

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 15 May 2002

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

### DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The **SPEAKER:** I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery of officers of the National Assembly of Vietnam who, for several months now, have been involved in a legal reform project conducted by various South Australian educational and other institutions, including this parliament.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Independent Gambling Authority—Inquiry Concerning Casino Codes of Practice—Report

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

Vocational Education, Employment and Training Board—Report 2001.

### DRUGS SUMMIT

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN:** As promised in the lead-up to the last state election, the South Australian government is convening a Drugs Summit at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre from 24 to 28 June 2002. I have sought to ensure that the summit is bipartisan and inclusive of a broad range of views, while providing as much opportunity as possible for South Australians to have their say. I am delighted today to announce that the five Drugs Summit co-chairs are: respected former members of parliament Jennifer Cashmore and Carolyn Pickles; serving members of parliament the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Fisher; and I intend to chair the final sessions of the summit. I have also invited the Leader of the Opposition to speak at the summit.

The Drugs Summit, which is to be held during National Drug Action Week, will be a crucial step in our attempt to tackle the problems associated with amphetamine type drugs, including designer drugs, in the South Australian community. Substance use amongst young people and Aboriginal people will be a major focus of the summit. Whilst recognising the importance of existing national and state drug strategies, the government also recognises that there is a need for more effective ways to convince and educate people, especially our youth, of the serious dangers of drug use. Sadly, drug use has a devastating impact on many individuals, families and the entire South Australian community.

The government is seeking as much input as possible from the community into the Drugs Summit deliberations. Throughout this month, local community meetings have been organised across the state at both rural and metropolitan locations. In addition, the government is seeking written submissions, and there is a web site providing information relating to the summit. There has been huge support for the Drugs Summit from the local government sector, and all state

MPs have been asked to contribute and participate through local community forums. All information collected prior to the summit will be provided to delegates as part of their preparation.

The nine key themes that will be explored in detail by the Drugs Summit are:

- 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 and intervention, and
- Illicit drugs in rural and regional South Australia.

The summit will include presentations by high profile experts from around Australia who specialise in a wide range of drug use issues. Renowned community activist, the Reverend Tim Costello; Radio National health commentator, Dr Norman Swan; the Director of the Australian Institute of Criminology, Dr Adam Graycar; and the South Australian Police Commissioner, Mr Mal Hyde, to name but a few, will be speakers at the conference.

Importantly, there will also be presentations from grassroots service providers from around the state, including police, health professionals and community members who have personally experienced in one way or another the devastation of drug use in South Australia. There will be 200 delegates from a wide cross-section of the South Australian community, including a significant number of young people, Aboriginal people and rural representatives. All members of parliament are being invited to attend, and access will also be available for members of the public to observe the proceedings.

The Drug Summit is not intended to be just another talkfest. This is a unique opportunity for the South Australian community to work together in a bipartisan forum to consider new and innovative ways to map out a future course of action, including changes to legislation that can really tackle the drugs problem in this state.

### BARCOO OUTLET

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:** Yesterday in question time I answered a question about the Barcoo Outlet. In a grievance following that question, the member for Unley suggested that I may have inadvertently misled the house by my use of the word 'effluent'. I do not believe I did, but I have sought advice and done some study on this and, in an abundance of caution, I would like to add to my answer from yesterday. The member for Unley had a dictionary definition of the word 'effluent'. I looked up the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, which says:

Effluent is stream flowing from larger stream, lake, sewage tank or industrial process.

On a layman's basis, I was correct in my use of the word. However, from a technical person's point of view, the word 'effluent' would generally be referred to as sewage or industrial discharge. The discharge from the Barcoo Outlet consists of rainfall from the Sturt River catchment containing all the material lying in gutters, roads and streams, including untreated animal waste. This is generally referred to as

stormwater. There is also the discharge of nutrient-rich, treated sewage effluent into the Upper Sturt River from the Heathfield sewage treatment plant. I want to add that to the statement that I made yesterday.

### CASINO

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

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has leave.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Thank you, sir.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I appreciate the member's help. I am pleased today to table the codes of conduct for the casino approved by the Independent Gambling Authority. The casino's codes are the first to be designed by the authority in accordance with its new legislative charter. I am also tabling the accompanying report of inquiry under the Independent Gambling Authority Act in which the authority sets out its reasons for its decision. The casino's codes deal with advertising and responsible gambling, and are the first of four codes of practice that will also cover lotteries and wagering, and gaming in hotels and clubs.

The IGA has indicated that it will seek to apply new measures equally across the gaming industry when all the codes are completed by the end of the year. This is likely to include mandatory warnings for all gambling advertising and a review of player loyalty programs.

The authority followed an open process of consultation in developing the casino codes. The government will seek to proclaim section 16 of the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Act into operation from 1 June to enable the codes to come into effect. The responsible gambling code of practice will require the casino to:

- provide responsible gambling material in five languages other than English, those being Italian, Greek, Chinese, Vietnamese and Arabic;
- display helpline stickers on each gaming machine and nearby ATMs;
- train staff to identify problem gamblers;
- take steps that prevent parents from leaving their children unattended, particularly in cars, and to notify police if necessary; and finally
- not serve alcohol to or allow a person who is intoxicated to gamble.

The advertising code of practice will require the casino to:

- ensure that its advertising is socially responsible and does not mislead or deceive the customer;
- comply with the code of ethics adopted by the Australian Association of National Advertisers;
- ensure that advertising is not specifically directed at minors; is not directed at vulnerable groups including recovering problem gamblers; does not promote gambling as a means of relieving financial difficulties; and does not make claims related to winnings that are not based on fact, are unable to be proven or are exaggerated; and
- disclose the odds of winning when advertising prizes. The authority has indicated that it will also require mandatory warnings for all gambling advertising.

Gambling is a legal and very popular form of leisure. It is appropriate for the casino and for other gambling operators to advertise the existence of gambling as a form of leisure. However, there should be guidelines that restrict the appeal of gambling as a way to make money. The authority charac-

terises gambling as an 'opportunity to enjoy oneself by losing money'. Just as cigarette smokers are reminded by advertising that their addiction to nicotine could kill them, gamblers should be reminded that they are likely to lose money. Addicted gamblers lose a lot or all of their money and they often lose their employment and their families. The authority will pursue mandatory warnings for all advertising of gambling rather than impose the measure on the casino in isolation. The authority has also indicated that it will investigate player loyalty schemes as part of the hotel and clubs codes of practice and apply those proposals equally to the casino and gaming machines.

People often have strong views about gambling. That is certainly true of members in this parliament. Some believe that the gambling industry is overly regulated, while others may criticise the casino codes for not going far enough to curb gambling in our community. I do not have the power as minister to reject or amend the codes. However, like other members, I will keep a watching brief on their operation and the evolution of the other codes as they are introduced later in the year. The parliament may choose from time to time to complement the codes with additional legislative measures. The authority's casino codes of practice are another step towards better regulation of gambling in South Australia, the result of which should be a diminution of problem gambling in our communities. I commend them to the house.

### MEMBERS, REFLECTIONS ON

**The SPEAKER:** I regret the necessity for a further statement regarding my attempt to lift the standard of behaviour in debate in the House of Assembly. I have been alerted to the remarks of the Hon. Rob Lucas in another place yesterday. It is not my intention to compound the offence by debating the matters with members in the other place. I will reiterate the principle, which I am advocating in the Assembly, which is an attempt to prevent that and other offences from occurring. I have been a sinner myself in the past, but standing orders and practices state it is wrong. Public expectation is that it must stop.

It is very clear from standing orders, the practice of this house and applicable practices of the Commons that reflections, professional or personal, on any member of either house by any other member of either house should occur only in certain circumstances, that is, on substantive motion. It is quite wrong for anyone to suggest that upholding this principle can in any way be construed as preventing or stifling debate. We all as MPs have rights. As MPs we have privileges, but neither rights nor privilege unless we accept responsibilities. I intend to discuss this—indeed I already have—with Mr President, because it is my belief that what I am attempting to achieve in the Assembly can only be of benefit to the parliament as a whole and will enhance its standing in the eyes of the public.

### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I bring up the first report of the committee.

Report received and read.

**Mr HANNA:** I bring up the second report of the committee.

Report received.

## QUESTION TIME

### HOMESTART FINANCE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Given the Treasurer's comments in the media today claiming that elderly people would be the most affected as a result of the federal budget, how does he justify his government's decision to suspend the HomeStart loans scheme for the construction of aged care beds? In an AAP news report this morning, the Treasurer is quoted as saying that the elderly would be the most affected by funding cuts within the federal budget. In that same article, he went on to say, 'That will have a dramatic impact on our large proportion of aged population.'

However, yesterday in this house the Treasurer admitted that he had ordered the suspension of the HomeStart loans scheme, which was designed to assist aged care operators to expand or construct new facilities, as well as fast track the take-up of 700 new aged care bed licences on offer to South Australia from the commonwealth. The opposition has already been advised that this decision has resulted in the withdrawal of funding for the construction of aged care facilities at the Millicent Health Service.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question, although it was very similar to a question asked yesterday. However, I appreciate it in light of the federal budget. I will quickly reiterate the situation. Upon becoming Treasurer, I was briefed by Treasury and was advised that the health budget of the former minister for health (now Deputy Leader of the Opposition) had blown out significantly and that we had been carrying recurrent deficits in the health budget; indeed, the hospitals had been carrying significant deficits. The health portfolio was one of the major contributors towards the significant cost pressures that the former treasurer failed to put into his mid-year budget review.

I was advised that the former minister for health had a number of schemes—a number of ways—in which he was trying to circumvent the budget process. His allocation of capital was already spent. The former minister did not properly provision for the upgrade of our major public hospitals that is currently under way, so further work has to be done to make sure that we have sufficient provision in out years for our major hospitals.

