

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 13 May 2002

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

HOSPITALS, NOARLUNGA

A petition signed by 1 164 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to ensure that the government funds intensive care facilities at Noarlunga hospital, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

WESTPAC CALL CENTRE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to announce today that many Ansett workers who were employed at the Ansett Contact Centre at Bedford Park are about to be thrown a lifeline by the Westpac Banking Corporation. Westpac announced this morning that it executed heads of agreement with the Harmony Corporation to secure a long-term lease of the former Ansett centre at Bedford Park. The centre has been empty since the last of the Ansett workers left there in February this year.

Part of the agreement signed this morning includes expanding the centre's facilities to accommodate 670 workers on site. Westpac will relocate its 350 call centre workers from its current centre at Lockleys into Bedford Park and then expand that work force by up to another 350 workers over the next three years. Leaving the Lockleys centre will allow EDS, which also occupies that facility, to expand its operations in the future.

As we know, about 380 Ansett workers were previously employed at the Bedford Park centre. It is understood that more than 300 of those call centre workers have been out of work since losing their jobs in December last year and February this year. Westpac will establish a special hotline for the former Ansett staff to register interest in the new positions being created by Westpac. The former government began the early stages of negotiations with Westpac to move into the empty Ansett building and when Labor took government we continued those negotiations through to their successful conclusion this morning. Once again, it is an example of bipartisanship working in the interests of the state. This is great news for the former Ansett workers and great news for South Australian jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I would like again to acknowledge the work done by the previous government in putting the jobs expansion program together—a process that began in year 2000. The important thing is that the call centre will be open. There will be more jobs, 350 more, and the Ansett workers who lost their jobs will be able to register their interest in taking up these new positions prepared by Westpac.

BEVERLEY URANIUM MINE, MINUTES

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to table two documents which were referred to last week as minutes provided to me from the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER: You will not need my leave; you are tabling the documents.

BEVERLEY URANIUM MINE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I informed the house last week of a special task force to inspect the Beverley uranium mine following growing concern within government over the number of reported spills at the in situ leach mine site. This government has made it clear from day one that it is committed to maintaining the highest environmental standards, especially in areas such as uranium mining. That is why, in conjunction with the Minister for Mineral Resources Development, I asked the Executive Director of the EPA, Mr Nicholas Newland, to lead a top level task force to inspect the mining operations of Heathgate Resources at its Beverley uranium mine last Friday. The EPA task force also included senior officials from PIRSA, the DHS Radiation Protection Branch and members of Workplace Services.

The focus of the task force's investigation at Beverley was on three key areas, namely:

- assessing the operational procedures of the mine;
 - examining workers' safety in the context of extraction of and potential exposure to radioactive substances; and
 - potential and actual environmental harm.
- The task force spent several hours at the mine last Friday and offered, as its interim conclusions, the following points:
- No ABS pipe work or fittings are to be used in new or replacement plant. This type of piping has been linked to a number of the equipment failures associated with previous spills.
 - Secondly, the findings of the hazard and operability study on the ISL plant undertaken by the company must be implemented by 15 September 2002 and be subject to scrutiny by the EPA and PIRSA.
 - Thirdly, the processing plant must have adequate secondary containment to back up the concrete bunding. Currently no backup is in place.
 - Fourthly, the wellfield must have adequate secondary containment. Again, there is no secondary containment in place.
 - Fifthly, no new plant to be installed or modifications to the existing plant to be made without being reviewed by a hazard and operability study.
 - Sixthly, no new plant to be installed or modifications to the existing plant to be made without being reviewed by PIRSA in consultation with the EPA.
 - Seventhly, while the evidence indicates that there has been no harm to workers or the surrounding environment from radiation, the company needs to have a clear process for stockpiling and ultimate safe storage of soil affected by spills of radioactive material.
 - Eighthly, incidents involving loss of processing fluids due to mechanical failure of equipment or control system malfunction to be considered in detail by the independent

review group on spills, with consideration of such spills being reported to the EPA.

And, finally, increased input of the EPA in monitoring and evaluation of environmental performance.

The task force will finalise its full report later this week, and I will make the contents of that report available in full to the house this Thursday. The task force indicated that its activities received the full cooperation of Heathgate Resources Management, which agreed that steps must be taken to improve the mine's operational integrity and to minimise the possibility of future spills.

Finally, I want to assure the people of South Australia that the government takes its environmental commitment seriously. With two spills at the Beverley Uranium Mine in less than a week, this government acted promptly to investigate the mine's activities. A decision to inspect the mine was made within 24 hours of the announcement of the second spill. The next day, a team was assembled and sent to the mine the following day.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I don't think the member opposite should lead on this issue. He has really got a glass jaw on this. The next day—

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The minister sought leave to make a ministerial statement, not debate with members on this side of the chamber, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The next day a team was assembled and sent to the mine the following day. The interim findings have now been reported to parliament, that is, less than five days after the second spill. As I indicated earlier, the task force is working on the final report, and I am told that I will be able to make that report available in full to the house this Thursday.

TAXIDRIVERS

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I rise to bring to the attention of the house the actions that the government is taking in relation to the two deplorable attacks on taxidriviers over the last week. In addition to the weekend's attack, a driver was stabbed and robbed recently at Croydon Park. I know all members would condemn these mindless acts of violence committed against these two individuals and other South Australians working in the service industry, and hope that the perpetrators are quickly brought to justice.

Labor came to government with a comprehensive taxi platform. It recognises the very difficult economic conditions that the industry faces—increasing costs, reported decline in patronage and low returns to drivers—and that, in order to provide a quality service, drivers need to be able to make a living. Labor stated that it strongly supported the installation of security devices in taxis and that it would work cooperatively with the industry to achieve this.

Labor also stated that it would extend the Liberal government's moratorium on the mandatory installation of security cameras for a further 12 months from its expiry in February 2002. Labor also committed to the establishment of the Premier's Taxi Council to meet at least every three months to provide a strong consultative forum for the industry on strategic issues. Moves to establish the Premier's Taxi

Council are under way, and discussions have occurred with the Premier regarding this commitment. Further details will be provided to the house on this initiative soon.

However, in the interim and in the light of these two recent events, I have called a meeting of key industry participants that will be held as soon as possible this week to examine measures that can be urgently taken to improve the safety of drivers and, hopefully, drastically reduce the occurrence of such events. I will report further to the house on this matter.

CSL YARRA

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: No further leave is required.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I rise today to provide details to the house on the matter involving Canada Shipping Lines and maritime industry unions in relation to the CSL *Yarra*. This dispute is about a CSL decision to replace the Australian crew with Ukrainian workers. On 4 May, the *Yarra* was sold from an Australian registered CSL company—CSL Australia Pty Ltd—to an overseas registered CSL company—CSL Pacific Shipping Inc. On the same day, 4 May, the *Yarra* was registered in the Bahamas. The *Yarra* has operated in Australian domestic waters transporting material for the cement industry, predominantly travelling between Adelaide, Melbourne, Brisbane and Port Kembla. The *Yarra* is involved in transport within Australia.

The *Yarra* was an Australian owned and registered ship, with an Australian crew, plying Australian waters. On 4 May, the *Yarra* ceased to be Australian owned or registered. The position of the crew is still before the courts and is the focus of the present dispute. Initially, the unions obtained an injunction restraining CSL from proceeding with its planned reflagging and sale of the *Yarra*. However, when the matter went before the Federal Court for trial, the unions were unsuccessful. The court held that CSL's actions did not breach the federal government's Workplace Relations Act, even though CSL did intend to dismiss the Australian crew with a view to replacing them with cheaper Ukrainian sourced workers. The unions have appealed against the decision.

On 2 May, the company ordered the *Yarra* to port to shut down and ordered the crew to go home. On 3 May, the unions applied to the federal Industrial Relations Commission for an order to stop CSL's actions. The commission agreed that CSL's actions were industrial action as defined by the Workplace Relations Act. However, when the commission issued its decision on 7 May, the *Yarra* had been sold and registered in the Bahamas. Due to the sale of the *Yarra*, its registration in the Bahamas and the fact that the Federal Court was still dealing with the matter, the commission declined to exercise its discretion to make an order. CSL has undertaken not to dismiss the workers until the Full Bench of the Federal Court hears the appeal. Notwithstanding that, they have been ordered off the ship. The captain and the officers have left. However, the crew remains.

The matter came before the Supreme Court last Friday. However, it has been adjourned until this Wednesday. The President of the Australian Council for Trade Unions, Sharon Burrows, has stated that CSL's plan to sell the ship to an overseas registered company and sack the crew, replacing them with cheaper overseas labour, would not be possible in

the United States. The *Yarra's* captain, John Briggs, is reported to have said:

I admire and support those who stay on board to try and ensure the future of Australian shipping, of Australian seafarers on Australian ships. We need to change the [federal] government's mind on the crazy administration of the Navigation Act which allows foreign ships to compete with Australian ships on a totally unlevel playing field, a field which favours foreign ships so much it is ridiculous.

Last week, the *Advertiser* reported:

The *Yarra* paid an estimated \$1 million in taxes into federal coffers last year. Reflagged with a foreign crew, it will be able to trade between Australian ports without paying income or payroll tax.

Captain John Briggs was also reported as saying about the crew that 'some of them are the best seamen I have ever sailed with and they deserve better.' This government says that all Australians deserve better than the disgraceful federal government policy, a policy to hand Australian domestic transport over to foreign companies and overseas workers. It cannot be forgotten that this is Australian domestic transport.

The Deputy Prime Minister, John Anderson, stated on ABC radio on Thursday 9 May that 'the operating costs . . . differences . . . are so wide the Australian government's position is that Australia is a nation that has an interest in reduced shipping cost . . .'. The federal government's policy is to reduce domestic transport by inviting foreign owned ships, using cheaper overseas crews, to service Australian domestic transport needs. Where will it all end—overseas rail companies with overseas rail workers, overseas bus companies with overseas drivers? The federal government is engineering a situation where the only part Australians play in domestic shipping is paying the bills.

The state government is extremely concerned at the cause of this dispute and is closely monitoring all developments. The state government, unlike the opposition, supports Australian workers and their families. The federal government's policy is derelict. It tells Australian workers that they must accept the employment conditions of overseas workers or be sacked. Even that might not be enough, as the federal government's policy provides for the avoidance of Australian taxation. The jobs will remain in Australia, but they will be done by the cheapest labour that can be found by the overseas ship owners.

The effect on Australian jobs is only one part of this tragedy created by the federal government. Can the federal government guarantee that flag of convenience ships will be maintained and operated as safely as Australian ships with Australian crews? Can the federal government guarantee that overseas ship owners and overseas crews will have the same level of commitment to protecting the Australian environment as do Australian companies and crews?

This derelict policy diminishes Australia's ability to ensure that our waters are safe and free from pollution. We do not support selling out Australian jobs and Australian industries. The federal government stands condemned for its treatment of Australian industry, Australian workers and their families.

The SPEAKER: I advise the minister that leave to make ministerial statements is given for the reason of providing factual information to the house. Over recent years ministers have tended to stray into the area of debate, relying on rhetorical questions and statements of opinion rather than sticking to the provision of information. Whilst it is difficult perhaps in every instance to draw a line there, the use of the rhetorical questions and similar devices contained in the

statement just made to the house is a classical illustration of what is not permissible in a ministerial statement and will not be tolerated in future.

AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR PLANT FUNCTIONAL GENOMICS

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: On Friday 10 May the Premier announced that we had won the ability to host the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics. The South Australian government will invest \$12 million over five years, while the federal government and the grains industry will contribute a total of \$20 million through the Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC) and the Australian Research Council (ARC). In the first instance, it is appropriate that I should thank the former government for its initiative in starting this bid in its early stages and working towards this project coming to South Australia. Full credit is due to them for their action earlier in the year.

The Australian Plant Functional Genomics Centre is a major national collaborative arrangement to provide a focus for the identification and application of genes with beneficial characteristics for the Australian grains industry. I am informed that the centre will directly employ an additional 65 science, technology and administrative personnel, with a further 35 PhD and post-doctoral students, who will be funded by industry and are yet to be appointed.

The centre's headquarters and base will be in Adelaide under the leadership of professors Langridge and Fincher at the University of Adelaide, but collaborating partners with a lesser role will come from Queensland University, Melbourne University and the Victorian Department of Natural Resources and Environment.

The infrastructure provided for the Australian Plant Functional Genomics Centre will be part of the new plant biotechnology centre based at the Waite and will provide both public and private sector research groups with access to state-of-the-art equipment, research capability and products of the research. The centre also will be able to house some of the spin-off companies and other commercial activities to build on plant biotechnology at this commercial hub in South Australia.

The Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics is pivotal in South Australia's objective in becoming a national leader in plant biotechnology, building on the recognised national and international capability of the University of Adelaide, CSIRO, the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) and the Australian Wine Institute, all collocated at the Waite. The collaborative initiatives of the Waite provide the unique capability to develop and deliver through the continuum from gene discovery and trait development to gene application and germ plasm development, to variety and novel product development as well as commercial delivery.

The Waite research and development partners have moved to ensure national prominence in plant breeding from discovery to commercialisation. The plant genomics centre will be complemented by a number of other plant science components already based at the Waite. These include:

- The world class plant science and breeding programs in cereals, pulses and legumes; and, recently, the establishment of the wheat breeding company, Australian Grain

Technologies Limited, which will provide one of the commercial focuses for the overall capability.

- The recent establishment of the agricultural node of the Australian genomics research facility at the Waite will provide a commercial focus and capability for high throughput molecular analytical support to plant and animal breeding programs. This facility will build on the successful contribution made by Australia in the sequencing of the human genome.
- The headquarters for the Cooperative Research Centre for Molecular Plant Breeding are also based here.
- There is the national technology delivery capacity of the South Australian Research and Development Institute and linkages that have been established with both the grains industry and the agribusiness sector.
- The nucleic acids and protein analysis unit is also collocated at this site.

This consolidation of plant science capability places the Waite precinct as the leading centre in Australia and places it as one of the top three plant research centres in the world alongside the Max Planck Institute in Cologne, Germany.

In order to remain competitive in the world economy, South Australia must continue to invest in science and technology. However, it is also important to strive for the right commercial climate and incentives to ensure that the ideas and knowledge that are created in South Australia help by investment flow to create products, services and jobs for South Australians. To achieve this, we need to develop closer links between our science base and industry in order to foster and develop the right skills to turn research excellence into commercial and economic success for South Australia.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

The SPEAKER: Order! Members must not make adverse reflections upon the chair in this place or in the media. That has been made plain. Today I warn the member for Flinders, the member for Morphett and the member for Schubert for comments reported in the *Advertiser* on 17 April which had escaped my attention when I made the same warnings to other members last week. Again, I point out that, if members are concerned with my decisions, they may in any way determine that they are clearly able to come, as the practices of the house allow, to discuss them with me. They may not reflect upon the Speaker in the media. In recent days a number of adverse reflections have been made on the Speaker in the *Advertiser* and in the electronic media.

It does not matter that an attack on the Speaker is made directly or made by innuendo, implication or inference. It is, and always has been, unacceptable for members to make adverse reflections on the Speaker, even if done by way of a background briefing or in an off-the-record manner to encourage adverse publicity. It is, and always has been, unacceptable. Amongst other things, members have been quoted refusing to make comments upon the chair for fear of retribution. Such a comment, in itself, is an obvious reflection on the chair—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!—and the practice will not be tolerated. It cannot be, if the house is to function properly. On ABC Radio on 10 May 2002 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated:

I think there's an air of frustration at present in the parliament. I'll say no more than that. I can't comment on the nature of rulings given in the house. The standing orders specifically exclude that.

He went on:

Standing orders of the parliament prohibit any member from commenting in any way that might reflect on the Speaker, so I can't answer any questions.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member was then asked if he would like to; the deputy leader replied, 'Sure I'd like to.' I repeat, if members are unhappy about any ruling made, or even any series of rulings, they have a remedy available to them. They can approach the Speaker privately at any time and I will be happy to discuss their concerns. To date, independently of the invitation which I agreed to and which the Leader of the Opposition took up, no other member has done so. The member for Unley has offered to write to me, and I welcome that.

In responding to this matter and to determine the practice of the house I have consulted the standing orders and extensively researched other documents which determine the practices and the rulings made by previous Speakers in this house and in other places similar to it, particularly the ruling made by the former Speaker on 27 May 1997.

I have given members fair warning of my intention to maintain the practices of the house which protect the office of Speaker. I therefore name the Deputy Leader and provide him with the opportunity to make an apology in a form acceptable to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Deputy Leader wish to be heard in explanation and apology?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Yes, Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker, I apologise if you took any offence at my comments, but I point out that I did a press conference on another issue and, unexpectedly, at the end of that I was asked a series of questions, and I quite rightly pointed out that I could not comment because to do so would be in breach of the standing orders. I think that was a fair and reasonable response.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

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

That the apology be accepted.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

FISHING, COMMERCIAL LICENCES

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier inform the house of the cost of compensation involved to terminate commercial fishing licences in the Murray River and does the Premier believe that adequate consultation was undertaken before the decision to terminate fishing licences was taken? After the election, the ALP agreed to a deal which included the banning of the use of gill nets on the Murray River. The member for Hammond told ABC listeners that the agreed method for compensation would be to pay each of the fishermen a figure based on the net present value of the rest-of-life earnings. Later that day, the Premier queried South Australian Fishing Industry Council claims that the cost could

be as high as \$60 million. The Premier claimed instead that it would cost no more than a couple of hundred dollars in total. This equates to \$10 000 per family for compensation for rest-of-life earnings, a figure which has insulted, and caused much anxiety for, the families involved.

