart from our two renegades, lost their seat. If your coward—the coward on the other side—the former member for Adelaide, whose name I have forgotten—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: She scared one out of the house and beat one before he got here.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly. Both were surprised by brave ‘Lord Armo’! Such a coward.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens has the call and needs no assistance from the Minister for Government Enterprises.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I am happy to receive any assistance. I am a humble backbencher trying to portray the facts as I see them. It was a valiant effort by the member for Adelaide in defeating a campaigner who probably spent about \$200 000 in the last four weeks of the campaign. He bought any advertising that he wanted, he had the entire Liberal Party machine working for him, and he had direct mail colour glossy brochures—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He pinched a lot of party donors for himself.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He so selfishly took a lot of party donors. We had mums and dads giving us \$5, which was all that they could afford, for our campaign in Adelaide. They had nothing else to give. We had first time donors giving us \$20 or \$10 to beat Michael Harbison. Why? Because they wanted him to be beaten. It was important that people like that were not allowed in this house. It was important that we have people of substance in this house, and I am glad the people of South Australia, and the people of Adelaide, have elected a member such as the member for Adelaide.

An honourable member: What about Norwood?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I will talk about Norwood in a second. I wish to talk about other campaigns which, I think, deserve mention, including that of the member for Mitchell. The member for Mitchell was put under great stress by the Liberal Party. He was not put under real stress, but great claims were made before the election about how the honourable member was vulnerable and that he was easy to take. There was an attitude of ‘No problem, we’ll get him.’ We had the likes of the Hon. Angus Redford who thinks he is a great campaigner in the upper house.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They were going to get me.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: They were going to get the member for Elder as well, but the member for Mitchell was in their sights. They thought that they had him on toast. What was the name of the opponent?

Mr Hanna: Hugh Martin.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Hugh Martin, who, I believe, bought all the plastic in South Australia. There was not a pole in the seat of Mitchell without his face on it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I think that was the thing he did wrong.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: They were full colour, too. Again, the Liberal Party was trying to buy another election; just write a blank cheque; ‘Here’s \$80 000 or \$100 000 to buy yourself a seat in parliament, son; you’ll go far.’ But, of course, the dedication, the hard work and the grassroots campaigning of our member for Mitchell, Chris Hanna, prevailed on the day with a swing. How big was that swing, Chris?

Mr Hanna: 4.2 per cent.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: 4.2 per cent—above the state average.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It blew them away.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It blew them away. And who ran that campaign? Where did that campaign come from? It was from Nick Minchin. Who was it from? It was from Nick Minchin, the great strategist and Senator—the man who gave us government on a silver platter and who said, ‘Here you go, take it; we’re no good, anyway.’ Nick Minchin, the great tactician—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Didn’t want our preferences.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: —who did not want our preferences. But, then again, there is another campaign about which I want to talk. The campaign for Elder was, again, a dirty campaign. Who ran it? It was the Liberal Party and Graham Jaeschke. It was a dirty campaign. What was put out? I will tell you how dirty this campaign was: the member for Elder in his closing remarks in the house wished everyone well—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Including those retiring.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He wished everyone well, including those retiring. In that speech he made a sarcastic remark that, if taken out of context, could look like he meant ill to the electors of Elder. But, of course, we all know he did it and we all laughed at it. We all thought it was funny.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I said with my massive vote I’m sure to be back.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He said that with his massive margin he was sure to be back. He was making fun of his small margin. So what did the Liberal Party do? It put out a pamphlet in his electorate stating that ‘the arrogant member for Elder thinks he will be re-elected in a landslide because of his margin.’ That is what it did. It was dishonesty. There is no honour left in this place from members opposite—and I will talk about that later in relation to the member for Schubert with his lack of honour in this house. There is no honour left in the Liberal Party. It is gone.

I will give another example of why members of the Liberal Party have no honour. The member for Norwood was instructed by the former Treasurer to move her office. She had to move her office. She did not want to move. She was forced to move by the former Treasurer. What did the Liberal Party do? On the last day before the election, it put out a pamphlet—a very good pamphlet, I might add—which was well structured and well designed. The pamphlet was put out to embarrass the member for Norwood and to claim that she insisted on moving her office a few doors down The Parade at a cost of \$20 000 to taxpayers.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We will remember all this.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: We will remember all this. It is dishonest and there is no honour at all.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We remember everything Lucas did.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It was desperate and dishonest.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: But what did the member for Norwood do, despite the mighty machine of the Liberal Party and all its money, wealthy donors and corporate donations? She was not phased by it. She got on her bike and went doorknocking to meet the ordinary punters in Norwood. She makes no apology for loving Norwood and for being proud of the eastern suburbs, but the Liberal Party makes a virtue of attacking her personally during every election campaign. Members opposite do not have the courage to do it in this house: they do it quietly in the middle of the night on the Friday before the election. That is how you attack the member for Norwood with your cowardice. You will not get up here and attack her because you cannot attack a woman in public. You do it deceitfully in the night, via the letterbox. That is how you do it. That is the Liberal Party—no honour, no integrity and no honesty. That is what the Liberal Party stands for—absolutely nothing; nothing but self-gain, themselves and their wealthy corporate donors.

In my own election campaign, another dirty trick, more dirty tricks. Can you believe it? More dirty tricks!

An honourable member: Because they are desperate and dishonest.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Why? Because they are desperate, dirty and dishonest, that is why. In the election campaign the very good Mayor of West Torrens (Hon. John Trainer) instructed that there would be guidelines for putting up election signs. He was well within his rights to ask this.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No, he was a good Speaker. The mayor fairly took down both my signs and the Liberal Party signs. He took no sides: he took both down equally. But do you know what the Liberal Party did? This is what the Liberal Party did: they put out a pamphlet, again unauthorised, by some ratepayers association against the waste of government money. Unauthorised, they put it out, again like cowards, in the dark on the Friday before the election, and saying what? Saying that I had cost the taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars by illegally putting up signs.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: My swing was 26 per cent in Novar Gardens—not bad, 26 per cent in Novar Gardens, but my swing overall was 4.9 per cent. What did they do? They put it out in the middle of the night on the Friday before.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: We will talk about you in a second, Gunny.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens should address the chair and ignore interjections, which are out of order from either side.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much for your guidance yet again, sir. I will discuss the member for Stuart's election campaign in a moment. The Liberal Party tried its best in West Torrens, and all I can say is: please do it again. We will be waiting. We had a great campaign. Please run my opponent again. I could not have asked for a better opponent. Kerry Packer once said, 'You only get one Alan Bond in a lifetime.' Well, I thought I only got one Graham Parry in a lifetime, but I am lucky: I got two. I want Theo Vlassis again. I want him again next time—do me a favour.

The member for Stuart, the father of the house, a man of integrity, honour and honesty—to some; to others, the member for Stuart has a lot to answer for in this campaign.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General should uphold the law everywhere, including here, and not interject. You have the call, the member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Stuart will be an example for the rest of the Liberal Party. He has been here since 1970. He has outlasted a lot of people in this chamber. He has achieved things in his own way. I will pay tribute to the member for Stuart.

An honourable member: How long has he been on the front bench?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That was what I was about to pay tribute to him for. The member for Stuart has so much experience in the Liberal Party, but what do they do? They ignore him, and they put him on the backbench. Why? I thought you were the party of the country. I thought you were a rural party. Let us count the rural backbenchers, shall we? The member for MacKillop, why is he not on the front bench? Why is he not representing rural voters on the front bench? Then there is the member for Stuart—30 years; the member for Schubert, 32 years, why is he not on the front bench? I thought the Liberal Party represented rural families. The member for Goyder—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The police minister is strictly out of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Goyder entered the parliament in 1985. Is that—

An honourable member: 1982.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It was 1982. He is a man of huge experience, with an understanding of standing orders and parliamentary procedure. Why is he not on the front bench? Instead, what have you kept? They are the same old losers who gave us a deficit blow-out, education disaster and cuts and a crisis in health. They are the ones on the front bench. You have kept the police minister who diverted money away from Rescue 1 helicopters to pork-barrel his own electorate. What about the one member of parliament that you have with an ethnic background—the member for Hartley? What about him? What about your links to non-English-speaking-background voters? How do you treat him? Does he get a front bench spot? No, he does not.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It was an heroic victory in Hartley. I had him written off. I thought he was going to lose. But he beat us.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: The littlest dinosaur.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The littlest dinosaur. He roared and he got us—and good on him; congratulations to him. The reason you hung on for three months involved him and the member for Stuart, Graham Gunn. The rest of your colleagues on the front bench did nothing for you.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Malcolm did all right; I'll give it to Bucks.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No. I will be fair. The member for Light fought a heroic campaign.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The police minister will find himself in big trouble shortly and the member for West Torrens should remember what this debate is about and come back to the substance of the Address in Reply.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I will, sir. I will just say this: unlike other members of the Liberal Party, the member for Light did not engage in dirty tactics. He did not engage in

deceitful campaigning. He and Annette Hurley fought a fair campaign. We have discussed it, and he agrees that the campaign we ran in Light was tough but fair, and he agrees that he did the same. He is an example to the rest of you.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It was fair in Hartley. You won, didn't you? You cannot complain. But look at the rest of the front bench. You have kept the member for Bright and the member for Mawson on the front bench.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Itchy and Scratchy.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Itchy and Scratchy. B1 and B2; Bill and Ben—call them what you want. Those two will be the undoing of the Liberal Party, so I say, 'Promote them.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I'll talk about Chika in a second. This government will rewrite the book on how to be a good government. We will rewrite the book on honesty and accountability. As the member for Enfield (I think it was) said yesterday, 'The best disinfectant is sunlight.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Who said it?

Mr Rau: Ralph.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Ralph Jacobi. We will open up and let the sunlight in on this place. We will disinfect the past. The past will be a bad memory. The future is here now and we will be a good government.

Mr Scalzi: We'll make sure.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I hope you do because you do need a good opposition to be a good government, but on your last two days' performance, God help us.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You're helping us, but not in the way you should be helping us. This Labor government will be a good government. We have a talented front bench. We have a Premier from the north who understands the concerns of ordinary South Australians and who has shown already in the short time of his premiership his strength of leadership by taking on the Parole Board, taking on people who want to see murderers and criminals released early, and saying: 'No; the South Australian community will not accept that. These are our values. This is what we believe in.'

Our Attorney-General will change the Liberal Party law to make it safe for South Australians to defend themselves in their own homes again—a law of commonsense that all South Australians support. I would like to see whether the Liberal Party will vote for that. We have a Treasurer who will restore faith and accountability to our books, who will make Treasury honest again and who will show this state to the rest of the country as an example of good economic management.

We have a Minister for Government Enterprises who will put police and government enterprises first and not pork-barrel in his own seat. He will be looking after the entire state, not just the lucky few who happen to live in a certain electorate.

We have a health minister who is compassionate and caring, an education minister who understands the needs of ordinary families, and an environment minister who will clean up the EPA and make the environment safer and better for us all. I commend this new Labor government to the house, and congratulate all its new members. I congratulate the state member for Napier, whose family has been attacked personally—again by Liberal Party and its agents—for no reason other than that they can do so. He will be a great asset to this house. He will show up a lot of members opposite with his business acumen. He will show you how to run an

economy. The member for Napier will be a great asset to the Labor Party, and I am sure that he will be on the frontbench in no time, as will the member for Enfield, who is also another very great asset we have picked up. Congratulations to all the members who won hard-fought election campaigns. We will win them again in four years, and we will be a good government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the member for Kavel, I indicate to members that this is the member's first speech, and I ask members to extend to the member the courtesy of hearing him in silence.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion. I express my sincere respect for Her Excellency the Governor Mrs Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. I have met Her Excellency on several occasions, and she is a most personable lady who performs her duties with real dignity and grace, and South Australia is most fortunate to have a person such as this hold this important vice-regal position. I would like to congratulate all the newly elected members to the house, particularly my Liberal colleagues.

I want to commence my remarks by saying that it is an absolute honour and privilege to be elected as the third member for Kavel. I hope and trust that I am able to emulate the achievements of my two predecessors who were responsible in a major way for progressing this state to the strong economic position we enjoy today. I also want to pay tribute to the Hon. John Olsen. He was a man of great courage, determination and vision. If it were not for the attributes and qualities of this man, this state would not be anywhere near the sound economic situation that it was in when the office was handed to the ALP. If John was guilty of anything, it was putting his heart and soul into pulling the state out of the economic shambles in which the previous Labor government had left us. In time, this state will come to the full realisation of the importance and benefits of the decisions this man made. I wish John and Julie all the very best in their retirement from politics.

As has previously been stated in this house, the name Kavel was chosen to commemorate Pastor August Ludwig Christian Kavel who, in 1838, two years after the foundation of South Australia, brought his followers to this country from Germany to seek religious freedom. Pastor Kavel first settled in the township of Hahndorf before moving to the Barossa Valley. The original party and succeeding groups of German migrants certainly made a lasting contribution to this state's development. When the electorate of Kavel was first formed, it encompassed an area running from Lenswood in the south, through the Barossa, to Morgan and Eudunda in the north. The electorate of Schubert today has somewhat similar boundaries as Kavel had in the 1970s. However, today the Kavel electorate is truly an Adelaide Hills seat, encompassing the area from Callington to Mount Barker in the south, to Forest Range in the west, the South Para Reservoir in the north and to Harrogate in the east. It covers an area of 903 square kilometres and has approximately 22 700 voters.

The electorate is quite diverse in terms of its industries, both primary and secondary. Our primary industries, to name a few, include horticulture (particularly in those areas which are noted internationally for their premium apple, pear and cherry growing qualities) and viticulture—we have all seen the tremendous expansion in that industry not only in my electorate but throughout many regions of the state—as well as dairying, grazing/livestock and cropping operations.

I have some recent figures confirming the value of agricultural food production in the hills region which show the important contribution that we make to the economic wealth of the state. The gross food value from the hills region totals \$558 million, which obviously has a significant bearing on our overall economic wellbeing. There are many secondary industries within the region which include engineering and metal fabrication works, printing, cosmetic manufacturing and furniture manufacturing, to name a few.

The industries that operate in the hills are as many and varied as any you would find anywhere in the state. Notwithstanding the overall benefit that primary and secondary industries provide, the tourism industry plays a vital role in our region's growth and development. Few visitors to South Australia would not attempt the trip up the freeway to our wonderful historic town of Hahndorf. Hahndorf is an absolute icon in South Australia's tourism industry. Its residents are very proud of their district and have a strong sense of civic responsibility. Beerenberg at Hahndorf is a well-known family business owned and operated by Grant and Carol Paech and their sons, and it attracts thousands of visitors every year. The Lights of Lobethal Festival is also a highlight of the state's tourism calendar and brings \$1.2 million into our economy.

The vast majority of our towns in Kavel offer real tourism highlights. Mount Barker, the region's largest centre, offers the well-known Steamranger: visitors can enjoy a steam engine train ride from Mount Barker to Strathalbyn and on to Victor Harbor. There is also the Summit Lookout at Mount Barker where visitors can experience breathtaking panoramic views in any direction. The Oakbank Racing Club holds its world renowned Easter Race Meeting: visitors come from interstate and overseas to enjoy the exciting atmosphere of this two-day race meeting. Gumeracha has the very well-known giant rocking horse and Birdwood has the Birdwood Mill Museum, which includes the National Motor Museum.

Everyone knows of the Bay to Birdwood Rally, and both spectators and entrants are attracted to our district from all over Australia as well as overseas to participate. Even the member for Schubert enters his 1912 Hupmobile in the rally. He would support my comments about how tremendous this event is and the hundreds of thousands of dollars that it brings to our state's economy. So, as you can see, the hills, particularly Kavel, abound in tourism attractions, all of which play a big role in showcasing the state's wonderful tourism industry.

The significant wine industry development throughout our region has also provided a real boost to the tourism industry. Last weekend, the state enjoyed the Adelaide Hills Harvest Festival with many wineries and cellar doors providing splendid opportunities to promote and showcase our region. To further enhance our tourism trade there are numerous B&Bs that provide a wonderful experience for those who visit. Tourism is a very large industry in our region. I know that its future is bright, particularly with the Chairman of the Adelaide Hills Tourism Marketing Committee providing strong leadership. I am referring to a recently retired member of this house, the Hon. David Wotton.

People enjoy our hills lifestyle. This is reflected in the large-scale residential development which Kavel has experienced, particularly in the Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne townships. Most forms of development do not come without their challenges. However, I know that both the elected members and the administration of our two councils are most capable of meeting these challenges to ensure that

our very unique hills lifestyle is preserved and our environment enhanced.

There are many issues that affect our region—issues that are peculiar to certain areas and industries—but, like most country electorates, the main issues that are prominent are those concerning road infrastructure, educational facilities, health services and planning. There are several very specific examples of these prominent issues.

I refer to the proposed second freeway interchange at Mount Barker. The Minister for Transport has come out only to say that it is a low priority. That may be his stance at the moment, but I hope that, in making those statements, he is aware of the growth that the region is experiencing. It is estimated that an additional 2 000 new homes will be built in the next three to four years in the district, resulting in a significant increase in vehicular demand on that present infrastructure. The minister says it is low on the list, but that will not stop the community and me from representing them continuing to lobby for that infrastructure development.

There is also the issue of heavy vehicle movements through the main street of Hahndorf. Again, members of that community believe that traffic congestion in the town justifies a need for a two-way interchange on the freeway to be built at Hahndorf, and a heavy vehicle bypass needs to be constructed to reroute those vehicles around the town. As a major tourism boulevard, visitors and locals should be able to access the main street safely, as there are prime movers, semitrailers, buses, cars and pedestrians all trying to use the narrow main street.

Another issue that looms large is that of the Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. We are facing the prospect of an increasing demand for the maternity ward at the hospital due to the closure of the obstetrics unit at the Stirling hospital. From talking to the Executive Officer, the Director of Nursing, and the Chairman of the board, I think the Mount Barker hospital could well expect an additional 100 babies to be delivered per year, and as such it will require significant infrastructure development to meet that demand. I have written to the Minister of Health concerning this, but have yet to receive a reply.

Another issue concerns schools and, in particular, the present condition of buildings and facilities at the Woodside Primary School. It is just not safe for classes to be conducted in one large classroom that was probably put there in the 1960s. There are holes in the timber window frames and the floor feels like it will collapse at any time. Again, I have raised this most serious issue with the minister. I can say that I have received a reply to that letter, and I will continue to push for a satisfactory outcome for that school's community.

Another major issue is the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment area. Some 60 per cent of Adelaide's water supply comes from the catchment, which covers an area of more than 4 000 square kilometres. Over the years there has been controversy about how this vital resource should be properly managed. There have been many debates over many years, and governments of different persuasions have taken various measures to preserve and enhance this resource.

All I want to say on this is that it is incumbent upon us all, not only those who live in and who are responsible for the water catchment area, but also the consumers of this resource, to manage it effectively in a sustainable manner. However, it is also a responsibility not to retard the future prosperity of the Hills region as a whole. It is easy to stop any development that has the remote possibility of environmental impact. It is the capability and capacity of people to sustainably manage

development that is the crux of the matter. It is essential that we have qualified people with a high level of expertise to give clear directions when it comes to development and not vague knee-jerk responses to real needs that have been the experience of a number of my constituents.

As I have said, I have written quite a number of letters to ministers addressing some of these issues. I have also written to the Attorney-General some weeks ago concerning the issue of public liability insurance asking what the government intends to do about this important matter. I have yet to receive a response. I can only presume that the government does not know how to manage this issue and, while that goes on, I have many constituents who face the closure of their businesses because insurance companies will not renew their policies when they expire. If this government's inaction on such a crucial matter as this is any indication of what is in store, we are all faced with a very bleak future. I believe we need legislative action on this.

The United States is a very good example to follow concerning public liability insurance because it identifies the issue of inherent risk and has legislated along those lines, and I will give the house an example. If you walk into a yard or a paddock where there are cattle, horses or even cranky rams there is a risk that you may sustain an injury if one of those animals takes a dislike to you. There is an inherent risk and if you are warned about that risk but you reject or neglect that warning and are subsequently injured I cannot see your having grounds to sue for compensation due to those injuries sustained.

I believe we need to legislate to protect qualified, accredited and, in some cases, licensed operators, who properly warn of potential danger and risk, against litigants claiming compensation against injuries that have resulted from those activities. We even now see our community activities threatened. Country show societies are experiencing difficulty in obtaining public liability insurance. It would be an absolute tragedy if country shows had to be abolished because of insurance problems. It is absolutely incumbent upon this government to develop sensible, manageable, fair and equitable legislation to ensure that this issue that affects all of our society is properly resolved.

There is also another exceedingly worrying trend that has emerged over the past couple of weeks. I refer to the recent industrial action brought about by union unrest. For a union to bring a vital industry, such as the car manufacturing industry, to a virtual standstill, costing the state millions of dollars, is of real concern. The government's inaction on this matter evidences who is actually in charge: it is the unions. The comments from the union bosses that this is only the start of things to come should send a strong message to our community that this government does not hold any sway in South Terrace debates.

The unions are running roughshod over this government. We also see the AEU causing trouble. This state, with a Liberal government over the past eight years, earned a reputation for industrial stability, which was a real attraction to potential investors to this state. It looks like we can kiss that goodbye for the time being. And talking about economic matters, I would like to comment on statements made by the Labor Government about inheriting a rust belt economy and the new Labor Economic Development Board being the last chance to revive the South Australian economy; but let us look at some real facts that show how strong our economy was when Labor took over.

Retail sales in the past 12 months were an amazing 11 per cent higher than previous years compared to 8.3 per cent for Australia as a whole; there was a 43 per cent increase in new home commencement this year; and building activity in South Australia is much stronger than in most other states. South Australian businesses estimate a 37 per cent increase in new capital expenditure in 2002-03. Recent export growth figures for South Australian businesses are the strongest of all states.

In March 2002 we had unemployment figures of only 6.6 per cent compared to a peak of 12 per cent. I think the Premier was employment minister when those horrific statistics came in. Recent job growth figures were the third highest for all states and territories for the past 12 months. This government has no justification at all in trying to criticise the health of the South Australian economy it inherited. It is attempting to rewrite history and, as an ex-banker and bank manager, I have studied plenty of balance sheets and profit and loss statements, and you can certainly put a different interpretation on figures if you wish. My colleagues and I know what set of figures are credible. There is a strong foundation upon which they can continue to build.

Before concluding, I would like to thank the many people who gave me very strong support during my preselection process and the election campaign itself. As some members would know, I was preselected four days after the election was called. We had 20 days to run, and to say it was a very intense period is somewhat of an understatement. There are many people to thank whom I could try to name personally, but I will not, for fear of missing someone. However, I most sincerely thank my SEC for their unwavering support and commitment, including my campaign manager, Mr Mal Wade, during that very busy period. I also thank not only Liberal Party members but also those who supported me who are not party members—those friends and friends of friends who have helped me. There is a group of people whom I want to thank most deeply, because without their dedication the job to win this seat would have been almost impossible. I refer to my family, particularly my wife, Tracey.

As I said, I believe it is a privilege to represent the people of Kavel and I look forward to honouring the trust they have placed in me and fulfilling my commitment to them in being a good, effective, accessible local member.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I wish to recognise that we meet on Kaurna land and acknowledge my respect for Kaurna people and particularly acknowledge the opening of parliament, which saw the participation of the first peoples of this country for the first time when they welcomed us here. I pledge my commitment to honouring that welcome by bringing respect and sincerity to my work in this house. I congratulate all former and new members on their re-election or election and look forward to working with everybody during this 50th parliament. The year 2002 will be a special year of celebration for South Australia; it is the Year of the Outback. This serves to focus our attention on those areas of our state away from the metropolitan and regional sprawl and out into the ageless and timeless heart of Australia. Our outback areas, regional communities and the greater metropolitan urban developments represent what is key to the future of this state—the people, with their courage, ingenuity, diversity, compassion, creativity and ability to work together to find ways to make South Australia better and the best place to live.

The amazing commencement of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, a promise fulfilled in the centenary year

of Federation, perhaps best illustrates that South Australia is the key entry point to the outback corridor which takes us through to Asia and the world beyond Darwin. We are the focal state midway between east and west and now with links through the centre to Darwin. I congratulate all the public policy makers, all the business and community visionaries and especially all the workers involved in this historic endeavour and look forward eventually to taking that journey north. As the Year of the Outback, 2002 follows on from the Centenary of Federation. The Federation anniversary makes us reflect on the recent history of Australia from the time of white settlement until now and on what sort of democracy and nation we wish to be, and follows close on from the Sydney Olympic Games which showcased a vibrant Australia, secure in its diversity across the global stage.

The year 2002 is also the time that we commemorate the bicentenary of encounter, the historic meeting of Matthew Flinders and Nicholas Baudin that has captured the imagination of so many people all over this state—about the amazing discoveries that show what a truly unique and special place South Australia is. The encounter fuels our imagination about both past and future, against the backdrop of the fascinating story of first meetings as seen through the eyes and writings and art of people on board the vessels who were part of the two expeditions, and those of the people of the Kurna and nearby lands.

The year 2002 is a time for our state to host many international visitors, to showcase our state and hospitality industry and to capitalise on the new and reinvigorated sense of a future we all share. The unifying Outback theme, the celebrations locally of the encounter and the dynamic and positive energy of this new and creative Rann Labor government will all set a great opportunity to bring together urban and rural communities, business and churches, the work force and the carers, the young, the old—all of us, in fact—in a strong, cohesive and lasting partnership, working together to make a better future.