But I am advised that in relation to aged care and a number of country hospitals he came up with a new way of getting around the system—a way of getting around the treasurer and getting around his budget allocation. To borrow money, he went to Homestart—the government's own home lending facility for low income earners not able to afford to borrow money in the market. Dean Brown went to Homestart to get money to pay for capital works.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** 'What's wrong with that?' asks the Leader of the Opposition. No wonder his government could not manage the budget. Borrowing money from Homestart is exactly the same as spending money. It means that it is accruing a liability to the budget. The Under Treasurer advised me, quite correctly, that this was not the right use of Homestart. On the advice of Treasury I did the prudent thing and put the program on hold until such time as I and my ministerial colleagues can assess whether this is the proper use of Homestart and whether this is the proper use of

a government lending authority designed to lend money for home ownership, not designed for ministers to use to circumvent their budget allocation. Until I get that advice, the program remains on hold.

### COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** My question is directed to the Premier. Can he outline the impacts on South Australia of last night's commonwealth budget?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** First, I think it is important to give credit where it is due. I was pleased to see confirmation in the budget papers of commonwealth support for the Mitsubishi package, which is so vital for South Australia. I was delighted to see eligibility for the Gold Card (that is, the repatriation health card for Australian veterans aged 70 and over) extended to service veterans who served after World War II. It is vital that as we go into a new century we provide for those veterans who helped to defend our country in the last century. That is the responsibility of those of us who follow and I am pleased to support the federal government in this initiative. I also welcome financial support for couples starting a family.

However, I am most concerned about the effect of this budget on the most vulnerable South Australians and also on this government's capacity to help those most in need. As a result of a decision made unilaterally by the commonwealth, and confirmed in this budget, South Australia is nearly \$70 million worse off over four years. That is the result of the commonwealth's breaking of the intergovernmental agreement signed by the Olsen government as part of the drive to introduce the GST. The commonwealth abolished fuel indexation and then passed on the burden to the states. As a result of the GST arrangements, South Australia is reliant for years to come on transitional funding from the commonwealth under the intergovernmental agreement. That means that we are reliant on Peter Costello's goodwill, and one of the first things he has done is to renege on his own deal. That places extra pressure on the state government's ability to deliver quality services to the people who need them most.

I am extremely concerned about the impact on South Australian families and the elderly of the \$1.8 billion cut to the pharmaceutical benefits scheme. Those cuts see the cost of a script rise by \$6.20 to \$28.60 for people who do not hold a concession card. For young families, where children are apt to become sick at the same time, that presents a very substantial burden. It is a rise of nearly 30 per cent per script. The rise for concession card holders is also bad, given that the elderly are high users of prescription drugs. Let us not forget that South Australia has the highest proportion of over 65s in Australia: 14.6 per cent of South Australians are aged 65 or over compared with 12.4 per cent nationally.

Again, the rise is almost 30 per cent to \$4.60, meaning that pensioners and other concession card holders could pay up to \$52 a year more. The price of scripts has risen by 70 per cent over the past seven years for both card holders and non-card holders. All this simply means is that the commonwealth is cost shifting, and greater demands will be made by the sick and needy on our public hospital system. I am also concerned about the changes to disability support that could see people with less than 30 per cent disability forced onto unemployment benefits, which could cost them up to \$52 a fortnight. Given that this budget also cuts funding to the Job Network, this move to push the disabled into the ranks of the unem-

ployed will be a worse service to our unemployed who need a hand up, not a put-down.

I am concerned at the apparent lack of any specific provisioning for support for the SAMAG magnesium project—a vital project for Port Pirie and the state. I hope the commonwealth will give the project the support it deserves. I certainly raised it with the Prime Minister during my last meeting with him during COAG, and I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has done likewise.

Finally, I note with great concern that the budget contains almost \$10 million to 'establish two radioactive waste management facilities, a national repository for the underground disposal of low level waste, and a national store for the above ground storage of intermediate level waste'. All the preferred sites for a national low level radioactive waste dump are within our state. I again put on the public record that the South Australian government, like the people of South Australia, opposes any attempt by the commonwealth to turn this state into the nuclear waste dump state. I reiterate that the government will legislate to prohibit a low level radioactive waste dump, established as a national facility, here in South Australia.

I reiterate that any attempt by the commonwealth to locate a medium or high level radioactive waste repository in South Australia will be met by our own deterrent—a referendum of South Australians in the week running up to the next federal election. I reiterate that we will ban the transport of radioactive waste from interstate or overseas within South Australia en route to any such commonwealth established national waste dump. South Australia has more than played its part in being a repository for these wastes. South Australia will not be the dumping ground for the rest of Australia and this government—hopefully, with bipartisan support—will fight the federal government every inch of the way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr Brindal:** Are you going to get it shifted back?

**The SPEAKER:** No; the member for Unley is mistaken. I did not call him; he is not the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

#### HOMESTART FINANCE

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Can the Minister for Health advise the house what other country hospitals will be affected by the government's decision to suspend the HomeStart loan scheme for the construction of aged-care beds; how does the minister intend to address the shortfall in aged-care beds as a result of this decision; and was it a cabinet decision? The HomeStart scheme for nursing home beds, particularly in the country and non-profit organisations, was approved by cabinet and the approval process that it had to go through was approved by the Treasurer and Treasury.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The HomeStart scheme—

**The SPEAKER:** Can I help the member for Mawson understand, too, that the explanation being given by the deputy leader is being given quite competently by him and he does not require the assistance of the member for Mawson. I can hear everything he is saying.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I repeat that the approval process was approved by cabinet, by the Treasurer and by Treasury. The HomeStart scheme is to provide a home for

frail, aged people on low incomes here in South Australia, who otherwise would not be able to access a nursing home bed. The decision to stop this scheme is discrimination against frail aged people who urgently need a home.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I need to take this point of order almost every question time. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition almost always in an explanation finishes with an opinion of his own, and it is not proper.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the member is straying into that area now. The Minister for Health.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** Do members want an answer? A number of country health services were asking for dollars through that scheme. I do not have the names of those services with me at the moment, but—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** No; I said 'a number'. The Treasurer has already mentioned, in his answer today and yesterday, that the scheme is on hold and under review as part of the expenditure review of government.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have a supplementary question?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As a supplementary question, my question to the Minister for Health—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is there a point of order from the—

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Sir, supplementary questions are alien to standing orders.

**The SPEAKER:** No, they are not. I assure the Minister for Government Enterprises that they are not.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, I appreciate your protection. The question that I asked specifically was: was it a cabinet decision to suspend the HomeStart scheme for aged care beds. Therefore, I ask the minister that question as a supplementary question, because she did not answer it the first time.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** The answer is that the Treasurer put the scheme under review.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Colton.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES BUDGET

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** Can the Minister for Emergency Services please inform the house whether there are any difficulties with the Emergency Services budget?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services):** I thank the member for his question, and I acknowledge his keen interest in the area of emergency services. There are difficulties with the Emergency Services budget, in particular the Country Fire Service budget.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** If members on the other side could learn any courtesy. Prior to the last election, I was concerned, as the shadow minister, with the state of the Emergency Services budget, and I went to the trouble of asking the former minister, the member for Mawson, as to the state of the budget, particularly that of the Country Fire Service. On 24 October last year, I asked the minister if he could assure me that there would not be a substantial and material blow-out in the Country Fire Service budget. The

answer I received at that time was very plain. The former minister said:

I am not aware that there will be any problem with the budget at the end of the year.

I quizzed him on that statement and he assured me that it was the case.

I can advise the house that, over the previous three years under the former government, structural and chronic difficulties had developed with the Country Fire Service budget. Back in the financial year 1999-2000, these problems began to develop. In the year 2000-01, they led to a budget overrun of some \$3.8 million, and at the time that the minister answered the question of 24 October the estimate from agencies was that the 2001-02 budget—the one on which I quizzed the minister—would overrun by some \$3 million. Changes since that time, and some accountability, will see that figure reined in. However, I advise that our best estimate is that the CFS budget will overrun by in excess of \$2 million this year. They may not sound like significant numbers to some people, but let me make plain. All they to do is talk through this—they really should be ashamed.

Let me put this in context. The budget base for the Country Fire Service was \$11.476 million. The total net operating base without the emergency services admin. unit charge was \$14.875 million. When that overruns by \$3.8 million, you have an overrun on the budget in excess of 20 per cent. Thank God, thank all powers, that this minister was in charge of the Country Fire Service budget and not the health budget or the education budget. We would not have had a black hole: we would have had a state on the road to bankruptcy. In addition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I really do believe these people need to be chastened by their behaviour and not continue to interject. Perhaps they could model themselves on the behaviour of the government. In addition, I am advised (and we are still doing the sums) that we have not been told about driven—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** By the officials who advised you that you would not listen to—by those officials, by the heads of departments. I am referring to further GRN driven costs that were never admitted to in excess of the \$247 million which may amount to, in CFS alone, \$17 million over the next four years—unavoidable, driven costs as a result of the introduction of the GRN in addition to the current budget overrun.

In the light of the information I have provided, I think it now falls to the Leader of the Opposition to have some consideration as to the standards that he expects of his shadow ministers and former ministers in terms of the truthfulness of answers to this house. Let me make it absolutely plain: when the former minister gave his answer on 24 October, the situation at that time was that the best estimate of his agencies was that the budget would overrun by \$3 million, or some 20 per cent.

#### MURRAY RIVER FISHERY

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier advise the house when cabinet will consider a compensation package for river fishermen, and will the families affected be consulted prior to the budget announcement, which occurs seven days after they lose their livelihoods? In response to previous questions on this issue, the

Premier has undertaken to provide me with a briefing, of which I am very appreciative. However, yesterday the minister responsible in another house said that this issue is yet to be discussed by cabinet. In the meantime, the fishing families have been written to and informed that they will lose their licence on 30 June, despite there being little or no consultation with them in respect of the compensation as promised to them by the member for Hammond.