To add to that anxiety, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries confirmed today that commercial fishing licences, which include the use of gill nets, will expire at the end of June and that none of the licences will be renewed, effectively removing the livelihood of these families.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): In the spirit of bipartisanship, I am very happy to provide a briefing for the Leader of the Opposition. I might be wrong, but I understand that the ban was part of the Liberal Party's policy at one stage, was it not?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay, it was not: I accept that. An announcement will be made in the budget, as members would expect with all budgetary measures. However, I will arrange for the minister responsible for fisheries, the Hon. Paul Holloway, to give you a detailed briefing about what is happening because, as you know, there is enormous public support for this measure.

In terms of outlandish claims about how much it will cost, it will be an extremely modest provision in the budget, but an effective and responsible one.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Treasurer advise whether it is true that recent rises in charges for compulsory third party insurance under the former Liberal government have not been enough to ensure the solvency of the Motor Accident Commission? Reports in the media over the weekend have speculated that cumulative rises of over 50 per cent were recommended to the previous government when in fact charges have risen by just over 30 per cent. Is it the case that the Motor Accident Commission now faces financial difficulty if action is not taken to resolve the situation?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I appreciate the question from the honourable member. We were concerned three weeks after being elected and sworn into office to receive the findings of the independent Third Party Premiums Committee chaired by Professor Suzanne Corcoran, including eminent people in our community such as Mr John Fotheringham, the CEO of the RAA, senior transport industry officials and other members appointed under the former government. Their task is to advise government of an appropriate compulsory third party (CTP) insurance premium which takes into account the need to have a solvent and profitable fund and one that is not subjected to massive taxpayer bailout.

I was horrified—as was my colleague, the Minister for Transport—when we officially received this advice. The advice recommends that government increase premiums by a whopping 21.7 per cent. We find that rise unacceptable. A 21.7 per cent rise is too much in one hit, and we can rule that out. We will be making statements soon about the final decision of government.

I advise that over the last four years of the recent Liberal government recommendations totalling approximately 51 per cent were made. However, the former government increased premiums by only 31 per cent. The reason for that is for others to speculate about. However, the solvency of the Motor Accident Commission was around 6 per cent as at

31 December: it is now at 4 per cent and going down. As a comparison with interstate premium solvency, the insurance scheme in Victoria has a solvency ratio of 25 per cent; the Northern Territory, 20 per cent; Western Australia, 14 per cent; and Tasmania even 10 per cent.

Let us look at how the premiums were increased against the recommendation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I hear the member opposite bleating, 'If Labor had only done this or that.' Yes, there was legislation in 1998 to reduce the benefits to injured motorists, and the parliament in a joint sitting of the houses, including members of the Liberal Party who were concerned, agreed to about 50 per cent of the recommendations. Do you know what the then Treasurer did immediately after that legislation was approved for only 50 per cent of the recommendations? He increased premiums by 3 per cent to cover what the parliament did not pass. Any suggestion that the parliament did not pass legislation and that somehow that has impacted on the premiums is wrong because there was an increase immediately after the parliament's not agreeing to the full complement.

In 1999, the third party premiums committee recommended an increase of 10.8 per cent. Do you know how much they put it up? They put it up 2.6 per cent. In the year 2000, a 7.8 per cent increase was recommended. Do you know how much they put it up? It was 2.6 per cent. In 2001 an increase of 13.7 per cent was recommended, but the actual increase was 4.7 per cent. The reality is that the third party premiums were kept down. Why? Because they were going into a state election. This party opposite was prepared to risk the financial ruin of the government's motor accident insurance company and to keep premiums down low in order to try to sneak back into government.

We now have a potentially insolvent motor accident insurance corporation because members opposite, the former cabinet, took a political decision to keep premiums down—and you have put at risk the future of a major government insurance corporation. You refused to take the hard decisions; you did not take the hard decisions; you failed to do the responsible thing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the minister and all members that we do not use the second person pronoun. All remarks must be addressed through the chair. The reason is quite obvious. When accusations are made using the second person pronoun, in this instance 'you', it is a pejorative and it inflames opinion and feeling. The minister should restrict his reply to the substance of the inquiry made in the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I conclude by saying that the former Liberal government embarked upon financial vandalism when it came to the Motor Accident Commission in this state. Labor will take the hard decisions. We will restore profitability and solvency to the Motor Accident Commission, but I do rule out the 21.7 per cent increase recommended. We will deliver a premium which will be a significant increase but which will be fairer on families. The reality is that members opposite embarked upon financial vandalism for their own political gain.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): Can the Minister for Housing confirm that many builders are facing serious financial hardship and laying off staff and/or subcontractors

due to the current crisis in building indemnity insurance, and will she inform the house what action she is taking as Minister for Housing?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I said last week that matters of building indemnity insurance are being handled by the Treasurer.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, if you heard that question, you will know that it was about the problems within the building industry and what action the Minister for Housing was taking specifically to resolve those problems. It was not specifically about solving the problem involving building indemnity insurance. Therefore, I think only the Minister for Housing can answer that question.

The SPEAKER: Can I say in answer to that point of order that there is no point of order, in that it is not a matter for the Speaker to determine which minister should answer: it is a matter for the ministry to determine.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I have been—
Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, no.

The SPEAKER: Now, the member for Mawson and the deputy leader. You have raised the point of—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will come to order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Minister for Housing, I am sure, would like, and be prepared, to answer any question about housing. This is about insurance and, as Treasurer, I have been handling it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, do members opposite want an answer, or not? I am happy to give it, but if they would rather not—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have been meeting regularly with the MBA, the Housing Industry Association and Royal and Sun Alliance and, indeed, my colleague the Attorney-General, as Minister for Consumer Affairs, also has a role in preparing a response from government. I can tell the house that we do have a problem in home warranty insurance—absolutely. But what we have here in South Australia, I am advised, is the capacity by Royal Sun Alliance, through the Housing Industry Association, to cover those builders that meet certain financial eligibility, that those conditions are no less stringent than what was offered previously and that, whilst there is a backlog, they are working through it.

I know what members opposite are saying—that there is a backlog—and I know that the member for Finniss, the deputy leader, has issues with some builders in his electorate, as do other members opposite and, indeed, a number of members on this side of the house (I know that the member for Wright also has raised some matters with me). At our last meeting, I told representatives of the Master Builders Association that we understand—and I do not want to be specific with respect to percentage, except to say that the vast bulk and majority of builders in South Australia do have insurance. Indeed, I understand that one, if not two, of the large builders which were having some difficulty are now in the process of being insured by Royal Sun Alliance.

An honourable member: What about the little guys?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly—and it is a question about the little guys. I have said to the Master Builders Association that I am prepared to offer the MBA the services of my officers to work through those builders that are having difficulty and that we will talk to the HIA. I extended that

offer to the MBA, which has since written back and declined my offer to act as a broker in wanting to get those small builders who cannot obtain cover to liaise with the HIA and Royal Sun Alliance to obtain cover. However, I am happy to again extend that offer to the MBA.

The alternative to allowing market forces to fix this problem, the alternative to allowing the free market to find a solution, is that the government has to underwrite it. Are members opposite suggesting that we should take the risk onto the government's balance sheet? The member for Mawson nods his head.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I did not nod my head, or anything, and I do not want this put on the record. It is not correct.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can I let the member for Mawson know that what he has done is ensure that it is on the record four times, not once, by taking a point of order. Let me make it plain to the minister: he should not use pejorative epithets to bait the opposition. If I have not made it plain before, let me make it plain now: that will be not be tolerated by the chair.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise, sir, and I apologise to the member for Mawson for having his name recorded on *Hansard* if that was not what he meant. In New South Wales and Victoria, because of the different make-up of their insurance businesses, they had immediately to underwrite and offer to underwrite the underwriters for insurance in those two states. What has effectively happened in Victoria and New South Wales is that those governments now have anywhere up to 50 per cent of the housing industry risk attributed to government.

As a responsible Treasurer, I have said that I am not prepared on behalf of taxpayers to take onto our balance sheet—to take onto government—the risk of the building industry if a builder goes broke. I think that is a reasonable position, but members opposite may have a different view. I would have thought that is the responsible thing to do. If the member for Bright has alternative ideas, I invite him to talk to me. I am happy to consult with anyone who can give me some suggestions as to how best to fix this crisis. My preferred position is this: I want the market to fix it. HIA housing insurance tells me it can cover all builders who are financially viable.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is what they are telling me. If the member for Bright talks to me afterwards, I will be happy to talk it through. That is the advice I am getting. I have said to the MBA, 'If your members can't get coverage, I'll sit down in a room and facilitate dialogue with HIA insurance services.' The MBA declined that offer. I know there are issues of membership tension between the two building associations, because both have provided insurance services. I understand that, but I have offered to be an honest broker. My colleague the Minister for Consumer Affairs is considering some other options, and government will make some announcements in the near future. Ultimately, we are doing all we can and being responsible, but I am not about to take onto the books of government the financial risk of underwriting the housing construction industry in this state.

SCHOOLS, SEAFORD PRIMARY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services please advise the house what is

being done to cater for students of Seaford Primary School, which was sadly damaged in last night's fire?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the minister, I point out to the house that, whilst it may seem courteous, it is not essential nor part of practices for members to beg answers from ministers. Indeed, it is the obligation of ministers to provide information.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Sadly, Seaford Primary School today is experiencing the heartache and devastation that comes from an arson attack. Last night, at about 7.30 p.m., the southern suburbs school of approximately 300 students was deliberately set alight, causing a blaze that ended in fire damage to five classrooms, smoke and water damage to others, and an estimated damage bill of \$1 million. Last night I made immediate arrangements to close the school to students today. While part of the school was unaffected, it is estimated that 60 per cent of the school has fire, smoke or water damage. The cooperation of the media was sought to alert parents to the school's closure this morning, and senior departmental officers were on standby, along with the Principal, to speak with those children who did arrive at school unaware of the previous night's events.

Provisions were made to provide emergency child care, but parents chose to take their children back home today. Social workers were on hand to offer support to students, staff and other members of the school community. Education department officers were at school last night and have been there all day assessing the damage, and working with the Principal to make sure arrangements for the students for tomorrow and beyond are in place. The school will be closed again tomorrow while it is made safe, but reception to year 3 students will be back on Wednesday in their normal classrooms, which only received minor smoke damage. Years 4 to 7 students will be bussed to neighbouring Moana Primary and Seaford 6 to 12 schools, where they will remain in the same class groupings, will retain their usual class teacher and have their own classrooms to minimise disruption to their learning. This arrangement will be in place for at least the next four weeks.

This is a most unfortunate attack, even more so because the school is part of a wider security strategy between the department and the local Onkaparinga council which has helped to reduce the incidence of break-ins and vandalism in the Seaford community. Ironically, figures being compiled for the first time show that we have certain success in this area; in fact, there was a 70 per cent drop in break-ins and vandalism in the last school holidays compared to the two weeks prior to the start of the school year, when we started taking these statistics due to measures put in place to avoid break-ins, vandalism and arson. The patrols will be increased for the next few weeks and widened to neighbourhood suburbs where there is the likelihood of follow-up or copycat attempts. The department's personnel are also looking at different patrolling and security measures to lessen those chances of attack and arson.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I rise on a matter of privilege. I believe that a member of this chamber has knowingly and deliberately misled this house in a way that will materially affect the deliberations of this house. By way of explanation, on Thursday 9 May the member for Mitchell asked 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?

In response to that question from the member for Mitchell, the Treasurer said:

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 further quote:

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.

That is the quote from the Treasurer. I have available for you, Mr Speaker, for your consideration a copy of a Treasury minute dated 21 December 2001. For your benefit, Mr Speaker, and for the benefit of the house, I quote from the Treasury minute. The Treasury minute, stamped 21 December 2001, indicates there is a provision of some \$205 million in the budget forward estimates for teachers' pay.

Mr Brindal: How much?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: \$205 million. I quote from the minute as follows: in the year 2003-04, supplementation in the DETE budget of some \$20 million. In the next financial year, 2004-05, supplementation in the DETE budget is some \$40 million. If you look on the next line and at the central provisions provided by Treasury, in the 2002-03 budget, it is some \$27.6 million; in the 2003-04 budget, some \$49.8 million; and in the 2004-05 budget, some \$67.6 million. Adding those five figures together comes to a sum of approximately \$205 million in provisions towards teachers' pay. I believe the Treasurer has knowingly and deliberately misled this house in a way that will materially affect the deliberations of this house. In view of the above, I ask that you rule on a prima facie case of breach of privilege in relation to misleading the house.

The SPEAKER: What the member for Davenport has put before the house is indeed a very serious matter, and the full detail of it was not something which I was able to digest as he revealed it. Clearly, that will require a very deliberate consideration on my part and to that extent I crave the indulgence of the house, assuring it that within 24 hours I will respond to the remark made to deal with the matter in whatever way seems appropriate according to the standing orders and practices of the house in the past.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Unley have a question?

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Yes, sir, I do—many in fact. Will the Minister for Local Government advise this house how many building approvals are stalled with councils due to the lack of building indemnity insurance for builders?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Local Government): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will take it on notice and bring back a reply to him at the earliest opportunity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WOOMERA DETENTION CENTRE

Ms BREUER (Giles): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the house about the role played by State

Emergency Service volunteers in assisting South Australian police to respond to the situation at the Woomera detention centre over the Easter weekend?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): Members will be aware that the state government is currently compiling a bill, which will exceed some \$500 000, for the federal government for providing South Australian police services at the Easter protests at Woomera and other operational matters arising from that. What was not widely reported (or factored into the costs for that matter) or recognised by the federal government was the unpaid work of State Emergency Service volunteers who played a key role supporting police over the Easter weekend.

SES volunteers from Roxby Downs, Andamooka, Whyalla and Port Augusta provided assistance throughout the weekend totalling more than 450 hours of unpaid time. Amongst their many duties, they assisted police at road blocks, and volunteers provided lighting and personnel; they set up shelters and provided meals for the police. I am sure that this in itself will have saved the commonwealth some money, again at the expense of South Australians. I recognise that, in addition to the member for Giles, a number of other members, including the member for Stuart, have raised this issue with me and have been keen to make sure that people are made aware of the work done by the SES volunteers over the Easter weekend.

I acknowledge and praise the excellent work of the volunteers who gave up spending time with their families at Easter to support the South Australian police and their own communities. I assure you, sir, that this government is well aware of the contribution of the State Emergency Service volunteers. We recognise it, even if it is not recognised by the commonwealth, and I place on record in this place my appreciation of their work.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Will the government rule out introducing a new levy, tax or charge to underwrite the building indemnity insurance scheme? Many builders have contacted the opposition concerned that, on top of increases in public liability insurance and the likely increase in WorkCover premiums, they now face a new charge, tax or levy.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): What I can say is that, particularly when this issue first broke, I made it quite clear publicly that, if needs be, we would look at a voluntary levy scheme to operate as an interim measure, exactly as your government did—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will come to order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—thank you, sir—exactly as the former Liberal government did when the HIH Insurance company collapsed. The former Liberal government put in place a voluntary levy scheme of some millions to pay for the home owners who could not get cover. I said publicly in a press release that I was prepared to consider a voluntary levy scheme if that would be of value, that we would have to modify the existing scheme, but that I would give that some consideration. That offer was put to the MBA. At this stage there has been no response. It has not indicated a preparedness to head down that road, but it was certainly something that I said publicly we should discuss if it can work.

HOSPITALS, FINANCE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Can the Minister for Health outline to the house the details of the budget position for hospital services left by the previous minister for human services? On 23 October 2001, during a debate on the Auditor-General's Report, the former minister for human services confirmed that the Department of Human Services had accumulated significant debts.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for this question because it is very important that South Australians are told the truth about the financial situation that we have inherited in our public health system. Between 30 June 1998 and 30 June 2001, hospital service deficits increased from \$11.9 million to \$56.4 million. The projection this year is a further budget blow-out for hospitals of \$9.9 million, bringing the accumulated debt to over \$66.3 million. That is the starting point for the new government on funding our public hospitals. Thanks very much.

The former minister also held discussions with the former treasurer on 20 December last year about a plan to claw back \$21 million of hospital debt. It was proposed that this amount be funded out of recurrent or investment funds and involved cuts of \$8 million to the health services for each of the next two financial years. If we add this \$8 million to the budget overrun of \$10 million, we are starting the budget process for hospital services next year with an \$18 million black hole.

TAXIS, SAFETY

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): My question is directed to the Minister for Transport and, while I note his earlier ministerial statement, I ask: will the government immediately reconsider the policy commitment made in January this year by the then opposition leader, Mr Rann, to defer for 12 months the compulsory installation of video surveillance cameras in taxis and bring forward the date to mid this year? The former Liberal government had set 1 May this year as the date for compulsory installation of video surveillance cameras in all 1 000-plus taxicabs operating in the Adelaide metropolitan area, a date prior to the occurrence of both violent events of which the minister earlier advised the house.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for his question and I refer him to my ministerial statement and ask that he be provided with a copy forthwith.