The people of Florey have again honoured me and given me the opportunity to work with them and on their behalf to make sure that their voices are heard in this place and heard also within this Labor team. I am proud that already ideas and changes are being introduced in a responsible and inclusive manner, and there is a sense that the state is brimming with energy again and an excitement far exceeding people's initial expectations at the change of government.

In 2002 we have the opportunity to make a real difference—a difference to our economy through the renewed hope and vision of the united efforts of the Economic Development Board, which brings together the best minds and experienced practitioners from all sectors of industry and shades of the political spectrum. And a difference to our society through the efforts of the new Social Inclusion Unit which, under the wise guidance of Father Cappo, will develop a whole-of-government response to the impact of the issues of exclusion from education, school retention rates and opportunity and, perhaps, the most tragic of all problems we face—homelessness and the cycle of poverty, isolation and unemployment which has marred our state in past years.

There will be difference to our governance. Through the efforts of the Premier Mike Rann, and with the support of the Speaker, we will ensure that never again will this house fall into the disrepute that saw a premier leave office and where untruths or blurring of ethical boundaries was allowed to seep into what must be the institution most above reproach in our society—the people's house and the institution of democracy.

There will be a difference, too, to our standing nationally and internationally, which now can grow again as South Australia begins to lead, not follow, the rest of Australia.

It is the setting of standards that will mark this 50th Parliament—standards of fair play in the criminal justice system, which will be mindful of community attitudes while administering justice fairly, and fair play also in ways that admonish blatant stereotyping—the sort we saw in our main paper last week, where some citizens were singled out concerning crime sprees in the western suburbs, which drew the valid complaint by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission that 15 000 other indigenous community members in Adelaide should not be held to blame for the inappropriate actions of a few.

This is fair play that recognises that criminal justice is intrinsically linked to social justice and that, without work, without adequate housing and without hope in a future that will provide dignity and support, anyone might lose their way. Fair play does not accept that thousands in our state remain homeless, seeking shelter in parks, vehicles and empty buildings. We have been lucky to have had a mild autumn but, come winter, we must not run away from the challenge that we face as a community to clothe, house and feed every South Australian.

Work is a key—work that is dignified and valued, with fair pay for a fair day's work. Fair play under our government will not let us stand by while workers are evicted from their jobs or entitlements. The struggles in Port Pirie and the struggles in our local vehicle factories are the ways in which fair play will be tested. The struggles of bus drivers and Ansett workers has hit Florey residents particularly hard and, while it is these workers today, it can be any worker in the future, unless we declare practices such as these totally unacceptable.

I acknowledge the central role which the trade union movement continues to play in the economy and social fabric of our state, and I particularly wish Janet Giles well as she takes over the lead role in South Australia, along with Sharon Burrows, whose federal leadership of the UTLC remains consistent, fair and clear in the pursuit of a better deal for all working people and their families. After all, unions sprang from the need for ordinary men and women to negotiate for a better deal and, unfortunately, the struggle continues.

The triumph at Mitsubishi shows the speed and determination which motivates this government to fight for our state, for our jobs and for our future. Fair play means not stopping people's entitlements because of prejudice based on gender, sexuality, race or religion. I am committed to working with my colleagues to ensure that the barriers to same sex couples enjoying the same superannuation entitlements as other couples are identified and removed.

This year, 2002, also presents the opportunity for us all to deal with the dilemma of how to respond to those desperate refugees who come seeking our tolerance and care and are interned within the state's borders by the commonwealth. I have been ashamed that it is in our outback at Woomera that some of the most inhumane treatment of desperate people has been shown to the world. Our community must be strong enough to allow all views to be aired and all solutions to be discussed as we work together to bring about a solution. How many of us here could imagine being beaten, traumatised, forcibly imprisoned and pushed to the edge of endurance? I am proud that, since Labor took office, there is a renewed focus on compassion and care, particularly for children and families within our state's borders who have been hurt by

John Howard's program of incarceration, intolerance and isolation. I wish for Her Honour, Robyn Layton, the serious cooperation and support of all sides of this house as we develop a better response to this terrible issue.

Fair play also means starting in our own backyards; fair play means more than letting the market decide who has a home and who does not. Adequate housing must be the key to community wellbeing, for with no fixed address work is difficult to get or sustain, delivery of benefits is almost unobtainable and the vulnerable become victims yet again. This government will find ways to enable the most vulnerable to access housing—not just rental but hopefully some form of purchase plan. A community that cannot house its people is a community without soul and a community with wrong priorities.

A divided and blaming community loses its vision, turns inward and divides us from ourselves. Fair play means more than letting some accident of birth determine the access and duration of our children's education. School retention, work and schools links, traineeships and support for teens to return to schooling in an adult learning environment are all ways to invest in a greater share of social capital for all South Australians and not just a privileged few.

Coming from Florey, my voice and heart lies in the north east. My vision and passion is in my schools and clubs, churches and workplaces in the vibrant community that is the north east. I put the house on notice that I intend to be a force for my community here and will unashamedly pursue the social inclusion strategies, the services and the attention we need in and around Modbury and the area that is Florey. To strengthen opportunities and ensure fair play will need three things: opportunity, equity and will. We have in this parliament now the opportunity for reform and progress, the like of which we have not seen for many years. We have in our hearts the passion for fair play and equity that will see the state unified, compassionate and great again. We have the will—as a government and from the people—to effect the changes so badly needed to move us forward in 2002.

In conclusion, I thank my wonderful family and campaign team who continue to perform miracles on such a slim budget. I thank my staff, particularly Tabitha Lean, for her continued dedication and commitment to both myself and the electorate of Florey. With this continuing support base that has seen my re-election, and the continued dedication to our electorate and its communities, I know we will play our part in making the lives of all South Australians better and the best they can be.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I support this motion and I thank Her Excellency the Governor for her excellent speech and also for the work that she will undoubtedly do during her period in office. To say that it is a pleasure to be back is an understatement, because many on the opposite side of the house predicted that I would not return. However, I would like to thank all the constituents of Light, which includes both Gawler and my new area of Munno Para, Smithfield Plains and part of Davoren Park, for their support in returning me to this chamber, where I can reflect their ideas and their opinions, which I have always considered to be a high responsibility and which I have always kept in mind when speaking in this house.

I particularly thank my campaign team. This is the first time that Light has been a marginal seat. It was held previously by Dr Bruce Eastick, and I took over in 1993. I believe that, for the constituents of Gawler in particular, it was

somewhat of a shock to them to find out exactly what a marginal seat was all about in terms of the amount of material they were receiving through the post and the types of arguments and political positioning that occur in a marginal seat. As I say, it was somewhat of a shock to them, and during the last week of the campaign we had people saying, 'Not more coming into the mail box, please.' However, that is what a marginal seat is all about.

I had an excellent campaign team headed by Ian Fyfe. They worked extremely smoothly and it is their work, along with mine, which sees me return as the member for Light. I also thank my family. My being the Minister for Education and Children's Services for the past four or so years has impacted very much on my family, particularly as I have a young family. I relied on my partner, my wife, Kathryn, basically to fill in for me when I could not be home because of ministerial and electoral duties. I sincerely thank her and my two children, Alexander and Olivia, for the tolerance that they showed during that time. I know that the new ministers in this government will find the demands on them just as heavy and that they will require the same level of support from their family to ensure that they undertake their position to their fullest ability and to ensure that they do the job well.

I would like to make mention of my Labor opponent for Light, Annette Hurley. As the member for West Torrens said, Annette and I ran a very straight and very tough campaign but a good campaign, and I commend her for that. Only one of us would return to this place. I respect Annette for the work that she did as both deputy leader and also as the previous member for Napier. It is a pity that one of us had to lose, but I congratulate her on the campaign that she ran. It was a good one; it was tough. However, as I said, there could only be one winner.

I was very pleased to see that the margin doubled in Light from 1.4 per cent to 2.9 per cent, and I believe that was as a result of 2½ years worth of doorknocking. As soon as Light became marginal under the Electoral Commissioner's hand, I undertook to doorknock as much of Light as possible—not that I had not doorknocked before. I believe that doorknocking is what wins marginal seats, because you find out exactly what people feel. They have the opportunity to meet you and to talk to you face to face about issues of concern to them. I think I doorknocked about 75 per cent of the total electorate.

I am pleased to say that in my new area of Munno Para, Smithfield Plains and the northern area of Davoren Park I met some very genuine and very good people. Some people in Munno Para, for instance, had lived there from day one of the opening of the suburb. These people were staunchly committed to the community, they had an interest in the community, and they were very happy to open their door to me and tell me what they saw as the issues in Munno Para, Smithfield Plains and that area. I will be very pleased to represent them.

One of the issues that this government needs to come to grips with, which our government over the past eight years and previous Labor governments did not do, is the rejuvenation of the Peachey belt area, and I will be lobbying the minister to include that in capital works programs for the Housing Trust because it is certainly an area in great need. That is what the Premier and other members opposite have echoed, that they will be concentrating on people in the community who have a lot of need. So it will be a pleasure to represent this new area and to take on some of the issues and the problems that exist in that area.

I would like to cover now what often gets lost over a period of time, particularly since the election, and that is

some of the achievements of the last eight years of Liberal government. We all remember that when in 1993 I came into this house, the government of the day was faced with a \$9.6 billion debt and I am pleased to say that, over eight years of prudent management, that has reduced to some \$3.3 billion, a significant reduction indeed. Before I came into this place in 1993, I was a research economist with the Centre for Economic Studies, and I remember reporting on the unemployment rate in South Australia at the time, and it was then just on 12 per cent with a question mark over whether it would go higher, and it is pleasing to see that it is now 7.1 per cent and very close to the national average of unemployment. There is still more to be done; there is always more to be done in that area.

It is also pleasing to see that, since 1993 and the State Bank debacle, confidence in South Australia has risen substantially. I remember back at that time that South Australia was the rust bucket, the rust state, and businesses had lost confidence in South Australia. When I talked to people on the east coast, they just treated South Australia with contempt, so I am pleased to see that business opportunities have risen dramatically over the last eight years. It really is a matter of reflection that over that period we concentrated on building up the exports of South Australia. Our current leader, Rob Kerin, is to be commended for the Food for the Future plan, which he undertook and which concentrates on exporting our clean, green and well-established food and wine industry to overseas countries.

We now see a booming wine industry in South Australia, with over \$1 billion worth of exports, providing jobs for people throughout South Australia. It must be remembered that it is not only the wine industry—it is all the feeder industries that supply goods and materials to the wine industry as well, whether it be cardboard packaging, bottles or agricultural chemicals and machinery. A large range of inputs go into the final bottle of wine, and the expansion of that industry, through the Food for the Future plan and through working with both wineries and growers here in South Australia, has seen that significant improvement.

More is yet to be done in aquaculture. We now have oyster farming in South Australia, which did not exist before, and South Australia now has at its doorstep the export potential of that market and other aquaculture markets. That is all because of a lot of hard work put in over the last eight years.

I look now at the funding that the former minister, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, committed to rural roads. On Kangaroo Island, for example, there has been improvement in the sealing of roads, making the island more accessible to our tourists, whether they be overseas, intrastate or interstate tourists. That has improved dramatically in the last eight years. It is an excellent program that was initiated by the former Minister for Transport. One has only to consider the Heysen Tunnels and the Mount Barker Road to acknowledge what a pleasure it now is to drive in that area. That was a \$100 million investment by the previous government in our road infrastructure. It cuts I think about 12 to 20 minutes off a run from Murray Bridge to Adelaide and has significantly reduced the danger of that road. I remember undertaking an economic impact study on that particular project when I was with the Centre for Economic Studies. The figures escape me now, but we worked out the number of minutes that it saved and converted that into a dollar value representing the additional time that people can spend in their businesses through spending less time on the road, and it was quite enormous.

The Southern Expressway is yet another major infrastructure project of over \$100 million which, again, saves southern residents many minutes in time. Only recently, I travelled from Port Willunga to the centre of the city and I reckon the expressway cut about 15 minutes from the travel time compared with the previous route down South Road. That is another major infrastructure project that was completed by the previous Liberal government.

Of course, as a new member commented the other day, the Holdfast Shores development at Glenelg had not been touched by many governments over a period of time but is now attracting additional investment in South Australia and providing additional hotel accommodation for what is probably the most popular beach in South Australia.

I will now touch on education, because much has been said about this subject over the last couple of days. I reflect on the fact that over the last eight years, under the former minister (Hon. Rob Lucas) and me, we changed education more than occurred at any other time in the past 30 years. After the introduction of the basic skills test by the former minister, members from both the union and the Labor party said that undertaking this test would irretrievably damage our children and that it would be a blight on their minds for the rest of their lives. What ridiculous statements they were! Surely, anyone with an ounce of intelligence would be able to see that that was not the case.

This form of testing is now accepted across Australia by Labor and Liberal governments and we are starting to be able to make uniform comparisons between the states, difficult though that is. We are here for the people of the community, and that particular test is the one point in time when parents can look at the result and say, 'Here is how my child is performing.' As I always said when I was minister, it is not the be-all and end-all. Teachers have an input into students' daily work and weekly tests in the classroom, but the basic skills test tells parents how their children are progressing in their studies compared with other students in the state, what band their children fall into and whether they are performing well or need help.

The previous government reintroduced vocational education training in 1997. In 1991 the Labor government closed our last technical high school, Goodwood Technical High School, which was the last opportunity for students to concentrate on a technical career rather than an academic career. The Liberal government over the last eight years and, particularly, over the last four years reintroduced vocational education training by opening two vocational colleges—one at Windsor Gardens and one at Christies Beach—to ensure that we form a partnership between business and our school community. I think that is extremely important and will have to continue if we are to close the links between the two, so that we produce students with qualifications that business requires and accepts. It is extremely important.

Of course, the one thing that will be introduced is that all year 10 students will undertake a certificate in information and communication technology so that, when they leave school, any employer will be able to see that they have that certificate, and employers will know that they have competency in Microsoft Word or Excel, or a range of other skills involved with information and communication technology.

Those vocational colleges are performing fantastically well. Windsor Gardens High School, for instance, had 400 students before we made it a vocational college. The number of students was falling, but it now has over 600 students. The students and the parents who want their

children to follow this path of vocational education have voted with their feet: there are now some 16 000 to 17 000 students undertaking vocational education training. You only have to look at places such as Fremont High School at Elizabeth. When I visited that school a couple of years ago, from my recollection there were 950-odd students, and 910 out of the 950 were undertaking the hospitality course at that school. Just seeing the opportunities there to develop those vocational skills, which would lead students onto a pathway of employment after they had left school, was gratifying. We all know that it is a fact that about only 30 per cent of our year 12 students will go on to university. The other 70 per cent will go onto a TAFE college or an apprenticeship, or they will go onto some other form of employment. I think that fact is lost on many occasions.

I believe that Partnerships 21 is one of the most innovative and radical things to happen in education in the last 30 years. Local management had been tried in the 1980s, but had failed. I believe that Greg Crafter, who was minister at the time, tried to bring it in. I am pleased that it has been taken up and that 90 per cent of our schools are members of Partnerships 21, which just shows that they were—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: It is a totally voluntary scheme.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member for Waite says, it is a totally voluntary scheme. When I was researching this I found that in other places where schools had been forced to enter the scheme, where on the Friday they were under government control and on the Monday they were on their own, that was not the right way to go. Of course, with any new scheme there are always detractors. You will never please all the people all the time. We know that. But this scheme has given new life to the schools in our community.

I remember that last year Elizabeth North Primary School won a national literacy award. Elizabeth North Primary School won a national literacy award! When speaking with the principal, he told me, 'We could not have done this without the flexibility which Partnerships 21 gives us. We are able to bring in additional teachers. We schedule an hour of reading and an hour of numeracy every morning of the week.' That is what has changed the outcome for our students—that flexibility and not the rigid system that was there in the past.

Every system needs a review at some stage, and I support the review that the new minister has introduced. I support and commend her on getting Professor Ian Cox back to chair that review. He did an excellent job of the first stages of Partnerships 21 and the setting up of what should be the outcomes and the equity issues in Partnership 21 schools. I commend Professor Cox for that and I am sure that, under his direction, Partnerships 21 can only go on to become a better and better system.

I think that all you need to say about education in this state is that you can always put more money into education. You could put in another \$400 million or \$500 million and still find money to spend. You could still find projects; you could still find buildings that need repair; and you could still find things to do. It is one of those portfolios, such as health, where, if you had a bottomless bucket, you could still keep on pouring money into it. There will always be pressure on the budget of those two portfolios, because the demands are so great. The demands are there in such magnitude that there will always be pressure on them.

I remember looking at a report on public buildings written in 1968. It warned future governments that, because of the baby boom period and the number of additional students who had come into public schools and the buildings that had been

put up during the 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s, in 30 to 40 years those buildings would need major refurbishment. We are coming up to that time now. In fact, we are basically on the edge of that time now. It is a challenge for any government of whatever persuasion to look at that and to find money to refurbish those buildings which were built 30 or 40 years ago. It is a real challenge; there is no doubt about it and it does not matter what persuasion of government is in office.

I look forward with anticipation to shadowing the ministers in transport and planning. I am pleased to have been offered this opportunity. There are many issues in terms of road safety and the design and infrastructure of our roads, and in terms of planning the metropolitan area of Adelaide and the many planning issues that go with the development of a state, particularly in this state where Adelaide is the centre of the state, the centre of industrial activity and the centre of the population of South Australia. It does make those development and planning issues very critical indeed as to the decisions that are made and, also, of course, with the Mount Lofty Ranges directly behind Adelaide, how that hills face zone is protected to ensure we have a vista from the city which is not only pleasant to look at but also is able to maintain a certain level of activity, whether it be agricultural or residential.

Many things are happening in my electorate of Light. This year we have seen a fantastic development by the AMCOR company of a glass bottling factory just north of Gawler. It is providing some 100 jobs to South Australians. Many of those will be locals and it is, without doubt, the greatest investment since GMH in South Australia. I commend AMCOR for its coming into South Australia because previously there was a monopoly in glass bottle manufacturing in South Australia. That is never a healthy situation. Some \$50 million worth of bottles were being imported into South Australia, and this will now give some competition in the marketplace. It offers small wineries, in particular, the option of a competitive marketplace and therefore more competitive prices for their wine bottles.

I am also pleased to see that, since 1994, I think it was, when Woolworths announced a new development in Gawler and the political game playing was done by various areas within Gawler to try to stop the development, that building work is now occurring. It is due to open in October and that, again, will provide many employment opportunities for young people within Gawler, and it will provide an extra level of competition and consumer choice for shopping in Gawler. A number of issues concern me. First, an application by a company, formerly Pacific Waste, for a landfill at Kalbeeba just on the edge of Gawler—not in my electorate, but just on the edge of my electorate. That development is vehemently opposed by the Gawler council—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: No, I didn't. I have never supported Kalbeeba.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Both of them, no; you have got it wrong.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: No, I did not. I have never supported it. There are two dumps at Kalbeeba: one we have defeated, and this second application is directly across the road from the first. It lies within 300 or 400 metres of the South Para River, and I have never supported and never will support that. Indeed, the Gawler council does not support this development, nor do all the residents in the Kalbeeba and

Gawler area. I will certainly raise this matter with the new minister.

I spoke about Gomersal Road the other day in a grievance debate. There has been a massive improvement in the number of heavy transport vehicles that are not now going through Murray Street into the Barossa Valley because they are using Gomersal Road. The change has been dramatic. If you talk to anybody in the street and read a letter published in the local *Bunyip* this week, you will find that they reiterate what I am saying, namely, that the level of noise and volume of traffic have reduced, and it is much easier now to traverse Murray Street without the 1 000 odd heavy vehicles moving through the street. It is a resounding success.

I am sure that over the next few months the Gawler traffic plan will come onto the radar screen. At the time, the Labor opposition indicated it would support that. I indicate to the Minister for Transport that it is not overwhelmingly supported by the residents of Gawler. In fact, the majority of residents in Gawler see it as transferring the traffic issue in Gawler from one street to another, namely, from Murray Street to Julian Terrace and Reid Street, and it is not the answer. Given that \$2.5 million has been requested by the council for this plan, I warn the government to think very carefully indeed about it.

As I said earlier, I had the pleasure of meeting many new constituents in the Munno Para/Smithfield Planes/Daveron Park area. Probably the three issues apparent in that area are unemployment, graffiti and traffic offences, with young people speeding up and down the roads. We need to address those issues, as well as—and I said this earlier—the rejuvenation of the Peachey belt area. I will be taking up that matter and approaching the minister to see what can be done, because it has been talked about by governments—whether they be Labor or Liberal—now for a period of over 30 years, and the time has come for something to be done for these people.

Another issue that will raise its head in Light is that of water supply. The Evanston Gardens/Angle Vale area is developing now with people pursuing horticultural activities. Only the other day a constituent came to me regarding an application for an increased water supply to grow roses. Initially it was approved by an acting district manager. However, when the district manager returned, the application was subsequently disapproved because there is not adequate water supply in this area. I have talked with SA Water people and found that the main that operates through that area needs to be expanded from 100 to 150 millimetres to increase the supply to that area.

I know that this matter falls within the area of the Gawler council and what it supports in relation to increased horticultural activity in that Evanston Gardens to Angle Vale area. In time to come, it may be that the Bolivar water will extend into that area and be able to develop further opportunities for horticulture. It is a prime region for that development, and it is being held back because of a lack of water supply. As I said, development plans will come onto the radar screen around Gawler over the next 12 months to a couple of years, and I look forward to discussing this matter with the new minister.

I thank the constituents of Light for returning me as their member. I look forward to supporting and representing them over the next four years.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Mr Deputy Speaker, I would like to begin my speech this afternoon by, first, congratulat-

ing you on your elevation to the high office of Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker. I look forward to your presiding over us when the house is in committee. I would also like to congratulate the Speaker for his elevation to that position. It is a shame that he is not in the chamber at the moment but, as the Premier said at the time of the Speaker's election, of all the members of this house, perhaps he has the greatest respect for parliament as an institution and for its privileges and traditions. I welcome his election to the office of Speaker.

I would also like to express my disappointment that the former member for Napier, Annette Hurley, is not among us today. I echo the member for Light's most gracious comments about her. She was a great Deputy Leader of the parliamentary Labor Party. She had, and still has, a great deal of wisdom, and the party will sorely miss her. We look forward to perhaps one day her re-entering this house.

I would also like to congratulate the members for Colton, Enfield and Napier (on this side of the house) on their maiden speeches, which I think are among the most articulate and learned speeches that I have heard in this place. They demonstrate the depth of talent on this side of the house, compared with the recycled has-beens opposite who have reappeared on the frontbench of the Parliamentary Liberal Party.

I would particularly like to direct my comments to the former treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas. Perhaps I should refer to him as the Hon. Jodee Lucas for his complete financial incompetence. I refer to some of the Treasurer's comments about the complete financial mismanagement of the previous government, and I would particularly like to put on the record some of the financial problems which the government now faces.

On an accrual basis, the general government net borrowing requirement will increase to \$392 million in 2001-02, and it is forecast to remain at levels above \$200 million across the forward estimate period. The accrual method of working out the state of the budget is interesting. During the previous state election, the then treasurer, the Hon. Jodee Lucas, was speaking on radio about the budget outlook which was released at that time and the forecast of an accrual based deficit. The former treasurer said on radio that accrual accounting is just a bit of an accounting trick, that you really need to look at the cash basis of the budget, that accrual accounting does not matter. It is a pity that the member for Light has left the chamber because I know that he, as an economist, would be absolutely horrified by that statement, because the accrual method of accounting is the only way of getting a proper and accurate look at the health of the state's finances.

Michael Egan said to me once that any fool could create out of thin air a cash surplus, but it is the accrual method of accounting that actually properly reflects the state of the budget. Here we had the former Treasurer on radio saying, 'No, accrual doesn't really matter; it's actually the cash basis that matters,' which is absolute nonsense. It is in fact the accrual state of the budget which allows us to make provision for capital expenditure in the future. It prevents governments from selling off assets and using the proceeds of those sales to make the state's finances look healthier than they really are. It is the accrual method of accounting which also allows us to properly compare South Australia's finances with the finances of the other states. That is why we do our budgets in this way.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr SNELLING: It is not just some clever accounting trick; it is actually a very important indicator of the health of the state's finances. The member for West Torrens interjects, 'What does Jodee think?' Well, Jodee does not think accrual-based accounting is important at all. Jodee is only interested in the cash basis of the budget.

If we look at what the government is doing to fix up the mess that has been left by the previous government, first, there has been the establishment of a budget review cabinet subcommittee which I think first came about in the early years of the federal Hawke government. It was a very effective way of reviewing the expenditure of departments and cutting out waste. My friend Peter Walsh was a member of that very first expenditure review committee, as it was called in the Hawke days, and he talks very glowingly about how millions and millions of dollars of government waste was able to be eliminated in the federal budget through the operation of this committee.

I congratulate the government and in particular the Premier and the Treasurer on establishing such a committee at the South Australian state government level to go through the budget with a fine tooth comb and find that wastefulness which tends to crop up in government budgets and eliminate it, to make sure that the taxpayers of South Australia get value for money. We will also be having a review of all spending priorities of government aimed at reducing waste and improving efficiencies.

If I may return briefly to the incompetence—in fact, the culpable negligence—of the previous government, and those things that were omitted from the 2001-02 mid-year budget review—

Mr Koutsantonis: The Jodee statement!