**An honourable member:** Tell us the truth.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I will tell you the truth. I have offered the Leader of the Opposition a briefing. All he has to do is pick up the phone and speak to the minister, Paul Holloway, and we would be very grateful to provide him with the information that he wants.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Sir, I have a supplementary question. I think the Premier misunderstood the question. The question was: because the minister said yesterday that the decision had not been made by cabinet, when will cabinet make the decision, and will the fishermen be consulted?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The cabinet will make a decision when the cabinet submission is completed and presented to cabinet. We have a 10-day rule that we try to apply—apparently that did not always apply with respect to the former cabinet. A submission will be put before cabinet and then cabinet collectively will consider that submission.

#### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. Was the previous minister advised of any problems in the CFS budget?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services):** I have already detailed to the house the dramatic overruns in the Country Fire Service's budget. Not only was the minister advised but also there is an absolute welter of documentary evidence of budget problems in the CFS going over three years. I will identify three specific instances where they were brought to the minister's attention.

In April 2000, at the start of what I would describe as structural and recurrent problems, he was advised of the likelihood of a deficit of \$1.5 million in that financial year's budget. A minute to the minister's adviser dated 27 September 2001 gave details of a \$3.8 million overrun for the 2000-01 budget. A minute dated 18 October 2001, six days before the answer of the former minister (the member for Mawson) in the house, refers to a verbal briefing having been given to the minister of an analysis that it was now certain that the CFS budget would be overspent by \$3 million. I again repeat my answer to the previous question: it is now up to the Leader of the Opposition to show some leadership and give some regard to whether he expects his shadow ministers and former ministers to be honest in their answers to questions in this house.

**Mr BROKENSHERE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Given your ruling, if the minister is quoting from a document or a docket, I ask that it be tabled.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Sir, I deliberately did not quote. I gave evidence; I gave factual basis. I can assure the former minister of this: if he wants me to produce all those documents to you, Mr Speaker, and to the house, I will be more than happy to do so. In fact, a little later I might quote from documents and produce them.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister anticipated my question to him. Accordingly, I will examine those documents and, should they disclose in the public interest that the information

provided by the minister has veracity of which the house needs to be aware, they will be tabled. As an aside, I am astonished. The inference, it seems to me, is that someone has misled the house. The member for Davenport.

### RADIOACTIVE WASTE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** Given the federal government's budget announcement last night that it will commit funding for the construction of a purpose-built, low level radioactive waste storage facility in Australia's safest place near Woomera, will the Minister for Environment and Conservation guarantee that existing South Australian low level radioactive waste, currently stored within South Australian suburbs and towns, such as Bedford Park, Mount Barker and indeed North Terrace, or newly created low-level radioactive waste in South Australia in the future will be stored in this commonwealth facility at Australia's safest place?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** It is apparent to me that the member for Davenport and the opposition just do not get the matter. The people of South Australia do not want waste from interstate stored in our state. That is the bottom line. We will resist every step that the commonwealth government takes to bring that waste into our state. We will introduce legislation next week to prevent them from doing that. We may fail ultimately in it, but we will fight them every inch of the way. This government's policy in relation to the waste that we have in our state now, which is generated from South Australian actions will—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Schubert will remain orderly for the duration of the day's sittings.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Mr Speaker, thank you very much. This government's policy on the waste that is generated in this state is that we will conduct an audit of that via the Environment Protection Agency. We will work out—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The member for Davenport would like to hear the answer, so give him the courtesy of paying attention. We will audit the state of the storage of that waste, and we will make a determination after going through that process as to how it should best be stored.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** Given the minister's previous answers to questions today, what is his understanding of how this problem occurred?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services):** I thank the honourable member for the question and assume she refers to the problems in the CFS budget. I was astonished to learn how they occurred. The best advice—and the documentary evidence provided to me shows—that in the 1999-2000 financial year the Country Fire Service (and I hasten to point out that it then had a different chief executive officer) engaged in something that I can only describe as a unilateral increase in its recurrent budget. That is, it decided that it would increase its budget, regardless of what the government did. It applied funds that were intended for capital purposes or, in this case, for a repayment of government radio network costs and addressed them to a program to employ extra staff, which of course makes an impact on recurrent funding and not on capital.

It is, first, not right to spend capital expenditure on recurrent funding and it is certainly not right to do it in a way that gives you an obligation into the future because it becomes a unilateral attempt to increase your budget, which is alien to proper financial management. The net result was that by the end of the 1999-2000 financial year the Country Fire Service had increased its staffing by 31 per cent. By the end of 2000-01, the Country Fire Service had increased its staffing by 69 per cent, its motor vehicle lease and incorporated costs by 129 per cent and its marketing and PR unit by 90 per cent on its recurrent budget, without any increase in recurrent budget for that. The reason the former minister was able to hide three deficits in a row in recurrent funding is that since that time the Country Fire Service has been spending its capital expenditure budget on recurrent funding. It has been filling in the hole through capital expenditure.

This is alien to proper financial management. It can be done while you are allocated new capital expenditure, but what occurs when that runs out? Do you start selling fire trucks and fire stations to pay for salaries? The most cursory examination shows how alien it is to proper financial management. On a number of occasions in recent weeks I have been approached about shortfalls and delays in the announced capital program of the Country Fire Service. I advise the house that a large responsibility for those delays must go to the former minister who allowed the capital program to be spent on recurrent expenditure. It is obviously a disgrace.

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you clearly said to the house a few moments ago that the inference is that someone had misled the house. I do not know what you were referring to, but clearly by your own rulings a criticism of another member must be the subject of a substantive motion. If someone has imputed an improper motive, I ask you to rule who imputed the improper motive and ask them to withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** I advise the member for Unley that in debate members may only refer to other members by substantive motion where it relates to those members' characters or conduct. In answer to questions, ministers are obliged to answer the question truthfully and without debate, and in this case it is a question and not a debate. The member for Davenport.

### RADIOACTIVE WASTE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Given the minister's previous answer, will he today rule out using the proposed national low level radioactive waste storage facility to store low level radioactive waste created in South Australia? Will he rule it out?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** The member for Davenport is obviously very obsessed with this issue and I can only repeat what I said before.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** We will undertake an audit of the waste stored in South Australia.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** You are hypocrites. Rule it out.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I object to that comment from the member opposite.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the member for Davenport will remain orderly for the duration of the sittings of the house.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. As I said to the member in answer to the previous question, the government's policy is that we will audit the material that is stored in South Australia. We will do that via the EPA and, after we have done that, we will determine what we will do. The issue of whether or not we might use the commonwealth facility is highly hypothetical because that facility does not yet exist and, if we have our way and if our legislation is successful, it will not.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Can the Minister for Emergency Services advise the house what steps were taken by the former disgraced minister to address the problems in the CFS budget?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for West Torrens to repeat the question. I was unable to hear it.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Can the minister advise the house what steps were taken by the former minister to address the problems—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot hear.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Can the minister advise the house what steps were taken by the former minister to address the problems in the CFS budget?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. The question just read out now is different from the question previously read out by the honourable member, because previously the honourable member included the word 'disgraced', which he has now deleted.

**The SPEAKER:** I could not hear what the member was saying.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I ask that you rule the question out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Not on that basis. The Minister for Emergency Services. The question as I have heard it is the one that he is to answer.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services):** I thank the honourable member for his question. I have never before heard an opposition insist that an offensive word be reinserted but I must indicate that the first time he was just a few weeks ahead of the game. In regard to the budget problems, which I have said over the last three years have developed into being chronic and recurrent ones, the previous minister did less than nothing at all to address them. In fact, all his actions were addressed at exacerbating the problem. I will quote from a document on this occasion, although I have not done so to date on this point. I think it is relevant for I have never read anything quite like it.

It is what I would term a despairing letter from the existing Chief Executive Officer of the Emergency Services Admin Unit to the Chief Executive Officer of the justice department, that being the relevant ministry, in regard to the repeated attempts to have the former minister address the funding problems in the budget and the responses that were given. I will table this and any further documents that you, sir, believe are necessary to explain this. Under the heading 'Increasing evidence of lack of financial and management control', I quote the Chief Executive Officer of the Emergency Services Admin Unit, as follows:

Given what I understand to be the outcome of your pre-Christmas meeting with the minister, it would appear that the minister is not

prepared to address the consequences of potential budget blow-out and financial recklessness by agencies, in particular the CFS. However, while these issues are well documented, it is gravely concerning that the message which is being given is that no steps will be taken to permit the review of agencies that, prima facie, are experiencing major difficulties in meeting their statutory responsibilities. Whilst I understand that you may be preparing correspondence to individual agency heads reminding them of their legal obligations, this lack of ministerial action will only encourage increasingly reckless behaviour.

I point out that, if any other chief executive officer committed to writing that sort of criticism of a minister, and were it wrong, I would expect them to have been sacked by now. He remains the Chief Executive Officer of the Emergency Services Admin Unit. He attempted to explain in his view why the difficulties occurred. Under the heading, 'Mounting aggressiveness by the CFS', he said:

It is my view that CFS management is quite aware of the minister's vulnerability and lack of desire to do anything which is seen to be critical of the CFS because of its politically sensitive volunteer base.

The head of the Emergency Services Administrative Unit—the head that he defended—said that the minister was allowing financial recklessness because he was worried about the votes of the volunteer base. Mr Speaker, that is a disgrace! I go on. The head of ESAU said:

As predicted, based on past history, the minister has supported the CFS on these issues, initially without hearing both sides of the argument.

The picture that is painted is of a minister who was prepared to allow the CFS to increase its budget unilaterally. But there is more.

*The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I honestly urge the member for Newland to desist from interjecting because I do not think she has this former minister's record and she should not be painting herself with his brush, because there is more.

**The Hon. D.C. Kotz:** What are you going to do—reject all the support for the CFS? Is that what this is about?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** When the member has restrained herself—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland will cease interjecting. The minister will not respond to interjections.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** The chief executive in November 2000 wrote to the then minister. She set out a number of things. She set out that the current management of emergency services was placing insupportable pressures on the Emergency Services Fund. One of the specific things that she set out was that it had an incapacity to handle the capital expenditure it was being given and that in many cases it was not applying it correctly. We have heard from the head of the Emergency Services Administrative Unit. The head of the Attorney-General's Department recommended that there should be a cut in capital expenditure. The minister, after that, went to cabinet with a recommendation to increase capital expenditure and was successful. And we know why.