BAISE MOI

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Can the Attorney-General explain what has occurred in relation to the regulation of the French film *Baise Moi* since he last referred to it in this house?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I am pleased to say that a four-member panel of the Commonwealth Classification Review Board met on Friday and unanimously determined that the film *Baise Moi* be refused classification, that is to say, banned. The decision means that the film cannot now be lawfully screened in Australia and South Australia, and it is effective immediately. In the review board's opinion the film warranted a refusal of classification because it contains elements beyond those set out in the classification guidelines and in the legislation—in particular,

strong depictions of violence, sexual violence, frequent actual detailed sex scenes and scenes which demean women and men.

The review board was of the opinion that, even though the film has significant artistic and cultural merit, that was not enough to override the guidelines. The film has been showing at only one place in Adelaide, that is, the Palace Cinema. Having become aware of the decision, I immediately telephoned the member for Newland to tell her the good news and caused to be sent to the Palace Cinema a facsimile attaching the media release from the Commonwealth Classification Review Board. Indeed, I even sent one of my ministerial assistants on foot from Pirie Street to Rundle Street to deliver the decision to the Palace so that they could be under no misapprehension that it was lawful to show the film. In my view, the decision of the Commonwealth Classification Review Board is the correct one. I applaud their unanimous decision overturning the classification board's six to five decision to give the film an R18+ rating.

If I had followed the advice of the member for the federal division of Makin, Trish Draper, and referred the classification of *Baise Moi* to the State Classification Council, we would find ourselves in the situation where the film *Baise Moi* was banned across Australia but with the possibility that the South Australian Classification Council could reach a different conclusion from the federal review board.

Ms Chapman: Absolute rubbish!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says, 'Rubbish.' Obviously, she is unfamiliar with this area of law, not having practised in it. We would be in a situation where the South Australian Classification Council would still be deliberating on whether or not *Baise Moi* should have a classification in South Australia. If the South Australian Classification Council agreed with the review board, the film would remain banned. However, it is an independent body and may well have come to the same conclusion as the classification board and granted it an R18+ rating. In that case, for the information of the member for Bragg, South Australia would be the only state in the commonwealth in which *Baise Moi* would be screened. I do not think that is a result that anyone but the member for Bragg would have wanted.

POLICE INVESTIGATION

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Has the Minister for Police expressed concern to senior police management about the participation of any police officer in a current investigation, and has any police officer been removed from that investigation after the minister's expression of concern to senior police?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Police): I am a little puzzled by the question but, if the member does have some belief or allegation to make, I would be more than happy to hear it. Certainly, I am unaware of any police officer being removed from an investigation as a result of anything that I have said or done.

WORKCOVER

Mr CAICA (Colton): Can the Minister for Transport advise the house how the planned trip to China by WorkCover officials came to be cancelled and whether the trip had the support of the Liberal government? The Chief

Executive Officer of WorkCover wrote to stakeholders on 14 March 2002. The stated purpose of his letter was:

to clarify the circumstances and issues surrounding the last minute cancellation of a proposed exploratory visit to China involving WorkCover Corporation and other officials.

The CEO went on to say that his cancellation of the trip followed the intervention of our new minister, the Hon. Michael Wright, who summoned him to a meeting earlier this week to indicate that the visit did not have his support.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Colton for his question. It would be fair to say that I am very concerned about government institutions under the former Liberal government using money in unjustifiable ways. This government will not discourage government institutions investing in South Australia's future, but it will insist on government institutions, which want to spend money, justifying it and doing it in the interests of all South Australians.

In regard to this matter, I wanted a good case to be established. I wanted to know the real benefits, and I sought the audience of the CEO and the chair of the board of WorkCover to have clarification and further information about a planned trip to China by some WorkCover officials and, I understand, a couple of people from the Adelaide City Council as well. As an incoming minister, I was a little miffed that I had a thick folder, which had a whole range of helpful briefings but which certainly made no mention of this trip to China. I was a little concerned that I had not been informed about it. I therefore asked for information about the benefits of the trip: how South Australian employers and employees would benefit; what assistance it would provide to the WorkCover system and the major stakeholders; and what was involved in the itinerary. It was general information of that nature that I requested at the time. I certainly did not rule out the trip: I do not think that I had the power to do so, and it would have been fruitless to do so.

However, when given the response by the CEO the very next morning, I was informed that the trip had been cancelled. The CEO also informed me that the Liberal government was aware of the intention for this trip to take place. I was advised by the Workcover CEO that the former Liberal government asked for a briefing on the return from the trip to China. It seems that it would be a little late to get a briefing but, needless to say, that is how the previous government used to operate.

When I asked for the briefing before the trip, the CEO chose simply to cancel the trip. I understand that the cost was in excess of \$100 000. I reassure members of the house that I will continue to support projects and investments which are justifiable and which provide real benefits to the state of South Australia. I will continue to require government bodies to justify their spending. I think a trip such as this must be able to demonstrate real benefits to the major stakeholders, employers and employees. If it cannot do so, it should not go ahead.

HEALTH REVIEW

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Finniss): Will the Minister for Health give details of what the daily rate of pay will be for consultant, John Menadue, who is involved in the health review? What other expenses of John Menadue are being covered, and what is the anticipated total cost of the review?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I will obtain the information for the Deputy Premier and provide it at the earliest opportunity.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Will the Minister for Tourism explain to the house what situation the Adelaide Entertainment Centre is in at the moment and the plans that the government is taking to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood has the call.

Ms CICCARELLO: Will the minister explain to the house the situation that the Adelaide Entertainment Centre is in at the moment and the steps that the government is taking to address the matter?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the honourable member for Norwood for her question. I know that she is interested in live popular music and youth culture. So, she will be interested in the events at the Entertainment Centre. As the three shadow ministers opposite would know, the sort of entertainment that is booked at the centre has been in decline for almost five years. They would know that the number of patrons in 1998 was 309 000; in 2000-01, it had declined to 170 000; and in 2001-02 it has declined to 139 000.

Of course, part of this decline is to do with 11 September and the reluctance of some major touring companies to travel around the world. I understand that other parts of the decline have to do with the demographics of world entertainment in that the large rock bands and entertainment of the past have gone into a decline and there are fewer large tours moving around the world.

An honourable member: Black Sabbath is making a comeback.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: However, we are looking for a Black Sabbath recovery, but at the moment the problem is the level of our Australian dollar, which really does prevent large tours coming to this country. In fact, as the three ministers for tourism would know, the Perth Entertainment Centre recently announced that it would not be taking bookings beyond August 2002. They would be closing down. This would produce a further impact on our ability to attract large events to our city.

Five years ago, there were 98 ticketed events at the Entertainment Centre and next year we expect to have only 46. The operating result after depreciation in 2000-01 was a deficit of \$2 063 404. This has resulted in the organisation itself being forced to act as an entrepreneur. It does this because it realises it needs to protect the 25 per cent of its income which comes from corporate boxes that would otherwise not have any events to see for extended black periods. They have booked six events in the coming year but, because its charter does not allow risk, these have to be careful, small shows which are not big generators of income and which are budgeted merely to break even.

There are several options for the future; several venues would like to move to this site. Members have heard it canvassed and seen it canvassed in recent newspaper articles. In fact, there have been four reports on the viability of the Entertainment Centre in the past two years, but none of them have seriously canvassed what other physical use the site could be used for. I have asked the CEO for tourism to do a scoping study on the site, and I expect a report to be produced

in the next few weeks to suggest what might be happening on the site and how it might be returned to profitability.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS REVIEW

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Can the Minister for Industrial Relations advise the house the total consultancy fee to be paid to Mr Greg Stevens for the conduct of the industrial relations review; how many staff members have been allocated to Mr Stevens across government to conduct the review; and what is the total budget for the review?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The honourable member certainly has a fetish for this particular review which is being undertaken. This will be the first review of its magnitude that will be undertaken since the Cawthorne report in 1981-82. Unlike the previous Liberal government, which brought in ad hoc changes to legislation on industrial relations, this will be a major review that will include all stakeholders right across the board. This is a review of significance and great magnitude which has been welcomed by all major stakeholders in the community.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, sir. Based on some comments you made about ministers answering questions, I would ask you, sir, perhaps after question time, to look at both the question asked and the answer given by the minister, because I believe that the answer is in breach of the standards that you put down for this parliament, as was also the comment made by the previous minister when she said that she knew the answer but was not going to give it—and she did that by way of interjection across the house.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point made by the deputy leader is well made and taken by me.

AIR SERVICES, REGIONAL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): My question is directed to the Minister for Transport. Is the government prepared to provide any assistance to the Australia-wide Airlines consortium in its bid for the Kendell/Hazelton regional air services? Last week the Ansett administrators nominated a preferred bidder for the former Ansett regional airlines services, Kendell and Hazelton, and the bidder, the Australia-wide Airlines consortium, was given 14 days to resolve all outstanding issues. The opposition has been informed that government support is critical to the realisation of this sale by the end of this week. At stake are all 70 Kendell jobs in South Australia; all airline services to Ceduna, Broken Hill, Olympic Dam and Coober Pedy where Kendell is now the sole operator of regular services; and Kendell's share of services to Port Lincoln, Kingscote, Mount Gambier and Whyalla.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I understand that a request came to me today from the company and a whole series of questions were asked of me. I look forward to meeting with the company at the earliest opportunity to discuss that information.

LOCHIEL PARK

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the government honour its pre-election promise to retain 100 per cent of Lochiel Park for open space? On 8 February the Hon. Mike Rann (then leader of the opposition) gave a 100 per cent commitment to retaining open space. He said:

We intend to save 100 per cent of Lochiel Park for community facilities and open space, not a private housing development as the Liberals have promised.

In a letter dated 27 April to Margaret Sewell and Sue Jenkins, the Minister for Government Enterprises gave a commitment to a moratorium but no commitment of 100 per cent retention of Lochiel Park for open space. Will the Premier honour his pre-election promise?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley knows it is not necessary to repeat the question and such practices are disorderly.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted to answer this question from the honourable member. In terms of a summary of the current state of the issue, the government has announced a moratorium on development at Lochiel Park until the end of the year so that community consultation can occur. The Land Management Corporation will shortly begin a public consultation process into the future use of land at the site. The process is anticipated to commence at the end of this month. In the meantime, the Land Management Corporation has resolved not to sell or develop the site this year and is awaiting the outcome of the consultation process. I know that the honourable member would be delighted with my response.

LOYALTY PROGRAMS

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Can the Minister for Gambling advise the house of the existence of loyalty programs operating in the liquor and gambling industry; and is the minister concerned that loyalty programs could exacerbate problem gambling?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Gambling): I thank the honourable member for her question, which is my first question as minister. I was beginning to think I was being ignored so I am very grateful to the member. They say you always remember your 'first' so I remember the member for Wright for this first question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Disorderly conduct opposite is distracting me. I understand a number of loyalty schemes are in operation in hotels and other places where gaming machines are available. Some of those operate only within that particular premises; in other words, if you gamble you can collect points. If you buy alcohol or food in the pub you can collect points and use those in the premises either to get gambling credits or cash for gambling or to buy food or drinks.

Some other schemes are proposed which go across venues. In particular, a scheme referred to in the press a couple of months ago involves a delicatessen in the western suburbs having a card which would allow customers of the deli to purchase goods to obtain points which could then be transferred in a hotel for gaming credits or for cash which could be used for gaming purposes. I was very concerned about that particular form of loyalty program. The first forms are reasonably benign in that they are kept within particular premises, but a form of loyalty program which is spread outside hotels and into places where people buy food could be seen as something which would encourage people into gambling who hitherto had not gambled.

I have asked the Independent Gaming Authority to look at all the loyalty card systems, in particular, to look at that form of loyalty card to see whether or not it is appropriate to be in operation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The IGA (Independent Gambling Authority) will be looking at this and developing a code of conduct, as is its duty. It is not up to me to make these decisions: it is up to the IGA to have a look at this to properly consult with the community. But I can give an indication to the house that the company involved has written to me and said that it will not be using the scheme that it has proposed (this is the J card loyalty system). I have had a meeting with its representatives, and they have undertaken to me that, in their development of this scheme, until the IGA has come down with a set of recommendations, they will not be using this card to allow people in delicatessens or outside of hotels to gain points that can then be used to obtain money to use for gambling. So, that aspect of this particular loyalty system will not be extended until the IGA has come down with its considerations.

OFFICE FOR THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Can the Minister for the Status of Women advise the house of the cost of relocating the Office for the Status of Women from Roma Mitchell House to Terrace Towers, and explain how this cost can be justified as a spending priority for the portfolio?

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: A very important shadow portfolio I enjoy having, thank you. At present, the Office for the Status of Women is centrally located close to several key women's services, including the Women's Information Service—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN:—and the Working Women's Centre at Roma Mitchell House. Collocation of these agencies has provided women with a user friendly, one stop location that is easily accessible to public transport. In terms of the government's social inclusion agenda, it is incomprehensible that it should choose to break up this user friendly set up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The member will come to order! Explanations are meant to be that, not statements of opinion.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for the Status of Women): A number of discussions have been canvassed in the portfolio in regard to the appropriate location for the Office for the Status of Women. Some administrative arrangements have gone through to locate the Office for the Status of Women within the Department of Human Services portfolio, and the discussion about the location is ongoing. When there has been more consultation and when decisions have been made in that area, I will be very happy to report further to this house about the location for the Office of the Status of Women.

DRUGS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Health support a national heroin trial, as suggested by the ACT Chief Minister, Jon Stanhope? On 2 April, the ACT Chief Minister wrote to the Prime Minister, to all premiers and to all health ministers, proposing a jointly funded national heroin trial. Will the minister now reveal her response to the request, and whether

the South Australian government supports a push for such a national heroin trial?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): This is not an issue that the government has yet discussed and, in fact, all issues in relation to drugs and drug policy will be referred to the Drugs Summit, which will occur at the end of June.

STREAKY BAY PIPELINE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the house when the water pipeline to Streaky Bay will be completed? As part of the holistic approach to water on Eyre Peninsula, the state Liberal government approved a connecting pipeline from Poochera to Streaky Bay, where industry and settlement have been held back in the past due to inadequate and unreliable water supplies. To date there has been no announcement from the government as to when or if this vital project will proceed as planned.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I believe that I heard enough of the question—I believe it was about the water pipeline to Streaky Bay. I believe I have the answer but, out of an abundance of caution, I will bring back the details. I believe I have the answer, but I will not venture it. I will bring back the answer to the member in due course.

HEALTH REVIEW

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Sir, I can now provide the answer to the question asked earlier by the deputy leader in relation to payments to Mr John Menadue.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the minister seek leave to make a ministerial statement?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I am sorry sir, my apologies. I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As I said, I can now provide the information sought by the deputy leader. For his services in the generational review of health services, John Menadue will be paid at the rate of \$800 per sitting or other full business day, and \$400 for a half day. He will also be recompensed for travel, which will be at economy class rate, and accommodation and usual expenses. My advice is that this is well within the range of up to \$2 000 per day for people with equivalent qualifications and experience who undertake similar tasks.

In relation to the second part of the deputy leader's question, as announced during the election campaign, an amount of \$750 000 has been allocated to fund the review. This includes the payment of sitting fees for review members, salaries of the review team and the public consultation process.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

McLAREN VALE AMBULANCE CENTRE

Mr BROKESHIRE (Mawson): Last week, the Minister for Emergency Services made some interesting claims—outrageous claims—about a scenario around the

McLaren Vale Ambulance Centre. I happen to have a full trail on this issue, and I just want to put a bit of this on the public record right now, because I think that it is outrageous that we have a government that is out there picking and choosing what sort of projects it will put up and what sort of projects it will knock back. The fact of the matter is that, sadly, some time last year, my office received a report advising that people were very concerned about response times in the Fleurieu Peninsula—and, in fact, I understand that, sadly, a life was put at absolute risk as a result of the fact that there was no ambulance on a particular occasion to be able to attend a cardiac arrest incident.

As the minister responsible for looking after life and for protection, I simply asked the CEO whether or not he was happy with the response times for the ambulance service in that area, given the ageing population, the growth in population and also the issues around road trauma, where in fact we had seen 12 fatalities in the region in the preceding 12 months. The CEO also said that he had some concerns and that he would have a look into it—and in fact, he had raised it with the board, and the board and the executive conducted a study into response times. When I assessed and checked the situation with respect to response times—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police is out of order.

Mr BROKESHIRE:—the fact of the matter was that, regarding priority response times, I was advised that it is normally about seven minutes for life-threatening responses. From memory, I believe that the average response time in the Fleurieu Peninsula, in the area about which I inquired, was nearly 14 minutes, nearly double the time, on a priority A for an ambulance to get to protect a life in our area. On top of that, with respect to priority B, instead of being about 14 minutes, the went out to something—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I seek an assurance that the former minister is not referring to government documents that should not be in his possession. He would only have had the documents as a part of his responsibility as minister, and he certainly should not have copies of them now. I would like his assurance that he is not referring to copies of government documents that he should not have.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will leave it to the member for Mawson to clarify the situation if he wishes.

Mr BROKESHIRE: I am referring to a briefing note that I requested at the time and also using my memory.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I repeat: I want to know what the minister was doing removing government documents. They are not his documents; they belong to the government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the minister for police! The chair cannot determine on the spot whether or not the member for Mawson has in his possession a document he should not have. I leave it to the member for Mawson to explain the situation if he wishes to clarify it.