Mr SNELLING: 'The Jodee statement', as the member for West Torrens likes to refer to it. These cost pressures deliberately omitted the negotiations taking place with the education union over teachers' salaries, the blow-out in the education budget that totalled \$30 million, the hospital deficits that were known to the government of \$44 million, the \$20 million allocation that was needed in order to replace the state bus fleet, the \$66 million blow-out in targeted voluntary separation packages and various other cost pressures which were deliberately, culpably omitted from that mid-year budget review that was released during the election campaign in order to create the false impression that the budget was in a far healthier state than it actually was.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr SNELLING: The member for West Torrens asked if the former treasurer were a CEO would he be in prison? I am not an expert on corporate law. That may well be something that could be researched and discovered. It was culpable negligence on the part of the previous government and the former treasurer; and any claim made by members opposite that they have any superiority in managing the state's finances are just dashed by the ineptitude of the former treasurer, the Hon. Jodee Lucas.

I turn now to the Governor's speech to which I am replying. I was particularly delighted to hear in the Governor's speech the attention that this government will be paying to law and order. Of all the issues that come to me in my electorate office, I think it is issues related to law and order that I hear most about and about which people in the community become most passionate. First, Her Excellency says that the government will be taking DNA samples from all convicted prisoners held in South Australian gaols, and what a marvellous step this is. I believe quite strongly (and

clearly the government does also) that this will lead to a tremendous clear-up of, perhaps, some previously unsolved crimes.

It is a pity that the member for Stuart is not in the chamber. He may be somewhere in the building and hear his name mentioned. He may race down into the chamber, and I surely hope that he does because I know that the member for Stuart is a great civil libertarian, particularly with respect to the civil liberties of convicted criminals. The member for Stuart has obviously been a strong advocate for protecting the civil liberties of convicted criminals because the Liberal Party has long opposed DNA sampling of all convicted criminals. When steps were taken in the parliament to broaden DNA sampling to encompass all prisoners held in South Australian gaols, who was opposing it? Members opposite; the parliamentary Liberal Party.

It is the civil libertarians and the parliamentary Liberal Party who want to protect the civil liberties of prisoners, and I refer in particular to the former attorney-general and the member for Stuart. But I must congratulate them on their strength on an issue that is so obviously unpopular. They are willing to stand against the weight of public opinion in order to protect the civil liberties of prisoners and convicted criminals. Whilst members on this side of the house on this occasion do not agree with the lengths to which they believe that civil liberties need to be extended, I congratulate them.

Members on this side believe that once you are convicted of a criminal offence certain civil liberties are denied to you, and one of those should be that a DNA sample should be taken from you—forcibly, if necessary—and that that DNA sample be kept on record in order to assist in the clear-up of some of the ugliest crimes in this state's history.

I notice that in her speech Her Excellency the Governor also referred to the introduction of guideline sentencing. It is an issue in my electorate, where people are heartily sick of the inconsistency of sentencing, and they want to see consistent sentences. They do not want to see some criminals able to get off very lightly on serious offences just because of the particular personal inclinations of the judge or magistrate they appear before. This side of the house—the government—believes strongly that judges and magistrates need discretion in sentencing; however, a standard must be set so that for particular offences the Attorney-General can seek a guideline sentence from the Court of Criminal Appeal so that it is quite clear what a typical sentence should be for a particular offence. I will be interested to see which way the member for Hartley votes when that legislation comes before the parliament.

Her Excellency also referred to the strengthening of the self-defence laws. The previous government watered down the rights of home owners to protect themselves, their families and their property in the event of a home invasion. It watered them down, but I am very pleased to see that the government will restore the rights of home owners to protect themselves and their families from people who seek to enter their homes and assault them. As the Governor said, it is important that we have a self-defence law that seeks to protect the householder, not the criminal. As well as that, the government will legislate to remove the defence of self-induced intoxication in cases such as Noa Nadruku in the ACT, who assaulted two young women, claimed that he was too drunk at the time to know what he was doing and was acquitted of the offence.

The ACT parliament moved very quickly to abolish self-induced intoxication as a defence, yet members opposite in

the previous government dragged their feet. They voted against amendments from the parliamentary Labor Party and the then shadow attorney-general, so self-induced intoxication as an excuse for committing a crime remains on the books. It will be a glad day for the people of South Australia when that legislation makes its speedy passage through the parliament. Hopefully, members opposite have come to their senses on this issue and will allow that legislation to make its way through the parliament.

I turn to the state election and in particular to the campaign in my seat of Playford.

Mr Koutsantonis: And a good campaign, too.

Mr SNELLING: The member for West Torrens kindly says it was a good campaign. It would not be possible to have a good campaign without the very many people who assist all of us in this house—those many hundreds and perhaps thousands of unnamed volunteers who do all that work for us: the people who letterbox for us, the people who hand out how to vote cards, the people who fold and stuff envelopes and do all those relatively menial jobs that are so crucial to a successful election campaign. I will refer to a few of those people by name who were so good to the Labor campaign to retain the seat of Playford.

First, I would like to thank Mrs Clare McAssey, my personal assistant. I could not have hoped for a greater and more devoted and loyal personal assistant. She is a tremendous worker, and I have to give her credit for much of the personal following that I have in my electorate because of her devotion to her job and the diligence with which she follows up the concerns of constituents who come into the office seeking assistance. She also has the ability to keep someone even as disorganised as I relatively on the correct path.

I would like to thank some of the people in my subbranch, in particular, Tait Speed, who came into my office just about every day, entirely voluntarily, to assist me in my campaign; Craig Withers, the President, Mark Foyle, the Secretary, and Davina Quirke, the Vice President of my Playford ALP branch, who all contributed a great deal to the campaign. I would also like to pay special tribute to Julie Woodman, who was the Labor candidate for Makin in the previous federal election. A harder working candidate I do not think one would ever find. She doorknocked thousands of homes. Those of us here who have doorknocked—and do doorknock—know how tiring it is and how stressful it can be. Yet Julie diligently went out every weekend and any day that she managed to get off work and visited people in their homes around the electorate of Makin. I think it is a great shame that she was not successful in securing the federal seat of Makin at the federal election. However, rather than taking a rest and sitting back and thinking, ‘My job is now done,’ having lost Makin, Julie immediately turned her attention to the state seat of Playford and to my election. I am very grateful for the way in which Julie campaigned for me and used her experience in the federal election to assist me. I also thank Julie’s daughter Lisa Woodman, who was of tremendous assistance.

I would also like to thank John Quirke, who still resides in the electorate of Playford and who is always of tremendous assistance and provides much advice to me. I am able to benefit from his many years of experience as a member of both this house and the federal senate, in addition to his general political experience, which stretches back a number of years.

I would like to thank, too, the many members of my family who assisted me in my election campaign—the various uncles and aunts, brothers and sisters and brothers

and sisters-in-law and parents-in-law. I would like to thank my mother and father-in-law Tom and Angela Iammarrone; my aunt and uncle John and Lyn Laycock; my aunt and uncle Melvin and Shirley Snelling; my aunt and uncle Peter and Margaret Roberts; and also Peter Oswald, who assisted me in my campaign. Thanks also go to my brother-in-law, Tony Iammarrone and my brothers and sisters, Tom, Caroline, Margaret and Ned. I also thank my very dear wife, Lucia, and my children, Molly and Helena. Some people joke that they are worth at least five or 10 per cent to my margin. The member for West Torrens says 11 per cent and he is probably right. My wife, Lucia, and my two girls are a tremendous advantage to me in the support and love that I derive from them.

In closing, I add my condolences to those expressed by the member for Waite yesterday to the family of Sergeant Andrew Russell. I understand that Sergeant Russell grew up in my electorate, in Ingle Farm, and, if I am correct, his parents still live in Ingle Farm. As the member for Playford and on behalf of the people of Playford I express my deepest sympathy, condolences and thanks to the family of Sergeant Russell, who obviously is a very great Australian who gave his life for his country.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I rise to support the motion and thank Her Excellency for her speech in opening the parliament and also congratulate her on the way she conducts herself in that role throughout the South Australian community. She has been well received and I wish her well in that role in future years. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the new members to the parliament, particularly those on our side of the house—the members for Kavel, Bragg, Heysen and Morphett—but also those opposite: welcome to this place.

It is a privilege to serve in this place. Not many people get the opportunity to be one of the 47 (or whatever number it will be in future) who serve in this place. My advice to new members is that if you have any ideas in relation to changes that need to be made, bring them to the chamber early in your time in this place because I could name many friends and colleagues on both sides of both houses who are no longer here but who would like to have had the opportunity to revisit some of their decisions in not introducing ideas, legislation or concepts to this house, assuming they might be re-elected at a future ballot but, not having been re-elected, they have lost their one opportunity to have an influence on society through the mechanisms available in this place. I encourage the new members in this chamber to take the opportunity to bring their ideas to the chamber for debate and decision so that their influence can be recorded and felt within the South Australian community.

I also take this opportunity, Mr Deputy Speaker, to congratulate you on your appointment to that position. You are a resident of my electorate and it is good to see someone from Davenport holding that position and I wish you well in that role. I know you will bring your balanced view to the decisions and role you now undertake on behalf of the parliament.

I also place on record my thanks to my campaign team in Davenport. We have an unusual electorate politically in that it is one of the highest Democrat voting electorates in Australia. Up to the last election it was the highest Democrat voting electorate within Australia, so we have to campaign against a minor party that is not held accountable for anything it says at any level, federal or state, and that makes it hard to

bring media or public scrutiny to debates the Democrats sometimes raise. Perhaps the only exception to that in recent times has been the public scrutiny we put on the Democrats about their policy of reintroducing death duties into South Australia. It was good that we were able to get the message out that the Democrats do stand for higher taxes, in particular death duties and succession taxes. I note that they are now reviewing their tax policy and one would suspect they will get rid of their long-held policy of reintroducing death duties. It was always a surprise to me that they had a party policy that they would try to get rid of the GST on funerals, whilst, at the same time, taxing your whole estate on transfer at death. It seemed to me an unusual policy to take to the electorate, but as luck would have it the Democrats did.

I look forward to performing my role as the shadow minister for industrial relations and workplace services and environment and conservation, and I also take up the role of being responsible for Treasury matters in the lower house. I look forward to holding the government accountable for a whole range of issues and initiatives that it may bring before this place. I note with some interest the government's approach to industrial relations. In the early days of this government, it has already been displayed that the approach is to sit on its hands and not intervene. I think it was unfortunate that the Minister for Industrial Relations chose not to intervene in the recent automotive dispute with Walker Australia and the AMWU.

The previous government did intervene and held a meeting with the various parties to head off what was an automotive industry dispute during our time in government. It was unfortunate that this government chose not to intervene in that dispute and ultimately saw the automotive industry brought to its knees within seven weeks of the government's taking hold. All the minister had to do was telephone his union mates and ask them to meet with the automotive industry to try to broker a solution. At least he could have taken that initiative; that is, at least tried to broker a solution. What we had was a situation where the automotive industry was brought to its knees. South Australia's reputation as a secure industrial environment in which to invest was put to the test.

Automotive companies were saying publicly that they were going to look at sourcing automotive componentry parts from overseas suppliers. The union's actions and this particular government's inaction have put at risk the operations of some of the component manufacturers in South Australia, because the automotive industry has now been forced to a point where the automotive companies during radio interviews have said on public record that they have no choice but to look at sourcing components from other suppliers overseas. I cannot see the wisdom of letting an industrial dispute get to that point. I cannot see the point of not taking any action when the automotive industry is saying, 'If you don't bring this to its natural conclusion, we are heading overseas to get our parts.' All that will do is export jobs overseas.

I cannot understand why the government sat on its hands and did nothing when the previous government had shown by example; that is, it brought the two parties together and helped to resolve the dispute. We had ordinary workers who were then asked to take days off without pay. How is it in the best interests of workers to ask them to take days off without pay? I cannot see how that is in the best interests of those particular families—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for West Torrens says that they were our industrial laws. For the information of the member for West Torrens, when they were our industrial relation laws in government, we brought the union and the automotive industry together and solved the issue. It is the same law now as it was when we were in government: the law has not changed. Why is it that our minister and our premier could meet with the automotive industry and unions to solve the problem, but your minister and your Premier could not meet with them? That is the point.

The point is that your government sat on its hands, and that sends a clear message to the unions that they have a free run in the early days of the government. They will get a free run in relation to their industrial disputes and in relation to what they are attempting to do to some of the businesses in the community. I was interested to note that, following the Victorian example, the state Labor Party has announced a wide-ranging review of the industrial relations system. We all know what that means: that is code for more union involvement in the business place, particularly small business—

Mr Koutsantonis: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: When you bring in your legislation we will tell you what is wrong with that.

Mr Koutsantonis: Why do you hate unions so much?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Why should unions be so much in charge of small business—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting and the member for Davenport will concentrate on his speech.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Certainly, we will have that debate when the legislation comes before this place, if it ever does. In Victoria, of course, they had exactly the same experience. They announced a wide-ranging review of the industrial relations system and then they tinkered with WorkCover. As a result of that tinkering, WorkCover costs to business in Victoria have increased by an average of between 17 and 40 per cent, with some of the businesses experiencing a 100 per cent increase in their WorkCover costs in Victoria. I understand that the annual cost to the Victorian business community is something like \$1.5 billion a year extra, so we will be watching to see what happens with the industrial relations review, what changes the government wishes to make to WorkCover and what the impact will be on small business and business in this state.

We worked very hard as a government, through Michael Armitage and other ministers, to bring down the cost of WorkCover to business. We inherited a huge unfunded liability in WorkCover from the previous government and we implemented changes which brought an \$83 million per annum saving to businesses in this state for WorkCover. We put the government on notice that we will be watching what they do in relation to WorkCover costs in this state and industrial relations reform.

I noted from the address of the member for West Torrens earlier today that he let slip that the government is going to show us how to run an economy. That will be interesting because I can remember when they last tried to run an economy. I had a business at that time, and I can remember going to the bank talking about 21 per cent interest rates.

Mr Koutsantonis: Are you saying that the state government controls national interest rates?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, I am saying it was your philosophy—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am saying it was your philosophy that was in charge—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens! The member for West Torrens is stretching his friendship with the chair at this moment. I call the member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I point out to the honourable member that not two minutes ago he tried to label me with John Howard's industrial relations laws. I take that on the chin, but you need to take on the chin the fact that it was your mob in Canberra that delivered to the Australian community 21 per cent bank interest rates, and we don't forget it.

I remember the last time you were in charge of the state economy. I remember 333 Collins Street. I actually went to Melbourne to have a look at what we spent all the money on. I remember the \$212 million that you lost on Equiticorp and the New Zealand forests. I remember the money you mob wasted on the plywood cars. I remember \$6 million that you lost on South African goat farms. I remember the money you lost on hurricane insurance on the Florida coast. I remember the money you wasted on New York property deals, and I remember the money you wasted on the entertainment centre at Wembley. I remember the scrimber fiasco that you imposed on this state and I remember the \$1 billion that you spent on the Myer-Remm Centre propping up your union friends. So don't come into this place and tell us that you are going to show us how to run an economy. The proof will be in the pudding over the next four years.

You have inherited an economy with the lowest unemployment rate we have had in decades. It was 12 per cent when you last ran the economy; it is now about 7 per cent. There are more South Australians employed now than ever in our state's history. We have driven the debt down from \$10 billion to just over \$3 billion.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport will resume his seat.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We have driven the unemployment rate down from 12 per cent to 7.1 per cent, close to the national average. There are more people employed now in South Australia than ever in the state's history and exports have gone from \$4 billion to \$8 billion. There is your audit line. We have drawn a line in the sand and now we say, 'Fine, show us how to run the economy from there.' Every six months or so we will test how you are going and we will audit you against those figures, against your performance, and we will see if you can better the performance.

I put the member for West Torrens on notice: you will fiddle with WorkCover, you will fiddle with the industrial relations system and you will fiddle with those figures, you will drive those figures in the wrong direction for this state. I welcome the member for West Torrens' comments this morning that they will show us how to run an economy. That might make an interesting campaign leaflet in the honourable member's electorate come the next election.

The government will need to look at other issues. As someone who was born and bred in the building industry, I am really concerned about the building industry and the

indemnity insurance issue that now faces the state's economy. The sum of \$1.2 billion is put into the state economy by about 1 200 builders in the building industry. We now have a private monopoly in relation to indemnity insurance, and the whole domestic building industry is now at risk because builders will be unable to gain indemnity insurance and, therefore, under the act they are unable to build. If builders are unable to build, they will not be able to pay subcontractors. If they cannot pay subcontractors they also cannot pay suppliers, and there will be a domino effect. That domino effect in the building industry is obvious in the great positive response to the federal government's first home owners' grant scheme, which has been hugely successful in underpinning the growing economy generated by the Howard government.

However, if builders cannot get insurance, that will all come crashing down around us. We now have a calamity within the building industry that needs to be addressed by the government. It needs to come to parliament and tell us what it intends to do about housing indemnity insurance. I know that as a builder we could not have lasted more than 6 to 8 weeks, maybe 12 weeks, because of cash flow, without indemnity insurance. I know there is a lot of nervousness within the industry about whether people will survive the building indemnity insurance issue.

I also have a very keen interest in volunteers and volunteering, being a past national president of Apex involved with many groups. I am pleased that volunteers over the past two years have received a significant increase in recognition within the community and, as minister, I was pleased to bring to parliament legislation protecting volunteers, and I will do all I can—as I know the shadow minister, Robert Brokenshire will—to reduce the risk to volunteers and increase participation.

There is, no doubt, a lot of concern within the volunteer sector about their role and what they can and cannot undertake safely, and there needs to be far more education of volunteer groups about what they are liable for and what they are not liable for. There is a lot of misinformation, and a lot of volunteer groups might be surprised, if they took some legal advice, to find out what they are not liable for, because they may be insuring for things they do not need to insure for.

Naturally, I have an interest in environmental matters, having been the environment minister prior to the election. I was delighted when conservation groups said that our policy was the most comprehensive environment policy put to the South Australian public in the past 10 years by any major party. So we are very pleased—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, that is right—Michelle Grady from the Conservation Council, and Channel 10 News, the day we released the election policy. So we are very pleased to get that recognition. We are also pleased with a number of initiatives that were put in place by the previous government that we will be watching with some interest. One of them is the second generation parklands running through the Adelaide Hills from Aldinga Scrub in the south to Mount Crawford in the north. We think that is a fantastic concept. We started it, and there has since been a lot of land added to the second generation parklands. Before I leave this place I would like to see the concept secured whereby we have a second generation of parklands around the Adelaide Hills linking all the open space areas together, not only for recreational purposes but also for biodiversity purposes. Adelaide would then have two sets of parklands. That is a

very good concept and we are very pleased to have got that off the ground.

I am pleased that marine parks will continue under the new regime. The Liberal Party spent an enormous amount of energy and time getting up a marine parks program. The fishing industry and the Conservation Council, when we announced it, said it was the best program in Australia for marine parks, and we look forward to the marine parks being developed. The land based park system has tended to be that the land of last resort becomes a park. We cannot do that with our marine environment because it is too important. We need to ensure that we develop a system of marine parks that has the appropriate balance between recreational, environmental and commercial interests.

I look forward to the container deposit scheme. While in government the Liberal party moved that the scheme be broadened to take in more containers, and it comes into effect next January. So, we look forward to South Australia's being an even cleaner place due to those stronger litter laws which were introduced by the Liberal party while in government. Having been to the Northern Territory recently, I can only strongly recommend to the Northern Territory that it have a look at the container deposit scheme because the amount of litter between Alice Springs and Ayers Rock was significant and, indeed, disappointing.

We hope that the parks agenda will continue in the environment and conservation area. The Liberal government put an extra \$30 million into our national parks over five or six years, and that allowed significant national park upgrades, such as the Innes National Park Visitors Centre and an \$8 million upgrade at the Flinders Chase National Park which I understand is to be opened in June. For the first time in a long time, the state has invested very heavily in its national parks through a \$30 million extra contribution over five years. We hope that program is not cut or reduced in any way, shape or form. National parks are part of our natural resource and part of our very strong ecotourism industry, and it will be a sad day for the state if the razor gang gets to the parks agenda program within the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

I am very pleased that the Nature Foundation is continuing to take up the concept of rehabilitating the environment for threatened bird species, using the land donated by the Law-Smith family at Gawler. The general purpose is to revegetate the land, specifically to try to rebuild threatened bird populations. Both land and money have been donated to the Nature Foundation to enable it to establish a trust and try to rehabilitate the bird population throughout the Mt Lofty Ranges region, which is a hot-bed in Australia in relation to threatened bird species. I was pleased to see that the Nature Foundation is proceeding with that.

I would like to place on record my thanks to all those community groups that had dealings with my ministerial office. They were non-partisan in their approach and genuinely trying to achieve good community outcomes in the environment, heritage and conservation areas.

As Minister for Recreation and Sport, I had the pleasure of securing from cabinet an extra \$17 million for community sporting groups. That brought the total, over a three-year period, to \$23 million, it having been only \$6 million previously: we invested an extra \$17 million to bring it up to \$23 million. The Liberal government, now opposition, did that because it was—and still is—very concerned about increasing community health problems such as diabetes,

obesity and those sorts of problems, the incidence of which is rising rapidly in modern society.

One part of a package of solutions to the problem is to get people more physically active. One way to do that is to invest more heavily in ordinary everyday, local-level community facilities, whether it be recreational trails (we invested another \$6 million over and above the \$23 million in recreational trails, so it involved \$29 million all up), football clubs, netball clubs, tennis clubs and all sorts of sporting groups. Many electorates, right across the state, received \$200 000, \$300 000 or \$400 000 to go to their local groups to get them to build better facilities so that people would be attracted into physical activity, whether it be competitive or not, with the aim of improving community health. The opposition believes that supporting community level sporting organisations is a very good program and looks forward to that program being continued under the new regime.

Locally, as you are probably aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, being a constituent of Davenport, a number of issues are on the drawing board, are about to commence or have just commenced. In this respect, I refer to the upgrade of Old Belair Road. In 1993, just three or four months before the state election, the Labor Party signed up the Craighburn development, committing the district to something like 1200 new homes, but did not put one cent aside for new infrastructure such as roads. Therefore, in the mornings, there is as much traffic coming down Old Belair Road on its one lane as there is on any one lane of South Road in peak hour. So, there is a 6 or 7 kilometre backlog of traffic in the morning coming down the Old Belair Road. I was delighted that the then minister, Diana Laidlaw, committed \$1.8 million to start to address the issues in relation to Old Belair Road. I know that the member for Waite has an interest in that issue, as do some other members in the area.

I am pleased to say that, after 25 years of negotiating with local and state government, the Blackwood Recreation Centre received sign-off from the Mitcham council the other night. It looks like the recreation centre will be on target to commence building later this year or early in the new year. It is a \$3.7 million project, of which the Liberal Party provided \$1.25 million, and we were pleased to do so as we were at the Heathfield High School. Previous Labor governments had ignored those areas for years and years. As the member for Heysen quite rightly pointed out as an example, the Heathfield High School, in her electorate, has been the national champion of the netball competition for eight years even though they did not have a suitable indoor facility in which to practice. So, if they actually get a decent facility there it will be interesting to see how good they become. Likewise, it would be good to have an expanded indoor facility at Blackwood to replace the one that has been there, in part, for 100 years, and renewed about 25 years ago.

The Eden Hills CFS looks forward to receiving its new fire station, as promised by the Liberal Party. The Coromandel Primary School looks forward to having its upgrade. I have raised this matter with the Minister for Education and, in fairness to her, I will not make any criticisms. I am awaiting her decision as to whether the government will uphold the Hon. Rob Lucas's written commitment that the money was in forward estimates and was committed for the \$2 million upgrade for the Coromandel Valley Primary School. I have written to the minister, Trish White, in relation to that issue and, in fairness to her, I will not comment further until I have her response. I hope that it is a positive response, because this school is 125 years old and does not have a solid

classroom. We thought it was high time they deserved an upgrade, and we allocated \$2 million for that. The community would be savagely disappointed if the Labor Party, in its first act, cut out solid classrooms to a school which has waited 125 years to get its first one.

My final comment is in relation to the Blackwood Hospital, which we supported through funding in relation to an after hours GP service. I thank the then Minister for Health, Dean Brown, whose family has had a long involvement with that hospital. His father Gordon was very heavily involved in relation to that hospital. Funding the after hours GP service has become a very important part of Blackwood Hospital's future survival. It is no secret that there were some concerns in relation to the losses made by Blackwood Hospital, and we believe that this addition will provide more security for the hospital. There would be great concern if the Minister for Health chose to cut off the funding, or did not support the continuation of an after hours GP service into the Blackwood Hospital.

With those remarks, I am pleased to support the motion and look forward to questioning members opposite in due course about their priorities and performance as a government.

Debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

A petition signed by 1 730 residents of South Australia, requesting that the house pass legislation providing for the prosecution of child sexual abuse offences committed before 1982, was presented by the Hon. M.J. Atkinson.

Petition received.

GOLDEN GROVE WAY

A petition signed by 165 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House will provide for traffic signals at the junction of The Golden Grove Way and Wynn Vale Drive, Golden Grove, was presented by Ms Rankine.

Petition received.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House prohibit the establishment of a national nuclear waste storage facility for intermediate of high level radioactive waste in South Australia, was presented by Ms Rankine.