I refer to a further document which is an email from the Attorney-General's Department to ESAU. One of the reasons why the minister sought an increase in capital expenditure without addressing recurrent expenditure problems was set out. It states (and I refer to the email):

But now for the crunch. If the CFS operating expenditure is running ahead of budget—

and we have abundant evidence that it is—

then it will have to finance that overspend by reductions to the capital program, given the minister's reluctance to go to cabinet on

this matter and the distinct possibility that the Treasurer will not support any increase.

The minister was not only deceiving the people of South Australia, but he was deceiving his own cabinet and Treasury. Instead of seeking the increase for the overrun in recurrent expenditure, he was allowing them to spend capital funds on it and he was hiding it from his own Treasurer. What lower standard of economic management by a government minister could there be?

But the then minister had two reasons why he wanted an increase in capital expenditure, and I refer to another email from one of the ESAU officers which states:

Remember here, at the same time, that the minister has asked us to commit the expenditure on the capital program ASAP by December.

I am referring to the year 2001. The rest of the capital expenditure was to go in a pork-barrelling exercise before the election. It is the most disgraceful and political management of a budget that I have come across in this place. Mr Speaker, I will provide the documents, and I will quite happily provide any further documents that you require to put these matters in context. I was astounded by the weight of documentary evidence against the minister. But let me make it absolutely plain that he not only refused to tell this house that the budget was overrunning, but he also refused to tell his own Treasurer.

I say again, as I said in the answer to the first question: the Leader of the Opposition is required to show leadership and he is required to show this house what standard he requires from his front bench.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson has the call.

### VOLUNTEERS

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Given the importance of this National Volunteers Week, will the Premier and the government remain committed to maintaining constructive and open dialogue with volunteer groups, such as Surf Lifesaving SA, Volunteering SA, those centres in the north and south, Emergency Services, Friends of National Parks, and the like, to ensure that volunteer groups are consulted about issues relevant to them? Volunteering has long been an integral part of the Australian way of life. Nowhere is it more evident than in South Australia—

**The SPEAKER:** That is well understood and it is a clear, agreed opinion that is not needed in explanation.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** South Australia has the highest rate of volunteer activity of all states and territories, with 38 per cent of our population participating. They make an enormous contribution. The opposition views support of volunteering as an ongoing responsibility of government, and I ask the Premier to advise us whether or not he will support open dialogue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is not really an explanation: it is a statement of opinion, and a statement that is not intended to be part of an explanation is highly disorderly.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I am delighted to announce to the house that on Volunteers Day, which will be the same day as the Adelaide Cup, I will be announcing a major consultation process with volunteering groups in this state, to a degree that has never occurred in the history of this state, with a view to reaching a compact of understanding at a later date. I intend that process to—

**Mr Brindal:** Everything is at a later date. We will help you to make a decision now.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** This is something, I understand, that is likely to be welcomed by the volunteering sector. Let me explain. If we were simply to announce a compact from one side, members opposite would then be jumping up in parliament and saying, 'Why haven't you consulted with the volunteering groups?' Obviously, the frontbencher did not appreciate that the member for Mawson just asked for consultation. When I announce consultation, members opposite attack me for delaying decisions. They cannot have it both ways. I will be announcing a consultation process. What is more, I am happy, if the honourable member would like it, for him to come to my office afterwards so that I can explain it to him.

### MIDWIFERY STUDENTS

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What action has been taken to assist midwifery students from Flinders University whose courses were in jeopardy because of a lack of insurance cover while training in public hospitals?

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** It is good news for the midwifery students at Flinders University. These students' courses were in jeopardy because they had no insurance cover while undertaking training commitments in public hospitals. The Department of Human Services has worked in partnership with Flinders University to resolve this problem. The university has agreed to fund the extension of the department's indemnity insurance arrangements to cover these students while they are training in our public hospitals.

It has been a stressful time for students who were forced into a situation where their courses were in jeopardy because they would no longer be able to carry out practical midwifery work at public hospitals. I am pleased to announce that, as a result of cooperation between Flinders University and the government, the problem has been resolved.

### LONZAR'S LODGE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Given the Premier's response to the previous question by the member for Mawson, where the Premier committed the government to open consultation with volunteer groups, why were the Friends of Parks members and supporters snubbed by this government and not consulted prior to the secret demolition of Lonzar's Lodge in Flinders Chase National Park on Kangaroo Island yesterday?

Lonzar's Lodge was built in 1958 by the then head ranger of the Flinders Chase National Park. The building is not only the ranger's residence but also a community focal point, which includes a tea room, post office, emergency service headquarters, visitor accommodation and a weather station. Lonzar's Lodge is a warm favourite of Friends of the Park and they did not want it demolished. The previous government had given a commitment to a moratorium on the decision until April next year with a promise of further consultation. Yesterday, the approval was rushed through to demolish Lonzar's Lodge while the bulldozers were on site—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The shadow minister cannot use such epithets and pejoratives as 'rushed through' in the course of the explanation. It is a matter of stating factual information to the house, which will enable it to understand



the context of the question, not to make a speech. Leave is withdrawn. The Minister.

**Mr MEIER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Goyder has a point of order.

**Mr MEIER:** Mr Speaker, I assume that the point you were endeavouring to get across is that the words 'rushed through' could be substituted with words such as 'instigated' or 'pushed through', because what other adjectives are we to use to highlight that it was rushed through?

**The SPEAKER:** Passed, determined.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**An honourable member:** A point of order or another question?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No; I am seeking a further clarification. Mr Speaker, my understanding is that you are making a judgment that using the word 'rushed' is not a fact—that the approval was not rushed. Mr Speaker, on what basis do you make the assumption that the approval was not rushed?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Upon listening to the explanations of the member for Davenport, I heard the member saying things which were not necessary to understand the context of the question but, rather, to put a point of view about his observations. That is debating the matter and, accordingly, when I heard the pejorative, I pulled him up and withdrew leave, and the precedent for withdrawing leave is to be found on numerous occasions throughout the rulings of the Speaker in the 48th Parliament.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Mr Speaker, with due respect, if I could finish my explanation you would see that I believe approval was rushed through. The bulldozers were on site yesterday morning to demolish the building, while the approval was put through that morning. My understanding, Mr Speaker, was that it was—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** —rushed through—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** —with the bulldozers on site.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have had plenty of time to contemplate the—

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** The officers of the department gave me a personal commitment and the officers gave me—

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

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I think the trouble is that the member for Davenport and the deputy leader are struggling to come to terms with the fact that they are no longer the government. We are the government: we are the ones who make the decisions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I would like to answer the question, and I would like the member to pay me the courtesy of listening to my answer. The member has asked a question, so will he now listen to what I have to say? I am not sure how many weeks ago—I think three or four weeks—but I visited Kangaroo Island for a number of purposes. One of those purposes was to visit the park on the eastern end of the island.

**An honourable member:** The western end.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I am sorry; I beg your pardon—on the western end. I visited the eastern end, too. I inspected the

building that is a matter of concern for the member of Davenport. I also inspected the development on the site, which is part of the former government's parks agenda, and I was informed by officers of my department that a range of buildings were to be demolished, except for the particular one to which the member for Davenport referred. I asked, 'Why is that the case?' and I was informed that a number of people had associations with the building and that the former minister had put a moratorium on the demolition of that building. I then asked, 'Will this cost any extra money if we have to come back with bulldozers and demolition equipment to demolish this building?' I was informed, 'Yes, there is a cost penalty for making that decision.' I asked, 'Am I bound by the decision of the former minister?' The answer was that no, I am not. I said, 'Well, I will have a look at this matter afresh.' So, I asked the department to consult—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Please, Dean! As I understand it—and I do concede that I did not talk to the Friends of the Park, because they had not made any representations to me on this matter, but—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Not to me, they haven't.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** No, they have not. I sought advice from the appropriate authority, namely, Heritage SA, and I was informed that there is no heritage value associated with this building. Heritage SA had no interest in the building. Therefore, I approved its demolition, which is the advice that was given to me by my department, just as it is the advice that they had given to the former minister.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I have a supplementary question, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** In the circumstances, I am satisfied with the reasons given in direct response to the question asked. I call the member for Playford.

## CHILDREN'S SERVICES

**Mr SNELLING (Playford):** Can the Minister for Education and Children's Services inform the house what provision is made for children's services in the 2002-03 federal budget handed down yesterday?

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley has a point of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** How, sir, is the Minister for Education in this place responsible for—

**The SPEAKER:** I cannot hear what the member for Unley is saying.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I believe that members have to ask questions that are relevant to the responsibilities of a minister in this place. I ask you, Mr Speaker, how the minister is responsible for the federal budget?

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. Quite clearly, the federal budget impacts on what the state will otherwise have to spend one way or another, up or down. The minister.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** Thank you, sir, for allowing me to proceed with the answer to this question, because, clearly, the opposition does want to hear what—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will answer the question. Whether or not she believes that the opposition

wants to hear the question is irrelevant; I want to hear it. The minister.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** The answer to the question is, quite simply, that the federal budget in the area of education generally is extremely disappointing for South Australia. But for a few crumbs it is obviously an opportunity missed for a state that could well have done with a significant funding increase. That is not what we have seen in this budget for education. With respect to the specific question asked by the member for Playford about children's services provisions in this budget for South Australian families, it is again a failure to provide for families with young children.

While the baby bonus initiative recognises women who choose to stay at home to care for their first child, the federal budget announced last night also reflects a reduced commitment to families through a cut in the strengthening families and communities strategy. The reductions to that strategy of \$10 million in this coming financial year and \$6.5 million in 2003-04 will reduce the funding available for future programs under that strategy. It will also become harder and harder for working families to find a child-care place in South Australia with the federal government failing to meet the increased demand for child care that we are experiencing here in South Australia.