Mr BROKESHIRE: My understanding is that the response times were way out of kilter. During the same time the ambulance service was responsible for the helicopter rescue service, we wanted to determine whether additional money was available through the tender process than was previously the case. With approval of the executive, it was agreed that that money could be utilised to assist the ambulance budget. The minister also raised the matter of my saying that I was prepared to take a budget bid forward—that

was all—to see whether we could get an increase in the ambulance service. At the expense of the region of McLaren Vale, Willunga, Mount Compass, Aldinga, Port Willunga, Blewitt Springs and Kangarilla, this government is leaving lives at risk as it is way out of the kilter on the matter of priority.

We saw the member for Kaurna raise this as an issue before the election, because members opposite were on a witch-hunt. I say to the minister and the government that, if they do not deliver on a project such as this for the region in the south, they will be the people responsible for the loss of life. If people have further trauma as a result of the ambulances not getting there on time, I will personally hold the government responsible, as indeed will our community. A response time of seven minutes over the appropriate response time for a priority one call is not acceptable to our community. I ask the minister to be fair and reasonable. The matter was independent of me, and the minister knows that. He should assess this matter fairly and reasonably and not on the basis that it happens to be in my electorate. The same issues are occurring when it comes to the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital, and I will have more to say about that.

Time expired.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Before the former minister leaves the chamber, I ask that he deliver to you the documents from which he has quoted for you to peruse. If they are government documents they should be returned to the government; they should not be in his possession. Mr Deputy Speaker, all I ask is that he deliver them to you for your inspection. I ask you to rule that he deliver them to you. He will not do it. He has government documents, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police has made his point.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If he doesn't have government documents, why will he not show them to you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police will resume his seat. I ask the member for Mawson to show to the chair the documents he has in his possession in order to clarify the situation.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I ask you: under which precedent are you asking any member of this house to produce documents to the chair?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I want to establish whether the member was quoting from a document that he should not have in his possession. The ruling is that no member in here should be acting in a way that may be illegal.

Mr BRINDAL: With due deference to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, could I ask you to take the matter under consideration? I know there are precedents in relation to the requirement of government ministers to produce what might be government documents. However, if I were to come in here with an elector inquiry or some other piece of paper—indeed, if any member comes in here—and the chair could ask to see that paper, it would call into question our right to speak for our electors and the confidence our electors might have in what they have given us remaining private. Mr Deputy Speaker, I am not disputing your ruling. I am asking whether you will consider the matter carefully before you finally rule on it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take the point, member for Unley. However, I still believe that the Speaker should be entitled to consider the document that is used, and I intend to put it before the Speaker for his ruling.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have been a member of this place for some 19 years, and this is the first occasion I can recall where a Speaker or Deputy Speaker has asked a member of the opposition to produce any material from which he or she is quoting. It is a vastly different matter when one is in government. A minister is a minister of the Crown, and specific laws relate to ministers that are totally irrelevant to members of the opposition. The member has no responsibility to show to the chair any document that he may have in his possession.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! As I indicated earlier, I ask the member for Mawson whether he is prepared to make the document available to the Speaker so that he may peruse it. I do not have power to compel him to do so. I have only asked him to do so.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. If the member for Mawson is prepared to undertake that he does not have a government document prepared for him by a government agency when he was a minister, I will withdraw my objection. However, I say this: it is highly improper—and I dare say quite possibly unlawful—for the former minister to have copies of government documents in his possession.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I respond by saying that the member for Mawson has concluded his grievance, and I have asked him whether he will make the document available to the Speaker for perusal. However, I do not believe that I have power to compel him to hand over a document.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask that you refer this matter to the Speaker. If that ruling is upheld, and if this opposition comes in with any leaked document, the government has clearly claimed that that would be illegal and a theft. As in other parliaments, we have seen them produce allegedly trunk loads of leaked documents and never been required to table them. I ask how the opposition can function if the government is going to insist that their public servants are guilty of some crime if they leak documents.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police will come to order. I am simply asking the member for Mawson, at his wish, to bring the document to the Speaker for consideration. If he declines, I cannot do anything about it. I call on the member for Florey.

Members interjecting:

An honourable member: You coward!

DRUGS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Tonight at the Tea Tree Gully Civic Centre—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will resume his seat. Members will not call out 'Coward!', and anyone who does so runs the risk of being named on the spot. That sort of language will not be tolerated in here. It is unparliamentary and reflects badly on the whole house. I call the member who has the right to speak, the member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Tonight at the Tea Tree Gully Civic Centre there will be a community consultation meeting which is part of the South Australian Drugs Summit 2002 which was announced by the Premier in

April. At one of many community meetings, the Modbury community will tonight have opportunities to feed ideas and concerns into the summit, which is a crucial step in formulating a coordinated approach to an issue that is the scourge of so many communities today. I will attend the meeting, and I know that as many members as possible will attend the meetings when they go around to the local communities throughout South Australia, and written submissions will also be accepted to this summit.

No longer do we deal only with substances such as tobacco and alcohol, although they are still a substantial problem for people in the community who are addicted to those substances. We now have to face the scourge of amphetamines, the new designer drugs. They will be a major focus for the summit, along with the effects of all substance abuse on young people. Another major focus will be the impact of substance abuse on the indigenous community that continues to suffer and be so decimated in many areas as a result.

The scourge of drugs is a huge issue for the community, and families are suffering. The summit will consult widely and is an initiative under the social inclusion unit. So, a workable course of action will be the result, and it will be duly implemented.

I want to put on record the nine main themes that will be expanded on by the summit: young people and drug use; Aboriginal people and drug use; illicit drugs and community action; breaking the drugs and crime cycle; law enforcement intervention in the illicit drug market; health maintenance and treatment services; illicit drugs and correctional services; school-based drug education intervention; and illicit drugs in rural and regional South Australia. I know that everyone here wishes for these deliberations to be full and frank and all options to be considered in the search for a solution.

I also want to draw the attention of the house to an article in today's *Advertiser*. It is an excellent article of hope by Vivienne Oakley which features one of Florey's wonderful public schools. It also talks about the findings of an Alcohol and Other Drugs Council of Australia project officer, Emma Saleeba. She mentions a paper that will be presented in Sydney today to the third International Conference on Drugs and Young People. I quote from the article, as follows:

Evidence suggested approaches such as random drug testing in schools, expulsion of students for drug use, searches by drug dogs and crackdowns on rave parties have significant limitations. Not only don't they deter drug use but they can, in fact, be counterproductive.

The article also includes a report on the benefits of keeping young people busy and involved in projects that appeal to them, and the Rock-and-Roll Eisteddfod is one of those projects. I note here that last year there was a question of funding being continued for the Rock-and-Roll Eisteddfod. Fortunately, that was continued by the then minister and it is something we need to consider in future as well.

The Rock-and-Roll Eisteddfod is now a regular part of many schools' year. I put on the record here my admiration for Hadyr Maher, the senior in drama at The Heights School. He has put 16 years of work into productions that have invariably made the state finals. I have gone for many years and watched the entire program, staying there until 12 midnight to watch the last act perform. So many students at The Heights School have gone through the project as have families of students. Not only do they go through it and enjoy it, but they come back year after year and support the cast and production. Mr Maher's comments ring true—and I put them on record today, too—where he talks about the demands of

competing in the national event, meaning that students have to be in peak mental and physical condition. He also goes on to say that he believes that such challenges and positive role models keep young people away from drugs.

I put on the record that the summit ought to think about music being part of this attack on drugs within the community. I will talk about the music program in the public schools section and the excellent program offered at Modbury High School under Reg Chapman. Each year we are treated to some fabulous performances. I will be travelling to Mount Gambier this week to see the Generations in Jazz Festival. I also go each year to the Norwood Concert Hall, where greats like Don Burrows and James Morrison work with students across the sectors—public and private—and all sorts of schools. I also want to talk about the fact that music competitions are held annually at the Adelaide Town Hall.

Time expired.

UNLEY ELECTORATE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise on a number of small issues that I want the government to fix in the next week or two.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: That is a tawdry comment, unbecoming of you. Before we changed office I was discussing these matters with ministers and I am quite sure that, were we still in government, we would have fixed them. The issues are these: the reopening, as a priority forthwith, of Millswood station. We made a mistake in closing three of those stations. I had been negotiating with the previous Minister for Transport on the possibility of reopening the station and we were getting somewhere. I simply want this Minister for Transport to reopen the station as quickly as possible. There is no reason for not doing it.

The second issue is Glen Osmond Primary School. That school is an absolute disgrace. The member for Waite took up the matter when it was in his electorate. I will now take up the matter. That school is a beautiful old school, but it is not maintained. I bet the member for Bragg knows about it: it is not in her electorate, but it is in such a disgraceful condition that she has probably heard about it across her border, and it needs to be fixed as a matter of priority. There is for our students and teachers such a thing as occupational health and safety requirements and that school simply does not meet them. I call on the current Minister for Education, as I know the last minister was looking at it, to make it an absolute priority in her budget and to get that school to some sort of reasonable standard and not looking like some refugee shelter from the third world. It is a disgrace and not fitting for any school in any electorate.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The Attorney interjects rudely, which is unlike him. I have been the member representing that school for all of two or three months, and this is my first chance to get on my feet about it, and I am doing that. The previous member was the member for Waite, who also made representations. The third issue is the problem—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The tunnel.

Mr BRINDAL: I will get to the tunnel later—you can build that as well. The third issue—and I am sure the member for Bragg shares some of these concerns—is the matter of air brakes at all hours of the day and night on Portrush and Glen Osmond Roads.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I wrote to the Minister for Transport about it and never got a reply.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General will come to order.

Mr BRINDAL: The Attorney-General says he wrote to the Minister for Transport and never got a reply. He is now the Attorney-General and does not need to write to the Minister for Transport—he can just lean down the bench and, as a more senior minister, say, ‘I wrote to the previous Minister and that minister did not even reply—fix it.’ If that is the answer he gets, I will get up in this place and praise the Attorney-General for fixing it, because I have electors, as does the member for Bragg, who at 2, 3 and 4 o’clock in the morning are subjected to the horrendous screeching of air brakes. Victoria—a place not known for its enlightenment since Jeff Kennett left office—at least has signs in country towns that between certain hours the use of air brakes is simply not permitted. If it is good enough for a Victorian country town to have road rigs—

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Playford says that we have them here. We might, but we do not have them on Glen Osmond, Cross or Portrush Roads. If members opposite think that this problem is so easily solved, fix it. They are three little problems I have outlined today. Members opposite have been gloating about their big salary packages and saying how good it is to be in government. It might be, but it carries some responsibility. You, sir, have been a minister and you know that there is only one thing you are required to do when you sit at the ministerial desk, namely, to make a few decisions. To the rude allegation that I that I took your job, both the Chairman of Committees and I can attest that I never followed the member for Fisher in any ministry at all and, where I did follow the member for Fisher some years afterwards, I found that the work he did in youth was exemplary. I say in this place, as I said to him, a lot of what I put in place as the Minister for Youth followed the work of the member for Fisher, and I am not ashamed to admit it.

Time expired.

TAXIDRIVERS

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I will not mention the remarks of the member for Unley. I will talk about the terrible incident on the weekend of a taxi driver—

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You may think it is funny that a taxi driver was nearly burnt alive while trying to do his job, but I think it is a serious matter that needs our attention. On the weekend a taxi picked up three passengers and a 10 year old boy poured petrol over the driver and yelled, ‘Set him on fire, set him on fire’, so that they could steal \$30 or \$40. Taxidriviers risk their lives when they do their job. They are a form of public transport and deserve the protection of the state and the government. I know that members opposite feel the same way as I do about this.

People who go about their everyday business and go to work deserve protection, whether that involves legislative protection or greater responsibility for police to attend these matters more promptly. When I was a taxi driver, often people in the taxi would refuse to pay, were violent, dangerous or abusive. We would ask for the police to be called and they would take a long time to arrive. I know that the police are very busy and have a lot of responsibility to protect the public. However, cab drivers are often left behind. As a

community we will not accept anyone attacking anyone in their work place or people going about their business. It is simply unacceptable. Pouring petrol on someone and threatening to burn them alive is one of the most vicious attacks I have ever heard of in the taxi industry.

I have known friends who have been stabbed; I have known people who have had ropes put around their neck; I have known people who have had guns pointed into their back while they were driving; but I have never known of a 10-year old boy pouring petrol over a taxidriver. If the offenders are caught, there are questions to be asked. For example, were the other two people in the car the parents of this child? What was a 10-year old boy—

Mr Brindal: They were both males.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Two males.

Mr Brindal: So they couldn’t both have been his parents.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I hope not. What was that child doing in a taxi that late at night? Was the child provoked by the parents? Was the child led by the perpetrators? If the child was being led by the other two people in the taxi, they deserve much harsher penalties than the child, although I am not saying that the child should be let off scot-free.

The idea that cameras are the solution to this problem is wrong. I do not believe that cameras are a deterrent to such violent crime. I do not think that cameras are what the industry wants. I know that our new minister, unlike the former minister, will consult with the taxi industry and speak to the operators on the ground, at the grassroots level, because I can tell you, sir, that the former minister had not visited a taxi company in about a year—she had not been there, had not asked and was not interested.

I know that taxi operators do not want cameras put forcibly in their cars. Maybe there is another solution, and I think there is a happy medium somewhere, but I am sure we all agree that this sort of attack on a taxi driver should not go without some form of government response. It does not mean that we should overreact by making a knee-jerk reaction. I am sure that taxidriviers are more than willing to work with governments. They do not make outrageous claims: they are small business owners and they understand the constraints of running a budget and a business, but they do not want to see their taxes wasted either. They want to work with us and, if we listen to them and take their advice, I am sure that we can reach a happy medium.

That does not mean that the new shadow minister for transport should suggest that the government should bring forward the installation of cameras in taxis. I do not think that is the answer. I think that the answer might lie with the Attorney-General, but I do not know. I want to discuss the issue with a few of my colleagues and with the taxidriviers who reside within my electorate, and with those who do not. I know that members on both sides have a number of taxidriviers in their electorates and I know of their concern for their safety. Hopefully we can work through this problem together and resolve it. I believe that the public is outraged by this attack, as is this house, and I ask members to consider it.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, and I apologise, but I did not want to interrupt the honourable member, who was making an important speech. However, in introducing the topic, I believe the member said that I was making fun of the topic that he was about to introduce. I object—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order; it is a personal explanation. Does the member seek leave to make a personal explanation?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I will not repeat what I just said. Suffice to say that the member had not introduced his topic; I was not making fun of it; and, if that is what he said, I ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I know that the member for Unley has an affection for taxidrivers, and I withdraw it.

VOLUNTEERS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Last Thursday I brought to the attention of the house a concern of one of my constituents who does voluntary work at a kindergarten and who found it really hurtful that she had to sign a contract about how to behave in front of children, with particular regard to her concerns about how hugging a child could be misinterpreted. I have spoken to that lady, who is an exemplary elderly lady who gives of her valuable time to volunteer at kindergartens, and we all know how important it is these days to have people who are prepared to give of their time and be role models as grandmothers for a lot of children who do not have contact with their grandparents.

I brought the subject to the attention of the house and I would like to continue with it because I did not have time to point out that I understand, as Val from Campbelltown understands, that we must have strict conditions so that children can be protected. She is not against that, but I believe, as she believes, that at times we go too far. As she said, she is not a person who is aware of political correctness; she just loves children and wants to help. We have to find a way to allow such people to continue to contribute to society.

South Australia has one of the highest percentages of volunteers per head of population in Australia. Last year, at the many ceremonies we attended, we all celebrated the many volunteer hours that South Australians give. The previous government made a special effort to give recognition to volunteers, and members would be aware of the certificates that were given out, and so on.

We all welcome the support of volunteers. No government, whether it be Liberal, Labor, Democrat or a combination of parties, can hope to deliver services to the community without the assistance of volunteers. I ask members to consider the opportunity costs, the millions of dollars, that would have to be found from budgets in order to make sure that services were delivered. Again, I give full credit to the volunteers in whatever capacity they contribute—those who belong to service clubs, those who volunteer at schools to do extra reading, those who help at kindergartens, and so on.

As I said, the previous government gave due recognition and, last year, it introduced the Volunteers Protection Act, which protects volunteers from personal civil liability. It is a good thing that occurred because we must not only give recognition to volunteers for the importance of their work but also protect them. The opposition will reintroduce the good Samaritan legislation, as is on the *Notice Paper*—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order. For some time now the member has been canvassing the merits of bills of which notice has been given on the *Notice Paper*, and he continues to canvass the merits of those bills. I understand it is contrary to standing orders to canvass bills before the debate on them has occurred.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take note of the point of order. The Attorney is correct. The member must be careful in his remarks.

Mr SCALZI: I am just stating the fact that it is important that we protect volunteers. It is important that governments of whatever persuasion acknowledge and protect the efforts of volunteers, who play a very valuable role in our community. I add also that teachers give of their valuable time not only in the classroom but also by taking sporting teams and so on, and, because of potential civil insurance disputes, a lot of people who have given many hours of their time are really holding back because they are concerned about that type of litigation. We have to be careful not to discourage volunteers, including teachers.