Petition received.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANNUAL REPORTS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 131 of the Local Government Act 1999, I lay on the table the annual reports for 2000-01 for the City of Charles Sturt; City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters; and City of Playford.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: A first-class public education system is the greatest contribution that a government can

make to its young people and to future generations. Raising the school leaving age to 16 is central to the government's education reform agenda. It is the critical first step in a package of education initiatives that will bring public education in this state up to world standard. It is also critical in building the strong economy we need to make the future of this state viable and secure. We know that labour market opportunities for young people relate to their level of schooling. We know that students who do not complete SACE have more difficulty in finding jobs than those who do. We know that a vigorous economy needs a highly skilled work force which matches or improves on those of our competitors.

Every student must be given the opportunity to achieve their full educational capability as a prerequisite to finding their place in the work force. Amending the Education Act of 1972 to raise the school-leaving age from 15 to 16 will provide the legislative basis for this reform. According to these reforms, a student of 15 may be involved in education or training but must be enrolled in a school until the age of 16. We know that schools cannot accommodate students who are at risk of dropping out without adjusting their curricula and structures. To deal with this, we plan to include more career planning and more vocational options in the South Australian curriculum. We will provide the strong support that teachers need to implement this change in policy. Increased pastoral care programs and mentoring will help vulnerable students in developing individual plans for their education and training needs.

More intense student counselling, with a focus on learning pathways and career planning, will be provided. Scarce resources will be directed towards the communities, schools and students who need most assistance. We must also deal with truancy. Absenteeism has a long-term impact on young people and in some areas and regions of our state, there are particularly high rates of absenteeism in years 9 and 10. There is also a strong correlation between schools with high absenteeism and drop-out rates. In our most disadvantaged schools only one in three students completes year 12, and that is simply not good enough. Unfortunately, in the past, some schools have seen the school-leaving age of 15 as a convenient way of getting rid of problem students.

The Minister for Education and Children's Services has established a task force, focusing on schools with high absentee rates, to develop ways of improving this situation. The newly created Social Inclusion Unit in my own department will also play a key role in this area. The unit is undertaking an extensive study of retention rates in our schools. Over time, we aim to return to the high school retention rates we had in the early 1990s. Raising the school leaving age is the first step towards achieving this goal.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

SA TAB Pty Ltd—

Approved Licensing Agreement

TAB Duty Agreement

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Animal and Plant Control Commission—South Australia—Report 2001.

BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Given the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's interest in the financial affairs of the Department of Human Services, I would like to expand on my ministerial statement of yesterday and advise the house of the details of a further budget impact included in the \$100 million expected cash deficit for 2002-03. A \$13 million provision was set aside in April 2002 and was included in the 2002-03 budget bottom line as a worse case scenario pending a resolution of a case before the Industrial Relations Court of South Australia relating to nurses' pay calculations. A decision of the court was handed down on 30 April 2002. Whilst the government is considering this decision, Treasury and Finance have advised that it is sound financial management to maintain provision for these monies in the budget bottom line for 2002-03.

Following a question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition yesterday regarding the 27th pay issue, a separate issue, I wish to expand further on the points I made in answer to the question and also in my ministerial statement on the current state of the budget. As I stated yesterday, the starting point for the 2002-03 cash-based budget position will be close to a \$100 million deficit. This is an official Treasury figure provided to me. It is not fictional. It is not dishonest, as the shadow treasurer said yesterday. In fact, analysis from Treasury shows that the deficit will remain quite possibly above \$100 million in the out years, growing to a figure closer to \$169 million deficit by 2004-05. This further deterioration of the deficit since my statement of 14 March 2002 is largely as a result of the following items:

- a reduction in grants from the commonwealth;
- increased interest costs arising from the general upward movement in interest rates; and
- errors in the pay calculations in the Department of Human Services.

These errors in the Department of Human Services amount to \$14.4 million spreading across the four year forward estimates period, with the major impact in 2003-04. These errors are the result of miscalculations in the number of pay periods by the Department of Human Services while the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and member for Finnis was the minister.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, sir. The minister has not provided copies of the ministerial statement, which has been common practice in this house, certainly for as long as I have been a member of the house. I wondered whether we could scrutinise his ministerial statement again?

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order; the deputy leader is quite correct.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What other errors did you hide from us, Dean—another one?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Another one!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Yes, you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

INTERNATIONAL SOLAR CYCLE COMPETITION

The SPEAKER: To save time during question time, I now apologise to the house for my late return. The purpose of my absence was simply to congratulate some outstanding young South Australians who happen to come from my electorate in the Eastern Fleurieu school and who are about to set out to represent South Australia in the world contest with the International Solar Cycle Competition in the United States. I am sure all members join me in wishing them well. It will certainly put this country, this state and this part of South Australia—our proud capital—on the map. The Greenhouse Office of the federal government is to be congratulated in its assistance in that regard, as is the South Australian government. The assistance provided there was done on a bipartisan basis. Other people participating were not there at the time that the function was to be held.

DOCUMENT, TABLING

The SPEAKER: Other matters of greater moment that will perhaps save time during question time relate to the occasion yesterday on which a question arose as to whether dockets or documents ought to be tabled. I do not have a definitive statement yet prepared for the house, but I will tell the house that there are three very good reasons why these matters need to be clarified and clarified forthwith, the first of which is, of course, that if ministers of cabinet—and that is what ministers are—wish to rely upon the opinion of the Public Service serving them they should cite that as a matter of natural justice and provide the entire statement and the background information to it.

If Sir Humphrey is to be selectively quoted, that is wrong, and it is a denial of natural justice and an impingement, it seems to me, upon their professional integrity and prospective career. I do not know of any Lady Humphreys.

The second point I need to make then is that, if it is in the public interest for the minister to make such a disclosure, it seems to me equally in the public interest to make that disclosure complete with the background information to it if a minister relies on that information. A further point is implicit in the second: if it is in the public interest—and there is a big distinction between that and what is of interest to the public—it ought to be in the public domain completely. That is the basis upon which I am doing my present deliberation, research and consultation on the questions. I will bring an answer to the house next week.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of clarification, sir, yesterday you gave a very specific ruling that the entire docket should be tabled. Whilst I appreciate your statement today in terms of future events, there is before the house a current ruling from you that the docket from which that memo was taken yesterday should in fact be tabled, and I ask: has it yet been tabled and, if not, why not?

The SPEAKER: It has not, and the reason is quite simply that the minute, I am told, upon which the Treasurer relied was a minute in isolation from any other piece of paper, whether docket or document. On that basis, there is no docket to be tabled. I have not yet concluded my discussion with the minister and, indeed, other ministers who have expressed an interest in the matter. Can I go on and say I will welcome any considered submission of opinion by any member of this place about these matters, which I seek to resolve quite clearly from this point forward. Recent rulings in the last quarter century are through the 360 degrees of opinion and

quite inconsistent. In my judgment, they are not well reasoned on the basis of what would otherwise be called case law, case by case, instance by instance. I will attempt to clarify it next week.

QUESTION TIME

HOSPITALS, MERGER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Was the Minister for Health aware of the merger negotiations between the Flinders Medical Centre and the Repatriation General Hospital when she first denied such merger talks to the media last Thursday? Just yes or no.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I am amazed that the member for Finnis persists with this question on this subject. Just on the matter of honesty, I would like to refer to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I would like to be able to answer the question, sir.

The SPEAKER: I understand.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Absolutely. The member for Finnis is obviously overwrought that he is no longer the minister for health, and he needs to divert attention from the real issues in relation to health and the legacy that he has left South Australians. I would like to make reference to what the member for Finnis alleged in this house yesterday. He alleged that I had said (and I am quoting from *Hansard*) that I have spoken to the chairs of the two appropriate hospitals and I can indicate that any suggestion that the hospitals will merge is completely false. That was a dishonest statement, as he knows, because the transcript of course did not say that. This is what the transcript said—and I quote from the transcript:

But certainly a suggestion that they will be seeking to merge at next week's board meeting is completely false.

Is it not interesting that it served the member's political purposes to dishonestly misrepresent me in this house for his own political purposes. While I am on that matter, I would also like to suggest to the member for Finnis, the deputy leader, that he might consider apologising for his failure to correct a banner headline in the *Advertiser* last week, 3 May 2002. It read, '\$3 million loss if hospitals combine, say Liberals.' The former minister knew only too well that the \$3 million—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: No, you listen to this one. You knew only too well that the federal government funding, the safety net funding, was due to finish in July this year. You knew that, yet you dishonestly misrepresented discussions—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, it is customary in this house that all remarks be directed in deference through you, and not directly across the chamber. I ask you to rule on that matter.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order and I invite the minister to stick to the substance of the question and leave it at that.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: In continuing on this topic, the member for Finnis likes to accuse other people of being dishonest when his own dishonesty is quite clearly revealed today. In terms of the Repatriation General Hospital, the position has been made abundantly clear by the Premier and

by me. The future of the Repatriation hospital is safe and secure. It will not be merged, amalgamated, privatised or sold by this government.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, sir, when you came to the position of Speaker you made clear that you would ensure that questions were answered. The question required a knowledge of whether the minister was aware of merger negotiations: we did not get the answer.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am considering a point of order and I do not consider it helpful to have other interjections interfere with that while I am trying to clarify to the house in addressing the matter that has been drawn to its attention. This is the first week of sitting. We are all on a pretty steep learning curve, and I suggest that all members pay closer attention to the purpose of question time and the respect or otherwise that we will earn from the public if we do not conduct ourselves in the way in which they obviously expect. I have said enough about that matter for now.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What did the shadow treasurer have to say yesterday about Treasury officials in relation to the budget black hole and were his accusations correct?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. I understand—and it has been reported to me—that the former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, the now shadow treasurer, made a number of remarks yesterday trying to defend the significant budget deficit left for the incoming Labor government. He went on for an hour or so—on and on and on. In part, I am advised, as reported to me, that he made references to the potential political advice, with almost an accusation of sorts that perhaps there was political motive, inference or interference in the way advice was provided. That is what has been reported to me. If that is correct, that is extremely disappointing.

Nonetheless, I asked my office to check with Treasury overnight, for the Under Treasurer to advise me whether the figures given to me on 14 March were correct, whether the significant budget deficit advised to me was correct or, as the former Treasurer would have us believe, whether it is a fictional, dishonest budget deficit. I reconfirm to the house that the Under Treasurer and Treasury have advised me that the budget deficit outlined to me when we came to office was and is correct and that the reference by the former treasurer to this not being the case simply cannot be sustained.

What I also did, again to make sure of my facts, was to find the number of cost pressures that the former treasurer was made aware of before he produced the mid-year budget review. These are the sorts of numbers that we are talking about between 2002 and 2005. These are the cost pressures that the former treasurer was aware of but failed to include in his mid-year budget review. For the Department of Human Services, the figures were close to \$29 million over the forward estimates period. For the Department of Education and Training (which we will have much more to say about over the weeks ahead), nearly \$157 million of deficits were unreported by the former government and the former treasurer.

In the justice portfolio, the former treasurer failed to advise the public during the state election campaign of expenses close to \$6 million. As I have mentioned previously,

let us not forget the \$20 million required to replace part of our bus fleet, which is actually required under law. There is no way they could not have known and, indeed, they were advised by the Treasury to include that in the mid-year budget review, but as we know the former treasurer failed to do so.

I have mentioned some of the things that the former treasurer noted as the reasons why he did not want to include these cost pressures. One of them was that he did not want to reward overspending in the Department of Education by a figure of around about \$25 million. What I did discover, as I said yesterday, is that he had been rewarding over-expenditure in education—\$47 million in 1999-2000, \$20 million in 2000-01 and \$37 million in 2001-02. I looked at some of the other comments. I mentioned that one of the big amounts of money that he failed to include in the mid-year budget review was an allocation for a teachers' pay rise. I am not going to reveal that number here today because we are in the middle of enterprise bargaining arrangements, but I can tell the house that it is counted in the tens of millions over the forward estimates period.

Do you know what the former treasurer noted in a docket? He said, 'I also oppose the size of the bid so Department of Treasury and Finance should not incorporate specific provisions for the bid in our documentation.' He said, 'Don't worry, I don't think they should get a pay rise, so let's not include it.' Let's have no nonsense from members opposite about the teachers' wage increase. Let's have no crocodile tears from members opposite because, if you believe the former treasurer, they were not going to pay the teachers—not 2 per cent, not 3 per cent, not 4 per cent, not anything. They were not going to pay the teachers. Explain that one, former minister for education!

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, in light of your previous statement, I ask you to consider this matter. The Treasurer purported to quote annotated notes of the former treasurer written on a government docket. I would ask you to take into consideration whether that docket in its entirety should also be produced for this house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not mind if it takes all day. When I have quiet I will respond to the point of order from the member for Unley. I am inclined to agree to his view. However, that considered statement has not yet been made to the house. It was going through my mind that, should the Treasurer perhaps some time in the future or any other minister seek to rely upon advice given by the senior Public Service personnel on whom they have relied, they ought to provide all that advice in written form to the house. However, that precedent is not yet made and my determination is not yet final.

I repeat: I will be happy to hear from the member for Unley or any other member, including ministers, on that and other substantive related points before making a considered statement to the house next week. Unless I can find other good grounds, it seems to me that it is not reasonable to quote from the opinion and state that it is the opinion of someone who is not here to defend themselves unless that entire opinion in its professional whole is tabled. I will leave the Treasurer to wind up his remarks without winding up the house.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will await your considered advice. I am not sure that the Hon. Rob Lucas would necessarily agree with some of these dockets.

But if the opposition wants the dockets released and wants all its former decisions released, that is something we will have to give consideration to. Let us remember that you were the ministers. We have some very interesting reading and I think it might be in your own interests if some of that information does not come out.

But at the end of the day the issue is that the Under Treasurer provided truthful, honest advice to me as an incoming treasurer that showed a significant, growing budget deficit counted in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The truth is that the former treasurer was advised of similar numbers before the election and during the election that he failed to release publicly. I simply say that if the former treasurer has to stoop to criticising the Department of Treasury and Finance that served him so honestly and so well over the four years that he was treasurer, and the public servants that served him, I think that reflects very poorly on the shadow treasurer.

HOSPITALS, MERGER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question again is directed to the Minister for Health. Will the Minister for Health explain why she denied last Thursday that merger talks were proceeding between the Flinders Medical Centre and the Repatriation Hospital, when about three weeks earlier she had agreed to the boards of the hospitals holding merger discussions? A leaked document, dated 18 April 2002, some two weeks before the denial, shows that the minister agreed to the boards holding merger discussions. The document states:

Inquiries with the minister's office have clarified the situation with the facts as reported hereunder. Approximately one week ago the minister agreed to a request that the boards of the hospitals hold preliminary discussions concerning coordination of services, including the option of a possible merger.

'Including the option of a possible merger.' There is a huge credibility gap in what the minister said to the media last Thursday, and it is quite clear that the minister has misled the people of South Australia.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, an explanation is to be factual. The words 'it is quite clear' are plainly a reflection of the opinion of the deputy. He has offered a lot of them in the last few days, but it is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and I withdraw leave. The Minister for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I would like to clarify the situation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Just listen to the answer. When I was visiting the Repat Hospital about three or four weeks ago the CEO of the Repat Hospital spoke with me about the need of the hospital to deal with a \$3 million shortfall in its budget that would come in a year or so as a result of the reduction of federal funding, the safety net funding, from the transfer of the vets' hospital from the commonwealth to the state, an issue which, of course, the former minister had not dealt with and had left in the lap of the current government. It is another issue that he failed to deal with.

At that time the CEO did raise the issue that Flinders and the Repat were having discussions about future service cooperation, which I applaud, because we actually do have

to have a sustainable health system—and we clearly did not have one and have not got one now. Amongst those discussions he mentioned that there was a range of things they were considering including possible amalgamation. Now, I said to him at that point (and this is very clear), ‘The boards can discuss what they like. The bottom lines are these: there will be no change unless two things occur: (1) that there is full consultation with the unions, and (2)—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson. I warn the member for Goyder. I warn the member for Light.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: —that veterans are fully consulted, are fully involved and approve the amalgamation.’ Now unfortunately, the deputy leader, full of testosterone, dashed out to the media—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Possibly—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: That’s the nicest thing anyone has ever said about him.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: It was only once. The deputy leader dashed out to the media and insinuated that an amalgamation was imminent. He dishonestly portrayed the situation. He scared many veterans. He dishonestly portrayed a situation which has been completely clarified by the Premier and me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the minister finished?

EMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Enfield.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr RAU (Enfield): Would the Minister for Employment, Education and Training inform the house of the latest Bureau of Statistics labour market figures that were released today?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): The member for Enfield knows that the figures were released this morning. Substantially there has been no great change. The participation rate has lifted slightly and we find that our seasonally adjusted headline unemployment rate remains steady at 6.6 per cent.

Mr Brindal: That’s a wrong figure, though; you said so yourself. You have got to add—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley does not need to assist the minister.

Mr Brindal: Well, she needs it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley had best understand that he is no longer minister. Has the Minister concluded her reply?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The trend full-time employment figures fell slightly in April by 600, or .1 per cent. Once again we have had a disproportionate fall in full-time employment compared to part-time employment in this state. Again, the youth unemployment figure has risen by 3.6 percentage points to 30 per cent overall. This is still a disappointing level and I remain concerned about the stubbornly high level of youth unemployment in this state. The one ray of light perhaps is that buried amongst these figures is a slight increase in the participation rate of .5 per cent, bringing our state’s participation rate up to 61.1 per cent. You will appreciate that this reflects a degree of

confidence in the future of South Australia and our government.

SPEAKER’S REMARKS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will you, Mr Speaker, clarify remarks you made in respect to me in the house yesterday and inform the house under which standing order you issued a warning to me?

The SPEAKER: The question is out of order. The leader will resume his seat.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, sir. I find it astounding that any member of this house does not have the right to obtain clarification of a ruling that you made to this house yesterday. That is all that the Leader of the Opposition is doing: he is asking for clarification, and he has that right under standing orders to ask for a clarification.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, sir. I would like to know under what standing order the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is seeking to protect his leader. It is necessary—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Government Enterprises—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Treasurer. There is no point of order, can I tell the deputy leader. It is clearly not within the purview of standing orders to question rulings of the Speaker. That is well stated in our standing orders and in Erskine May—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order, sir. I did not question your ruling: I asked for a clarification.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I invite the Leader of the Opposition, if he wishes to discuss the matter, to see me at the conclusion of question time so that I may more clearly understand what it is that is worrying him. The member for Reynell.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Can the Minister for Education and Children’s Services advise the house of the benefits of raising the school leaving age in South Australia? Many young people in Reynell, especially young men, are failing to complete year 12 and frequently failing to complete even years 11 and 10. They then find themselves facing long-term unemployment, especially after they turn 18.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children’s Services): I thank the honourable member for her very important question. She is a member who is particularly active on education issues in her electorate and she is chair of the government’s caucus subcommittee on education. We can expect to hear a lot more from the member for Reynell in promoting the government’s agenda on addressing a number of educational issues.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: That is, of course, South Australia’s agenda, as my colleague points out. Fewer of our young people today are completing year 12 in South Australian schools than was the case in the 1990s, particularly in the early 1990s. After eight years of a Liberal government more concerned with manipulating the statistics and the figures than actually addressing the problem, we have seen our year 12 retention rates plummet in recent times. There is

clear evidence of the link between young people proceeding through education and training, getting a good education and training, and having more success in finding long-term employment. The link between the school leaving age and unemployment rates is quite clear. For example, employment statistics show that at August 2001 (last year), 12.7 per cent of people who were schooled only to year 10 were out of work compared with an unemployment rate of 8.5 per cent for those who completed year 12. This compares, as the employment minister just advised us, to an overall state unemployment rate of under 7 per cent.

Currently, in South Australia school students must remain in school until their 15th birthday. That used to mean staying in school to year 10 but, as many of our students are spending more time in junior primary, quite a portion of our students who leave school at 15 are leaving at year 9 level, so there is a significant gap compared with someone who completes year 12.

Of the approximate 2 000 15 year old students who walk out of the school gate, only a minor proportion go on to training or employment and, in the past, there has been no effective monitoring of the rest of that group nor even of those who do not make it to completing their apprenticeship or traineeship. We are doing our young people a great disservice in waving them goodbye at the school gate. Under the government's plans to raise the school leaving age, children will be required to remain enrolled at a school; that is, they will be able to stay at school or participate in other forms of training, but they will be required to remain enrolled at school so that there will be improved support and assistance to help those young people stay engaged in their learning.

Simply raising the school leaving age will not address the problem: schools must and will develop specific mechanisms to meet the needs of those young people who do not find that schooling suits their present needs or is relevant to their lives. There will be enhanced counselling and one-on-one support to help those students on a clear path and, if they falter, to be there to help reset them on their course. In addition, there will be targeted programs based around schools where there are particularly high numbers of students who leave early. Exemptions will apply, as they currently do under the present legislation.

However, exemptions will not be a rubber stamp, and it will not be acceptable for schools to allow students at risk of leaving early to waste their middle years of schooling or to disrupt their peers, nor will it be acceptable for schools simply to use suspension or expulsions to avoid supporting these students in the future. Unlike a government that talked much about doing something in this area and unlike a government that said it was going to raise the school leaving age for all of its last term of government, this government is not about excuses: this government today moves at the first opportunity to introduce this change.

INSURANCE, INDEMNITY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Has the Minister for Tourism taken any effective and immediate action to protect tourism operators from rising public liability and indemnity insurance premiums? The minister may not be aware that the Australian Tourism Export Council's National Symposium in Adelaide last week expressed its alarm at the impact on the tourism industry of rising public liability costs. Claims for minor slips and trips are now being awarded at around

\$60 000 per incident. Many tourism operators, in regional areas particularly, have already been forced to close and others face bankruptcy, putting hundreds of jobs at risk. Swift action by the state government is needed to ensure that South Australian tourism operators can be protected from this catastrophe in waiting from our tourism industry, which may risk being in tatters.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I am mindful that the collapse of the insurance industry and the problems felt by many operators in small business, tourism, medical practice, community events and sporting clubs is so prevalent across society that it is not something that the Minister for Tourism can single-handedly cure at a stroke. We know that the insurance industry has been impacted by injudicious management, bad operative practices and directors who have behaved in a less than exemplary manner.

There is no question that tourism operators, like many people in small business, are adversely affected. We all know that insurance premiums have risen. As the member knows (he has been one of five tourism ministers in the last two years, only three of whom are left; two have gone: they have all known the size of the budget for tourism) we could quite easily dissipate every cent of that amount in paying people's insurance premiums. I ask what possible good that would do. We also know that the former government's budgetary situation has left every portfolio area in absolute strife, and that the little money we can afford to spend in tourism has to be spent wisely, not on fun events that produce no economic benefit, not on infrastructure investment which is not for the community and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop and the member for Davenport will come to order now!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The increase in employment in the tourism sector is 8.5 times that of the whole employment sector in South Australia. It is a key industry. We know its importance. But we also know that the insurance industry is more than the tourism portfolio can take on. That is why our Treasurer is behaving sensibly in this matter and negotiating with the federal government.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Will the Minister for Health inform the house what action she has taken to address the critical problem of medical indemnity insurance? The recent collapse of one of the major medical insurance companies, United Medical Protection, is having a devastating effect on our health system, particularly in country areas. Already many country doctors are having to pay double the premiums—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member may explain the question but not express opinion. That is clearly an opinion—maybe one I share—but it is out of order. In explanation, simply state facts which are in explanation of the question.

Mrs REDMOND: Thank you for the direction, sir. I will leave the question as it stands.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): This is a very important issue. The issue of medical indemnity insurance is as much an issue for doctors and health practitioners as it is for consumers. It is an issue of national concern that requires a national solution.

On 23 April, I attended a national forum in Canberra convened by the commonwealth Minister for Health, Senator the Hon. Kay Patterson, and the commonwealth Assistant

Treasurer, Senator the Hon. Helen Coonan. This forum was attended by all the nation's health ministers as well as national leaders from the medical community, the insurance and legal fraternity and consumer representatives. Members will be aware that this forum was convened in the week before United Medical Protection announced that it would be seeking voluntary liquidation. I might add that the federal government, through the Prime Minister, stated at the time, and has since repeated, that the commonwealth would not allow UMP to cease trading and would provide adequate ongoing support to ensure stability in the provision of medical services through to the end of this financial year.

Federal and state health ministers all agreed, at the conclusion of this forum, that clear and nationally coordinated steps needed to be taken in order to effectively resolve the problems facing the medical indemnity industry. The ministers resolved in the joint communique, publicly issued at the time, to commence significant pieces of work to address these complex issues. Specifically, all ministers noted that issues facing medical indemnity insurance were in many ways common to other forms of liability insurance and as such would be affected by the outcomes of the national ministerial meeting convened by Senator Coonan on 27 March this year. The Treasurer attended that meeting on behalf of South Australia.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Certainly, just listen and I will say. Specific agreements by the health ministers included an agreement to undertake urgent work to develop proposals for the provision of more efficient access to compensation; beginning work on developing a workable model to effectively provide for the long-term care needs of the catastrophically injured; reaffirming the work of the Australian Council on Safety and Quality in Health Care aimed at reducing adverse medical outcomes; and improving the health system's responsiveness to complaints and developing a national database for all medical negligence claims.

My department is commencing work on these areas of agreement and I will report to the house on these matters as they are progressed. These are, of course, whole-of-government concerns and I will be working closely with my colleagues the Treasurer and the Attorney-General in ensuring that we get the right package of reforms for South Australia. However, I assure the house and the community of South Australia that, despite what they may hear from some national commentators, there is no threat to the stability of medical services in South Australia. In addition to the commonwealth government's guarantee to secure the immediate future of UMP, I can assure the house that all public provision of health care in this state is secure.