The budget contains no additional child-care places for centre-based long day care, family day care or outside school hours care. In South Australia, that demand for child care exceeds supply across all program areas. Services are at capacity. Without new places, services will be unable to meet demand. This will lead to further demand, longer waiting lists and increased pressure on services. Those shortages are compounded by the fact that the allocation of new child-care places in South Australia in recent years has dropped—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that, to be consistent with previous rulings, the minister is straying into opinion rather than answering the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I confess to the house that I did not hear what the minister was saying. If the minister is beginning to debate the question, that is not in order: it is out of order.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** In recent years South Australia has not attracted its traditional 8 per cent share of the national funding for child care in this state. Allocations have not kept pace, let alone kept pace with any increase in demand. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, 76.2 per cent of children under three in South Australia use child care (both formal and informal) compared to the national average of 65.3 per cent. In addition, the ABS statistics show that South Australia currently has the highest proportion of informal child-care users—more than 50 per cent use informal care in South Australia compared to 43 per cent nationally.

There are definite strong links between economic growth and work force participation with access to quality child care. South Australia needs more places, but did not get them in this federal budget. The federal budget, indeed, does nothing to address the urgent need here in South Australia.

### HEALTH REVIEW

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Health rule out hospital closures or amalgamations as a result of the health review announced yesterday, and will the minister release immediately the full terms of reference for the review?

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** On numerous occasions before and during the state election—

**An honourable member:** And after.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** —and after—the Premier, other members of the government and I stated very clearly that, under a Labor government, no public hospital would be privatised and no public hospital would be closed. End of story.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### ROADS TO RECOVERY PROGRAM

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** Will the Minister for Local Government advise us of the impact on South Australian local councils of the federal Liberal government's decision to cut the Roads to Recovery Program? Last night, the federal Treasurer announced a cut to the national Roads to Recovery Program, which was to provide additional local funding to South Australian local government councils of \$100 million over four years to 2004-05.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Local Government):** Under the Roads to Recovery Program, South Australia was to receive \$25 million over the next four years, with \$21.25 million going direct to councils and \$3.75 million going into a special projects fund. The federal Treasurer's announcement that this year's funding will be cut by \$100 million nationally is of serious concern to South Australia. This is likely to result in a reduction in the 2002-03 allocation to South Australia in the order of \$8.3 million. This is a reduction in funding that councils in South Australia can little afford, particularly given that South Australia receives such an inequitably low proportion of national funding for local councils under the Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grants Program, both in general purpose grants and in grants for local roads. There is also a practical aspect of this decision that has been ignored by the federal Treasurer's cut, that is, that many local councils already have entered into contractual arrangements for works on the basis that they would receive funding under this program. This is a disaster.

I am advised by the Local Government Association that the federal government gave it no indication that these cuts were on the cards. In fact, last year, councils were encouraged to bring forward their local roads programs due to the lead times needed to undertake roadworks.

I will be looking for a commitment from the federal government that the shortfall in local roads funding will, indeed, be made up within the next three years. Furthermore, I will be seeking a continuation of the one-off funding that was provided under the Roads to Recovery Program in a way that will rectify the current—and longstanding—inequity in the way in which federal road funding has been provided to this state. We are looking to work with the Local Government Association to achieve this outcome. I am aware that the former minister also knew that this inequity was in place, and he was not able to do anything about it in the time he was there. But we will be looking, in a spirit of bipartisanship, for his support in the interests of South Australia.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question before the house—

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I would like a ruling from you as to whether you treat supplementary questions as a full question and, therefore, include it as part of the 10 questions each day.

**The SPEAKER:** I am in the hands of the house as to what the length of question time will be and how many questions are asked. Standing orders are quite clear on that. The time for questions has expired.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a further point of order. A certain compact was reached in which there were to be 10 questions each day—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Well, we asked eight primary questions and I am therefore seeking a ruling from the Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The standing orders are quite explicit. If the house wants anything different all honourable members know, probably better than I, what the procedure is. The member for Davenport.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** There is no need. I know what the standing orders say in this respect. The amount of time for asking questions in the chamber—

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I understand. I also point out, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** —is 60 minutes.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —in fact, there was only one supplementary question—

**An honourable member:** Two.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** No, one.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mine was a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Davenport has the call. We are in grievance, as per standing orders, not as per members' feelings.

## LONZAR'S LODGE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** Well, Mr Speaker, it has gone: in a secretive move by the government, Lonzar's Lodge has been demolished without any consultation with the volunteers or the Friends of Parks group. The tragedy of this is, I think, that it will colour the relationship between the Friends of Parks groups, the volunteers and the new minister. Today, the new minister came into the house and told us that this was not an instant decision: it was something that he contemplated for three or four weeks after a personal visit to Kangaroo Island. He had enough time to pick up the phone and seek advice from his own agency, but he did not have the time to pick up the phone and speak to any of the Friends of Parks groups or the volunteers. There are something like about 6 000 or 7 000 Friends of Parks volunteers groups—or individuals. The minister had time to ask his own agency what the view was, but did not have the courtesy, the manners, the enthusiasm or the energy to pick up the phone and seek out the views of those people who had lobbied the government and the department on this issue for a number of years.

Lonzar's Lodge may not be important to the minister: it may just be an old building to be demolished. But, as the

Minister for Environment and Conservation, he has a two-part role in relation to heritage and conservation issues. This house was built in 1958 by the then Head Ranger of the Flinders Chase National Park. It was built with the assistance of the people in the nearby soldiers' settlement and, indeed, was constructed from handmade bricks made by Mr Lonzar and his good wife. It has been directly associated with that park since that time. The building served not only as the ranger's residence but also as a community focal point, and included tea rooms, post office, emergency service headquarters, visitors' accommodation and weather station. Lonzar's Lodge was associated with the work of the flora and fauna board which was created to manage the new Flinders Chase National Park in 1919, and which was managing it at the time when the house was built. The board, indeed, held its meetings there until 1972.

The tragedy of the minister's action is clear, I think, from his recent answer to the house. Here is a minister who sat there for four weeks contemplating a decision about an issue in which his department had been involved for some two years. He would—or should—have been aware through his briefing papers that a moratorium was in place until April 2003.

Did we really think that the officers of the department walked around the western end of Kangaroo Island with him (it was the western end and not the eastern end, for the minister's information) over the \$8 million development, talked about Lonzar's Lodge and did not advise the minister that a commitment had been made to the local member (the member for Finnis) and to the volunteers that there would be a moratorium on any decision until April 2003? Does anyone in this house believe that the minister was not told that the moratorium was in place on the volunteers?

Here we are, in the middle of Volunteers Week, and the Premier stands up and promises a consultation process on a compact with the volunteer community. What is the point of a compact with a volunteer community? What is the point of saying, 'You will have a consultation process' when you have ministers of the Crown who could have been advised by the agency that a moratorium was in place until April 2003? They have four weeks to pick up the phone, to flick an email, to write a letter or to send one of their 1 300 public servants or one of their own political staffers to talk to the volunteer groups and ask, 'What's your view?' It is not a hard question. It is not a hard process.

What this minister has done has sent a very clear message to the volunteer groups within the national parks service that he will not take any notice of your view; your view is not important. He does not have the enthusiasm and the energy to pick up the phone and make one simple phone call to ask the people, 'What's your view?' That is a tragedy. It underscores the approach of the government to its volunteer groups. It underscores the approach of the minister on important issues. It is a tragedy for those volunteers who have worked so hard to save this building that the application was rushed through yesterday morning, the bulldozers were on site and down came the building. It is just a tragedy that they were snubbed and that this government undervalues the service and support of the volunteers to such an extent that the minister has four weeks to make the decision and snubs the volunteer—and not a courtesy phone call from the minister's office to boot. It is an absolute tragedy. It is a snub to the volunteers.

**Mr VENNING:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. We had a lot of difficulty hearing that contribution here—

especially today, as the sound was very distorted. I have now been in this place nearly 12 years, and I have never known the audio to be as bad as it is now.

**The SPEAKER:** I have to say to the member for Schubert that I find that to be the case. Having checked with honourable members, we are doing our best to get the engineers back to see what can be done to have the problem fixed, after having drawn their attention to the inadequacies of it earlier this week. I apologise to honourable members for the difficulties they have. Although I had no difficulty hearing the member for Davenport today—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I see. I thank for the member for Schubert and assure him that the matter is in hand. I call the member for Giles.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that there is no minister in the house, and there is always a minister in the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Whilst standing orders do not require it, practices have always, almost without exception, observed it, but that does not stop the house from proceeding.

### VOLUNTEERS

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** Today I want to pay tribute to the many volunteers throughout the state, particularly in my part of the state. Of course, we know that Monday 20 May is South Australian Volunteers Day, and some 420 000 volunteers in South Australia will be honoured for their role in keeping this state functioning. Of course, this week is actually National Volunteers Week, as we have heard on a number of occasions in the last couple of days. In recent years volunteers have become more essential in many of the important services that we have in this country, particularly because of the many cuts to both state and federal funding by Liberal governments. Most volunteers work very hard for very little recognition, and it is interesting when you go into communities to note how often the same people are involved in so many different organisations. You can guarantee that, if you go along and see three or four organisations, in many instances you will probably find many people who are a part of all those organisations.

Some very hard working people in our communities play an extremely active role in their communities. Unfortunately, many other people are quite happy to sit back and watch this happen. Of course, these people are the unsung heroes of our communities, those people who do the volunteer work. I hope that one of the things that come out of National Volunteers Week is that people who are not presently helping out in their communities find out how easy it is and begin to take part in some of the organisations, which are desperately crying out in many instances.

Last year I was very pleased to nominate many Whyalla women for inclusion on the South Australian Roll of Honour. I presented them all with certificates to commemorate this for them. At the presentation, I was amazed at how many tears there were amongst the women who were there, because they had never been publicly acknowledged before for their work. This is very neglectful on our part as a society, and I am pleased that we are having events now such as Volunteers Week and the South Australian Volunteers Day so that these people can be recognised in their roles.