Time expired.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): The member for Hartley has been discussing volunteers, and today is the beginning of Volunteers Week in South Australia, which runs from today until 20 May, which is National Volunteers Day. There will be a week of celebration throughout the state whereby the South Australian community will have the opportunity to say thank you to our many hundreds of thousands of volunteers. On Friday I look forward to attending a function organised by Northern Volunteering to say thank you to the volunteers from the northern suburbs in particular, where my electorate is situated.

When we won government the Premier chose to become the Minister for Volunteers. He believes, as I do, that volunteering is vitally important to our community. He believes that volunteers are an essential ingredient of a caring and cohesive society—and they are. I would say that they really are the heart and soul of our community. Volunteers make contributions in all kinds of ways—in our schools, sporting clubs and communities. They daily, without hesitation, put their lives on the line. During the recent devastating Sydney bushfires I went to see at first hand the bravery and outstanding feats of both the New South Wales firefighters and our South Australian contingent. The Salisbury CFS, of which I am a member, was there and was particularly delighted when, a couple of months ago, Premier Bob Carr visited the Salisbury CFS station and thanked them personally for their efforts.

We see the absolute selfless generosity of those who turn out regularly to contribute to our community. Again, in my electorate we have two Meals on Wheels organisations, for example—Modbury Meals on Wheels and Salisbury Meals on Wheels. The Salisbury Meals on Wheels kitchen organises and prepares over 200 meals a day. It is an amazing feat. Their commitment and organisational skills are as outstanding as they are amazing. There are many pressures on people today. They have extra work pressures and family commitments; they have children, aged parents and family members to care for. But this makes it as important, if not more important, to maintain our sense of community and our sense of belonging, understanding what it is to give, to care and to share. Today the Minister for Industrial Relations spoke about the circumstances of the *Yarra* in Port Pirie. I think that is a perfect example of a committed and caring community—one of which I was proud to be a member for a number of years—coming out and supporting its fellow Australian workers in their fight to maintain their jobs.

I know that the Premier hopes that by taking on the mantle of Minister for Volunteers he can bring a new and greater focus to this important work and hopes to encourage more

people to become involved. The government understands that in today's complex world the volunteering sector is facing a whole new array of challenges, and we acknowledge that steps need to be taken to address these challenges. I was delighted recently to be appointed parliamentary secretary to the Premier and I will be helping him in the volunteering sector. I will be taking a hands-on approach working with the community and the Office for Volunteers to advance the status of volunteers in South Australia. We have over 110 000 volunteers helping out in government programs and over 400 000 volunteers across the state.

We will be taking a strategic cross-portfolio approach in regard to volunteer management, and the member for Hartley referred to some of the problems facing volunteer managers at present. This government will acknowledge the importance of volunteers in real and practical ways. We will actively promote the image of volunteering, and we aim to enhance its image and break down barriers to participation, particularly for young people. It is really important to get our young people out and working in the community. One of the great concerns I have spoken about on a number of occasions in this house is the intergenerational fear that is developing in our community as we segregate the age groups in our community.

I had the pleasure, on Thursday, of attending a precursor function to this week's celebrations. It was a function organised by Volunteer SA, one of the state's peak volunteer agencies.

Time expired.

HEALTH REVIEW

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I need to correct my earlier statement in relation to the payment of Mr John Menadue as chair of the Generational Health Services Review. He is to be paid a consultant's fee of \$900 per day and \$450 per half day, not \$800 and \$400 respectively as I mentioned previously. In addition to the other information I provided previously, the review will be provided with in-kind support by the Department of Human Services.

LIQUOR LICENSING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill makes some significant changes to the provisions of the Liquor Licensing Act relating to complaints about noise and disturbances associated with licensed premises. It is similar to a bill previously before this parliament but, unlike that bill, it does not deal with the question of the review of or appeal against licensing decisions. Members will recall the background. There has been a concern expressed by the live music industry and by publicans that noise complaints by local residents may put at risk the future of live music in hotels and clubs. The former government had, during 2001, convened a working group representing a range of stakeholders concerned with the issue of live music in hotels. The working group made some suggestions for legislative change

to protect the interests of live music. I commend, in particular, the work of the Hon. Angus Redford, who participated in this working group. The bill implements some of those suggestions. It also makes some technical amendments to the act in light of comments of the Supreme Court in a recent matter.

The bill amends the objects of the act to refer to live music as one of the vocations associated with the liquor trade—that is, it will be an object of the act to further the interests of live music, among others. The bill provides that the objects of the act must be regarded in deciding any matter before the licensing authority. This provision is intended to recognise the value and importance of live music in South Australia and to make its interests a relevant consideration in licensing matters. For example, in deciding a noise complaint involving a live music venue, the commissioner or the court would have to consider, among other things, the furtherance of the interests of live music. The bill goes further as a result of recommendations of the working group and adds new provisions designed to balance the interests of local residents and licensees in the process of dealing with noise and disturbance complaints.

The bill proposes that when a complaint is made the commissioner should serve a copy on the licensee within seven days and that there should be then 14 days before the matter progresses to conciliation or hearing. This is to ensure that the licensee is aware of the concerns being raised by the complainant, and also provides an opportunity for the licensee to address the complaint if he or she agrees that there is a problem, or for the parties to seek to resolve the matter if so minded. Thereafter, a conciliation will normally be held, but the bill also provides for a party to apply to the commissioner to proceed directly to a hearing. This can occur if the commissioner is satisfied that good reason exists. It will be for the commissioner to consider this case by case.

Further, the bill creates a new choice for the parties to a complaint that is not resolved in conciliation. Rather than having to go to the Licensing Court, as at present, the parties can agree to have the matter determined by the commissioner. So, the bill puts parties to such a complaint in a similar position to parties to a contested application, in having the choice whether to have the commissioner or the court determine the matter. The provision does not, however, alter the present position, where either party for any reason objects to the commissioner determining the matter. Either party can still insist that the matter go before the court.

Finally, the bill sets out a list of matters that it is proposed should be regarded by the licensing authority in determining a complaint. These include the period over which the activity complained of has been occurring, the unreasonableness or otherwise of the activity, the trading hours and character of the business conducted at the licensed premises, the desired future character of the area, as provided in any relevant development plan, and relevant environmental policies or guidelines. These are all factors to be weighed, although none is decisive, and any other relevant matters must also be considered. It is hoped that by spelling out these relevant matters in the bill, it is made clear that the history of the activity at the premises, such as the history of live music, such as the Governor Hindmarsh at Hindmarsh in my electorate, can be taken into account, as can whether the activity or noise from the premises is reasonable or not in all the circumstances, and factors such as whether the area is residential, commercial or mixed use. That is, the complaint is not decided in isolation, but is considered in its proper context.

Of course, the bill does not propose to apply any fixed rule in dealing with these complaints, nor does it propose to privilege any category of complainants or respondents. Each complaint must be considered individually on its merits, having regard to all relevant factors. The government believes that this is the approach most likely to lead to a just result.

The bill also adds a new provision that the licensing authority may grant an application on an interim basis, or specify that a condition of a licence, permit or approval is effective for a specified period. There is no such express power in the act now. This puts beyond doubt that the authority may grant approval on an interim basis, for a trial period, before deciding to confirm or alter it. This is desirable because a licensing decision can have significant consequences for both the parties and for the community and the public, and it can be valuable for the authority to be able to evaluate the likely consequences of the proposed decision, through a practical trial, before committing itself to a final decision.

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

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Indeed, this is often welcomed by the parties as it gives the applicant the opportunity to prove the decision desirable and the respondent the opportunity to assess the real effects of the decision, before it becomes final.

Further, the bill makes two minor technical amendments to the Act, arising out of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Liquorland (Aust) v. Hurley's Arkaba Hotels*, a judgment of the Full Supreme Court handed down on 18 July 2001. It adds to section 61(1) the missing words 'the removal of'. That is, the applicant for removal of a hotel licence must show that the removal of the licence, rather than the licence itself, is necessary in order to provide for the needs of the public in that locality. This is obviously the meaning of the section and the words were simply omitted in drafting.

The bill also makes a minor alteration to the provisions of s.77 relating to objection to an application. In the *Liquorland* case, the Court noted that the grounds of objection to a retail liquor merchant's licence in s.77(5)(c) fail to mirror the matters which the applicant must prove, that is, that the existing licensed premises in the locality do not adequately cater for the public demand for liquor for consumption off licensed premises, and the licence or the removal is necessary to satisfy that demand. The amendment would repair this defect by deleting the word 'provide' and substituting 'adequately cater'. Clearly it is the intention of the Act that the objections to be taken relate to the criteria for the grant of the application.

The amendments proposed by the bill are intended to make the procedures in this jurisdiction more internally consistent and more effective. I commend the bill to honourable members.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides that this Act will be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Objects of this Act

This clause amends the objects section of the Act by, firstly, including the live music industry in the list of associated industries the interests of which are to be furthered, and secondly, by providing that the Commissioner and the licensing Court must have regard to the objects of the Act when making any decision under the Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 53—Discretion of licensing authority to grant or refuse application

This clause makes it clear that a licensing authority (i.e., the Court or the Commissioner, as the case may be) may grant an application on an interim basis, or impose a condition for a specified period, and give any necessary consequential procedural directions.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 61—Removal of hotel licence or retail liquor merchant's licence

This clause makes a small amendment to clarify that an applicant for removal of a licence to a particular locality must satisfy the licensing authority that removal of the licence to that locality is necessary to satisfy the needs of the public in that locality.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 77—General right of objection

This clause makes a minor amendment to achieve consistency of expression between section 58 (grant of hotel licence or retail liquor merchant's licence) and section 61 (removal of such a licence).

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 106—Complaint about noise, etc., emanating from licensed premises

This clause makes several amendments to section 61. Firstly, the Commissioner must cause complaints to be served on licensees within 7 days of lodgement. No meeting or hearing can be held for a period of 14 days. Secondly, it is provided that a party can request that the matter proceed direct to a hearing without attempting conciliation, but, for this to happen, the Commissioner must concur. Thirdly, the Commissioner will determine a complaint if the parties so request. Fourthly, in determining a complaint, the Commissioner or the Court (as the case may be) must now take into account various matters. The relevant history of the licensed premises in relation to other premises in the vicinity and, in particular, the period of time over which the subject matter of the complaint has been occurring must be considered, as must any significant changes in its level or frequency. The unreasonableness (or reasonableness) of the actual behaviour or noise is to be assessed. The trading hours and character of the licensee's business, the locality's desired future character set out in any relevant Development Plan and any applicable environment protection policies or EPA guidelines must also be taken into account.

Schedule—Statute Law Revision Amendments

The Schedule makes several non-substantive amendments of a statute law revision nature.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION (COMPULSORY EDUCATION AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Education Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: 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 government has a commitment to improve the economic and social outcomes for young people and education is one of the key vehicles to the achievement of that goal.

Fewer of our young people today are remaining at school until year 12 in South Australian schools than was the case in the 1990's, particularly in the early 1990's. There is clear evidence of the link between young people proceeding through education and training, getting a good education and training, and having success in finding long-term employment. The link between school leaving age and unemployment rates is strong. For example, the Transition from Education to Work statistics show that at August 2001 12.7 percent of people who were schooled only to year 10 were out of work compared with an unemployment rate of 8.5 percent for those who completed year 12.

Overseas trends are to raise the school leaving age and extend the period of compulsory education. For example, fifty American states and countries including Britain, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Spain, Sweden, Germany and New Zealand have a school leaving age of at least 16 years. Tasmania has had a school leaving age of 16 for some years. Queensland has recently released a green paper debating the school leaving age and has proposed raising the school leaving age to 16 or 17 years in the paper.

The amendments to the Education Act 1972 are intended to send a strong message to schools of their responsibilities to the educational welfare of these young people. The Education Act 1972 currently requires student to remain in school until their 15th birthday. For the majority of young people that means staying in school until year 10, but with changes made to early childhood education, a significant portion of our students who leave school at 15 are leaving at year 9 level. It is the government's view that this does not give them a sufficient basic education to sustain a successful transition to adulthood or the skills needed to compete in the labour market. The education and skills gap compared with someone who completes year 12 is too great.

The government is addressing this problem by introducing this bill to amend the Education Act 1972. Under this amendment bill from January 2003 children will be required to remain enrolled at school until they turn 16. They will be able to stay at school or participate in other forms of education and training, but they will be required to remain enrolled at school to enable them to receive improved support and assistance and to stay engaged in their learning.

Two previous attempts were made to raise the age of compulsory education. In July 1996, Labor Leader of the then Opposition in the Legislative Council, Hon Caroline Pickles, introduced legislation to make it compulsory for children to be enrolled in schooling or an approved form of training until the age of 16. That legislation was opposed by the then Liberal government whose education minister told Parliament on 2 July 1997, in opposing the bill:

This will be one of the significant issues of difference between the government position on education and that of the Labor Party. The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mike Rann) has indicated that this is a key issue for him as Premier. (They) have indicated that, if the government opposes this issue, the Labor Party will campaign long and hard about it in the schools and, should they be elected to government, this policy will be implemented by a Labor government. I am delighted to hear that the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor education spokesperson feel so strongly about this issue and will seek to make it a campaigning point. The government strongly opposes this bill. We see it as being ill-conceived.

After the Labor Party took the policy of raising the school leaving age to 16 to the 1997 State Election another attempt was made on 26 October 2000 to raise the school leaving age when I introduced the Education (Compulsory School Age) amendment bill on behalf of the then Opposition.

Despite public statements from March 1999 by former Premier John Olsen that his government would legislate to raise the school leaving age, no such legislation was introduced by the former Liberal government in their previous term of office.

This government recognises that simply raising the school leaving age will not address the problem: schools must and will develop specific strategies to meet the needs of those young people who find that schooling does not suit their needs and is not relevant to their lives. The government is therefore proposing to improve counselling and one-on-one support services to help students identify a clear path, and, if they falter, to be there to help them on their course. In addition, there will be targeted programs at schools where there are particularly high numbers of students who do not complete their schooling.

As is currently the case under the Act, it will be possible under the proposed bill to seek exemptions from the compulsory attendance provision. 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 abandon their middle years of schooling and in doing so disrupt their peers. Nor will it be acceptable for schools simply to use suspension or exclusion to avoid supporting these students in the future. The government is committed to the education and training of our young people and this bill is the first step in achieving our objective.

A provision for expanded exemptions by the minister from compulsory attendance requirements is included in the bill in order to allow for new negotiated arrangements for students who choose to participate in training or further education options outside of the school setting.

I commend this bill to the house.

Explanation of clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides that the Act will come into operation on 1 January 2003.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of 'child of compulsory school age' with the effect of raising the school leaving age from 15 years to 16 years. The intention of this amendment is to ensure that all children under 16 years of age will be involved in some sort of education or training.

Clause 4: Repeal of s. 77

This clause repeals section 77 which provides for exemptions by the minister from the compulsory attendance provisions. This exemption power will now be found at new section 81A.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 78—Employment of children required to be enrolled

This clause strikes out subsection (2) of section 78 which provides for exemptions by the minister from the provisions prohibiting the employment of children of compulsory school age. This exemption power will now be found at new section 81A.

Clause 6: Insertion of s. 81A—Exemptions

This clause sets out an expanded exemption provision. New section 81A gives the minister the power to grant an exemption from any requirements of the Part (consisting of sections 74 to 81), conditionally or subject to conditions. An example of such a condition could be that the child attend training of a particular kind for a certain number of hours per week instead of attendance at school. The clause also gives the minister the power to vary or revoke an exemption. Subclause (3) makes the contravention or failure to comply with a condition of an exemption an offence attracting a maximum penalty of \$500.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 9 May. Page 120.)

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech opening this session of the 50th Parliament. I also offer my congratulations to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your elevation to the office you hold in this house, and also offer my congratulations to the Speaker. I also welcome the new members on both sides of this house, and to those who have been re-elected: well done on your campaigns and welcome back. I am looking forward to working with all members during this 50th Parliament.

It really is difficult to believe that 4½ years have flown by since I was first elected in October 1997. Back then I was a very green politician and childless. Now I am far more seasoned as a politician and thoroughly enjoying motherhood. Tilly is now 3½ years old and a source of constant joy to both her mother and father.

I wish our new Minister for Education, the Hon. Trish White, all the best over the coming months as she awaits the arrival of her second child, and I commend her for the example she is setting for other women. I thought it was a mighty effort just to be a new mum in this job, but new mum twice over and minister for the second largest budget portfolio is no mean feat.

The election of 9 February 2002 was my first report card. Having served in the 49th Parliament, the people of Chaffey were judging me on what I had achieved and not by what I promised. In preparing for my campaign, I had cause to reflect upon my first 4½ years as a parliamentarian. It has been an extremely steep learning curve. I have forged many new friendships and built partnerships with a whole host of community organisations in my electorate. Just discovering who and what made my communities tick was a mammoth task in itself. Very early in my first term, I realised the importance of getting out there and making myself available to the broader community. My experience in getting to know the Riverland and Upper Mallee communities has been enormously fulfilling, and I am extremely privileged to represent the seat of Chaffey. I have also had the privilege of working with countless wonderful people, and, for most, just to serve the communities they live in is the motivating factor.