Additionally, provision has been made to guarantee that rural doctors providing public and private health services have secure indemnity arrangements. I will certainly be keeping the house informed of the important developments. I intend to call a round table conference shortly in South Australia for all stakeholders so that we can discuss the specific issues related to the national agreements and how they relate to South Australia. Thank you for the question.

WOOMERA DETAINEES

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is directed to the Premier. What action is the South Australian government taking to prevent cost shifting by the commonwealth to our state in relation to detainees at Woomera and to ensure that

all laws in relation to the care and protection of detained children are complied with in full?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I thank the honourable member for his question. Under the previous administration there was no strategic whole-of-government approach to the issues that affect the state as a result of the commonwealth policies on unauthorised asylum seekers and detention centres. This has resulted in a range of problems and cost pressures for South Australian taxpayers, which are only just coming to light because no-one in the previous government appeared willing to take on the commonwealth over the issue, in the same way that they did not take it on over the nuclear dump in any effective way and stand up for our state. Early estimates are, I am advised, that over \$6 million has been expended by state government departments to date and this is expected to rise dramatically when all bills have been totalled. To rectify this problem I have directed the Department of Premier and Cabinet to develop a more integrated approach to produce the best social as well as financial result for all South Australians.

This government is opposed completely to the commonwealth's plan to open a second detention facility at Baxter near Port Augusta, the site of the El Alamein Army camp. I therefore was disgusted to receive a letter from Minister Ruddock which confirmed that the commonwealth was indeed opening a second detention centre in South Australia in the middle of this year. I am astounded by the choice of Baxter for the commonwealth's next detention centre.

The Assistant Commissioner of Police has inspected the Baxter Detention Centre and advises that it is about 400 metres away from a commonwealth weapons firing range, and this has obvious security implications as well as consequences for already traumatised people. The commonwealth will need to address this matter sooner rather than later. Such is the design and construction of this facility that there is a real risk of any fires that are lit by detainees getting out of control with, of course, a threat to human life. I know that members of the Port Augusta council, led by Joy Baluch, are also opposed to the Baxter detention centre as they are concerned that they will also bear the financial cost of the commonwealth's folly.

I will be meeting with Mayor Baluch on Saturday to discuss our common concerns and, immediately following that, I will be meeting with Minister Ruddock where I will be stating clearly South Australia's case. It is a pity it was never done before. The cost implications for our state relate to child protection, detainee health, housing, correctional facilities, cost of settlement packages, emergency services, policing and educating detainee children. This applies—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What was that, Rob? You are supposed to be the nice guy. Being Premier is more than going to the Crystal Brook hotel. This applies—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order. The Premier is making a ministerial statement, in effect, not answering a question.

The SPEAKER: He is responding to a question, as I understand it. I am listening to him.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On a point of order, I would just like to correct the perception in the last comment of the Premier, where he misrepresented me. What I have said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The comment that I have made—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is entirely out of order. That is not a point of order. It may be the substance of a personal explanation at the conclusion of question time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Come on, Rob, let's be bipartisan.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Sir, could you please be even?

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will sit down.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Please be even.

The SPEAKER: I am, and do not reflect on rulings of the chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I take a point of order. The Premier used Christian names across the house. In the past you have made sure that you picked up members for doing that. I would ask you to do so again today.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take the point of order. Neither the Premier nor any other member will refer to members by their names. You are not here by your own name. You are here to represent some 22 000 South Australians. You have the honour and the responsibility. For God's sake, use some dignity!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay. If I can go back to my answer, there are a whole range of funding issues that need to be resolved with Minister Ruddock this weekend.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister for Government Enterprises was clearly just reflecting on your statement and ruling to the house. He was sitting there mocking the Speaker. He was deliberately trying to send up the chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are any one of a number of reasons why the Minister for Government Enterprises might have been bilious, or something. I do not know; I did not see it. There was someone yesterday who was feeling bellicose or uncomfortable and I did not identify them. This is parliament. You are members of parliament. All members should conduct themselves in a manner—

Mrs Hall: Mr Speaker, we can't hear what you are saying from this end of the house.

The SPEAKER: Order!—which would bring honour and respect to themselves and, if not themselves, to the remaining 46 of us who do value our reputations. I ask the Premier to resume his remarks and for the Minister for Government Enterprises not to behave in a way that might be provocative to anybody, whether here or elsewhere. The member for Unley has a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, my colleague was trying to draw your attention to the fact that it is very difficult, and has been for the last couple of days, to hear some of your remarks. There appears to be something wrong with the audio system. From where I sit it is sometimes difficult to hear you, and it is also difficult for the member for Coles. We respect the office of the chair, but if we cannot hear your rulings we cannot respect what you have said.

The SPEAKER: Some less noise from the floor of the chamber would help, I am sure, in that respect. In addition, if the member for Coles has a point of order, I will be pleased—

Mrs HALL: The member for Morialta, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta: I apologise to the member.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If we can get back to the point and everyone cool down and be bipartisan, let me go back to this issue about—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Come on, I heard what you said and it was offensive. The cost implications for our state relate to child protection, detainee health, housing, correctional facilities, cost of settlement packages, emergency services, policing and educating detainee children. This applies, in particular, to people who obtain three year temporary protection visas. The South Australian division of the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs advises that South Australia takes 25 per cent of these people, significantly more than the 8 per cent it should be allocated based on a per head of population basis. Importantly, the costs associated with this group are predominantly absorbed by this state.

So, I was greatly disturbed by reports regarding the welfare of up to 160 children in the Woomera Detention Centre and that is why, following Easter, I sent a team of child protection specialists to Woomera to check on the condition of child detainees. That report, the contents of which have greatly concerned me and my government, was sent to the commonwealth for urgent attention. What we need to do—and let us hope we can do it in a bipartisan way—is convince Minister Ruddock of the real potential for negative impacts on South Australia and South Australia's image and, therefore, on our capacity to attract investment and to convince the commonwealth that it is in its best interests to work consistently and constructively with us.

It is certainly not our vision that South Australia should be the dumping ground for the commonwealth's problems, whether they are in the form of detention centres or nuclear waste dumps. This weekend I am meeting with Minister Ruddock—on Saturday around lunch time—and we have to send the message that if the commonwealth wants responsibility for detainees it has to pay for it, not shift the costs on to the South Australian taxpayer. This is costing us millions of dollars and, of course, locating a detention centre next to Port Augusta will simply ensure that a city that already has enough problems of its own will be stressed even more, with a real impact on law and order and the local health services. So, it is time for all of us to stand up to the commonwealth government to ensure that we get some satisfaction for the detainees and for the taxpayers of South Australia.

INSURANCE, INDEMNITY

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What action has the minister taken to address the spiralling insurance costs that are crippling South Australian sporting clubs and events? A recent survey showed that for some organisations public liability costs have increased by up to 300 per cent. Clubs are collapsing and competitions are being cancelled across the state. For organisations such as gymnastics, for example, this has already led to the closure of four gymnastic clubs.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I will answer this question because, clearly, members opposite do not realise that, in fact, as Treasurer, I have responsibility for the public liability issue. I am not sure that I want it but, apparently, it has fallen into my hands.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to answer the question, and I will do so briefly. Bear in mind that there was a three week delay, because we could have been on to this three weeks earlier had the opposition given way and allowed a government to be formed. So we started three weeks late.

Within a week or so of getting into office I flew to Canberra for a meeting—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Would the members opposite like the answer or do they just want to interject?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You want the answer? Thank you!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will continue to provide the answer and not engage in an activity called spoiling bears.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you sir, I will endeavour not to 'spoil bears'. It was a very good and important question, and I am pleased to answer it by simply saying this: within a week or so of being sworn in as Treasurer, I took part in a meeting in Canberra chaired by Senator Helen Coonan, the Assistant Federal Treasurer, and all state treasurers and ministers responsible for finance. I have to say that it was an extremely productive meeting. I thought Senator Helen Coonan was excellent in the way she conducted the meeting and brought the states together in an attempt to find common ground consensus and a series of strategies that all states can at least agree to. The solution to this is going to be difficult unless we get some degree of harmonisation among the states.

At that meeting we resolved to work as quickly as possible, and we instructed a group called the Heads of Treasuries—that is the heads of each of our Departments of Treasury—to nominate a senior Treasury official to work on a paper to be presented to all treasurers on 30 May this year, in a couple of weeks' time. I understand that the heads of Treasury had a meeting which concluded yesterday and at which a number of options were worked through for all states and the commonwealth to consider. Some states have acted on their own: New South Wales made statements about tort law reform, as you will have heard and I understand that Queensland has made some other statements. That is about it from the other states, but there is no doubt that there is a whole raft of issues that we have to deal with. I hope that at the 30 May meeting we will be able to move quickly towards a package of solutions. It will not be easy, but it will involve a whole series of components, not just one easy answer.

Can I also say in respect of the member's question about individual clubs that there is no doubt—and this is where it intersects with the portfolios of my colleagues, the Minister for Sport, the Minister for Tourism, the Minister for Volunteers and other areas—that there is a problem with the small community clubs. There is the local government risk insurance service, I think it is called, that is available—

Mr Brindal: It is called the Mutual Liability Scheme.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Mutual Liability Scheme. Thank you to the former Minister for Local Government. My Treasury officers are talking to local government at present to see what we can do, as a state government, to assist local government in providing that package of insurance. I am happy to follow that up if the member would like to contact my office. However, it will clearly require a whole of state, a whole of country approach. We hope to make significant advancements on 30 May.

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

That question time be extended by 20 minutes.

Motion carried.

NATIVE VEGETATION REDUCTION

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises, in his capacity as minister responsible for the Country Fire Service, give the house an assurance that a program of controlled hazard reduction in national parks, conservation parks and other large areas of native vegetation will continue in the public interest, notwithstanding the recent controlled burn-off which got out of control? The minister would be aware that many thousands of dollars of taxpayers' monies have been expended endeavouring to control wildfires in national parks and conservation areas. The controlled burning program, which is the only way to successfully reduce these hazards, must continue. I ask the minister to completely ignore the comments of the Conservation Council's Jasemin Rose.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for Stuart for his question. I recognise the longstanding and, I must say, intelligent interest that the member for Stuart has in this issue. He has a background and I recognise that, and I think it only fair that when we get an intelligent question in this place—rare as it is—it should be recognised. I can assure the member for Stuart that we will continue to support the program and our fire services, and other services, which engage in it.

Unfortunately, there is an inherent risk in any burning-off exercise. We hope those risks are never realised but, on occasions, they are. In relation to the fire in question, I can inform the member for Stuart, that despite the closest possible cooperation with the Bureau of Meteorology there was an unexpected wind change. There was more ferocity in the fuel load. There was a fall-back point and it was contained within the fall-back point. We would hope it would not happen but, despite the political risk associated with a program of burn-off, I am very aware—and this government is very aware—of the very high fuel loads we have in South Australia after three very good seasons of rain. While there may be an occasional embarrassing price to pay for a government when a burn-off does go out of control, we are prepared to pay that price rather than pay the price of bushfires such as we saw recently in New South Wales or in South Australia in 1983.

I thank the services that do the job. I think it is unfortunate that those people, mostly volunteers, doing the job for the government and the people of South Australia should be subjected to such unfair criticism. I apologise for the fire having got out of control. I wish I myself could have done something about that, but I thank the people involved and I thank the honourable member for his question.

POLICE BAND

Mr CAICA (Colton): The Minister for Police would be aware of many community events actively supported by the South Australian Police Band in this state.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton must ask a question before attempting an explanation.

Mr CAICA: I take your point, sir. Is the Minister for Police aware of the next concert planned by the world renowned police band, and can he tell the house how the South Australian community benefits from such concerts?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Police): I thank the honourable member for his question. I know he is a keen

supporter of the police band, as everyone in this place should be. There is a very good reason for this question—as much as the member for Unley wants to snicker and laugh. The police band has a gala concert this Saturday evening at Her Majesty's Theatre.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am asked whether I am going. Unfortunately, I am not able to go because I enjoy the police band—as do all South Australians. The police band does enormous work in the community and is an extremely valuable organisation. I urge all members to attend on Saturday night, if they are able. In the bilateral processes of the budget—if I might leak a little information about the budget—I did protect the police band and that other icon, the police greys, from the Treasurer so they will continue their good work for many years into the future. Although the Treasurer did have a proposal to sell the band bus and require the band to ride the greys in future, I can assure the parliament that will not be happening.

It is important that this parliament and the people of South Australia support the police band because it so ably supports the people of South Australia. The concert has an 'Out of Africa' theme and will include a number of musical arrangements that have their origin in African countries.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The band has had discussions through its community support branch with Monarto Zoo, which will be providing props for the evening. It will be a spectacular gala and I urge everyone to get their tickets because they are selling fast—and I so regret I myself will not be able to be there.

INSURANCE, INDEMNITY

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Why has the Premier not followed the lead of his counterparts in New South Wales and Queensland and taken decisive action to resolve the crisis in public liability and medical indemnity insurance? In the past week we have seen both New South Wales and Queensland take decisive action. We have heard the Treasurer today referring to talks. Why has the Premier not taken the decisive action taken in New South Wales and Queensland?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): There is no doubt that the leader is struggling in his job. The leader is certainly struggling: Vickie, come on down! The fact is that the member for Newland just asked the question of me and I gave the answer, but for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition I will walk through it one more time. I apologise for having to repeat it, but I will walk through it one more time because the Leader of the Opposition obviously was not listening. Leader, you have to listen in question time.

This is what I said before: I became Treasurer and I flew to Canberra and had a meeting with your Liberal colleague, Senator Helen Coonan. In relation to public liability insurance, Senator Helen Coonan asked us to come to Canberra for a meeting. We had a meeting. Helen Coonan, your Liberal colleague, then said, 'We need to meet again on 30 May. I would like a working group to give us all, including the commonwealth, a series of options.' Your colleague, Helen Coonan, Liberal Assistant Treasurer, asked us to wait until 30 May. I said, 'That's good advice.'

The leader referred to Peter Beattie and Bob Carr. I just told the member for Newland that New South Wales and

Queensland have taken some steps, but no other state. Those steps are one tiny element of the package of possible solutions. I have a budget to bring down. I have decided—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If members opposite had let us form government three weeks earlier, we might have been a bit further down the track.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I explained to the member for Newland that we are meeting on 30 May because your Liberal colleague, the federal minister, asked us to wait until 30 May. I am following the instructions of your Liberal colleague in Canberra. If members opposite have a problem, they should ring Helen Coonan.

SPEED LIMIT

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Can the Minister for Transport outline the current status regarding the possible introduction of a 50 km/h residential speed limit in South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for his question and I acknowledge his passionate interest in road safety. This government is committed to introducing reforms that will improve safety on our roads for all motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. A Labor government will not remain soft when it comes to road safety regulation and policy. Research shows that broad measures, such as the reconstruction of substandard roads, improves safety and leads to a reduction in fatalities. Likewise, increasing enforcement, improving legislation, and driver education and training improves road user safety. Without question, driver behaviour—alcohol, speeding and seat belt use—is a key component to improving safety on our roads. There is also significant research supporting the road safety benefits of a lower urban speed limit.

This government understands that on urban roads the risk of a road crash doubles for every 5 km/h above the present default speed limit of 60 km/h. We are also looking to other states that have implemented the 50 km/h limit to see what impact the change has had on road safety. This government is examining research, interstate examples and findings within the South Australian context before we state our road safety reform agenda, but let me give one assurance: we are committed to making our roads safer for all South Australians—and we will do so.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DOYLE, Mr M.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Has the government given Mr Mick Doyle a commitment to appoint him as a Deputy President or a member of the Industrial Relations Commission in South Australia? A concerned citizen has contacted me, believing it is a payback for the work that the Secretary of the United Firefighters Union did for the Labor Party during the election.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise to take a very serious point of order. It is not only contrary to standing orders but also somewhat duplicitous for the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The standing order that requires an explanation to be factual, to which you have

referred several times today, Mr Speaker, cannot be got around by the member referring to some unknown person who holds an opinion. He cannot get his opinions in by reference to an unknown person that holds the opinion.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I think on Tuesday, or it might have been yesterday, we had one of the leadership aspirants asking a question about the firefighters with regard to their wage negotiations. The question was completely wrong and did not undertake the knowledge that the member should have known. With respect to another aspirant who asked another question today about Mick Doyle, I can categorically assure him that the answer is no, and your informant is incorrect.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next question, let me make it plain that there was a serious breach of standing orders in that question—not raised by any member—and that is that if the member for Mawson was imputing improper motives to the minister, or any other member, that is highly disorderly and an unthinkable way to proceed.

CLASSIFICATION REVIEW BOARD

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given the view expressed by the Attorney-General that the session of the National Classification Board in relation to the French film *Baise-Moi* was probably wrong, why did the Attorney-General refuse to act immediately to stop the screening of the film pending the review of that decision by the board?

In October 2001 the National Classification Review Board gave an R18+ rating for *Baise-Moi*. It has been widely reported that the decision of the board was split six votes to five—five members would not have given it any classification. As has been widely reported, *Baise-Moi* has been translated as ‘rape me’. The first 10 minutes of the film include two pack rape scenes, and the story of two sisters on a sexually explicit murder spree follows. As a result of widespread concern, the federal Attorney-General indicated on 21 April that he would use his powers to ask the board to reconsider the film’s R18+ rating.

On 29 April, the federal Liberal member Trish Draper MP wrote to the South Australian Attorney-General asking him to put an immediate ban on the movie. Under section 16 of the South Australian Classification ((Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995 the Attorney can prevent screening. On Radio 5AA on 3 May, the Attorney-General expressed the view that the decision of the Classification Board was, to quote him, ‘probably the wrong one.’ Given this view expressed by the Attorney, why did he not act to prevent the film being screened pending the review of the federal board which is due to meet on 10 May? If he had done so, the South Australian public could have been protected while the matter is resolved nationally.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The last part of that ‘personal explanation’ is a gross abuse of standing orders, and the member for Hartley has been here long enough to know that that is a straight-out expression of opinion and not permitted as an explanation to a question.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Mr Speaker, the question is a good one and it requires an answer. I thank the member for Hartley for the question. We have checked with the Alliance Française and the pronunciation is *Baise-Moi*. It is a French-language film classified

R18+ by the National Classification Board. The board did so by a 6:5 vote, a majority of one, on 4 October 2001. So it is a fair while ago that the federal body did the classification. It is presently showing in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth. In view of the concerns expressed by some members of parliament, particularly Senator Brian Harradine, who only rang me comparatively recently about this, the commonwealth Attorney-General, Daryl Williams on 21 April asked the National Review Board to review the classification. I thank Daryl Williams for doing that. I think that was the right thing to do. The review is expected to occur tomorrow, 10 May. Concern arises from the content of the film, which includes scenes of actual sex and of fatal violence and gore. In particular, there is a violent rape scene involving actual sex and a scene of a massacre in a sex club.

Mr Brindal: Have you seen it?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, I haven’t seen it, but I have taken steps to ascertain the content of the film and done much reading about it. The board assigned this film the following consumer advice: strong sexual violence, high level violence, actual sex and adult themes. The law requires the board to consider the following factor in classifying a film, namely, the standards of morality, decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adults. However, the law also provides that the classification decisions are to give effect to the following principles, namely, that adults should be able to read, hear and see what they want; that everyone should be protected from exposure to unsolicited material that they find offensive; that there is a need to take account of community concerns about depictions that condone or incite violence, particularly sexual violence; and the portrayal of persons in a demeaning manner.

I must make three points in response to the member for Hartley. First, I have been asked by the member for Newland, I understand, to ban the film temporarily, and I think that was a good point to make. I asked the Crown Solicitor’s office whether it was within my authority, under the South Australian Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995 to ban *Baise-Moi* temporarily, and the answer was that I did not have that authority; and that, if I chose to make that decision, that would be an enduring decision and could not later be reviewed.

Secondly, had I called my State Classification Board together at the earliest possible opportunity and then gazetted a decision, it would not have been gazetted until today. So, in fact, we would have been only one day ahead of the federal decision.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, yes, there is a precedent regarding the film *Salo*, which was banned by the then Attorney-General, the Hon. Trevor Griffin. Thirdly, and I think that this is the most important point the member for Newland ought to consider, namely, that had I referred the question of how to classify *Baise-Moi* to the South Australian Classification Council and it had made a decision (which it could well have made) that it should remain an R18+ film to be screened in South Australia, and then the National Classification Review Board decided to reverse the decision of the federal body and refused *Baise-Moi* classification, we would have had the paradoxical situation that neither the member for Hartley nor the member for Newland nor I seek: that *Baise-Moi* could have been screened only in South Australia; and I think that is an outcome much to be avoided.

The review board has the power to vary the classification decision of the national board and, as I indicated earlier, it is

expected that it will meet tomorrow to determine whether *Baise-Moi* has been correctly classified R18+. As I said, South Australia has its own classification council that can attach a classification that will prevail in South Australia to the exclusion of the national classification. So, I mention again for the benefit of the member for Newland: the risk here is that if we refer it to the State Classification Council, and the National Review Board then refuses a classification but the State Classification Council gives it an R18+, it will be banned everywhere in Australia except South Australia.

I would not have thought that was an outcome that the member for Newland would want. I wrote to the federal Attorney-General on 3 May asking him whether it was possible to convene an earlier meeting of the Classification Review Board—earlier than 10 May. He has responded to my letter, as follows:

The Classification Review Board is an independent review board. Its membership is drawn from across Australia and it is also part time. I am advised that, in those circumstances, the date of 10 May 2002 was the earliest the board could be convened for review.

The problem here is a decision of a federal body and a delay in seeking review of the decision. The film was classified in October last year. It took until April for those who were opposed to the classification of the film to twig that it was a violent and sexually explicit film. It takes more front than Myers for the member for the federal division of Makin, Trish Draper, to try to project the blame for *Baise-Moi*'s screening in Adelaide from the government of which she is a member to the government of South Australia.

HOSPITALS, MERGER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health explain why she claimed, in answer to the first question today, that the Flinders Medical Centre and the Repatriation General Hospital boards were not considering merger proposals this week? The chair—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You might have wanted it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No. You look at her answer to the first question today. The chair of the Flinders Medical Centre told five members of parliament at a briefing breakfast last Thursday morning—five members of parliament were there—that the Flinders Medical Centre Board was to consider a merger proposal on Tuesday of this week and the Repatriation General Hospital board on Thursday of this week. I will read to the house the proposed motion that was to go to the Repatriation General Hospital board this afternoon. Part of that recommendation states:

The Repatriation General Hospital Board of directors supports in principle the proposal to amalgamate the Repatriation General Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre as set out in the preliminary business case.

There is a huge gap now between what the minister has said earlier this afternoon and what the evidence now shows.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The last sentence of the explanation, so-called, by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as he knows, is very highly disorderly. It is an expression of opinion in debate and not to be countenanced. If members cannot respect the standing orders then it disturbs me—as I am sure it will disturb members of the general public—that they do not understand their responsibilities and obligations,

not only to this place but to the public. I implore members not to do that. Next week will be the second week of sitting, and things may be different then. The minister.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I have already answered this question twice today and once yesterday. I would like to suggest to the shadow minister that perhaps he contact the chair of the Repatriation General Hospital Board who, I think, will be able to explain to him precisely what happened in relation to that suggestion. I am sure that—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS:—if the shadow minister would just be quiet and if he would take some advice from someone who was at the meeting, the Chairman—he will get the answer he requires.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

VOLUNTEERS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to bring to the attention of the house an important concern of volunteers. A woman (to whom I will refer as Val) has written me a letter about her concern. She is a volunteer at a local kindergarten at Campbelltown and she has expressed concern about the forms that she has to sign. The letter states:

Dear Joe, This letter is in regards to the discussion we had earlier this week regarding the volunteer contract I was asked to sign at the Campbelltown preschool. . . The agreement states the following issues:

1. I agree to work as a volunteer.
2. I will discuss all relevant issues regarding the children with the appropriate persons at the preschool.
3. I will not approach any member of the public, parents of children or others regarding my concerns or private information that was gained during my time as a volunteer at the preschool.

I feel I cannot sign this contract/agreement as in good conscience I cannot say I will abide by all items stated in the agreement. I also have been asked to have no physical contact with the children and while I fully understand the need for such rules in today's society to protect children from undesirable persons who may do them harm I would have to drastically alter my natural behaviour to achieve this aim. I am an older person who does not automatically embrace political correctness or understand that my responses to people may be misinterpreted as harmful to the children or adults that have contact with on a daily basis.

I believe I have immense value to the children at this preschool as I give love, support, encouragement and for some have filled a void in their young lives due to the death of their own grandparent as I am known as Granny. . . to all the children that attend this preschool. One little boy who is named [and I will leave the name out] seemed a little upset when I first started coming to the preschool. I took the time to talk to [him] and he informed me that his grandmother had died mid year 2001. I gave him an explanation as I have done on many occasions for my own grandchildren. I suggested if he would like me to become his granny and gave [him] a cuddle and a kiss.

I am also adopted granny [of another boy] who entered my life as the son of a new neighbour who had moved from New South Wales with his mother about 11 years ago now. He also had no granny and we formed a strong bond and relationship that has given his mother. . . and myself a beautiful relationship where we call each other, go and visit and discuss what is going on in his life as he now lives in Salisbury East and attends Charles Campbell Secondary

School and he proudly tells people that I am his granny, and his mother refers to me as mum quite often.