I want to mention many organisations today, but I certainly will not have time to mention them all. First, I need to mention the SES. I have very active SES members in my

electorate in places including Whyalla, Andamooka, Woomera, Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs and in many of the other smaller communities. They are incredible people and their role is certainly varied. They can play parts in so many issues in our communities; for example, the SES played a huge role in the sea search for the Whyalla aeroplane two years ago. It is regularly involved in rescuing road accident victims and in searching for lost tourists in my part of the state.

I was interested to hear in this place in the last couple of days that they were involved in the control of the Woomera break-out. They devote hours of time, and they help in so many ways. I thank all those people involved in the SES. Of course, the CFS very often works alongside the SES in Outback communities particularly, and we have many CFS officers in our communities. Once again, these are important volunteers. We do not have the equivalent of a Metropolitan Fire Service in most of those communities so they do this voluntarily. Although we do not see many bushfires in Giles as there is not too much bush, we have other fires, so it is very important in our communities.

Other sorts of organisations need to be mentioned. We have an organisation called the Air/Sea Rescue Squadron, Whyalla. It has just got some new headquarters at the foreshore thanks to the previous minister (and I acknowledge his presence here), and it is very pleased with this. It has certainly contributed greatly over the last few years in many air/sea searches, particularly in the Whyalla Airlines search. It is still playing a vital role in our community, and it is happy with its new headquarters. I will be working with it and looking at some other issues that need to be resolved there.

We have organisations in Whyalla other than the CFS and SES; for example, we have a group called Advancing Whyalla. It is there mainly to promote Whyalla as a community, to promote things within our community and promote our community outside Whyalla, because we often have problems with our media image. Another organisation that works along it is Cuttlefish Capital. We have an absolute treasure in our region as we have this incredible site where cuttlefish regularly congregate and spawn, and I believe divers come from all over the world to see this. We have film crews coming in constantly and people diving to look at this, and it is certainly taking off.

Those people who are prepared to promote our communities in other ways—still working as volunteers—are an essential part of smaller communities. Of course, the churches in all these communities play an incredible role. In Whyalla we have the Bunyarra Christian Community. St Vincent de Paul which plays a vital role in so many communities is at this stage playing a vital role in Woomera helping out with the refugees. There is also the Salvation Army, Lifeline, Anglicare and the Central Mission. We could not function without these communities in so many of our areas, and I thank them.

Time expired.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I rise to make some comments about the Country Fire Service and the allegations in the house earlier today by the Minister for Emergency Services. What we have seen here is only part of what we will continue to see from this government for some time. However, it cannot fool the community of South Australia when it comes to where we have left the state compared to what it

is saying, on a range of issues. Not the least of these is the Country Fire Service. The angle on which the minister was coming in was to say that he asked me during questioning on the Auditor-General's Report whether the budget for 2001-02 was on track at that stage. That was the question that the shadow minister then asked me. My answer was that as far as I was aware it would come in within budget.

At around that time I had a minute from the fund manager, and I recall that the minute indicated that that budget was on track. In fact at that time, short of having a major issue like an Ash Wednesday, which was potentially possible given the high fire load, the budget would possibly come in even under. At that stage, from memory, the indication was approximately \$500 000 in capital works and \$500 000 when it came to the operational budget.

This is about the Labor Party positioning itself to look after the United Firefighters Union in an enterprise bargaining agreement. It is about cutting the budget for the Country Fire Service in future.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** We gave the Country Fire Service a record budget for this financial year of \$40.3 million.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Police will not interject.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** What did Labor leave them? It left them a \$13 million debt and left them unprotected during Ash Wednesday, and quite frankly the Labor Party could not have cared less about the Country Fire Service during its time in office. What did we do? We paid off the debt, and we were, and still are, committed as a Liberal Party to 17 400 volunteers. I make no apologies for fighting for increased budgets. When Labor was in office not only did it leave them with a \$13 million debt but also, one will find, the only way it survived was, year after year under Labor from my understanding, to spend capital funds for operational purposes in order to get through.

When it comes to the GRN and the levy, let us look at what the Labor Party did to work against the Country Fire Service and the SES during that time. They opposed that levy at all times. We had to take the pain, but it was worth it to look after volunteers and to protect the community of this state. All they wanted to do was rip the levy apart. If we had had a professional opposition then, volunteers in this state today would have an even better levy than they have now, but it is a marked increase from what they had under the Labor Party when it was in government. We paid off the CFS debt and committed a \$40.3 million budget increase. Go out and ask volunteers whether they are not better off now, thanks to a Liberal Government and a minister who fought for them and who believes in them—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Police!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** —not for political reasons but because I know what they do for the South Australian community. I will continue to back the CFS and the SES all the time.

The other point I will raise is the GRN. The minister, when he was deputy and again now in office, attacked the GRN. How can he attack the GRN when for approximately \$22.50 per man, woman and child we are delivering across the major part of South Australia a radio network integrated to all emergency services—for \$22.50 a year: paid for, built,

owned and operated over seven years. Yet, Bracks in Labor in Victoria is spending \$100 million for one agency only—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Police!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** —on a paging system, and we have not heard the Labor Party opposing that. This is more about positioning themselves to give firefighters an EB agreement without a fight, out of the levy and to cut future Country Fire Service budgets. I will ensure with my colleagues that we will continue to fight for increased budgets for the Country Fire Service.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling the next member, I remind members that accusations of misleading the house have to be in the form of a substantive motion and not thrown across the chamber. The member for Colton.

## VOLUNTEERS

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** I have been disturbed over the past couple of days with respect to the attitude of the opposition in relation to its perception of our attitude towards volunteers. By way of background, I was a firefighter for almost 20 years before I came into this house. I was also Secretary of the United Firefighters Union of South Australia—something of which I am very proud—and the National Secretary of the United Firefighters Union of Australia.

I and this government understand the work done not just by CFS volunteers but by all volunteers in this state. I suggest that, despite the best efforts of the previous government, now the opposition, with respect to generating a good working relationship between volunteers and MFS, it did not exist—they worked against it.

By way of background, back in 1993 when I was the Secretary of the United Firefighters Union a rationalisation process was established then by the Labor government. That process was to look at ways by which there could be an integration between the roles and responsibilities of the CFS and the MFS. That is in the area of training, communications and mutual response. We would get more closely together and through that there would be an integration of responsibilities, less duplication, greater efficiency and the promotion of a good working relationship between volunteers and metropolitan firefighters. It was something the United Firefighters Union at that time developed as part of its policy. We had a policy on volunteers. In fact, that policy was ably assisted by the Volunteer Firebrigades Association at that time to make sure that it was in line with its thinking; that at that time the union promoted a good working relationship with CFS volunteers.

In 1993, when the Labor Party lost government, that approach towards rationalisation and integration of responsibilities fell into a black hole—very similar to the black hole about which the Treasurer has been talking in recent times with respect to the budget. There was a commitment to providing a decent working relationship between the CFS and the MFS firefighters. Despite the fact that it fell in a hole, there continued to be a good working relationship between MFS and CFS firefighters. That continues today and is something of which I am very proud. I am proud that the United Firefighters Union has been able to play its part in ensuring that such a working relationship exists between both organisations and their front line firefighters.

Something was said earlier today (and I could not pick who made the comment as there were so many interjections from the opposition) about what we want to do—whether we want all CFS volunteers to be paid professionals? Nothing could be further from the truth; it is a nonsense. It is constantly promoted by the opposition as the aim of not only the United Firefighters Union but also, through the interjections, the aim of the government. It is rubbish. How can you have paid professional firefighters at Yunta, for example? That would be ridiculous—it cannot be done.

This government and the union I once represented respects volunteers and respects the role they play in the community. The difficulty that has existed in most recent times is the fact that the former minister and the government he represented did not respect or pay due attention to the people who are the paid personnel and undermined the relationship that existed between the two organisations. We will get that relationship back on track.

**An honourable member:** One fire service?

**Mr CAICA:** A single state fire service is not a policy of this government. We respect volunteers and understand the role they play, and I advise the member for Morphett to have a close look at the way in which the fire services interact with and react to each other.

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett will cease interjecting.

**Mr CAICA:** The member for Morphett has obviously forgotten a lot of what he may have learnt at that time. Unlike the opposition, this government respects and understands all people who contribute to the delivery of emergency services in this state. I am proud of that and our government will excel in that area. I look forward to the minister in future question times detailing how the MFS budget has been diminished at the expense of the former government's overt attitude towards volunteers against others involved in the system. It has not been an integrated or holistic approach by the now opposition to the delivery of emergency services in this state, and we as a government will remedy that.

#### ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to draw the attention of the house to the Premier's announcement today of the creation of the Adelaide International Film Festival. This morning at 10.30 the Premier made certain announcements and put out a media release indicating that there would be a biennial film festival in the off year to the Adelaide Festival of Arts. The Premier indicated that he would like this to be a fairly grand film festival and that he foresees it as being a premier event, internationally recognised and respected, and of equivalent status to the Adelaide Festival. He announced the appointment of a board of eminent people and that board is to guide the film festival.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Don't go away, Premier; I will be a little less complimentary in a moment. The opposition gives its very cautious support to this initiative. The point, however, is that what the film industry in South Australia really needs is a well considered, long-term strategy that creates jobs and investment in high quality production of feature films, documentaries and other film. What the film industry in this state really needs is support. If there is money to be spent, what the film industry wants it to be spent on is

the production of good product and the creation of opportunities for people involved in the film industry. What the industry does not want is a glitzy showcase event that draws funding away from the real meat of what the fabulous film industry in this state is about.

In giving its cautious support and welcome to this film festival, the opposition asks that the Premier, in his capacity as Minister for the Arts, back it up with a substantial strategy and a plan for significant investment in the film industry so that our industry can really grow. The Premier's opening act as arts minister, frankly, was a bit of a flop—to cut up the Barossa Music Festival and throw it on the scrap heap, without offering any substantial alternative to that festival for the people of the Barossa region. It was an act of reckless vandalism that has been passed off with throwaway lines about looking at some other event.