As a community, we have achieved so much. It is only by working together that this is possible. In health, together with

the Riverland community, we have delivered a new 25-bed aged care facility at the Waikerie Hospital; air-conditioning for the Barmera Hospital; the process has commenced for the upgrade of the Renmark Hospital acute facilities; and three new resident specialists have moved to the region. We now have more GPs servicing our community than ever before. This does not happen as a result of individual effort, but because a community makes it happen. Our challenges in respect of meeting the demands of the community in the future are immense, but with a whole of community approach, we stand a better chance than most.

In the Riverland, we have embraced the challenge of education for rural doctors. Our highly successful PRCC program, in partnership with Flinders University, has provided student GPs with the opportunity to experience country practice first hand. Our success in attracting \$12 million in federal funds to support a regional clinical school is acknowledgment of our commitment to rural doctor education. This year we have also successfully attracted 20 university nursing placements through Flinders University—locals studying locally for the benefit of the region.

The member for Wakefield and Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Hon. Neil Andrew, must be congratulated for his efforts on behalf of the Riverland community. When we can, the member for Wakefield and I work closely together in support of state and federal government projects to assist our community.

Education is a key element to the success of a region, and my community has been at the forefront of driving initiatives to bridge the gap between metropolitan and regional education. Vocational education training is a key element in providing information on career alternatives to students, and providing them with valuable work experience. Our school industry links committee has worked with the EVE coordinator in the region to drastically improve the traineeship uptake in the region. We have a long way to go with apprenticeships, however, and there needs to be a concerted effort to improve in this area. The user-choice funding for trainees, I believe, needs reviewing as the criteria inhibits the uptake of trainees, particularly horticultural trainees, in the rural sector.

In Renmark, the Tolley committee has been working on a proposal to integrate tertiary learning opportunities through a central administration in the Riverland. The proposed Chaffey Learning Exchange offers real opportunities to use today's technologies and networks to ensure that it is no longer a disadvantage to one's learning capacity to live outside the metropolitan area. Other educational highlights include the commitment to the redevelopment of the Loxton High School after 30 years of lobbying by the Loxton community; and the establishment of the Waikerie Children's Centre, built during the term of the Liberal government but opened by our new minister, the Hon. Trish White—and a mighty fine establishment it is, too. I know first-hand because my daughter is a regular attendee there. During my first term I was also successful in introducing a private member's bill that prevents school closures without community consultation.

During the past 4½ years my passion has been for the Murray River. The Murray River is the lifeline to this state, but for Riverlanders it is our life blood. We face tough times ahead negotiating a sustainable future for our river with our eastern neighbours. There has been a considerable amount of negative publicity about the plight of our river, but for the record I highlight the considerable efforts made by the Riverland community and the former State government—and,

hopefully, the present State government—to ameliorate the situation.

The Liberal Government committed the state to the \$100 million national action plan for salinity and water quality. The sum of \$40 million has been invested in the rehabilitation of the Loxton irrigation scheme; and \$7.2 million has been expended to build the Qualco-Sunlands ground water scheme. This initiative has delivered a ground-breaking scheme to a local community that has also made a significant financial commitment to the scheme over the life of the project. This project took almost a decade to come to reality and, while we are still experiencing some operational problems, it is widely recognised as a leading edge project for future investment in salinity mitigation projects in partnership with the community.

The former government was committed to the construction of salt interception schemes at Waikerie and Bookpurnong/Lock 4. Given the state's obligation under the Murray-Darling salinity strategy, I feel confident that the new government will honour this commitment.

One of the most rewarding roles that I held in the previous parliament was as a member of the Murray River select committee. This select committee spent 18 months investigating the issues plaguing the Murray River, and I believe that the state was well served by the bipartisan approach taken by all members. The committee signed off on a bipartisan way forward, and I will be doing all in my power to ensure that the way forward gains momentum and that real changes that make a real difference will be instituted.

The new government has committed to the introduction of a Murray River act, and I welcome the emphasis it is placing on the importance of the river. I feel confident that with a full consultative methodology to the development of this legislation we will see an integrated approach that will have beneficial outcomes. I do, however, question whether a separate act is necessary. However, if this legislation is a step toward a more integrated approach to natural resource management then it will be a step in the right direction. I do look forward to a continuation of the bipartisan approach to the Murray River issue, and discussions over the next few months will be integral to the success of the government's initiative.

Our new minister for water, land and biodiversity conservation has clearly indicated that he has the will to deliver real change. Let us hope that Treasury will back him up. It is vital for the future prosperity of the Riverland that the government recognise the need for an incentive driven approach to change rather than a heavy-handed legislative approach. I enjoyed working with the member for Kaurna (now the minister) on the committee and I look forward to working with him as the new minister.

The government's commitment to sustainability of the native fish stocks in the Murray River is also to be commended. During the 49th parliament I was a member of the ERD standing committee which undertook an inquiry into the sustainability of native fish stocks in inland waters. Whilst I recognise the emotive concerns of the river fishers and their traditional claim to a state resource, there comes a time when all factors impacting on a resource must be considered when determining whether that state resource should continue to be commercially exploited.

It is my view, and that of the majority of my constituency, as well as that of the ERD committee, that the days of commercial fishing in the Murray River are over. I do, however, firmly believe that the 30 commercial fishers

impacted by the closure of the fishery to commercial take should receive adequate compensation. This is not widely supported in the community, but I believe it is essential to ensure that the individuals and their families are treated fairly.

During my last term I established a consultative group to assist me to gain information about the community's response to fishing issues. This group undertook a survey to gauge the community's position in regard to inland recreational fishing licences. The results were overwhelmingly in support of a recreational fishing licence, conditional upon the removal of gill nets from the river fishery and on the revenue raised being reinvested in the fishery. I have forwarded a copy of our survey results to the new minister, as well as the results of an impromptu petition done by the *Murray Pioneer* calling for the removal of gill nets from the river. I look forward to working with the new minister to resolve many of these issues in the near future.

Over the past 10 years the Riverland has gone from basket case to boom region. However, it is not without its casualties. The citrus industry has undergone tough times with the removal of trade barriers, for example, the importation of cheap Brazilian orange juice concentrates. However, the industry has rallied, changed direction and embraced the global market to the benefit of many. The introduction of quality control measures has seen Riverland growers able to compete in the world market with spectacular results—apart from one recent season. However, it is important that we do not allow opportunism to creep into the equation by quality auditing's falling victim to market abuse by consultants. A review of the Citrus Act has been under way for some time and I look forward to the release of a discussion paper detailing comments submitted during the review.

Fruit fly free status for the Riverland is a key advantage for our produce, but South Australia could benefit significantly if this status could be established for the Japanese market. Recently, Citrus Growers SA and PIRSA trialled a random fruit fly check point at Blanchetown, and the results were extremely disturbing. Over 90 kilograms of fruit was confiscated, and the lack of understanding by travellers of the implications of their actions was cause for alarm. This trial has highlighted the inadequacies in the system and, if we are to be successful in gaining new markets as a result of our fruit fly free status, we need to do much better.

The wine industry has been another huge success. However, the expected adjustment in the markets is having some impacts on some growers. The failure of Normans Wines Ltd has enhanced the problem, resulting in an oversupply of uncontracted grapes. Relations between some contracted growers and their wineries have been tenuous this vintage, and there will need to be a concerted effort by the stakeholder associations to ensure that a greater sense of security for all growers and wineries can be achieved.

I commend the Minister for Primary Industries for making himself available to industry representatives so early after his appointment, and I trust that he will endeavour to take a leading role in supporting the industry into the future. I am pleased to report that the Riverland has had an exceptional harvest this year with quality and quantity achieving well above expectation. I remind members that the Riverland grows about 60 per cent of the state's wine grapes and, if it were not for the efforts of Riverland growers, South Australia would not be a leading exporter of fine wines. The Wine Industry Act has also been under review, and I put on the record that I will be supporting the retention of existing provisions for the establishment of terms for grower payment.

The previous government's commitment to regional communities through sporting grants, arts grants and the Premier's community grants have really had a significant impact on the improvement of the social fabric of my electorate. Many projects would not have come to fruition without this support, and I only hope that the new government will not take the axe to these extremely valuable grants. As reported in the press, the government has undertaken a major review of industry support through the Department of Industry and Trade and the Regional Infrastructure Fund.

I welcome the review of these programs, so long as it results in a fairer distribution of government support for industry, both regional and metropolitan. Much has been said about corporate welfare and the cost to the taxpayer of trying to attract business to the state to create jobs. I am firmly of the view that, if we want lasting benefits, we should invest in home grown business expansion first and foremost. After all, South Australian companies have already made their commitment to the state. Assisting expansion of South Australian businesses to create jobs will have lasting results. Paying through the nose by entering into bidding wars with other states to attract new industry is a risky venture and may result in short-term political advantage and short-term job creation but, sadly, it is often too high a price to pay, and benefits are not always sustained in the long term.

Continuation and, indeed, expansion of the Regional Infrastructure Fund, properly administered, is vital for future prosperity in our regions. Escalating costs and the uncertainty in the energy market is proving an obstacle to attracting new development to regional areas. We cannot compete with the eastern states unless we can offer competitive energy options. Any rash decision to axe this fund will result in long-term consequences to the regions that have helped drive this state's economic recovery.

Honesty in government—now, there is an interesting terminology. I do not think there is a person alive who would disagree with this notion. It is very much a sad day, however, that this government has deemed it necessary to legislate what should be a given for all elected members. I will be looking very closely at the legislation that has been put before the house, and I look forward to the debate. I hope that the legislative program warrants the changes in relation to days of sitting. I believe that the average South Australian person likes to think that our politicians are working very hard, and it is unfortunate that the media portrays us as only working when the parliament is sitting. In fact, the best and most rewarding and productive part of the job for me is that with my community. I, for one, do not want to sit for the sake of sitting when I could be working productively for my community in my community. I am a firm believer in getting on with the job—the less humdrum the better.

The people of Chaffey have entrusted me with their confidence to represent them in this 50th parliament. I give my solemn commitment to do the best of my ability at all times, and I thank all those who have supported me—in particular, my wonderful staff, Jan, Robyn and Josie, who manage my electorate office and my life so capably. I would also like to thank my husband, Dean, and my little treasure, Tilly Rose, for their unconditional love, encouragement and support at all times.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in so doing, I first want to also thank my family for their support over a period of time now, and particularly last term, which

was a very busy term for all of us in government, especially those of us privileged to be in the ministry. My wife, in particular, was always superb (as were the children) and never complained about the fact that I was hardly ever home. They were always there to support me in the electorate and to back me up—and I particularly want to thank my wife for the way in which she goes about running the farm better than I ever did when I was home full-time and had more time. To them I say, 'Thank you very much.' They know what we are here for: we are here to make this state a better place in which to live.

I am sure that, from a historical point of view, when people look back, they will see that the record of the Liberal government from 1993 to 2002 was a very good one. I would also like to thank my electorate because, as I often say to people, it is a privilege to have been a minister and to now be a shadow minister but the biggest privilege in this place is to be able to represent people with whom I have grown up, being able to represent an area that I strongly believe in and also being able to ensure that more occurs to support the future development in all aspects of the region that I represent. Clearly, Mawson is a diverse electorate: it is both rural and residential and is fast growing economically, fast growing with respect to housing and fast growing with respect to further development of the region as a community. I want to thank the people of my electorate very much, and I can assure them that I will continue to work for them, with my primary goal being to support them, to represent them, to be available to them and, hopefully, to be able to achieve more for them in the future.

This cannot be done unless one has a team. Of course, all members would know, by looking at House of Assembly seats, that staff in those seats are pretty thin on the ground—in fact, we get a personal assistant and, from time to time, a trainee. Compared to most other states (when you visit them and you see what House of Assembly members receive), I do not think anyone could say that MPs in the House of Assembly in South Australia are over blessed with staff.

My electorate is an extremely busy one: it is a seven day a week job almost without exception. I want to thank my personal assistant, Fiona (who has been with me for eight years now) for the fantastic job that she does. It does not matter where I am around the electorate: people see our office as a team and they appreciate the service, as rapidly as we can get it to them, on any issues or concerns that they have. However, to achieve this, we need a lot of volunteers. In particular, I mention Max Gamlin, who is a fantastic man who has put in thousands of hours in my electorate office every Thursday, week in week out, for years. Sadly, Max's health is not all the best at the moment and he is not able to spend that eight hour period in my electorate office each week. I can tell him that the job is a bit harder as a result of that. But what a fantastic effort when I get someone who comes into my office eight hours a week for eight years because they believe in the region, they believe in what one is doing as a local member and they also believe in the ideology and the principles of the Liberal Party. This also applies with respect to Helen and Malcolm Harrington, Mary Collett, Wanda Miller and the 130 or 140 other people who regularly support me around the electorate one way or another. They know what they are doing, I certainly know what they are doing, and I want to place on the public record my sincere thanks to them. I look forward to working with them over the next four years.

When we first came into office, the south was known as the 'forgotten south'. It had good reason to be known as that because, whilst the southern community had been very fair to the Labor Party by supporting it with both ministers and members of parliament for something like nearly 13 years (from my recollection of how long it was represented in government there), the fact was that, even after that long period, the south was still known as the 'forgotten south' because the Labor Party simply did not deliver. Of course, we have seen and listened to the Premier and also the member for Kaurna—Minister for the Southern Suburbs—talk about the fact that they now have a Minister by that portfolio name. I was pleasantly pleased by the honesty of the member for Kaurna, when he has admitted on a number of occasions in and around the south that the reason why they now have a Minister for the Southern Suburbs is purely for political reasons. It is sad that that is the case but, notwithstanding that, at least that minister had the honesty to admit it.

Now that the Labor Party has a Minister for the Southern Suburbs, not only I, as an elected member in the south, but all our community, expect to see results, and we expect to see delivery, not warm and fuzzy discussions around issues such as, 'We will develop a partnership here, we will set up a committee there, we will make representation to the federal government, or we will assist local government in kind.' We want to see things happening in the south that will deliver jobs, deliver a strong economy, give small businesses the chance to expand and see families in our community with more disposable income. That is what they want. They told us that in 1993, and we listened, and I am very proud of the achievements that we have put in place in the southern area. But I am extremely concerned about what we may or may not see occur in the next four years.

I will be extremely vigilant at all times to ensure that the momentum we now have in the south is not hindered and that its continuing growth is supported over the next four years. We have seen a lot of people in small and medium sized businesses put their neck on the line and borrow big amounts of money because they believe in what is available, what is happening and the opportunities for the future, and the fact that they had eight years of a government that listened and delivered. I will have more to say about that later.

Extraordinary money—that is, money over and above that which goes in on a recurrent basis to pay for teachers, police, health workers, and the like—in the south in the last four years amounted to well over \$100 million. It was spent across electorates in the south—both Liberal and Labor—on projects such as the Southern Expressway, the extension to the Noarlunga hospital, the Vocational Education and Training College and general road infrastructure. I will say more in this parliament in the future of my concerns about the Labor Party looking to support some electorates and regions more than others. In the last term of the Liberal government, a minimum of \$100 million of additional money went into infrastructure in the southern area.

As a result of that, we have seen record increases in house sales. At present, we have a record number of applications before the City of Onkaparinga. The councils of Alexandrina, Yankalilla and Victor Harbor are vibrant with building applications. For some years now, we have seen an ever-increasing expansion of businesses in Lonsdale, Hackham and McLaren Vale. Of course, we have also seen growth in tourism and hospitality. That has come about because, as well as creating an economy and confidence for the whole state, each year we were seeing our fair share of the more than

\$7 million of government expenditure coming into our region. However, a lot more needs to be done.

I am delighted that we are no longer the forgotten south. As I said, I am concerned, though, whether this government will be about rhetoric or whether it will continue to deliver. I will be writing to ministers responsible for different portfolios, highlighting the needs prior to their putting down their budget. Of course, they already know what those needs are, because it was no secret that the previous government had already been working on budget bilaterals. So, I do not think it would be necessary for them to make many changes.

Having said that, I want to make sure that issues such as the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital are addressed and addressed urgently. I do not appreciate, nor does our community, the fact that the only answer of the Minister for Health to the professional indemnity insurance rise from \$37 000 or thereabouts to \$143 000 approximately was to say to the community of Mawson (and she is saying this not only to that community but also to the member for Kaurna's electorate), 'That is the way it goes; head off to Victor Harbor or the Flinders Medical Centre.' Of course, that is a just a flippant comment which shows that the minister is not interested in our area. It reminds me of how the Labor Party treated the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital so badly during its years in office. It did so to the point that the hospital was placed under enormous pressure.

I want to congratulate all the volunteers and the staff in that hospital. I can assure them that I will be there fighting with all the breath I have to ensure they receive ongoing support, because they have delivered well for our community. It is time that the minister stopped talking about setting up a round table conference to address professional indemnity insurance issues in this state and came out with some answers and solutions. I understand that she is keen to get on a plane. It would not be a bad idea for the Minister for Health to get on a plane and visit the premiers of New South Wales and Queensland to see how they quickly got on with addressing a range of these issues. Some Australian premiers have realised that it is not a federal issue alone and that the state can do things. Other states are getting on with the job, but we are not seeing it here.

I turn now to the matter of finances and the future of South Australia. When you clean out your office and shift, and given that you have had eight years in parliament, it is interesting to reflect on some of the material you see when you are going through your office; for example, it is interesting to see what an editorial from an *Advertiser* of July 1993 had to say about what they expected to happen in order to address the debt. That debt was horrendous; it was real debt.