As this time no volunteers work at the Campbelltown preschool and this agreement could be the reason. I have given not only my time but have made numerous donations to this kindy in the form of library bags, soap, towels and spare clothing for children that have accidentally wet or stained their own clothes. I do not believe I have done any harm, only enhanced the atmosphere of this preschool by my warm, caring presence. I am an old fashioned woman who is known as a 'touchy, feely person' who learnt this behaviour due to my daughter marrying an Italian man and the whole family give freely of their hugs and kisses. I am the same to children, friends and any person I know whom I feel would benefit from the physical contact that a hug etc. gives.

Thanking you in advance for your time and assistance in this matter, which has upset me greatly, and left me wondering what the world is coming to for all people when innocent gestures can be so grossly misinterpreted.

I wanted to bring this letter to the attention of the house because, whilst I can understand the reasons behind the contract that volunteers have to sign, we also have to be very careful not to discourage volunteers from giving their valuable time—

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

Mr SCALZI:—for the care of children.

The SPEAKER: Order! When I advise the member that his time has expired, he will cease speaking and sit down.

MEMBER'S COMMENTS

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I want to briefly refer to the extraordinary statements made by the member for Finnis, accusing me of dishonesty. I completely reject those statements and invite the member for Finnis to repeat them outside the parliament. From his behaviour, it is clear that the member for Finnis is not proposing to work constructively with the new government to improve our health services. Clearly, he is still playing the blame game and behaving like a sore loser. I want to remind the house that, when it comes to misleading statements, the member for Finnis is a master. The former minister is a serial offender. The following are just a few examples of the member's behaviour.

As I mentioned in question time as recently as last week the former minister failed to correct a banner headline in the media on 3 May 2002 which read:

\$3 million loss if hospitals combine, say Libs.

The former minister knew full well that the Repat Hospital faced cost pressures of \$3 million as a result of the ending of the federal safety net funding and changes to pricing for programs. He knew that this \$3 million cost pressure had nothing to do with the hospitals working together to find ways of improving services. I ask the former minister to explain to the house why he did not correct that dishonest headline and apologise.

The member for Finnis started misleading South Australians in his policy speech on 28 November 1993. He said:

There will be a hospital bed when you need one.

We know that during the period when the member for Finnis was Premier, or Minister for Human Services, almost 500 hospital beds were closed, and often people were forced to wait more than 24 hours for a bed. When did the minister correct that dishonest statement or apologise to the people waiting for beds?

Let me remind the house of what the former minister told the house about the sale of ETSA. On 24 February 1998, the former minister told the house that the sale of ETSA could result in an extra \$2 million a day for health. That is over \$700 million a year. I invite the former minister to tell the house when he intends to correct that dishonest claim.

Finally, I want to quote from a media report dated 3 May 1996 relating to a court case about the defamation of a former senior public servant by the Brown Government. Justice Olsson is reported as saying that there were 'significant divergences in factual detail' between the evidence of Mr Brown and the complainant, and the judge is reported as saying that he unhesitatingly preferred the version given by the complainant.

The member for Finnis should be more considered before making allegations of dishonesty against others under the privilege of parliament. The house should remember that it was the behaviour of the member for Finnis and his colleagues that has necessitated measures to guarantee honesty and accountability in government.

GOVERNMENT, PERFORMANCE

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise this afternoon to say that I am very alarmed indeed at what we are seeing in this house when it comes to action—or the lack of action—by the government. We have seen a lot of warm and fuzzies over the last few weeks, from the Premier, in particular, where he knows that it will buy support from the community. We have seen a lot of issues brought up when it comes to how strong the economy is, and there have been a lot of openings, and so on, as a result of the work that we have done—and one expects that when one goes into opposition. But one also expects that a government that is serious about getting on with the job will start to take some tough decisions. We have not seen that yet, and today was a classic example. We have tens of thousands of people out there—volunteers, people in sporting clubs and people in recreation clubs.

We have doctors who have already flagged that they have major concerns about whether they will continue to do operations and, whilst we have seen action from the federal government and action from state Labor governments such as New South Wales and Queensland, clearly today significant questions were asked in this house about the wellbeing of South Australians, about the community fabric of South Australians, about whether football and netball clubs will continue to operate in this state or whether we will see more of them at risk.

I saw in a report recently that a number of them are now uninsured, but because it is so important that they do continue to keep active communities they are now running at a risk. The question was asked of the Minister for Health on the issues around professional indemnity for doctors and about sporting clubs and associations. Most importantly to me, as shadow minister for volunteers and as someone who was proud to be one of the first ministers for volunteers (and the Premier made great statements and tried to make a lot of mileage of the fact that, if they got into office, he would take over that portfolio), the Premier was deathly silent when the Leader of the Opposition and other of my colleagues asked their questions. What happened when that specific question was put to the Premier? He dodged it! That is the start of what we will see regularly from Premier Mike Rann. That is just the start of it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I seem to recall less than a hour ago somebody taking a point of order, and I made the point then strongly that members must not use the personal names of other members when they refer to the remarks made by those members. They either use their ministerial titles or the names of their electorates.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Premier was silent and the Treasurer got up and tried to circumvent the situation because he did not want the media to pick up and focus on it. Why is it that the Premiers of New South Wales and Queensland can get on with a lot of initiatives, many of which clearly state governments will have to address? The federal government alone, as already highlighted, will not be able to fix the issues when it comes to professional indemnity. We have a situation at the moment where, after sending out 6 000 surveys when I was minister, nearly 500 responses thereto have been sitting on a minister's desk for eight or nine weeks with no action whatsoever being taken. That is what this government is about: no action, but rhetoric, warm and fuzzies.

The volunteers in the community of South Australia deserve a lot more than that. Why are they not out there starting to address issues such as occupational health and safety when it comes to supporting clubs? Why are they not out there looking at whether or not they should be capping when it comes to claims? Why are they not out there looking at whether they should be doing a tender for all these clubs and organisations so that they can buy better and be secure? Why are they not out there working with SACorp to see whether or not, like some of the organisations which are protected with their volunteers, they can bring more into the loop? I will tell members why: because they do not have the ability or skill and they are interested only in trying to lift the polls at the moment in case they need to get a reasonable result.

The South Australian community will look further into this, and over the next several years we will continue to show and illustrate to the South Australian community that this government lacks substance. It will not have the direction and, most importantly, it will not have the intestinal fortitude when it comes to biting the bullet on big issues.

On Saturday when members of this house go to netball, football and other sporting clubs, when they go around at night and visit their electorates and their youth clubs, people will tell them how concerned they are about the inaction of this government.

WHYALLA, DUST

Ms BREUER (Giles): I want to talk today about a problem that has been part of Whyalla for many years: it seems to be an ongoing problem and is insoluble at this stage. It is a real issue for us in Whyalla. When visitors come to Whyalla they cannot fail to see the red dust that is on one part of Whyalla. We certainly have a very red tinge in the older part of the town. The reason for this is the pellet plant that was built there. I am old enough to remember when it was built, but I cannot remember the exact year; it has been there for probably 25 or 30 years. It was certainly built when it was okay to locate an industrial site in the middle of town. It is in the older part of the town, and it is quite ludicrous and ridiculous nowadays to see it there.

This has been a problem for many years, but perhaps in the past two or three years it has got worse. It has had a major effect on the city: houses and shops in the vicinity are covered in red dust. This occurs every day and it is difficult

to remove. Hummock Hill, a landmark in Whyalla, certainly has a red tinge all over it and even its greenery is red. Even in areas such as the marina, the yacht owners have problems with red dust covering their boats; the jetty is covered; and it is a real issue.

In recent times a group of local residents have become very vocal about this issue, understandably, as their houses are in that part of the town. I refer to Mr Ted Kittel and Robert Hannan, who have mounted a really intensive and in many ways an admirable campaign to alleviate the problem.

When the new indenture act was written a couple of years ago and the company was sold as BHP and became Onesteel in Whyalla, in the new indenture process this matter was taken into account. I made a point of taking into account the fact that the dust was an ongoing problem about which something needed to be done. Prior to that, Onesteel certainly made a major attempt to do something about the dust problem. That is really interesting because I remember 10 years ago you would talk about the red dust in Whyalla and BHP would say, 'What dust?' They would never admit that there was a problem. That they are admitting that it is a problem is a move forward.

Recently they spent \$34 million on a chimney, which was supposed to solve or alleviate the problem, and it was part of the new indenture act that it would be done, with undertakings from Onesteel. However, that has not worked. In fact, the problem has got worse. I have had discussions with the CEO of Onesteel, Mr Leo Sellick, and there is a genuine desire to do something about it. They have genuinely spent money on the area, but I have a series of emails from Mr Ted Kittel regarding this matter. They start back on 3 February and state:

At 7 p.m. this evening. . . I witnessed a fully loaded train heading towards the pellet plant and passing our residential area. Dust was streaming off the heaped ore.

I have similar emails dated 22, 25, 26, 27 and 28 February. Each day there were significant emissions from the pellet plant and from that area of the site. The emails continued on 2, 4 and 5 March and so on—it kept going. These emissions can come from the pellet plant itself. There is an area that they call the block hole, where it is particularly bad.

This is an ongoing issue. Obviously, there is a problem, despite the work Onesteel has done—it has not been fixed. So, what do we do from here? I am pleased that the new minister has looked at the problem carefully. I have had numerous discussions with him. He has undertaken to go to Whyalla to talk to the local environment committee which has been set up specifically to look at this problem. He has undertaken to do that and to talk to the EPA. Local residents would like to see the EPA's hold strengthened. They would like it to do more and to see someone from the EPA based there permanently until this issue can be sorted out.

It has been a real issue for the town. I am pleased that the minister is taking notice of this. It is a problem that we should not have to put up with. I know what it is like. My house is covered in red dust as well. You try to wash it off the walls, but it keeps going on and on. There must be some sort of answer. The residents in Whyalla should not have to put up with it. One of the problems is that some of the older residents say it is an industrial town and we should put up with it. However, I think the issue needs to be looked at quickly.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I wish to raise a matter of public importance. On 11 January 2002 you, Mr Speaker, in

your capacity as member for Hammond, rang me from Jakarta. You asked me to ask the police to lay off a person called Terry Stephens who, according to you, was trying to assist the youth of Kapunda but was being victimised because of his criminal past.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member needs to contemplate where he might be going with these remarks in terms of the subject matter. As I understand the precedence of practice and all the standing orders between numbers 104 and 150, in a grievance debate members cannot make the error of confusing the right to speak on any topic, of course other than those which anticipate items on the *Notice Paper*, with being allowed to ignore the rules of debate. That is the trap the member might have. You have a right to speak—all members do—but not to make reflections and impute improper motives to other members, reflections in particular on the Speaker. As to the practices of the house, I draw the member's attention to Erskine May, pages 332 and 333, as well as the practices of the House of Representatives on page 190. That one, closer to home for us, says:

Except in moving dissent from a ruling, the Speaker's actions can only be criticised by substantive motion.

It is not acceptable for the Speaker to be criticised incidentally in debate and otherwise it is not proper to make reflections upon, among other people, the Speaker, as the member will find when he consults Erskine May on the pages to which I have referred. I urge him to take great caution and, if he is thinking of going where I suspect he is, he may not do that under standing orders. That is highly disorderly.

Mr VENNING: I have not made a reflection on the chair and this was before you became Speaker. I had not previously met or heard of Mr Terry Stephens. A few days later when you returned to Adelaide, you asked me to contact the police minister Robert Brokenshire to follow up on a letter you had written regarding the sale of antique firearms both in Australia and overseas.

On the evening of 15 January 2002, I was in the main street of Kapunda when I happened to see you and another man. I stopped and you introduced me to a person you were with, Terry Stephens. We were outside the new Arrow video store about 300 metres from my electorate office. The three of us went inside and a number of matters were discussed in my presence. One of you told me that Stephens or his company was to buy into your company Goldus and that a contract was to be signed later that week. The election had been called on that day and Stephens said to you that he would pay into an account for your campaign expenses. You and Stephens also discussed the contents of Shenandoah mansion, and the guns and their sale, in my presence.

Mr Speaker, these are facts. Yesterday, I was accused of making 'grossly intemperate remarks and criticisms of the Speaker'. It was alleged that I made such remarks on a number of occasions and in relation to a number of matters. As the remarks allegedly made by me were not particularised, the people of my electorate are left in the dark about those matters. So am I.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, sir. I seek your forbearance on this. This matter may be one of police investigation. I am very concerned that comments made in this place, if it is to go somewhere in the future, might in some way affect that. I do not think that I can rule the member out of order but I certainly do wish to draw his attention to it.

Mr Brindal: You can't, but the Speaker can.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I don't think the Speaker can, either.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: What is the point of order? Do the police have an interest in this?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Okay, you go right ahead. I have warned you, you go right ahead. I will explain in a moment.

Mr VENNING: As the remarks allegedly made by me were not particularised, the people of my electorate are left in the dark about those matters, and so am I. That is why I am setting out the facts. They speak for themselves. I emphasise that the events I have described occurred before the state election, before, sir, you were elected to the position of Speaker. I have not reflected on the Speaker of the parliament in this place. I reject the charge that I have done so. I will speak the truth and will not be intimidated by threats of retribution from anyone.

The SPEAKER: Order! By way of personal explanation, since the remarks were made about me personally, I make it plain that they are the subject of a police investigation and, whereas the assertion was made by the member for Schubert that there was some discussion of guns, I utterly refute that. In every other particular, what he said is correct. I trust that he did not imply that at that time either he or I knew of the criminal record and the outstanding warrants against the man Stephens to which he referred.

Mr VENNING: That was the reason for your first phone call to me.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There is a further grievance.

Mr MEIER: The member for Schubert has a further two minutes of his grievance.

The SPEAKER: No, the member sat down.

Mr MEIER: The member sat down because you came to your feet, sir.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order. The member sat because you were standing as required by standing orders. The member has two minutes remaining in his grievance.

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is mistaken. I was seated when the member for Schubert sat. I rose after the member for Schubert sat and gave a personal explanation. Does the Minister for Government Enterprises have a point of order?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I wish to offer this grievance and I wish to take the heat out of this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no opportunity under standing orders for a further grievance.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sir, we have had only two.

The SPEAKER: Order! I apologise to the house. There is one more grievance. The Minister for Government Enterprises.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I came down here, and I am almost sorry I did, because I was attempting to help the member for Schubert. I think as a matter of opinion that it is highly improper for the member for Schubert to ventilate the matters in this fashion. However, my primary concern is this: the subject matter of the member for Schubert's grievance may well be the subject of some court proceedings in the future. I have already heard explanations previously that there is a difference of opinion between two members of the house as to the truthfulness of the member for Schubert's statements. It may fall in some quarter or another that the truthfulness of those statements

may be the subject of a court inquiry. The absolute privilege of this parliament will make that an extremely difficult job. I would have thought that, if the member for Schubert genuinely did—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have the two legal experts here, Itchy and Scratchy, giving me their opinion. You guys should speak about what you do know, and that will keep you quiet for most of the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will direct his remarks to the chair.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: My concern is that it will leave open to someone to agitate in a court whether the truthfulness of statements in parliament can be inquired into. This is very dangerous ground on which the member for Schubert has proceeded. I assume that he did it out of ignorance, as he does most things, but I came down here to do him a favour.

I might use my remaining time on something else, if I can think of something, but it is certainly one of the last times that I will attempt to do the member for Schubert a favour. I am sure that it will not be last time that the member for Schubert manages to do himself harm without thinking. No, that is it, I have had enough of this place for a short while.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Clerk has the call.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I want that remark withdrawn. The member for Bright just said that I would have a harassment case against me in a short time. That is the most despicable reflection. If he wants to walk outside and say it, I will take his home from him.

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the member for Bright make the remark which the Minister for Government Enterprises alleges?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, the member and I were having a private discussion, which he has just taken out of context.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I ask him to withdraw. The man is a coward.

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the member for Bright make the remark across the chamber to which the Minister for Government Enterprises has taken exception?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, the full story is I expressed concern to the member about the way in which he is treating staff and indicated he may well have a harassment claim against him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I cannot believe this man wants to have it debated.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Government Enterprises will resume his seat. The member for Bright will answer my question directly: yes or no.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In part yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes or no.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In part.

The SPEAKER: Then I direct the member for Bright to apologise and withdraw.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Say it outside, you coward!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I will apologise and withdraw, to allow parliament's proceedings to continue.

The SPEAKER: There is no qualification permitted. If the member does not apologise and withdraw, I will name him.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I have apologised, Mr Speaker, and withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Government Enterprises must also withdraw the remarks which he made which were equally unparliamentary and threatening. Remarks must always be made to the chair.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I withdraw the comment 'coward', and I apologise for it.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, and I thank the house for its resolution of an incident which should never have arisen. All members need to be temperate in the way in which they conduct themselves, lest they otherwise offend against the standing orders, which outline quite clearly for us what is parliamentary and what is not, as if we didn't otherwise know. The Minister for Environment and Conservation.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY (PROHIBITION) (REFERENDUM) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The current *Nuclear Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000* prevents the construction or operation of a facility to store or dispose of certain types of nuclear waste generated outside of the state, and prevents the transportation of such material into the state.

These prohibited wastes include Category S radioactive wastes, as defined in the National Health and Medical Research Council's *Code of Practice for the Near-Surface Disposal of Radioactive Waste in Australia 1992*, which are long-lived intermediate radioactive wastes.

The current Act also prohibits the storage or transportation into South Australia of what are known as high-level radioactive wastes. While the Commonwealth has stated that Australia does not have any high-level radioactive waste at present, the Act prohibits the importation of such waste into South Australia from any international source. South Australia must not become the dumping ground for the world's high level radioactive waste.

Repository

The Act does, however, allow the storage or disposal of Category A, B or C such as contaminated laboratory equipment, glass ware, paper, plastics and soil. A commonwealth government proposal to build a radioactive waste repository for the disposal of such waste in South Australia is currently being investigated.

In 1994, the commonwealth government identified eight regions of Australia that could possibly contain a suitable site for a National Radioactive Waste Repository. In February 1998, the commonwealth government identified the central-north of South Australia as the preferred region for further investigation and selection of a site.

Three potential sites within the central-north region of South Australia were investigated by the Commonwealth for their suitability—all sites are on pastoral land, with one site being within the Woomera Prohibited Area.

On 24 January 2001, the Commonwealth announced site 52a at Evetts Field West in the Woomera Prohibited Area as the preferred site. The Commonwealth is at present conducting an environmental impact assessment of the three sites under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. A draft EIS is to be released in mid June 2002 for public consultation.

As has been stated on a number of occasions, this government sees the repository as being the first step in using South Australia as a dumping ground for all of the nation's nuclear waste, and while the

Commonwealth has suggested that a store for long-lived intermediate wastes would not be co-located with the repository, it did not rule out South Australia becoming the eventual site for such a store.

As a part of this government's commitment to ensure South Australia does not become the nation's dumping ground, this bill has been introduced into the House to amend the Act to prohibit all nuclear material, including low-level to short-lived intermediate radioactive waste generated outside of South Australia, being transported into the State and placed in a repository.

Referendum

Should the Commonwealth seek to establish a facility for storage of long-lived intermediate or high-level nuclear waste, the proposed amendment to the Act would enable the South Australian Minister to call a referendum to gauge the attitude of the community to such a proposal. The proposed amendment provides the actual question to be put to the referendum so that there is no doubt as to what will be asked of the electorate should the need arise.

I commend this bill to the honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the Act by substituting an amended definition of 'nuclear waste'. The amended definition is similar to the current definition but is widened to include all Category A, Category B and Category C radioactive waste as those categories are defined in the *Code of Practice for the Near-Surface Disposal of Radioactive Waste in Australia* (1992). The definition of 'nuclear waste' is by this means widened to include all low level radioactive waste. A definition of 'Code of Practice' is also inserted.

This amendment has the effect of prohibiting the construction or operation of a facility in this State for the storage of low level nuclear waste (other than nuclear waste to which the Act does not apply by virtue of section 6). The amendment also has the effect of widening the prohibition in section 9, so that the importation or transportation of low level nuclear waste (other than waste to which the Act does not apply) for delivery to a nuclear waste storage facility in South Australia is prohibited.

Clause 4: Insertion of ss. 15, 16 and 17

Clause 4 inserts three additional sections. Section 15 provides that the Minister may direct that a referendum take place if he or she forms the opinion that an application is likely to be made under a Commonwealth law for a licence, exemption or other authority to construct or operate in this State a facility for the storage or disposal of long-lived intermediate nuclear waste or high level nuclear waste generated outside of South Australia.

The question to be submitted to the referendum asks 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 of this State.

Section 16 deals with formal matters associated with the conduct of the referendum. It is contemplated that regulations will be made for the purpose of adapting or modifying the *Electoral Act 1985*, which applies to the referendum as if it were a general election.

Section 17 empowers the Governor to make regulations necessary or expedient for the purposes of the Act.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 93.)

The SPEAKER: In calling the Minister for Tourism, I point out to the house that this is the first contribution the minister has made to the parliament, and I trust that honourable members will observe the usual courtesies.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): Mr Speaker, I first acknowledge that we are on Kurna land and say how pleased I am to congratulate you and the Deputy Speaker for your appointments and for the way that you have conducted business in this chamber. I am particular-

ly pleased, also, to congratulate the Premier and the government members for the very successful campaigns that have led to Labor coming back into government in South Australia. I congratulate all new members of parliament, particularly those for Colton, Enfield and Napier. Unlike them, I believe that the seat of Adelaide was the one that swung government in our direction, but I will indulge their views just for this occasion. On the other side of the chamber, I congratulate the members for Heysen and Bragg. Their intellect and skills will certainly lift the quality of debate in this chamber, and I welcome them.

I thank the electors of Adelaide for their trust in allowing me to represent them in this house. Adelaide, of course, is the only capital city named after a woman and it is a privilege to represent the people. In so doing, I acknowledge that I follow after many distinguished politicians representing this seat, most recently Mike Duigan and, before him, the Hon. Jack Wright, the former distinguished deputy premier and father of my ministerial colleague and friend, Michael Wright.

A century ago in this seat, in 1917, the controversial and colourful Albert Augustine Edwards was elected as the member for Adelaide. Like me, Bert Edwards began his political life as councillor for Grey Ward in the City of Adelaide. Although I share his commitment to social justice, I do not expect to emulate his further political progress. He was, indeed, colourful. He was a hotelier, a philanthropist and a politician. He worked on stalls in the city markets and at racecourses and, from 1915, ran a tea room in Compton Street.

He was licensee of the Brunswick and leased the Newmarket. He was strongly anti-conscriptionist, a defender of the city's poor, a supporter of libraries and an active prison reformer. Ironically, he was later sent to prison, having been accused of an assignation with a minor. He was a great benefactor. He gave St Vincent de Paul to the poor in Whitmore Square, and a shelter in Hutt Street, again to look after the homeless. He lived, even after his brush with the law, to represent again on the City Council the people he worked for for many years—the destitute families of the city, those people whom he made sure never went hungry, never went to a pauper's grave. He represented the West End, where I now live.

My childhood was spent in a similar socioeconomic area in the East End of London, a community that had seen Clem Attlee as the mayor of Stepney before he became the member for Limehouse, and went on to be one of the greatest British prime ministers, later becoming the 1st Earl Attlee of Walthamstow. He was a man who radically changed British society through social welfare reform, including the national health service and massive investments in schools and higher education. I grew up in his shadow and am a beneficiary of his actions.

Like many women, my values were matrilinear and were developed at the knee of a working mother who needed to leave me in full day child care from the age of three months. My mother had left school at the age of 13 years and was quite clear that I had to have responsibility for those without a voice. This commitment of hers began during the war when, as a shop steward in a factory making gun sights, she was especially enraged to find that the male conscientious objectors, who merely swept the floor, were paid nearly twice as much as the women, who did the work.

She taught me that I could do anything that I chose, but especially had an obligation to help others around me. As a child, I learnt the art of courteous complaint by taking the

worm-laden fruit back to the greengrocer, because she said that if I could not stand up for myself in simple things then I would have no hope when it really mattered. By the time I was 13 years of age I was teaching swimming to people with disabilities in what was then called a Dr Barnard's Home. She told me that no-one would ever look after these people and it was up to me to make sure that they were not forgotten.

That early community service provided a foundation for my future involvement in South Australia and opened the way for me here to serve the people of Adelaide. My mother was the first to make it clear that my education would lift me out of dependence into certainty and that whatever I achieved would be nothing unless I believed in supporting others. There was no doubt I would go to university, even though we socially had never known anyone to achieve this level of education. And even then there was no doubt that being a good student was not enough. I always was involved in lobby groups and community activities. At the age of 18 I taught disadvantaged youth in an East End boys club, and at 20 started to sleep one night a week as a warden in a shelter for alcohol and drug affected women.

The medical school I attended had a motto which was significant when I came to South Australia: it was 'Humani nihil a me alienum puto,' and it stood over the door at the entrance to the room in which the Elephant Man was given shelter when others in London abhorred him and treated him with contempt. They were the words that many of you heard at the commemoration service for Don Dunstan. They mean, 'I'm human; therefore nothing human is alien to me.'

But it was some years after leaving university that I actually heard the name of Don Dunstan for the first time, in the context of why I should come to South Australia. I have to say it would be fair to admit that, like most Londoners, I had never actually heard of Adelaide. I was told it was the renaissance capital of the southern hemisphere because of a man called Don Dunstan. At that time I was drawn to the state by a picture of reform, social justice, legislative change and cultural experimentation.