If it is the Premier's intention to cut further into regional arts, if it is his intention to distract scant arts funding away from other arts activities into this film festival, then the opposition expresses sincere and earnest concern. We would like to ask the Premier a number of questions and we want information on the budget for this film festival. How much is it to cost us every two years and over the next 10 years? Are board members to be paid? How much are the structure and operation of the board to cost the taxpayer? How much are the Don awards going to cost the taxpayers of South Australia? What return on their investment will the taxpayers of South Australia receive from this proposed film festival?

It is a festival that could quickly blow out into a major cost to the arts budget as we struggle to differentiate our film festival from the many other film festivals in Australia and overseas that will compete with us. These are matters to which the Premier needs to give his most careful attention. Further, the Premier keeps trading off Don Dunstan's name. We are now going to have the Don awards—I assume some sort of statuette of Don. It is all very humorous but I think it is time for the Premier, as Minister for the Arts, to cut his own path and his own identity in the arts portfolio. He has not got off to a very good start.

This is an extremely important industry. We want to see it grow, we want to see our arts community with jobs, producing fabulous products, and a really vibrant and exciting arts industry, and I commend the previous minister, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, for her outstanding effort. I follow on in a shadow capacity to ensure that the Premier meets the obligations and expectations of the industry.

Time expired.

#### HOSPITALS, MODBURY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Yesterday the house heard from the member for Newland in her Address in Reply speech about 'a local electorate example' of the inability to tell the truth. The example concerned the Modbury Public Hospital and I rise today to put on the record information that I hope will correct some misconceptions that may have arisen from the member's contribution and to clarify a few inaccuracies with some factual information of which she may not be aware.

The Labor Party, of which I am a member, has never pilloried the Modbury Public Hospital because it was used as an experiment in privatisation. What was opposed was the privatisation of a public hospital because as we all now know, as has been acknowledged by the former ministers for human services and government enterprises, the contract signed with

Healthscope, the group that took over the management of the Modbury Public Hospital, was not workable and has been renegotiated twice. In other words, the demands of the contract were such that they could not be met, so to protect patient health and safety or corporate viability, or perhaps even both, the former government allowed the contract to be renegotiated.

Part of the original contract, the part that was claimed would be the jewel in the crown, so to speak, of the whole exercise, was never realised, at least in full or for very long. The north-eastern suburbs were promised, as part of the deal to make the contract profitable for Healthscope and of value for patients wanting to use private facilities, a separate, collocated private hospital. For various reasons, this form of private hospital never eventuated and, for a while, a private ward ran within the Modbury Public Hospital building. That is where the discrepancy comes in.

The Modbury Public Hospital, which remains operational and delivering quality health services to the best of its ability and capacity to the north-east, remains the only part of that contract still running. With that avenue of profit removed, it became apparent to north-east residents, some of whom were part of the Modbury Hospital Local Action Group, which is an incorporated group, that the only other way for the contract to work would be for the hospital to reduce costs further, by shedding staff or services or both.

The Modbury Hospital Local Action Group, as I recall, began in 1994, prior to the signing of the original contract by the Hon. Michael Armitage. The group involved community activists of all political persuasions and continues to operate with those people and, while it is no longer as active as in the past, it still meets regularly. With much of its active membership involved in other areas now, unfortunately the group has not been able to maintain as high a profile as it did in the early days. These people held and still hold a point of view contrary to that held by the then government, that privatisation could not work, even by using the most efficient public hospital in the state as the guinea pig, so to speak. It is worth noting that moves to involve the QEH in a similar privatisation were scrapped, perhaps because it was recognised that the model was flawed.

Community activism is part of the democratic process and, without it, people are denied the opportunity to participate in democracy at a grassroots level. Rather than show 'complete disregard for the safety of the community', these measures were identified as a threat to community safety, that is, to cut either staff or services. The Modbury Public Hospital was bypassed many times, most importantly by ambulances, and that has been documented many times here, and, as I am sure the house is aware and to the best of my knowledge, the Modbury Hospital Local Action Group has no influence with the South Australian Ambulance Service. Rather than show 'complete disregard for the staff at the hospital', this was and remains the major concern for all, for without staff hospital services cannot be delivered. In fact, staff were present in their hundreds at the initial meeting to explore the privatisation, to show their concerns about decisions they feared had already been made, decisions with adverse impacts on patient care and work conditions.

Rather than being 'malicious and untruthful'—the campaign that we saw in the recent state election—the comments that the member for Newland picked up on were subject to the State Electoral Commission, and what the *Advertiser* happens to print is its business and also nothing to do with the Modbury Hospital Local Action Group.

The function that was held on 5 March, which we also heard about in the honourable member's Address in Reply speech, was indeed a happy day because it saw the opening of the refurbished maternity unit. The new minister was performing her first official opening and we were all very honoured that it was at the Modbury Public Hospital. The minister has inherited the difficulties associated with the problematic contract of the Modbury Public Hospital and is working with all stakeholders to ensure the future of the hospital and well-being of the patients and staff.

Unlike the past, when Modbury was not mentioned in the same breath as the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the QEH, Flinders or the Lyell McEwin, Modbury Public Hospital is again being considered and being promoted as part of the public hospital network.

Time expired.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 14 May. Page 178.)

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am not sure in how many Address in Reply debates I have participated, but I was elected to the Thirty-Ninth Parliament and I am honoured to have been re-elected to the Fiftieth Parliament. I am proud to be a member of the Liberal Party, and I will have more to say about that and the process of our two party system.

At the outset, I commend the efforts of Her Excellency the Governor for the manner in which she is carrying out her duties. She has a long history of public service to the people of South Australia and, indeed, has a long history of outstanding sporting achievements. I also indicate the appreciation of the people of South Australia to her predecessor, Sir Eric Neal, and Lady Neal for the outstanding contribution that they made to people right around the state.

I look forward to the challenges that will face members of parliament in the next four years. I said earlier that I am proud to be elected as a member of the Liberal Party because I believe that democracy operates at its best in an efficient party system. All the great democracies around the world operate where there are well organised, informed political parties. All but two members in this chamber owe their election to initial endorsement by one of the two major political parties. No matter how members try to dress up or to otherwise explain their election to this place initially, they all were very pleased to have the endorsement of the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. The only two exceptions are the member for Gordon and the member for Chaffey, and the member for Chaffey belongs to a political party which, of course, is recognised across Australia to a lesser degree. So, I believe that our system in this state functions very well on most occasions.

This is the second occasion that I have sat in this parliament when the Liberal Party has gained the majority at a general election. I would have no problem sitting on this side of the house if the Labor Party had won the election fairly and squarely and received the most votes. I would have no problem at all—that is democracy. I think it is interesting to note the information provided to us by the electoral commission that the Labor Party received 344 559 first preference votes (that is 36.3 per cent of the vote) and the Liberal Party

received 378 929 votes (or 40 per cent of the vote), and that is a clear and absolute majority for the Liberal Party.

Based on what we have been told in the past, the Liberal Party should be in government. The people of South Australia, when they exercised their franchise to vote, believed that they were voting to re-elect a Liberal government with a small majority. I believe that in the future, unless there are extraordinary happenings, we will not see huge majorities on either side of the house.

I think the comments which I have made clearly indicate that I intend to participate vigorously in the debates in this chamber, because when I was originally—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** In your usual, incomprehensible way.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It is a great pity, Mr Deputy Speaker—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You have trouble with the English language, don't you?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Attorney-General knows better.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It really shows something about someone when the only comments that he can make across this chamber, towards me in particular, are nasty, personal and vindictive. He must be a very unhappy person. He can never say anything nice. Because some of us never had the opportunity, and if I do not have the same grasp of the English language that the Attorney-General has, that is not my fault. He had much better education opportunities than I had. But, Mr Deputy Speaker, I think I have made a reasonable success of my life, and I take his comments towards me as great personal effrontery. I have been elected notwithstanding the scurrilous and untruthful campaign that he and his colleagues entered into, and I will have more to say about that later. If the best he can do as Attorney-General of South Australia is to engage in that sort of personal conduct, I feel sorry for the people of South Australia and he ought to be ashamed of himself.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What was the disgraceful question you asked? Do you remember that?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Attorney-General will cease interjecting and making derogatory comments. It is not helpful and does not reflect well on any of us.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; you are absolutely correct. I came into this chamber many years ago with a view to giving my constituents a strong voice in parliament and effectively representing them within government and its agencies. I am pleased to say that, even though the electoral boundaries have changed considerably, I have been successful in each of the elections that I have contested. I greatly appreciate the honour and privilege that has been bestowed upon me in being elected 11 successive times.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What difference have you made in those 30 years?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Attorney-General that he is going down a very dangerous path. He should know better, and he needs to act in an appropriate manner and not interject. He should be setting a standard, not lowering himself by his behaviour.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I suggest to the honourable member that he should travel around Eyre Peninsula and in the isolated communities in the northern parts of the state and ask the people whether I have given them fair and reasonable representation. Had I not done so, I would not be back here today. The Attorney-General could not represent a large

country district because he does not have a driver's licence, so he could not get himself around it.

**An honourable member:** He'd find a way.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** He would want to make a better job of it than he has until now. The honourable member, in his usual unfortunate attitude toward people on this side of the house—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No, I like people on your side.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have already warned the Attorney. I ask the member for Stuart not to encourage the Attorney. You will both desist from making personal derogatory remarks; otherwise, I will take appropriate action.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would not want to encourage him; I assure you of that. I want to make a few brief comments in relation to my understanding of why I am here and what we should be looking to achieve in the future. When I came into this chamber my residents were the farthest west of this place than those of any other member of this place. Because of the way in which the electoral boundaries have been drawn and the new system, it is unlikely, unless someone is rather fortunate, that anyone from my part of the world will have a real chance of getting elected to this place again in the future.

Looking at the operations of this parliament and its instrumentalities, it concerns me that we are talking about having a constitutional convention. For what purpose? It would appear to me to be nothing more than a waste of taxpayers' money—a talkfest, with no understanding or desire to improve the welfare of the people of South Australia. It will occur purely at the behest of one or two individuals.