Members will recall that this state then suffered the single biggest corporate loss in Australia's history in the form of the State Bank. Of course, we never even got an apology out of the present Premier for what his government did at the time, and from him as an adviser and later on as an MP and a minister. We have never had one apology for the deplorable situation that was left in this state where we had approximately \$10 billion of core debt. We know it. We had \$1.4 billion of debt with the Housing Trust; we had \$3.3 billion of unfunded public sector superannuation which was going to basically handcuff our young people's future forever; and we had even smaller debts such as \$13 million with the CFS. Of course, on a recurrent basis, there was a bona fide, genuine and real black hole then—a \$367 million black hole recurrent. If we had not addressed it, by today, going about business the way Labor did when it was in office, we would have had a

deficit, ballooning out on a recurrent basis, of close to \$800 or \$900 million, or even \$1 billion.

But what do we have today? We have core debt completely under control. True, there is still a bit more work to do be done there, because some of that core debt still has not delivered jobs, infrastructure or opportunities. That is the only time you should have debt in a state—when it is growing the state and not pulling it back. We have balanced budgets. Try as the Treasurer may to twist that around, the bottom line is that members opposite are walking into a government that is gold plated compared to how it was when we took office in 1993. That is when the state had its problems. That is when we saw the biggest financial reversal in this state's history, and that is when we had a basket case as a state.

It is a stark contrast to what we have today. In all the trend indicators, for over 18 months we have consistently been the second fastest growing state in Australia. We have seen record exports more than double in just a four or five year period. We have seen unemployment come back from around nearly 13 per cent when the new Premier was the minister for employment to a figure within .1 per cent of the national average. There is still a lot more work to do in all these areas, and there are still a lot more challenges facing South Australia. Anyone would give their right hand to be able to come into office—as this government has—to a state in such great shape. We do not need to turn around the economy in this state as the Premier has said, because the only way we can turn the economy around in this state is to put it into decline. That is my biggest fear now that the Labor Party is in office—that it will put the economy back into decline.

It is incumbent on every opposition member of parliament to do their best to ensure that this does not occur. We will not see it in the next 12 months or so, because this government is not making any tough decisions or decisions that will be in our long-term interests; it will simply sail along on the golden path that has been developed for this state. From here, they should grow it further. That is their challenge. That is the plan, commitment, energy and experience that we would have been able to return to the community if we had had the third term which the South Australian community gave us. The South Australian community gave us a third time term but we were robbed, and I will talk a little more about that down the track.

I also want to talk about issues in my portfolios, namely, police, emergency services, correctional services, volunteers, gaming and gambling. I had an enormous privilege in representing all the men and women who make up part of those portfolios. The police in South Australia are the greatest police in Australia without a doubt. We are the third oldest police force in the world, and we are certainly leading the way when it comes to creating a safer community, and we can benchmark with any police department anywhere around the world.

I was very pleased to be their minister and to deliver three budgets in a row providing for increases on the year before, delivering more for people in South Australia, supporting the police more, meeting the challenges we had with respect to crime and seeing the crime rate coming down as a result, and delivering a record allocation of about \$400 million for police in the last budget. That is \$114 million more in one year than they got under Labor when last in office.

The volunteers in emergency services and the paid people who back them up are superb. It is incumbent on us to ensure that we continue to support these emergency services because these men and women risk their lives. Our Government did

more when in office by way of providing support for those people than we have seen in living memory. I will be watching to ensure that all emergency services, particularly the volunteers, continue to see growth in their areas. Without those volunteers we would not be able to protect the community the way we do. That is why I was so proud to be minister for volunteers. We set up an office for volunteers, helped lift their profile and backed them in when it came to legislation, finances and exposure during the International Year of Volunteering. To the almost one in three people in South Australia who volunteer, a big thank you from me.

I also thank the Public Service, which knew that we had a difficult job to do when we came to office in 1993. A lot of the decisions we had to make were extremely tough decisions. The Public Service got on with it and, by and large, supported what we were doing. Whether I needed public servants with me at 6 a.m. or midnight, whether I needed to ring them on the weekend or on holidays (whilst I did not make a habit of it), I always got full cooperation and support from them. It is time people had a look at how hard most of the public servants in this state work. I hope that this government will be fair and reasonable to all public servants in South Australia and will not simply go and pay back favours to certain sectors at the expense and demise of other sectors. I feel that will occur, but we will keep a close eye on that and highlight it the minute we see it happening.

It is interesting to see that the Labor government now has a Minister for Social Inclusion. I do not know exactly what the Minister for Social Inclusion is responsible for and what that minister will do. My understanding of social inclusion is about providing the best opportunities for every South Australian, about providing the best health, the best education, the best law and order and the best infrastructure possible. We have done well with that and there is still more to be done, but at the end of the day it is not about pulling people down to the lowest common denominator: it is about encouraging the strong and supporting them to get even stronger and in so doing we can put more into support services and create more jobs for those people who are struggling to achieve improved lifestyles in this state. It is, therefore, about managing an economy. It is about understanding business practices and about knowing that you cannot and should not make promises that you cannot keep.

That is what this black hole is all about. It is about two things: first, the fact that in a desperate bid to get into office the Labor Party promised at least \$63 million more than was ever available in the recurrent budget for a start. That is where part of the black hole is. Secondly, members opposite do not understand about managing budget pressures. Thirdly, I have already counted \$93 million minimum to finalise the deal done between the now Premier and the member for Hammond—\$93 million totally unaccounted for. We all know that there will be tens of millions of dollars more when it all comes out of the woodwork, if it ever does. It is interesting that members opposite do not talk too much about that. They are the facts and that is what we need to talk to the South Australian community about. We know and the community know and have now had a taste of what it is like to have a vibrant economy, to have an opportunity and a state that people do not regard as being one without a future. We know that that may now be at risk because of what has transpired, involving that dodgy deal. It is a deal that should not have occurred and in time I believe that deal will be fully exposed. Anyone in South Australia who knows any aspects of that deal I would be pleased to hear from.

In the time left to me I want to talk about a couple of other issues. We need to ensure that every possible opportunity is capitalised on. The Premier is now keen to talk about bipartisanship. In every ministerial statement he has made and question he has answered, as well as in his comments reported in the media, he is still talking about bipartisanship. Is it not a pity, when the Premier was leader of the opposition, that bipartisanship was at a record low! We had the most irresponsible, the most negative, the most carping opposition in Australia when the then leader of the opposition, now Premier, was leading them for seven of the eight years. I have often said that, if Lynn Arnold had not been the sacrificial lamb, South Australia would have been a mile further ahead because, unlike this Premier, who never apologised for the mess he left when his party last left office (he simply wanted to continue to look at something on his wall that, in his mind, had a picture of himself as Premier: that was his goal, irrespective of whether it was in the best interests of the state), Lynn Arnold when Premier was a man who knew that South Australia was in diabolical trouble: he was a man of principle who went about supporting our government in that first year or so. From then on every effort was made to work against us, yet even despite that we were able to deliver.

Of course, we will not be an opposition like that because we will be a responsible opposition, a proud and professional opposition. You have already seen it when it comes to Mitsubishi. A great deal of that work was done before and, fortunately—and I thank it for this—the Labor government acknowledged that. The research project announced at the Waite Research Institute yesterday was also initiated primarily by our government. A lot of other projects are rolling out now. Today we heard the Premier talking about what would happen at the old Ansett call centre. I am delighted that is occurring because I want to see jobs for every man, woman and young person in this state who wants a job.

But my ears are still echoing loudly from the negative, carping, whingeing leader of the opposition who attacked EDS every time he had a chance. There was a chance for Westpac, but he attacked it. Even with Mitsubishi, sadly, whilst he was careful about it, he used innuendo in trying to get up questions in this place. The member for Colton can shake his head, but look at *Hansard* and at the questions on Mitsubishi and I can tell you that the innuendo—if it was not almost expressed—in those questions was that it might be a good thing if Mitsubishi did not get up. That is not what we were about. Whether it involved chasing the car tariff issue set up by the previous federal Labor government or getting new anchor jobs in here to support small business, that is what we were about. I point out that 73 per cent of all that industry development fund money went to existing medium and small businesses in this state. It did not go to bringing over the big anchor tenants. Yes, 27 per cent did, but where would this state be now if that had not occurred?

I will support the Labor government if it spends approximately one-third of industry development funds in bringing new anchor tenant businesses over here because it is necessary in a state which has zero population growth and which does not have some of the natural advantages of the other states. We all know how much money other states and countries around the world pour in when competing for these companies.

Let us look at Motorola, and we have not heard much about that from members opposite since they finished their dirty deal. What a success story! Members should ask the

white collar workers who have graduated from our universities and who are now working with Motorola how proud they are to have a multinational company back in South Australia. As well as all the other things that I mentioned were lost under the Labor government, very many headquarters were lost over that period. People used to ask me, 'Why don't we have any headquarters here?' They knew how important it was.

In summary, that paints a reasonably good picture. It says that the Liberal government will go down in history as being one that rebuilt the future for South Australia. It also reminds the community in my electorate of just how bad it was under the years of Labor. Hopefully they have learnt a few lessons. We are yet to see whether they have learnt those lessons, but they will get a professional opposition from us, not a mob of whingeing, whining, carping, negative people, like they were, who worked against every possible opportunity that we put forward to rebuild this state.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Ciccarello): Order, the member for West Torrens!

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Also, we were focused on building up that community spirit, building up that social fabric—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will come to order!

Mr BROKENSHIRE:—but knowing that, if it is going to be sustainable, if it is going to be more than just for a season, if it is going to be perpetual, then underpinning that you must have an economy that can sustain itself and grow. That is what we delivered. That is the challenge for the Labor Party, and I leave one blank area in my speech, one area with a question mark over it, and that is, what can the Rann government do to improve our record, from when they were last in office, by 2006? That is a very big question and there is a big blank spot there at the moment. We have heard about warm and fuzzies from the Premier, and that might make people feel good at the moment, but deeper down than that people want to see a government with substance, a government with commitment, and a government that can make the right decisions, the tough decisions.

Mr Koutsantonis: That's why they voted you out.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I ask members to remember that, while we will be professional about what we do, contrary to what the member for Peake is saying, we had 51 per cent of the two-party preferred vote—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

Mr BROKENSHIRE:—and a dodgy deal saw us leave government, and the community of South Australia will always remember that.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I first pay tribute respectfully to Her Excellency the Governor as I make this address in reply to her speech to the joint houses of parliament. The Governor has exhibited a grace and commonsense in the exercise of her duties which is appreciated by not only members of parliament but the members of my community as well. One of the key points which stood out to me in the Governor's address to the assembled members of parliament just a short time ago was the proposal for honesty and accountability measures to be brought into this parliament by the Premier, the Hon. Mike Rann.

The concepts of honesty and accountability in respect of government led me to think about these concepts as they operate at a national level. It made me think of the Prime Minister, the Hon. John Howard, and some of the behaviour he has exhibited over the time since the last federal election campaign until now. I make that remark in the context where leadership is often discussed in our community, leadership coming from the state parliament, coming from the national parliament.

The Prime Minister prides himself on being a leader, perhaps a stoic leader, perhaps a conservative leader, but certainly not a man for all people. He has been ruthless in his exploitation of the worst aspects of Australian life. He has cunningly played upon the racism and tendency to exclude others that we as Australians have as characteristics, just as much as any other nation. In most western democracies, the issues of racism and xenophobia are treated at arm's length by responsible members of parliament and parliamentary leaders. Not so with our Prime Minister, John Howard.

His idea of leadership is to look at what the opinion polls say and to appeal to the lowest common denominator, all the more so because he knows that, to chip away at the Labor primary vote, he must appeal to people whom we would usually characterise as working class, people perhaps who have not had the good fortune of education that many members of parliament have had. The Prime Minister and many others who go along with him have played upon the most primitive prejudices of a great many Australian people, and this largely accounts for the outcome of the last federal election.

I have been speaking generally but I am going to be a bit more specific about one of the most appalling ways in which the Prime Minister has sought to take advantage of these base motives. I refer in particular to the children overboard affair. As I have said, the Prime Minister has built up a record of creating divisiveness in the Australian community, not only with respect to foreigners, not only with respect to people of Asian heritage, but also in relation to single parents, unemployed people, gays and lesbians, Aboriginal people and a range of other minority groups. Wherever he feels that he can get the backing of more than 50 per cent of the Australian population, he is willing to weigh in to a minority group and bash them for the sake of a short-term electoral gain, or at least a rise in the opinion polls for his Liberal Party government.

This appalling behaviour was most prevalent in the lead-up to the last federal election held in November 2001. One of the most reprehensible aspects of the Prime Minister's dialogue with the Australian people at that time was to link the people coming here in boats, people desperately seeking asylum in Australia, most of them beyond doubt fleeing persecution in their home countries, with terrorism, particularly in light of the terrible events of 11 September last year, when two planes flew into the World Trade Centre in the United States of America.

To link those poor, hungry, desperate people with some of the most reprehensible human behaviour that we have witnessed in the western world in recent times was the most breathtaking piece of gall designed to induce hatred among the Australian people for those who have not yet become Australians. I have phrased my language in that way because, without question, most of the people who have come here by boat over the last few years have been accepted as Australians. They have been accepted as genuine refugees and have gained temporary protection visas. True it is that it

remains to be seen whether they will all be granted permanent protection visas but my hope is that the people who have come here seeking a peaceful life, a life of hard work and a better education for their children, will be allowed to stay as Australians, just as we accepted many tens of thousands from Greece, Italy, other Mediterranean countries and the Baltic countries after World War II.

Interestingly, as with most ruthless political ploys, the ultimate goal of the Howard government in this regard was to be able to achieve wealth redistribution without losing office. When it really comes down to brass tacks, that is what politics is about: either you care about the whole community and see that wealth and income are equitably distributed, or you see life as a scramble—a law of the jungle to be applied—and you look after those who can look after themselves the best. That is what the Liberal Party stands for and that is what Howard has managed to do. He has introduced the GST with significant redistributive effects. The GST has managed to pay for the company tax reductions which we have seen in the last couple of years and, as a result, the people who can afford tax the least—pensioners, unemployed people, people on low incomes—have been subsidising those who own Australia's companies. Generally speaking, they are people who are better off than the average person. Howard has managed to get away with introducing the GST and making the rich richer by using his divisive, racist politics.

In respect of the children overboard claims, we saw during the federal election on national television screens video footage of refugees in the water of the Indian Ocean—footage taken by navy personnel, presumably. This was portrayed by the federal Howard government as an example of the inhumanity of those who sought to come to Australia relying on this nation's sense of humanity. What a perverse claim that was! Not only were the offices of the Prime Minister and the defence minister used to portray this false claim but also the higher echelons of the Public Service were also used to further the Prime Minister's political ends.

Although a senate inquiry has been instituted into this affair, there are certain facts that we know which are already on the public record, and I propose to go through those briefly to establish the case to answer that the Prime Minister faces in respect of this issue. On 7 October last year, a small group of senior bureaucrats met in Canberra as an interdepartmental task force on people smuggling. During this meeting a call came through to Brigadier Michael Silverstone, Commander of Northern Command, who was present. The call was from Commander Banks on the *HMAS Adelaide*, which had boarded what was termed a 'suspected illegal entry vessel'.

Exactly what was said during this telephone call is the subject of conflicting reports. Mention may or may not have been made of refugees threatening to throw children overboard. What is known is that Commander Banks, who was in charge of the *HMAS Adelaide*, issued a clarification on 10 October which clearly stated that no children were thrown overboard from the suspected illegal entry vessel. By that time, however, John Howard and his senior ministers were off running with their scare tactics.

Within hours of *HMAS Adelaide* personnel boarding the illegal vessel, immigration minister Ruddock had launched his own media campaign, claiming that children had been thrown overboard. The Prime Minister and the then defence minister (Peter Reith) joined in. The federal election was announced only days later, and the ongoing discussion of the so-called children overboard affair was allowed to continue.

Claims that the navy possessed video footage proving the incident had occurred were repeatedly made by Peter Reith. Reith also released photographs of children in the water to back up his case. These photographs were subsequently found to have been taken a day after the immigration minister first announced this matter. All of this occurred despite the Department of Defence's own investigation, which concluded that no children were thrown overboard. This conclusion had been made by 11 October. Despite this, the government maintained that children had been thrown in the water right through until the election on 10 November last year.

It is absolutely incredible to think that senior defence personnel were aware of the true situation, that they had communicated the same to the defence minister at the time and, on a highly sensitive political issue, the Prime Minister himself was not implicated. That is absolutely incredible, and the only conclusion that I personally can draw is that Howard was in it up to his neck.

So, this is the sort of leadership we have in the country at the moment, whereby the Prime Minister is playing to the baser side of Australian people, relying on their primitive prejudices rather than on their pride as a nation which has taken a humanitarian approach to so many hundreds of thousands of refugees since World War II.

But there is another aspect to the Prime Minister's leadership. I move to the topic of the Governor-General. The Governor-General is Howard's champion. He is a symbol of the conservatism which Howard puts forward as the ultimate respectability, yet we have a Governor-General who has disgraced that position in the way that he has dealt with claims of sexual abuse by Anglican priests over the years. I say that not only in respect of the Governor-General's behaviour while he was still Archbishop of Brisbane but also in respect of his behaviour since he became Governor-General.