In 1999, in his tribute to Don Dunstan, Mike Rann, our Premier, quoted Clive Jenkins, on a visit to South Australia from England. It was the darkest days of the Fraser years and he described our state as 'the beacon of light in the night of Australian ignorance'. Now our beacon shines across Australia, but none of us will rest until the darkness is expunged in Canberra.

I had lived, researched and taught in London, Paris and Boston, but I chose to live in Adelaide. On arrival here as a doctor, I was shocked to see acute rheumatic fever, for the first time in my life, in Aboriginal communities—shocked because I had learnt that it was unlikely that I would ever see this disease again in the United Kingdom as it was now only a Third World disease, eradicated in postwar Britain by reducing overcrowding, by good housing and good nutrition. That shocked, within my first few months, was important in my growing commitment to Aboriginal reconciliation and an apology to the stolen generation. It was later instrumental in my involvement in a reconciliation statement and an apology from the Adelaide City Council when I was Lord Mayor.

Yet the decision to become involved in the political process here, 14 years after first hearing of the Don Dunstan renaissance, was not taken lightly. It involved, first, my taking up Australian citizenship, at a time when I was increasingly enthralled by the prospect of a new nation, of reconciliation and of a republic. A decade later, I have had

moments of shame and absolute despair about the political leadership in this country.

My move to local government was based on the view that my local council had failed in its duty to deal fairly and equitably with residents. I was enraged, when having taken great care when buying a city property, to the extent of buying a copy of the local planning rules and doing land title searches on vacant land in order to determine the likely outcome of development near my home, to be informed of a motel development. At first, I did not believe it could be true, so when a neighbouring resident brought me a petition to sign against it I said, with the arrogance of innocence, 'Don't be foolish. It's zoned R35. They couldn't do that here'. She laughed. 'You haven't lived here long have you?', she said. Well, I had not, but the reality was that I expected fair treatment, as others should receive. Many local councils fail to understand that consistency and equity are essential in dealing with all their ratepayers, residents and citizens. If consent is continually given to non-complying developments, it disadvantages other owners, not just residents, by affecting the reversionary value of land.

Certainly the last government had scant regard for process, planning law or consultation. Why else would it treat city residents with such contempt by secretly planning a stabilisation centre and dealing in a covert manner to bypass planning procedures? Again, had I felt well represented by the previous member for Adelaide, I would not have considered standing for state parliament.

My decision also reflects my view that a different benchmark needs to be set in representative government and good public service. The Rann government will do that. Earlier this week, the Premier announced that he will introduce what I believe to be seachange legislation. It will see South Australia lead the nation in ensuring greater transparency, accountability and honesty in government. He has introduced a charter of budget honesty, widened the powers of the Ombudsman and made moves to tighten up public accountability for senior public executives, employees and directors of government boards. In addition, the new code of conduct will be the toughest for ministers and will set a new benchmark. I trust the government's tough codes and proposed legislation will help bring a significant shift in the perception too many people have in the community about political process, and indeed will foster a spirit of honesty, accountability and good government.

The length of time these adverse views have been felt in the community is greater than we imagined. It was, indeed, Robert Louis Stevenson that the member for Goyder quoted when he talked about politics being the only profession where no preparation or thought was necessary but, believe me, people say far worse about the people in this house. The disconnect between expectation and realities has, to date, been stark.

Today, communities expect social obligation, an environmental agenda, a strategic policy framework and the will of government to adhere to them. What they have had in South Australia has been cavalier, negligent and arrogant. I think this is partly because for too long governments have failed to believe in the very process of government. The public expects that governments they elect will listen but also lead. If they had listened, they might have known that market forces have not provided hospitals, housing or education for the whole community. They have failed to recognise that the only legitimate vehicle for social progress is elected government.

As the writer and thinker, John Ralston Saul, a friend of our Premier, has said:

The most powerful force possessed by the individual citizen is her own government. . . Government is the only organised mechanism that makes possible that level of shared disinterest known as the public good.

The broad community knows the complete irrationality of decision making based on a single financial bottom line and wants respect for social and environmental values. We have seen not just the outsourcing and the sale of our assets but the outsourcing of our thinking. By that I mean our access to debate is hampered by the appropriation of terms and the language we use. It is difficult for us to think or argue when our perceptions about people and values are changed by the words in current use. How can you deal properly with asylum seekers when they are marginalised and called 'illegals'. We have customers rather than citizens; clients rather than patients; and for those of us on telephone lines dealing with greedy banks and telcos we know their efficiency in customer service is about their profits at the expense of our time. But how can we respond when they keep telling us that our custom is important to them?

Until we reclaim a vocabulary of dissent we will never be able to re-engage in debate. It is worth remembering that some of the words that actually epitomise a real debate, such as 'selling the family silver', were not even first used by socialists. When they were first commented on in the context of selling government-owned infrastructure it was the British Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan who likened it during my childhood to, as I say, 'selling the family silver'. Such a phrase could not have come from the consciousness of the union movement and could only have been used by a man from the right. Curiously, such a person would hardly rank a place in today's Liberal Party—now that many institutions have been so dramatically and economically and irrationally dismantled over the past decade.

Public health care, psychiatric hospitals, provision of utilities and education have all been replaced by systems that have been known to produce social disruption and anguish elsewhere throughout the world. Increasingly, education is a marketable commodity, not an investment in civil society. Some people still see education as a private advantage, not a public good. It is a mystery to me why so many failed ideologies are followed mindlessly when the results are well known around the world. After all, does anyone really believe that the expensive and rationed US model of health care is better than ours? Surely smart politics from any wing—right or left—might recognise the social costs of deinstitutionalised psychiatric care and at least try to do it better when it is tried here.

Why think we will govern better because we have a desire for progress not just dismantling? I think we are honoured to have a slim majority supported by a compact between Independent members and the Australian Labor Party. I think a coalition of this sort will produce stable government and it will inevitably reduce the adversarial nature of the political process and encourage collaboration, consultation and respectful handling of differences.

We also might understand that politics need not be poll driven. I remember long ago a conversation with Don Dunstan when he explained his disappointment at having been branded as the man who introduced polling into politics. He pointed out that he had polled in order to judge public opinion as a prerequisite to a campaign to lead debate and policy change. That is not the same as being driven by polls,

as is the current Prime Minister, and today much of what is said to be consultation is in fact push polling with only half the facts put forward. Inclusive participatory community involvement is one whereby people are informed of the pros and cons, the upsides and downsides, and why hard decisions have to be made. Certainly, we will be letting the community into our confidence when we are forced to make hard decisions and throughout our entire term.

I will turn now to one of the areas that I would imagine is reaping a harvest in terms of productivity and policy change, that is, our relationship with the Public Service. In my experience in local government I was often asked how I handled 'them'; how I handled the Public Service and forced 'them' to fulfil my wishes. I was somewhat bemused by the question, but in fact the question was more interesting than the answer. It indicates people's prejudices. Too often, people, especially from the other side of politics, go into public life expecting the enemy to be the staff when in fact the Public Service would want to give fearless advice and be engaged in debate; to be used for policy development rather than program implementation.

Our promise that we will reduce the number of consultants used by government will save money but also open the way for these outcomes, and I expect there will be a new compact also between the arms of government respecting our roles and understanding our boundaries. Certainly, our government will be committed to supporting an independent Public Service. Just as important as this relationship between government and the Public Service will be, I think also the way we operate in this house will be quite different. Clearly, we are helped as a party by being bound by a distinct ideology and a commitment to long-held values and beliefs. I quote Seneca:

If one does not know to which port one is sailing, no wind is favourable.

Since we know what we want to achieve we will also give more thought to the means, not just the ends. The bills we introduce will be discussed and negotiated with a range of parties, and no doubt improved in the course of those negotiations. I expect the Rann government to be marked and remembered by its ability to give credit, be inclusive and behave respectfully. Such behaviour will clearly be different from some of the behaviours we have seen in the past. I am fortunate to be part of a government that envisages and is engaged in changing the paradigm.

I am especially fortunate to find that the portfolio areas for which I now have responsibility in the new Rann government are those that have shaped my life and career. Education has been the key to unlocking my ability and to being involved in the work force and the community beyond the expectations of my family. My science education has taught me to want to understand facts, trust numbers and make decisions based on an understanding of information along the lines that 'if you can't measure it, you can't manage it'—and that is not a bad way to approach public decision making.

But science is currently viewed as something of a risk. Instead of entering an age of enlightenment, we hover on the brink of an age of darkness where science is regarded with some suspicion and medicine is regarded as some kind of recent alchemy. Recent debates have focused suspicions about the role of autopsies referring back to 18th century body snatching. That debate overlooked the fact that these examinations are an audit and the only way in which to seriously check treatment and surgery, not to mention an important basis for training, research and progress.

I cannot help wondering how we will ever begin to discuss gene therapy, genetic profiling of individuals and the prospect of stem cell research in this climate. As Dickens said:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times.
It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness.
It was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity.
It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness.
It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair.
We had everything before us, we had nothing before us.

Rather than focusing on an abortion debate from a quarter of a century ago, why would we not look forward to discussions of real and likely imminent issues? One urgent issue must surely be to do with the availability and confidentiality of genetic information that will increasingly be able to predict heart disease and evolving cancers from the time of birth or even before.

There are areas of privacy that we will have to deal with in this house. We will have to work out whether or not insurers or employers should know that information. Of course, insurers will argue that they need to actuarialise risk—that is, to cream-off and insure those at low risk. The public, of course, will largely want lower premiums, and indeed I enjoy the same because of my gender and being a non-smoker.

But then, as ever, we will see the privatisation of profit and the nationalisation of risk. Governments will need to legislate for confidentiality or take on the risk in pensions and health care, as some have suggested they should in medical indemnity, tourism activities, the building industry—private health insurance but public illness. In an era of the individual, taxing to support the marginalised will be even more difficult and take a cultural shift.

If genetic profiling is scarcely debated, we will all soon be deep in debate on embryonic and adult stem cells. In this area, we have already seen more heat than light. I believe that there is significant potential and value to South Australia in supporting research in this area. Stem cell research should never be confused with human reproductive cloning for the purpose of producing babies—this is the procedure that led to Dolly the sheep. No rational government or individual supports reproductive cloning of humans; and certainly neither would I.

Stem cells themselves are particularly important because they might produce nerve cells to treat brain or spinal injuries, pancreatic cells to treat diabetes, or heart cells to repair the heart after a heart attack. That is why there is so much excitement about this field of research.

There is also some excitement about what one might do with the smaller numbers of cells that remain in an adult. These are called adult stem cells, but their use is tempered by their reduced capacity for differentiation. To put it simply, they are narrow in their potential, in the way that a 60-year-old brain surgeon cannot easily be expected to become a fighter pilot. Only skin and bone marrow are relatively easy to collect, and there is real doubt that they will transform into anything else.

There is not yet resolution about much of the work in this area, and for the time being the only useful stem cells are likely to be of embryonic origin. South Australia already has a world-leading position in stem cell research. This has been built on important contributions from the University of Adelaide. This field is highly relevant to me: science is at the leading edge; small business, where success might see small businesses become very large businesses; employment training and further education being self-evident; and in a

curious way even tourism, because there is a real option in the future to use Adelaide as a base for cell therapy treatment and transplant.

Why, might you ask, would they bother to come here? The reason for that is that Australia and South Australia have led the world in IVF technology, which is the basis for this sort of research. This area for research has real potential for humanity because it can offer cures to very common, absolutely incurable and important diseases such as Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injury and diabetes.

For example, there are 300 000 to 600 000 people with Parkinson's disease in Australia; 10 per cent get it before the age of 40; and it costs between \$8 000 and \$20 000 a year to treat them, just at a time when they are establishing their life, their employment and their independence. Similarly, of the 250 new spinal cord injury cases a year, 80 per cent (as one might imagine) are male and it afflicts 15 to 44-year-olds. Again, just when they are establishing independence with young families and career opportunities.

Apart from the problems of physical and psychological adjustment, it can cost \$600 000 to \$4 million in the life of a tetraplegic. Stem cells offer hope. Take the type of diabetes that requires insulin injections. Evidence suggests that if you want to stop people getting blindness, heart disease, kidney disease or a stroke you need very tight control of blood sugar levels—that means more tests and injections.

Just think, if a successful pancreatic stem cell could be made, the blood sugar levels could be controlled automatically and normally, just like yours and mine. This would be a real step forward. Such therapies are tantalisingly close, and stem cell research has the potential to offer major advantages.

The proposed legislation that is being suggested out of COAG is relatively conservative, and some might argue that it does not go far enough. But it does open up a wide range of opportunities. Why am I so concerned? It is not just a nerdy scientific curiosity. No, there are several reasons why we in South Australia might take real advantage from producing such cell lines. First, I understand cell lines available in the United States were derived in culture with mouse cells. The mouse to human cell contact engenders potential safety risks from mouse viruses. After all, knowing what we know about BSE or AIDS would you want a transplant from a potentially contaminated stem cell? Secondly, if these cellular therapies are effective, existing human cell lines do not provide enough genetic and immunological diversity for the whole human race.

Some people have suggested that we need 600 to 1 000 stem cell lines to produce enough genetic immunological material in order to treat people usefully throughout the world. Australia is uniquely placed to help the world community in this area, which brings me to why we can do it better and take advantage of this scientific niche. It is essentially to do with our cultural values. Australia is multi-ethnic and multicultural. Australia's policy for allowing access to IVF to the whole community contrasts strongly to that in the United States where IVF is essentially limited to the middle and upper classes.

The current policy of routinely discarding embryos after 10 years provides a major opportunity for Australia to contribute to national and international medicine, human good and to save medical costs in the future. The proposals to liberate the research and to provide opportunities for patients from around the world and in Australia have been, of course, vigorously opposed. We should respect their views but note that over 69 per cent of Australians agree with

couples donating excess embryos for research rather than discarding them, and that 86 per cent of Australians approve of IVF for childless couples.

These ethical issues are intensely personal, but in order to understand these debates we need an unprecedented level of scientific literacy. As Thomas Jefferson said:

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be.

Biotechnology will help shape our future. It is a large part of the new economy and the new opportunities. We need to understand those opportunities and control the process intelligently. Of course, government is about seeking new opportunities, recognising our competitive advantages and, in our case, investing in social inclusion and social capital.

Adelaide needs a clear vision of its advantages and it needs to be identified as a learning and environmentally sustainable city within a state with a healthy rural economy capable of ongoing education change. In fact, more than ever, we as individuals are dependent not on one skill and one course but the willingness of our community to engage in ongoing skills and training. When I was younger I thought that being a doctor would be just one career. It never occurred to me that we would all need to reskill and be multiskilled as part of a changing future. I suspect that for all of us in the house our political role is a passing phase in our life; that many of us would have many careers and some might have many more, but all of us would want this to be our most useful.

This government will strive to help South Australians achieve their potential with generosity, egalitarian fervour and creativity in the spirit of our Labor values. I hope that South Australians are proud of their new government and I hope that I can live up to the faith and trust of all those who encouraged and supported me: in particular, the many women who believed I could make a difference. Some were members of Emily's List from across Australia, but many were local women (again some from Emily's List) who gave their time, energy and insight. They gave advice and the benefit of their experience. They gave help in kind—many kinds. They were my touchstone. They were irreplaceable.

There were also, naturally, many generous men: tradesmen, professional students and retirees—those fabulous volunteers, many of whom are here today to listen to me. Although he would hate to hear this, I am especially grateful to a former deputy premier and treasurer, the member for Whyalla, the Hon. Frank Blevins, whose sensitivity, intellect and wisdom never failed me. I think that our alliance was a match made in heaven. I am grateful to the union movement. I am not ashamed to say that I was recruited to a union in 1979 by Bob Catley when I taught at Adelaide University.

Not all of the unions to which I have belonged have been affiliated. I have been a member of FAUSA, SASMOA (Salaried Medical Officers), the AMA (there's a union for you!) and the HSUA. As a small business owner, I have been pleased to have the cooperation and assistance of my workplace unions. I would not want to live in a society where the interests of working people were not furthered both in their workplace and in the political process. I also thank the many state and federal Labor politicians, past and present, who have been my mentors and given freely of their time during my campaign. Indeed, there are really too many people to mention independently, but I would say that I have learnt a great deal from many people in the last two years. I hope I continue to learn.

I am especially indebted to my family, who have been patient, indulgent and ever forgiving. My husband and children keep me in touch with reality and teach me daily humility. Being a parent, a soccer mum, and having to maintain some semblance of order in one's life is very good for one's sense of humour and contact with reality. My children constantly make me laugh at myself. I remember recently giving a speech and some awards for customer service, and I heard them talking in the corridor. One said, 'Where is she going tonight?' The other said, 'Customer service awards.' The first one said, 'What does she know about customer service?' The answer came, 'She is a difficult customer.' So I look forward optimistically, just as Don Dunstan said in the 1976 Chifley Memorial Lecture:

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

This government will revere our heroes but, in honouring them, we will build a new future.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I start my contribution to the Address in Reply debate by congratulating all those new members who take their place in this house for the first time. Unlike some members, I will single out not those just from our side but rather those from both sides. I think all new members deserve equally a welcome, not just those who happen to be your colleagues.

The last election is now history, and this parliament settles down to do its job. However, it would be remiss of me if I did not record that section 83(1) of the Constitution Act, which is there by the will of the people of South Australia, provides:

In making an electoral redistribution, the commission must ensure that, as far as practical, the electoral redistribution is fair to prospective candidates and to groups of candidates, so that if candidates of a particular group attract 50 per cent of the popular vote determined by aggregating the votes cast throughout the state and allocating preferences to the necessary extent, they will be elected in sufficient numbers to enable a government to be formed.

I note that those on this side achieved more than 50 per cent of—

Mr Koutsantonis: Not true!

Mr BRINDAL: If the member for West Torrens wants to display his ignorance, I will produce Chris Schacht and such other of his colleagues who acknowledge—

Mr Koutsantonis: Chris Schacht couldn't count his toes.

Mr BRINDAL: Well, there is Labor loyalty! Chris Schacht couldn't count his toes. That is a dreadful thing to say about one's colleague.

Mr Koutsantonis: What did you say to me in the corridor about Robert Hill?

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Acting Speaker, could you remind the member that it is very tawdry to speak about corridor conversations?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order! I do not need any assistance from the member for Unley. I ask the member for Unley not to respond to interjections.

Mr BRINDAL: I will try, sir, but I am sorely tried by the member for West Torrens, as I am sure you can appreciate. The fact is that, in the last election, the Liberal Party and those who were supporting a government of the Liberal Party

achieved 50.7 per cent of the vote. And for the member for West—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If the member for West Torrens makes the allegation that I am misleading the house, let him say it and let him call a committee of privileges and let us have this matter examined, because—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Excuse me, Mr Acting Speaker, I cite as my reference the Electoral Commissioner. If the member for West Torrens looks at the first determination of the Electoral Commissioner and his preliminary evidence, in looking at the state of this house and casting the votes according to the two-party system, as required in the Constitution Act, the vote comes out at 51.7, I think it is, 48; that is how it comes out. So, whichever way the member for West Torrens wants to cut it, there is an undeniable fact that more than 50 per cent of South Australians wanted this side of the house sitting on that side of the house: that is an undeniable matter of fact.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Pardon?

Mr Hanna: You've got 24 non-Labor members, so the result is correct.

Mr BRINDAL: That is very interesting. The member says we have 24 non-Labor members. As a matter of fact, there are those (and this is a matter that I will not canvass in great depth) who thought that, going into the election, they were perhaps voting for someone who would support a non-Labor government. In the end, there are 24 people in this place who are prepared to support a Labor government. The Constitution Act requires that, where a group of people support a particular form of government, that form of government to be elected should get 50 per cent plus one of the vote. And that is not—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: So, we have a constitution that defers itself to the next election?

Mr Hanna: That is what the law says.

Mr BRINDAL: The law says that, in making the redistribution, the Electoral Commissioner is required to do this. The point I make (and I cast no aspersions on the Electoral Commissioner, because he simply cannot be expected to read people's minds) is that, as we speak, at the last election more than 50 per cent of the people made a choice, and that choice was not for the government which now controls the Treasury benches in South Australia.

What will be happening very soon is of great interest to all the people of South Australia, and it is this: what does the Electoral Commissioner now do, because we can see who supports Labor on that side of the house? Therefore, their seats, if they are to retain them, must be counted as Labor seats. So, we require—

Mr Hanna: There are only 23.

Mr BRINDAL: You are not going to tell me that the Electoral Commissioner will not count the current Speaker as supporting a Labor government?

Mr Hanna: Of course he should not.

Mr BRINDAL: Well! He sits here every day; he has been elected by this place; and he has a duty as Speaker to be impartial, but also to support the stability of the government of the day.

Mr Koutsantonis: Did he vote with us in the confidence motion?

Mr BRINDAL: We haven't had—

Mr Koutsantonis: How many votes did we receive in the confidence motion? We received 23—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens has been warned once today.

Mr BRINDAL: I have made my point, and I thank the member for Mitchell. One thing I will say about the member for Mitchell in this place presently (and in previous times in this place) is that, unless we get him a bit excited (which is something that we have achieved on one or two occasions), he normally talks a lot of commonsense and is normally a pleasure to debate against because, unlike the member for West Torrens, he at least tries to listen to a line of argument, not just inanely gabble some interjection he has learnt before he came in.

Ms Thompson: He doesn't learn them; he invents them.

Mr BRINDAL: Does he invent them? I thought that, because they are so poor, half of them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley is straying, as is so often his wont.

Mr BRINDAL: I am sorry, sir. I just make the point that I think that, for all of us, the next electoral redistribution will indeed be very interesting, because there are a number of inherent dilemmas that will now be faced by the Electoral Commissioner, and I would rather be sitting where our party sits in terms of the determinations of the Electoral Commissioner than where the Labor Party sits in terms of the determinations of the Electoral Commissioner. But that of course is a matter for the independent umpire, and I will await with great interest which seats we will pick up in the next election as a result of the redistribution on the grounds of electoral fairness.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It's not arrogant at all; I make comments in this place. Unlike the member for West Torrens, some of us, such as the members for Fisher and Hartley and I, have been here a bit longer than two minutes and we look back with some pride now on a number of parliaments and are able as older people to make some reflections on the nature of this place and the changing nature of democracy. I hope that the member for West Torrens eventually stays here just long enough to grow what might kindly be called a little more wisdom.

I commend the government for much that was in Her Excellency's speech. I think there are some good initiatives and some bold promise. In concert with my colleagues and on the advice of some of the shadow ministers, I would expect to be voting for a whole lot of legislation. After all, why would we not? We were the ones who drafted the legislation; it was sitting in the folders and was all prepared and you had the notes there. If we were prepared to bring it in ourselves and you bring it in as a good new government, of course we will support it. We will support our own initiatives, even if you steal them, because we are about—

Mr Snelling: You opposed it in the house!

Mr BRINDAL: I don't know what I opposed; what did I oppose?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford is out of order. The member for Unley has the call.

Mr BRINDAL: So, to that extent there are some good initiatives, and I will even acknowledge that this government may well show some promise of trying to introduce some new initiatives of their own. I am sure I speak for all my colleagues on this side of the house in saying that it will not be our job to unnecessarily delay, prevaricate or hold up something that the government can convince us and the

people of South Australia is a good initiative. Unlike those on government benches, we do not do not pretend to have an absolute monopoly on wisdom. We have never claimed that.

Mr Koutsantonis: You're a beacon to us all.

Mr BRINDAL: I know.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is getting very close to having serious action taken against him.

Mr BRINDAL: I thank you for your protection, sir. I would also like to thank the member for West Torrens. For a Labor member to call any member on this side of the chamber a light on the hill is the highest compliment that can be paid, and I thank him. As I said, I believe our aim in opposition, as we tried to achieve in government, is the constructive leadership of this state. If this government comes in with a measure which my colleagues and I as a party can accept and which the people of South Australia accept as a good measure, I absolutely doubt that we will oppose. I do not think obstruction for obstruction's sake has any place in a parliamentary democracy. The role of the opposition is not blind obstruction but to be constructive in its criticism, to think carefully about what the government is doing, to try to point out alternatives where they exist and certainly to block, argue and cajole wherever we think the government is making a mistake. But, where we think the government deserves credit, I believe we will be strong enough to give credit. I briefly contrast that with the person who eight years ago walked into his caucus and said that the duty of the opposition for the next eight years was absolute mayhem and if any member—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, sir: I believe the member for Unley is imputing an improper motive to a member of the government, and I would ask him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member for West Torrens has taken offence, will the member for Unley withdraw? I did not hear it, because I was talking with the Clerk Assistant.

Mr BRINDAL: No; the member for West Torrens understands. I was talking about a comment made eight years ago by an anonymous figure whom I did not name. I impugned no improper motives to any member of this parliament in this session. As the honourable member knows, standing orders cover only this parliament. Parliament does not protect previous parliaments but only members of this parliament.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I think that is right.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley is throwing verbal hand grenades across the chamber and I do not think it helps the conduct of the chamber.

Mr BRINDAL: I will try to restrain myself, sir. I think there were some good initiatives. Some of the initiatives we would have introduced because it was part of the ongoing nature. That is not a criticism, because any government that comes in and completely ignores the work of the last government or the detailed work of the Public Service is starting with something to answer for. If any government, Labor or Liberal, ever takes the Treasury benches and says that whatever it is the previous government was doing is by definition wrong, then South Australia and stable government is the poorer for it. However, I do not think this government is guilty of that. It is not a criticism to say that it is copying some of our ideas but rather a statement. It has promised

some things which it will try to claim uniquely as its own and to which we will give merit and consider on their merits. If they are good for this state, so be it. I was less pleased about the same criticism levelled at me, in all fairness. There were lots of words about some of the important issues, but not much evidence—

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr Koutsantonis: You are in the shadow of greatness.

Mr BRINDAL: As I am in the shadow of greatness, perhaps afterwards you can explain to the minister, sir, that she should have asked me to sit down so that I could seek leave to continue my remarks. In fact she should have so moved as it is not a point of order.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I apologise: I am always happy to take the advice of the member for Unley.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are one of many who take the advice of the member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: It was the same criticism that was made of me.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It was not outrageous but just the same criticism—namely, in terms of the river there are a lot of words and we have yet to see some of those words matched by actions. I was perturbed to read in the *Advertiser* a couple of Saturdays ago some criticism—and I hope it was the journalist who misunderstood the Premier—by the Premier of the previous government for having obtained only 70 gegalitres of water in return for the sale of the Snowy Mountains scheme. The Premier knows, as I heard him say on the next Monday morning on ABC radio, that there are three deals over environmental flows in the Murray River.

There is the Snowy Mountains Authority deal, which is basically a compact between the commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria and in which South Australia is included only in so far as the commonwealth demanded our inclusion, and there are ways around South Australia's obstinacy, if we choose to so be. In that background we negotiated for nothing—for no financial consideration from South Australia—70 gegalitres of water in respect of the Snowy scheme. The *Advertiser* purported to say that it was shamefully outrageous that that was all we got for South Australia for environmental flows. That was wrong. That was all we got for South Australia for environmental flows in respect of the Snowy deal, and that is one deal and it stands on its own. That was backed up by the Premier on Monday morning when he said on ABC radio, 'You have to understand—there are three deals here. One is the Snowy deal; one is any ministerial deal come to by the ministerial council of the Murray-Darling Commission; and the third is the private deal that I have negotiated today with Premier Bracks.' I happen to know that we should give credit where it is due and that Minister Hill was the one who did it. The Premier, as usual, took all the credit, but this happens—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Rubbish.

Mr BRINDAL: No, this happens all the time and I think this house should know that Minister Hill did all the work and gets all the credit. While it is quite fair that the Premier takes the limelight, the house should acknowledge that we have

Minister Hill to thank for that. Together with Minister Bracks, this government has negotiated 30 gegalitres of water. Now, it is not quite as advantageous as the deal that we got because, unfortunately, our state has to contribute \$10 million in—what is it John, three years?

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is \$10 million; sir, you would think that the minister at the table was in fact the Treasurer, he sounds so Treasurer-like. That sum is to be contributed 'over a period of time'. However, I would be churlish if I did not say that that \$10 million is supplemented by \$15 million from Victoria. It is \$15 million more than we got out of Victoria; therefore, I would congratulate the government in so far as it got that 30 gegalitres, but I still register my disappointment that on that night when that deal was announced Premier Rann busily added our poor and inadequate 70 gegalitres to his 30 gegalitres and claimed what a good job they had done because now they have 100. I put that on the public record.

In this house I publicly—and have privately—pledged the full cooperation of the opposition on any matter revolving around the Murray River—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Just as I did.

Mr BRINDAL: The minister says, 'Just as I did', and I acknowledge that publicly to be true. I also congratulate the government on the appointment of the Hon. David Wotton as chair of the catchment management board. It was my full intention to appoint him: I could not do it because we were in caretaker mode. I was very worried that partisan politics might see that he was not—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: From me; you're joking.

Mr BRINDAL: It was your caucus I was worried about, not you.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Our caucus are puppy dogs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will address the chair—

Mr BRINDAL: I will, sir—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER:—and he will ignore out of order interjections from the government side.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise, sir. I certainly will, sir, because I could not possibly listen to puppy dogs, could I? I was worried that it might not happen. I do congratulate the government on the appointment. While the Hon. David Wotton might have spent his career on this side of the chamber, I think he is universally acknowledged as a person who has a passion for the environment—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: He spent a bit more time in government than you did.

Mr BRINDAL: He had a longer career than I have had so far, too. He has a passion for the environment. He is well regarded and respected by all sides of politics and I think he will bring leadership—and I hope some flare—to that board. I will be interested when the River Murray Act—and I will be asking the minister for a briefing on it—is proclaimed in how he is possibly going to do his job because, if it is proclaimed under the new boundaries of the board, which I presume will be the case, being the watershed of the Murray River, his horticultural responsibilities will extend throughout the Mallee and up to near Burra. It will be, as I am sure he realises, a huge job—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I will be interested to see how it will be done. In the time remaining I want to raise a matter of serious import not only to my electorate but to the electorate of West Torrens also; that is, the propensity of Adelaide to flooding, a matter which for the last 12 months—

Ms Thompson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member says we wasted money on the Barcoo Outlet. I inform the member that the area served by the member for West Torrens, a number of others and me requires remediation, which has been estimated to be in the vicinity of \$100 million to \$150 million and—

Ms Thompson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell will have her opportunity shortly.

Mr BRINDAL: There is a serious problem in my own electorate because many of the houses there can and will be flooded, and we have had lots of debate in the chamber today about the nature of insurance companies and the upscaling of costs. I believe that, in the next few years, many ordinary, average South Australians will suddenly find that they have no flooding insurance—and I hope that, at least, we force the insurance companies to disclose when the little flooding clause disappears from the contract. In an area like Adelaide, that will be a disaster.

I am sure that all members know that, when Adelaide was colonised, the area basically from Thebarton down to the coastline, right across to Port Adelaide and as far across as Glenelg, was natural flood plain and, basically, it is only a system of drainage that has saved those areas from flooding. Historically, I believe all members will be aware that one of our great icons, the Torrens Linear Park, came about because of some flooding in the mid-1960s, when engineers realised that we could lose entire suburbs of Adelaide if the Torrens Valley was not kept clear. I do not know under which government it was, but I distinctly remember it as a much younger man. So the linear park, which is a great recreational pathway, was as much a flood mitigation scheme as a recreational reserve. Yet the other creeks of Adelaide—First Creek, Second Creek, what was the Sturt River and others—have largely been neglected.

In contrast to the neglect of those creek systems (and you, sir, as someone very keen on the environment would know there has been a very high environmental cost just because of the neglect), members will also be aware that the policy of urban infill of both governments, both our last government and your government before that, has resulted in increased run-off, and I would say run-off to the point that was never coped with by the natural ecosystem before settlement. Where once on the average suburban block perhaps one-third of the landform was covered with a roof, now in places like Unley and Burnside there are two Tuscan villas, they are close together, they are larger, and the surrounding yard is completely courtyard so, instead of about 30 per cent run-off there is 100 per cent run-off, all going into—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: We have lots of condominiums in Kings Park—high-rise. What happens is that the councils give permission for urban infill. The councils are required to take into account infrastructure—

Mr Koutsantonis: What do they do?

Mr BRINDAL: They don't do it, and for once the member for West Torrens is exactly right. The electricity is provided by the state, the roads are there and the rubbish van goes past. The only infrastructure needs that it basically alters are floodwater needs, which they ignore and take little responsibility for. I am not criticising solely local government in this. What I am saying is that there is a great need in this parliament, whoever occupies the government benches, whether it is us or whether it remains you for the entire four years, to address this problem. It is the most serious problem

that South Australia is facing. It is a problem that could spell ruin to my electors.

The member for West Torrens might be interested to learn that in February 12 months ago, when we had that big rainstorm, his electorate was 10 minutes away from having \$150 million worth of flood damage, and members will recall that much of Unley was damaged. The Bureau of Meteorology announced that a front was moving in. It dissipated 10 minutes from Adelaide but, had that front not dissipated and that rain been dumped on Adelaide, they estimate that most of West Torrens would have gone under water, and that includes—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: That would have included businesses such as Collotype Labels and businesses that bring enormous economic wealth to this state. As shadow spokesperson for the Murray River and water resources, I will make every attempt to support the minister in such honest endeavours as he undertakes to rectify some of these problems. The problem of flooding in metropolitan Adelaide is probably the most serious one facing us.

In conclusion, I hope that this government takes up this issue and addresses it squarely and honestly. I say that in the context that, when we were last in opposition, I raised several times with the then government the problem of earthquakes in the city of Adelaide and the fact that many of our public buildings were dangerous when it came to earthquake protection.

One thing this government can check is that, in the last eight years, every building that we have upgraded and updated we have made sure that we have done all that we can to earthquakeproof those buildings, and those buildings include the Art Gallery, the Museum and this place. Most importantly—and it can now be said—probably the most dangerous building in Adelaide was the old police headquarters. Members opposite may well know that the new Emergency Services Centre was, in fact, built behind the old police headquarters. The lift and slab method that they used is probably the most dangerous in earthquakes, because if one of the pylons shifts the whole thing collapses on itself. Over eight years, we have quietly modified, restructured and made amends. The Labor government was alerted to this but did not do anything about it.

That is past history. What I am asking is that the government, having been alerted to the dangers of flooding in metropolitan Adelaide, Glenelg, West Torrens, Unley and other suburbs actually takes the bull by the horns and comes to this parliament with adequate measures and does something about it. I wish the government well for its term: I hope it is not too long.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I wish to start my remarks by congratulating you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your new position, and I particularly congratulate the Speaker on his election to the important position of chair. I would also like to congratulate and welcome new members from both sides of the chamber and say how particularly pleased I am to hear the new members from this side. They have done a wonderful job of stepping straight into responsible positions, whether it is on the back bench, the front bench or in committees: they are all stepping up exceedingly well and demonstrating the absolute bevy of talent that exists on the government benches. We have plenty spare. There would be plenty to fill the opposition benches, but we do not intend to sit there for many, many years to come. So, members opposite will have

the problem of looking at a strong, united group of very talented people who know what they are doing, know why they are here and who intend to do such a good job that the people of South Australia will embrace us warmly at the next and subsequent elections.

I am pleased that, as a result of the redistribution in Reynell, I have the pleasure of representing some quite different areas and getting to know the people and the slightly different community on the eastern side of Morphett Vale. This means that I have responsibility for several new schools. I have already met the principals and the school councils—generally, governing councils—in those areas. I am pleased to welcome Wirreanda High School, Morphett Vale East Primary School, Coorara Primary school and Pimpala Primary School into the electorate of Reynell. I commit myself to serving them as well as I have served the other schools in my area.

Members who have been here for a while would know that I have a passionate commitment to education. I am yet another one of the members on this side of the house who are here only because of the education we were able to receive. For many of us it was the result of some form of scholarship or Gough Whitlam's free education or, in my case particularly, the opportunity of study leave from the public service to work my way through university. It has changed my life and I expect that it will change the lives of many people in Reynell, as they also have the opportunity of a broader range of education than was available in the past.

Also coming into the electorate of Reynell are some kindergartens and preschools, and they are the Archer Court Kindergarten, the Coorara Pre-School Centre and the Woodcroft Children's Centre, together with the Emu Children's Centre which is a community child care centre. I recognise the importance of kindergartens and child care centres in our community. We spend most of our time talking about schools and universities and we spend a lot of our time talking about high schools, in particular, but it is the child care centres and the kindergartens that often form the base for our children's education, giving them the social skills, the discipline and the development of a routine that enables them to do well at school. The workers in these areas are often overlooked, and I pay tribute to them in these remarks.

However, that is not, in any way, to diminish the importance of the other schools in the electorate and I am pleased that the Southern Vocational College still remains within the electorate of Reynell, together with Christies Beach High School and Morphett Vale High School. The Southern Vocational College has been a success. What has been unfortunate about it is that the previous government loved cutting ribbons and opening things but it was not always so good at enabling them to keep going. Christies Beach High School has undergone some considerable funding difficulties as a result of the previous government's failure to properly fund the Southern Vocational College. I expect that very soon this will be rectified, but it has caused considerable anxiety to the vocational college and the members of the management committee, the community members of the management committee of that college and Christies Beach High School.

Christies Beach is also facing a couple of other difficulties. One is a result of the way in which the previous government raced into a commitment before the 1997 election to redevelop Christies Beach High School. The school welcomed the fact that it was consolidated on one campus (the eastern campus) instead of being spread between buildings that were, effectively, a kilometre apart. But, again, all has

not been happy, as with so many of the things that the previous government did. It was the ribbon that was important rather than the functionality.

They decided that they really could not afford all of the money required to properly redevelop Christies Beach High School so they cut corners all over the place. The result is that two blocks have been flooded badly, one of them on two occasions. The first time that flooding occurred in the technical studies area it was so bad that the very valuable wood floor warped. The other building that has been subject to serious flooding contains the domestic science area and some of the technology areas. The result of two lots of flooding is that sewing machines, computers and other domestic appliances have been lost twice. All the work that staff and students have undertaken that was recorded through the computers has been lost. They went through considerable after-hours activity to get things ready again so that students missed minimal opportunities for education. This is all because the previous government was more interested in cutting a ribbon so that it could say that Christies Beach High School had been redeveloped than in doing it properly. So, now, another of the tasks this government has will be to try to work out a way of fixing up the problems left by the previous government's rush to redevelop the Christies Beach High School. As I said, we welcome the redevelopment; we just wish things would be done properly.

Another example of the previous government rushing in to do things against all advice is the legislation with regard to governing councils. When minister Buckby introduced the legislation for P21 schools forbidding anyone employed by a school being the chair of a school council, I warned—as did our shadow minister (now the minister)—that this would cause problems for many schools in outer suburban areas where often the person who seemed to have the confidence of the community to be the chair of the school council was an SSO. SSOs were seen as representing the community and yet being sufficiently familiar with the education system to be able to undertake the role of the chair of the governing council.

At that time, I specifically mentioned that Christies Beach High School would be in danger of losing the services of Pam Borthwick AM, who has been a magnificent leader of that school for many years. She has worked as the parent liaison officer and she has also been the chair of the school council. She has filled a major role in the whole of the southern school community; yet, Ms Borthwick is now ineligible to be the chair of the school council. In a community such as Christies Beach High there are not always a lot of parents who have the confidence, the skills or the time. Many of them travel many hours in a day and have casual and contract work, so they cannot make a commitment to be at the school at a regular time. This reduces the number of parents who might be available to take on the challenging role of chair of the school council.

The previous government once again raced in against our advice and is causing difficulties not only for the Christies Beach High School but for at least three other schools in the electorate of Reynell who have had to change chairs when, if the procedure had been free and there had been no restrictions put onto the choice of chair, they may well have chosen a different chairperson.

Morphett Vale High School, another high school in my electorate, is doing extremely well. It has an enterprise focus and works with Mitsubishi and Mobil in developing the enterprise skills of students. Morphett Vale High School

played a leading role together with other schools in the southern vocational cluster in the recent opening of a shopfront facility. This facility is being managed by students on Beach Road, Christies Beach in the electorate of Kaurna. It is a very attractive shopfront in a very attractive area, and the students are using this as an opportunity to develop skills in self-management and cooperation as well as in producing goods and services for sale through this retail outlet.

Those who are driving this school, such as Anna Maria Zupancic, are being careful to point out that this is not just about developing skills in retail and leaving it there. We hope that many of these young people will develop their own businesses, some of them in retail, but we also point out to them that the skills that they develop in retail will be important to them in whatever challenges they take on in life, because many high school teachers like me are committed to increasing the higher educational participation of young people in the south. At the moment, the university participation rate in Reynell is about 6 per cent, which is one-third of the state average.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: Yes, six. This is simply not good enough. We need to find many opportunities to encourage young people and their parents to take on the opportunities that are available through university education as well as TAFE. We have had a better experience of our youth attending TAFE. The rate of people with TAFE qualifications in Reynell is higher than the Adelaide statistical division average. However, unfortunately, at the moment, some of those qualifications are not enabling people to get good jobs.

Mature age men, particularly, are finding that, despite having previously held skilled jobs that helped build this nation and make it prosperous in the past, a TAFE qualification is not serving them so well now. We need lots of retraining opportunities for these people as well as encouraging them to work with their children to take advantage of greater educational opportunities than they ever had.

Wirreanda High School is proudly embarking on the project of building a gym and I am happy to acknowledge that in the last days before the election the former government suddenly found some money, after not having been able to find any for quite some time, to enable this sports specialist school to actually have a decent gymnasium. It did seem a little bit of a farce to have a specialist sports school serving the needs of many schools in the southern area with no gymnasium, but that is finally under way.

Other issues of concern to people in the electorate of Reynell, particularly those that are legacies of the previous government—projects that have been half, three quarters or 90 per cent done—include the Expressway, which, as has already been mentioned, is there; it is up and running. Most of us find it very convenient and useful, and it certainly has made Main South Road a much quieter, more peaceful and safer place. Indeed, travelling on the Expressway is safer than travelling on Main South Road, particularly at peak times. However, a number of my constituents feel that they have not received the same consideration with regard to the impact of the Expressway on their lives as have residents in the eastern suburbs involving the upgrading of Portrush Road.

The issue of the landscaping around the Expressway and the impact that has on their daily amenity is simply not being properly addressed—at least it was not in the past. A number of residents are finding that the noise prevention measures are inadequate and that, instead of mitigating noise, the measures are actually funnelling loud noises right in their bedroom

windows in the early hours of the morning. This is particularly distressing for people who have chronic health conditions or who have young babies, and they are the ones who have been complaining to me about being woken up, day after day, at 3 o'clock in the morning or thereabouts, by the single motorbike or the single truck coming down the road and dissipating sound for miles which seems to end up, as I said, in their front rooms. So, I am sure that the new Minister for Transport will take the needs of the people of Reynell into account when trying to reallocate funds, whether or not any are left over from the Expressway, to make their lives a little more comfortable.

The Flinders Medical Centre is also of great importance to the people of Reynell. Together with the Noarlunga hospital and the health service, Flinders Medical Centre meets most of their health needs. But, in this regard, they have been sitting and watching the decline progressively over the last eight years. Staff speak to me at events such as netball matches, as do patients, about the lack of service they have experienced. Staff tell me about the problem they are having in recruiting the top-level staff that have traditionally come to Flinders Medical Centre because of its special relationship with Flinders University. Many world-recognised staff found coming to Flinders attractive because of the opportunity to research, teach and engage in clinical practice and clinical research all at the same time. This opportunity was unique in Australia and has been responsible for many innovations in clinical practice as well as in pure research. But the way the budgets have been cut at both Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University has meant that this has not happened as much as in the past.

They are now finding it difficult to get staff, and one of the reasons for this would be that staff are not fond of treating patients in corridors. They want to be able to give emergency patients proper service and not leave them in corridors for 24 hours. I hope that we in this house all know that Flinders has an extraordinarily high ratio of emergency attendances to beds, or maybe that is a low ratio. They have very few beds available for the high number of emergency treatments, which means that scheduled operations are easily bumped down the list when there is a high number of emergency patients being admitted in one night.

This causes disruption to the lives of people in the community. People who have been preparing for serious operations have them postponed. It is simply not good enough, and this situation has been allowed to deteriorate over the last eight years. We look forward to addressing this.

During question time we heard peculiar statements made about Flinders Medical Centre and the lack of clarity regarding what is happening in terms of a proposed amalgamation with the Repatriation General Hospital. This really is indicative of the low level to which public administration in this state has sunk under the previous government, which had no respect for public servants, no respect for fearless advice and simply wanted to hear music to their ears. It was not interested in reality.

I have with me the agenda for a breakfast meeting at Flinders Medical Centre on Tuesday 30 April, to which a number of local dignitaries and members of parliament were invited. The notes I have from that meeting state that the Repatriation General Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre were looking at combining support functions. At that briefing there was no mention of a merger, because if there had been I would have raised it, since I know perfectly well the attitude

of veterans to any attempt to touch the Repat General Hospital.

Last time there was any talk about even sharing medical records, a number of Vietnam veterans were at my door saying this was not on, and I have been told before by the veterans from any war that any attempt to amalgamate Flinders and the Repat is not on. We listen to people in the community; we know how they feel; and we know how important the Repat Hospital is to them.

Many in my community who are not veterans also attend the Repat, particularly for orthopaedic surgery and rehabilitation. They too respect the role that the veterans community has in relation to the Repat and the importance of allowing them a medical service which they feel belongs to them. So, had there been any mention of a merger at that breakfast, I would have responded.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett has had his opportunity to speak.

Ms THOMPSON: The member for Morphett was at a different breakfast meeting. I am pointing out what was said at the meeting on Tuesday 30 April, and that was not said by the Chair of the Repat Hospital, who was not at that meeting: it was said by a representative of Flinders Medical Centre.

Another issue that the previous government failed to deal with was housing. I acknowledge it was a little difficult for it, given the constraints because of the commonwealth housing agreement. But did it do anything—any single thing—to indicate to the commonwealth just what despair was placed on people in this state because of the plight of housing here? Every time we talked about the number of public houses that had been lost because of the administration of the housing sector by Liberal governments, members opposite just squabbled about whether or not we were counting community housing.

Well, we were counting community housing, and figures I have previously quoted in this house from the Auditor-General's Report—and members can check them to get the exact numbers—showed that from November 1993 to July 2001 we had lost approximately 8 000 public houses. In the Housing Trust the figure was around 11 000. If one deducts from that number the increase in community housing and Aboriginal housing, one sees that it is a loss of 8 000 homes. That is 8 000 families who are desperately looking for homes.

Many of those families come to my office. They come with stories about sharing couches; moving from family member to family member as they wear out their welcome; not being able to give their children a good start in life because not only do their children feel lost and homeless but they cannot keep going to the same school. Every time they move from private rental accommodation to private rental accommodation, from friend to family to friend, it costs them. They keep getting further behind in their financial standing and have less chance of getting anywhere.

At random I have pulled from my correspondence a letter which is a typical story. Although it is not one of the worst stories, it is one of the easiest stories in terms of people being able to deal with it. It is about Melissa, who is 19, has one small child and is pregnant again. She was not able to stay with her partner because of his violence so she returned to her family home, where she is living in one very small room with her young child. The result of this is that they are on top of each other all the time. They disturb each other's sleep and they are just not able to get on. She is expecting another child

very soon and is wondering how on earth she and two children will fit into one small bedroom in her parents' home.

Melissa did not tell us much about the rest of the family in terms of the distress it is causing them, but so many people in a similar situation tell me about the distress caused to the rest of the family, particularly when an older family member is unwell or infirm and there is a young child crying in the middle of the night. The ears of 70 year olds and 80 year olds are not used to babies' screaming in the middle of the night. They find it very distressing.

This sort of story is repeated again and again. People in this situation are absolutely staggered that they cannot get public housing. They believe they are exactly the sort of person that public housing is designed for: someone who is not accommodated by the private rental market. Even if they could get stable private rental, they would still feel insecure because they are always worried about the house being sold over their head, but most of them cannot get near the private rental market because they do not have a credit rating, utility bills in their own name, jobs or referees. These young people are just facing an incredibly difficult start to their adult life, and the same applies for many older people in the community.

Housing was an area that was seriously neglected yet I have to tell my constituents that despite the election of a Labor government we will not be able to address it overnight. It took eight years for the former government to madly sell off 8 000 houses; we are not going to be able to replace them in anything like that time, particularly while we have the Howard Liberal government in Canberra with no understanding whatsoever of the housing crisis that faces our community.

I would like to talk about some positive things for the last couple of minutes of this address. I have been really pleased that the Noarlunga theatre has remained open, and I would like to particularly commend Tony Brookes who is the author of a new play that recently premiered at the Noarlunga theatre. It premiered on Anzac Day and is entitled *Ice*. It celebrates the achievements of Douglas and Paquita Mawson. That was excellently supported by a superb sound production from John Wilson from TAFE. John is doing a magnificent job of encouraging community use of that theatre.

I would like to commend the success of the Lonsdale Business Association in getting such solid membership operating in the area and of really developing a charter for what needs to be done to enable its members to thrive. One

of the first things it has identified as being required is an audit of just what the infrastructure is to support business in that area. It was promised to them for some years by the previous government. It has not yet been achieved but I am confident that it will be achieved within the first four years of Labor governance.

I would also like to commend our neighbourhood centres who provide a real anchor in our community. It is somewhere for so many people to go, feel loved and be loved, to contribute to the community, to develop new skills and to develop confidence. The neighbourhood centres in the south, under the leadership of the Reynella Neighbourhood Centre, recently conducted a very successful study on marketing thanks to the leadership of Maralyn Blake and Gabrielle Kelly. They will be enabling more members of the community to get the benefit of the neighbourhood centre.

In closing, I would like to thank my campaign team, particularly Susie Duggin and Sherina Kuik, who worked incredibly hard to ensure that Reynell was so successfully returned for Labor. I would like to acknowledge the many volunteers who worked on the campaign. They do a magnificent job, and it always stuns them when they find out that so many Liberal helpers are paid. These were simply not paid and gave up much of their time and their leave.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired. Before I call the minister, I remind everyone that parliament is sitting next Monday.

The Hon. J.D. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.48 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 13 May at 2 p.m.

Corrigenda:

Page 11—

Column 1—

Line 11—For 'many' read 'some'.

Line 19—For 'Six' read 'During the six'.

Line 26—For 'decision' read 'system'.

Line 38—For 'and' read 'or'.

Line 54—For 'precedence' read 'precedents'.

Line 54—Start new paragraph at 'Constitutional'.

Line 56—For 'precedence' read 'precedent'.

Column 2—

Line 28—After 'join' insert 'with'.

Line 51—After 'it' first occurring insert ','; after 'gone' insert ','.