It hardly needs to be noted that the Governor-General, under our Australian Constitution, has primacy. It is the most senior position and commands respect. However, the Governor-General, while he was Archbishop of Brisbane, was faced with a dilemma. He was confronted by numerous reports of Anglican priests having abused their parishioners and people whom they knew in the context of the priestly relationship. It is appalling to think that people in senior positions within any organised religion, within any church, take it upon themselves to be the investigator and judge of these sorts of claims when we as a society recognise that specialisation is needed in the work of social workers and police to properly deal with these complex and agonising claims. However, the Governor-General did just that. He took it upon himself to investigate a number of these matters and, to cut a long story short, took the advice of the church's insurance company in trying to hush up the claims that had been made rather than to air them and to have them properly dealt with. I will give a couple of examples.

One priest continued to practise, despite admitting having previously sexually abused children. On this matter, Peter Hollingworth, the current Governor-General, is quoted as saying:

After making inquiries, I could find no evidence of his having offended since becoming a priest. I am deeply disturbed—

Mr SCALZI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer to standing order 121, which refers to the use of the sovereign's name and the Governor's name. I seek your

guidance and deliberation on the honourable member's speech with reference to the Governor-General.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been listening very carefully. I am well aware of the standing order that cautions members about reflecting on the monarch or her representatives. I do not believe the member for Mitchell has done that, but he needs to be mindful of that standing order.

Mr HANNA: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will repeat that quotation:

After making inquiries, I could find no evidence of his having offended since becoming a priest. I am deeply disturbed that eight years later the priest did inform me about other abuses.

As far as I am concerned, if you have offended in that way against children, I do not care what job you have: special care needs to be taken to ensure that reoffending does not occur.

Perhaps even worse in terms of betraying the current attitude of our Governor-General is the discussion that took place on *Australian Story* on ABC television on 18 February this year. When discussing a relationship between a 27 year old priest and a 14 year old girl, the Governor-General argued that she had consented and, therefore, that it was not a matter of rape and was in some way less serious. He said:

My belief is that this was not sex abuse. There was no suggestion of rape or anything like that—quite the contrary—and my information is that it was rather the other way around.

I was absolutely disgusted to see that reported in the media. Our community has been striving to get people in positions of authority, especially in the police, the legal profession and the judiciary, to acknowledge the terrible significance of child abuse.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Heysen has a point of order.

Mrs REDMOND: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I take on board your previous comments to the member for Hartley, but I seek your further ruling. The member speaking just referred to his disgust at the comments made by the Governor-General. I believe that those comments contravene standing order 121, which states:

A member may not use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to the sovereign—

the Governor-General is, of course, a representative of the sovereign—

and nor may that person be gratuitously referred to for the purpose of influencing the house in its deliberations.

I seek your guidance, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the member for Heysen, but I do not believe that the member is transgressing that standing order. It is a fine line between reporting on events involving that position and denigrating that position. I do not believe that the member for Mitchell is denigrating it, but I remind him again to be careful in his choice of words.

Mr HANNA: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I want nothing more than a Governor-General whom we can all admire and respect. When I see sexual abuse being treated in this way—being thought and talked about in this way—I am disgusted. This is particularly pertinent when the Rann Labor government has started its four-year term with an investigation by the eminent and esteemed Queen's Counsel Robyn Layton into this very issue. I have already forwarded my submission to that investigation.

In summary, there are a couple of key issues that have shown the appalling lack of judgment and lack of compassion in John Howard and the key people on whom he relies. If we are to have honesty and accountability in government, it

really has to start at the top. We will do our part as a Labor government but, unfortunately, the Howard government has let us down badly in that regard in recent times.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I am proud to rise in my place in this house to respond to Her Excellency's opening speech. In doing so, I place on record my strong regard for the way in which she has carried out her duties to date. There is no doubt that Her Excellency has managed to find a place in the hearts of most South Australians through the way in which she is undertaking her duties. Indeed, she has been handed a formidable task. To follow in the footsteps of Sir Eric and Lady Neal is no small task, but I believe that she has responded admirably to the task before her. I also take this opportunity to congratulate you too, sir, on your appointment to the position of Deputy Speaker. Knowing you as I do, I am sure that you will undertake your duties with the honour which the position demands.

It is also a privilege to be elected to the parliament for what is now my fourth term, and also to be elected by an increased majority. When elected to this place in 1989, for those first four years I, and indeed you, sir, and also my colleague the member for Newland, as well as the member for Heywood, now the member for Unley, regularly received similar taunts and were referred to as 'oncers'. I think it is fair to say that we have all demonstrated that not to be the case. Throughout my second term—and I know that some members received the same taunts—it was going to be the end of my career. Likewise, through my third term, the same thing was said. The member for West Torrens regularly taunted me across the chamber that it was to be the end of my time in parliament. Well, I am delighted that the electors in my suburbs have responded not only favourably to my representation and demonstrated their confidence in me but also demonstrated their confidence in the Liberal Party.

I am particularly proud that the new suburbs added to my electorate, albeit on electoral voting terms ones that would reduce my majority, particularly in the case of O'Sullivan's Beach, were a contributing factor to my increased majority. That is something that does not usually happen in Labor voting suburbs.

Something that was often the source of some mirth among my classmates at Henley High School was that, on entering parliament, my Labor predecessor was actually my year 12 maths teacher. That is something that school students whom I regularly take through the parliament enjoy. Something else of some amusement to my past classmates is that, during the time of my role as Minister for Emergency Services, I would often do battle with the then Secretary of the United Firefighters Union. I am pleased to now welcome him as the new member for Colton. While, despite our friendship during school days, I would have naturally preferred to see a Liberal member for Colton, I am sure that the new member for Colton will represent his electorate without fear or favour. Knowing him as I do, I am sure that he will undertake the task admirably, and I wish him well in his new role.

It is fair to say that, like I, he has been loyal to his political beliefs. We also undertook first year politics together at Adelaide University. I had a very strong Liberal persuasion and, in those days, he had a very strong Marxist persuasion, which I think it is fair to say he described himself as having. It was a mild source of amusement to me that, after the now member for Colton took 12 months' study leave, I came across him outside a shop on Greenhill Road, Toorak Gardens, where he was washing the front windows. He had

not returned to his studies at that time. I said, 'So you have taken on a window cleaning job now?' He said, 'No, this is my shop.' If memory serves me correctly, it was a plant shop on Greenhill Road. I said, 'But you are a Marxist,' and his response was something like, 'Ah, but that doesn't put food on the table.' Those words have stayed with me for the two decades plus since. I do not think the member for Colton would claim to be a Marxist today, so his philosophy has probably moderated somewhat. I only wish that it had moderated a little further and perhaps we would have seen him on this side rather than the other side of the chamber. Needless to say, I am sure he will represent his constituents as well as he can, nonetheless. We have probably both regarded each other as politically misguided but good blokes, and that does not change.

I also welcome the election of other new members to this chamber, notably my new colleagues, the members for Bragg, Morphet, Kavel and Heysen. Of course, the member for Morphet is my electoral nextdoor neighbour, and I am sure that we will be working together on a large number of issues both within and outside this chamber. Likewise, the election of the members for Adelaide, Enfield and Cheltenham on the other side: I am sure they too will represent their electorates with the dignity expected by their electors.

It has been reported in the media that some on this side of the house are somewhat angered by the fact that we are in opposition. I do not think that that word is overly stated, because there certainly is some anger on this side of the house, particularly with those of us who were also serving here in 1989. As with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on being elected in 1989 with 52½ per cent of the vote, I had to see, effectively, an attack on our democratic system. Thankfully, in 1989, we had two Independents, now former members of parliament—Norm Peterson and Martyn Evans—who also agreed that, even though they, as stated Labor Independents (as they always stated themselves to be), were supporting a Labor government in office, they recognised the electoral injustice of the fact that a party which won 52.5 per cent of the vote was unable to govern. In their recognition of that electoral injustice, those members worked with the then Liberal opposition to ensure that appropriate amendments were made to the State Electoral Act.

Those amendments were effectively intended to ensure that the injustice that occurred in 1989 did not recur. Regrettably, of course, what could not be foreseen by either the drafters of that legislation or the public servants who administer it was that it did not take account of the fact that a member of parliament, regardless of their political persuasion, might change their position from that stated to their electorate at the time of the election to effectively side with the other mob. That presents this parliament with a challenge.

Much has been said about a constitutional convention. There can be nothing more fundamental to go before the floor of any convention examining our Constitution than the basic principle that the party or grouping of individuals that wins 50 per cent plus one of the votes must be able to form government. It is imperative that the convention that is about to occur focuses on that fact: the party and/or grouping of individuals that gets 50 per cent plus one of the votes must be in a position to govern.

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

That the time for adjourning the house be extended beyond 5.40 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: At the last election, the Liberal Party received a two-party preferred vote of 50.93 per cent. On that basis it deserved the right to govern; it was the party favoured by the majority of South Australians to govern but, regrettably, we have been denied that opportunity for what, in my view, amounts to nothing other than a dirty back room deal.

Much has been said in this parliament of late about a code of conduct, and I will be very careful in my remarks because I am aware that notice has been given of legislation to come before this house. It is not that to which I shall refer directly but, rather, in the first instance, to commend the Commissioner for Public Employment for releasing a code of conduct for public servants. That code, dated October 2001, was widely distributed to the Public Service in November 2001. I would like to share with the house some aspects of that code of conduct. The code, in part, describes the reasons for having this particular code of conduct as follows:

As a public sector employee you are employed to provide services for the South Australian community consistent with the policies of the elected government. While you are a public employee you are in a unique position of trust requiring standards of behaviour that reflect community expectations.

They are important words: 'requiring standards of behaviour that reflect community expectations'. Maintaining the trust of the public means:

- properly using the resources, information and authority you have as a public sector employee.
- ensuring that the public sector serves the public through the direction of the government of the day by providing service and advice that is apolitical, frank and without fear of reproach.
- ensuring that your personal interests do not adversely influence the way you carry out your duties.

They are very important words: 'ensuring that your personal interests do not adversely influence the way you carry out your duties'. The code continues:

- complying with the acts, regulations, guidelines and policies relevant to your work.

The code goes on to describe three broad elements that underpin ethics and standards of conduct in the South Australian public sector: integrity, respect and accountability. I think it is fair to say that this code of conduct (that came into operation in the Public Service last year) is reasonable for members of parliament to reflect upon and, in future debate on a bill that will come before this house, I will go into that in more detail. The Public Service code also talks about harassment and bullying, and states that harassment is unlawful. The code defines harassment as follows:

Harassment consists of unwelcome, offensive, abusive, belittling or threatening behaviour directed at another person.

Again, I think that is particularly relevant. It saddens me that some members of parliament would find such a code of conduct that is guiding our Public Service today a very difficult code with which to comply. I am particularly troubled that, at various times during my time as minister, and in fact across two portfolios, I have had to deal with a member of parliament who was particularly difficult about the way in which they undertook their duties. This particular member of parliament certainly breached the Public Service code that relates to harassment and bullying. I remind members that public servants are told that harassment is unlawful.

They are told that harassment consists of unwelcome, offensive, abusive, belittling or threatening behaviour directed at another person. I was concerned that my staff, during my time as minister, were subjected to a number of telephone calls from this particular individual. Often those telephone calls became abusive and often four-letter obscenities were used against the public servants concerned. It reached the stage that, in my two roles as Minister for Administrative Services and then more recently as Minister for Minerals and Energy, I found it necessary to provide an unlisted telephone number to my departmental employees so that they could transfer this problem member of parliament to me when that person so behaved.

It disappoints me that any minister would have to go to that length, but further it disappoints me that any member of parliament would behave in such a way. The issues, in one instance, involved the access by that particular member of parliament to a chauffeured vehicle. Some quite important rules were in place with respect to the use of chauffeured vehicles. On one particular occasion that comes to mind the honourable member concerned wanted access to a chauffeured vehicle on Christmas Day. The honourable member concerned was advised that was not possible. The public servants concerned received a barrage of abuse and the honourable member was put on to me.

I dealt with the honourable member and said that, under no circumstances, would that chauffeured vehicle be available on Christmas Day. I demanded of the honourable member what government business was being undertaken by them on Christmas Day. I was dissatisfied with the reasons forthcoming. The honourable member indicated that they would express their displeasure to the Premier. The Premier subsequently backed my decision, which is what I expected would occur. On another occasion the member became particularly insistent over the way in which aspects relating to their mineral tenements and exploration licence applications were being treated, and in fact made a number of repeated calls to my staff, which I believe to be harassing and intimidating in nature. On more than one occasion I had an upset staff member following treatment by this particular member.

I was particularly affronted and offended when the member himself expressed a view to me that the government TEISA program (the initiative to encourage exploration in different areas) should cover that member's own mineral tenements so that that member might be able to better see what minerals might be within that region for their particular personal mining advantage. I have seen, I believe, actions that have been inappropriate by that member of parliament. There was another occasion when I had cause to take issue with that member of parliament (it was over their electorate office), again as Minister for Administrative Services. It troubles me that this member—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Do you have the courage to name this person?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: All in good time. It troubles me that this member wished to—or in fact did—take up an electorate office, and the electorate office was owned by their spouse. And, indeed, the cleaning contract was held in the name of that member's spouse, not the name by which they were most commonly known on a day-to-day basis but, nevertheless, held in that way. I put it to all members of parliament that, if it were inappropriate for a public servant to own the office that they occupy and to have a family member clean the office that they occupy, then that would be

entirely inappropriate behaviour. Certainly, as far as a public servant is concerned, it would be in direct contravention of the public service code of conduct guideline ensuring that your personal interests do not adversely influence the way you carry out your duties.

Those are issues that I believe all members of parliament need to focus on very carefully. Of course, the member was not only limiting their abuse to public servants, nor their insistence to public servants. Indeed, on a number of occasions (but one most notably) I was threatened with questions in the parliament which, of course, I welcomed and indicated to the member that, if they wished to ask questions (in this case it was a question about mining in the Gammon Ranges, something in which I know both sides of the house have a strong interest), I would advise the estimates committee, where it had been threatened I would be questioned, that, before answering any question from the honourable member, I felt it appropriate that the honourable member should declare their interest in the matter and ensure that the committee was aware (or, if they asked the question in the house, the house was aware) that any questions so asked could have the potential to advantage that member, because if mining were to occur in the Gammon Ranges anything found may be of benefit to an adjoining tenement holder.

I am a very strong believer in a code of conduct and I believe that such a code of conduct must be applied properly and used thoughtfully, and I commend the Commissioner for Public Employment for putting this code in place. But, Mr Speaker, I think you and I know very well the member to whom I am referring and you would be very familiar with the details of this information that I put to the House. In so doing, I reflect not on you—for this occurred before you were Speaker—but, of course, I refer to the member for Hammond.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH secured the adjournment of the debate.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Order! The matter raised as a matter of privilege by the member for Davenport seeking some direction from me as to whether there is a prima facie case for the Treasurer to answer that he has breached privilege by knowingly and deliberately misleading the house in a way that will materially affect the deliberations of the house requires me, I think at this point, to give some clear indication of what I have discovered in consideration of that request in relation to those matters.

The house is already in possession of the figures that were included in a document dated 15 January provided by the Under Treasurer to the then treasurer, to which the then Treasurer (Hon. Robert Lucas) appended some notes, the gist of which has already been reported to the house by the current Treasurer. The most significant of those sentences are:

As you know, I also oppose the size of the bid, so DTF should not incorporate specific provision for the bid in our documentation.

Further on, the then treasurer said:

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

The member for Davenport then asks me to determine whether the amount of funding referred to in that document of 15 January is inaccurate by implication in the underlying deficit that would result. That amount was contained in a

document dated some time in December, a document which extends to five pages and which was provided by the Under Treasurer to the Treasurer. This document was not seen, I have determined by close questioning of the Treasurer, until after Thursday 9 May, the last day of sitting last week, in which he made those statements to the house.

He further points out that the figures it contains are already out of date. Those figures contained a contingency of 1.5 per cent. They also refer to a 2 per cent supplementation in the figures of the Department of Education, Training and Employment, DETE as it is known. However, the department itself, notwithstanding the fact that it had that in its mind, was already in deficit, so that would not be relevant to the calculations. In my simple arithmetic, it therefore appears to me that the remarks made by the Treasurer, based on the information at his disposal at the time, mean that he did not mislead the house.

I will have something further to say tomorrow on the question of privilege, especially as it relates to the disclosure of documents from which ministers quote in the course of their remarks to the house. However, suffice to say now that the minutes forming enclosure that were provided to the

treasurer of the former government (Hon. Robert Lucas), that five page document of December last year, contains material which I judge to be in the public interest not to disclose at this time, knowing that it contains the strategies and other documentation to be followed in the enterprise bargaining arrangements that are currently on foot, and assuring members that, in the fullness of time, that will most certainly be available any way. In all probability, it will be, if no sooner, then at least by the time the budget estimates committees review departmental appropriations for each and every purpose, and they may choose to seek access to it at that time.

Against the background of the information provided to me, and notwithstanding the various remarks that have been made by the previous Speaker, my predecessor, and earlier Speakers than that, at this point I do not find that there is a prima facie case to answer. However, the determination of that ultimately rests with the house.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 14 May at 2 p.m.