At the end of the day, the talk of restructuring the parliament and of reducing the membership of it is a dangerous course of action and contrary to the best interests of the community and democracy. The fewer members of parliament there are, the more exclusive the club becomes, the easier it is for the bureaucracy to manipulate and manage them and the less ability the average South Australian citizen has to become a member of this place.

It is terribly important that the average citizen has the ability to become a member of this place. We need a cross-section of the community in here. We do not want those people with the ability to buy their way into the election. One of the things that did restore my faith in democracy at the last election was that in my seat alone it was proved beyond doubt that you cannot buy your way into parliament.

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I had a campaign launched against me which was estimated to have cost some \$230 000. That is the rumour that is going around Labor circles. As well, it has been suggested that they funded the Independent candidate, Mr David Moore, and his advertising campaign. That is what the Labor Party functionaries are saying around the district.

I understand that a deal was done with Mr Moore at the Trades Hall to organise him. Of course, it is also interesting to note who actually authorised Mr Moore's material. It was authorised by the member for Hammond. Both the electoral material which was distributed and his how-to-vote cards were authorised by the member for Hammond.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** He was running for CLIC: of course it was authorised by Lewis.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It is also interesting—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Tell us something interesting.



**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Attorney-General for the second time.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** The comments that Mr Moore was making around the district as he travelled around and in certain hotels he frequented were interesting. He was indicating that there was more than an expectation that he had been given an undertaking that he would be able to mine in the Gammon Ranges National Park. Everyone knows, no matter what process took place, that was not going to happen. I personally agreed that he ought to be able to buy the lease from BHP if he so desired. I said that at the outset. However, I did indicate to him that everyone knew he would never pass the next step, that is, an environmental impact statement. He never would have passed that step.

However, Mr Moore and his group were so keen on mining that they entered into these particular arrangements. His preferences went against me. We had a One Nation candidate who did not know the difference between \$50 000 and \$50 million, and did not know the difference between state, federal and local governments. Being a so-called right wing party, they gave their preferences to the Labor Party. Well done! The Labor Party has been very critical of One Nation but is very happy to take their second preferences.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It would appear that, as a result of the comments he is making, the honourable member who interjects is a supporter of the One Nation cause. One of the things I have learnt in this place is that when government passes laws it should be very careful to protect the rights of individual citizens against bureaucracy. One of the challenges we all will face in the future, this government in particular, is whether it passes legislation in the public interest or whether it passes legislation put to it in the interests of the bureaucracy.

In many cases the bureaucracy is insensitive to the needs of the average citizen. It puts forward proposals purely to make its life easy, no matter the expense to the individual or groups of individuals and no matter how unfair or unreasonable. When an ordinary citizen is taken to court or is under challenge from the government, one of its employees or agencies, they are at grave disadvantage. In many cases they do not understand the law; they do not understand their rights; and they do not have access to legal representation. The government, through its instrumentalities and the bureaucracy, has unlimited funds and time. No matter how difficult they make it for an individual, they always believe they are right. It is absolutely imperative we ensure that at all times we protect the public against bureaucracy.

When I first became a member of this place, a very senior experienced public servant said to me, 'The first thing you should remember as a member of parliament is that you are there to question the government. No matter how annoyed the minister gets with you, whether he is a member of your government or, if in opposition, a member of the government of the day, do not be put off. The second thing is that you are there to question and challenge the bureaucracy—members of the public service—about how they administer acts of parliament, how they interpret regulations and how they carry out public policy. You should do it all the time, because every time you back off someone misses out and someone will be badly treated and stepped on.' That is good advice which I have always remembered. I have tried to pursue those objectives which the very experienced, successful public servant made to me.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You have.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I have tried very hard. I have many examples where ordinary law abiding citizens have been the victims of quite disgraceful public administration, but I give one example which greatly annoyed me. A constituent of mine had a visit from two inspectors from the Department of Transport. They arrived at her home and served her with a summons because a vehicle which belonged to a partnership to which she belonged had been allegedly overloaded. They had been charged with that offence.

There was a bushfire in the district and the person who drove the vehicle and understood how to load the truck was away fighting the bushfire. The father of the person who used to drive the truck overloaded the vehicle. He was greatly inconvenienced by the inspector. The truck was in top condition. However, the summons was served on the daughter-in-law. She had never had a truck licence and her name did not appear on the registration. When she so advised them, very rudely they said, 'Get onto prosecution.' When she rang the prosecution section, she was told, 'You will appear in court and you will do it when we say.'

At that stage, a very irate person rang me. I believed that it was an outrage so I took appropriate action. I contacted the minister at 10 o'clock that night and I addressed the minister in appropriate terms which he could not fail to understand. I advised my constituent what was going to happen. I sought advice from a very prominent member of the legal profession about how to deal with the issue. The lady in question was a highly skilled member of the nursing profession whose services were required at the Port Augusta Hospital on a regular basis. The skills she had were in short supply. What was she to do when she was to be brought down on a trumped-up charge for an offence she never committed when she had to be at the Port Augusta Hospital helping to deliver babies in the middle of the night? Was she going to be dragged to the court at Port Pirie by these aggressive, vindictive people who should have been sacked for their conduct? I said to the minister, 'You take her to court and we will have every television camera we can muster there. I look forward to going there and I will be willing to pay to get one of the leading QCs to represent her. We look forward to seeing you in court but remember that you will get a censure motion in the parliament on you and the public servants as well.'

I demanded a full apology from the minister and the two inspectors—which I got. That again demonstrated to me that members of parliament should not back off. If we had not pursued that matter a number of other people would have been treated in an equally disgraceful manner. How can you take someone to court when they have never committed the offence? The people in question had no understanding of the law; they had no ability to get legal representation; and the rudeness and the arrogance of the officers in question was a disgrace.

We have now passed so many laws that the cost of obtaining legal representation is becoming so high, that it is not too far off when this parliament will have to appropriate money for a public advocate so that people can obtain legal advice. We have gone down this track of these dreadful on-the-spot fines. In my view, the parliament was misled when these fines were first represented. It will take a bit to get me to vote for another one of those expiation clauses in a bill. I believe that they have been misused and abused, and people lose their rights. The stock answer of a person writing out one is, 'If you don't like it, go to court,' knowing full well that that is a very expensive option. Of course, what they did not

bargain on is that there are a few other tricks in the 'member of parliament book'. Start putting questions on notice about a particular officer, because the Deputy Commissioner will have to answer the question and he does not like doing it.

Every time a member sees bureaucrats being over-zealous, put questions on notice. It annoys their boss, I can tell you. It is an old trick. I say to new members, 'Don't be put off that the minister will be cross with you.' I have been in government: ministers have been cross with me on a regular basis, but I have never lost an ounce of sleep. When they have told me that I am hard to get on and that I am difficult, I own up to it, with no apology.

I am not here to please ministers and bureaucrats but to represent the people who elected me. I am here to participate in the parliamentary process. I am honoured to be endorsed by the Liberal Party, and I stand by those principles and I have never faltered in them, which gives me a great deal of freedom to operate as an individual member of parliament. I do not intend to be told how to carry out my duties. If they do not like it, they know what they can do. What I will do is ensure that my constituents are properly represented.

In the few minutes that I have left, let me just tell you what happened at the last state election. The government has talked about a code of honesty, a charter of open government. If government members really believe in that they ought to apply it to the tactics, tricks and standards that their political party applies when campaigning in certain selected seats in Adelaide. Let us be completely transparent. Let us not ride two horses; let us be quite open. Let us just see what happened in the electorate of Stuart.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Well, you spent \$230 000 and took 130 votes off me. That is what you took off me. I started with a 630-odd vote majority and ended up with a 504 majority—and you spent \$230 000. Well done, a good investment! It is very important—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You will not be here for four years.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** This government could fall over tomorrow. I accept that and look forward to it. If it was based

on merit, you would not be there today. If it was based on decency or what the electorate of South Australia wanted, you would not be Attorney-General today. Everyone knows that. If you had an ounce of decency and political principle you would not be there.

Let us see what happened in the electorate of Stuart. The Labor Party obviously came to the conclusion that it could not attack the Liberal Party or me on the sort of representation we had provided for the electorate, so they engaged in a personal campaign of misrepresentation and character assassination. First, they endorsed a candidate—one of the Attorney-General's friends; his group. The Labor Party gave him a motor car with a big sign on top of the car—

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Well, look the less you say—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has been warned twice; he is running out of warnings. The member for Stuart has the call.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If the member will just let me finish. I could have engaged in the same sort of personalised campaign, but we determined that two wrongs don't make a right.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I did not engage in character assassination. If the member wants me to, I could say plenty of things. I have had lots of people tell me things. My own electorate secretary comes from Quorn, just remember that, and knows the background. One of the documents that they put around has a sign—I think it is the Coldstream Guards at Buckingham Palace—and it says, 'Missing you.'

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It is not funny. It's got 'To the patient taxpayer'. It goes on to give a brief explanation about some of the trips I have made overseas. If the Labor Party is so interested in when members of parliament went overseas and how they travelled, don't they believe in parliamentary travel? I therefore seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table setting out the travel expenses for the last four years of all members of the House of Assembly.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the table purely statistical?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Yes, it is Mr Deputy Speaker. Leave granted.

House of Assembly members annual travel report 1997-98

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Allison, Hon. Harrold	0.00				0.00
Andrew, Mr K.	25.20				25.20
Armitage, Hon. Michael	2,857.60				2,857.60
Ashenden, Hon. Scott	0.00				0.00
Atkinson, Mr Michael	1,244.32		1,514.00		2,758.32
Baker, Mr D.	1,886.37				1,886.37
Baker, Mr S.	0.00				0.00
Bass, Mr S.	0.00		0.00		0.00
Becker, Mr H.	894.40		756.00		1,650.40
Bedford, Ms Frances	1,087.45		2,542.00		3,629.45
Blevins, Hon. F.	0.00		0.00		0.00
Breuer, Ms Lynette	963.19		756.00		1,719.19
Brindal, Hon. Mark	192.00		280.00		472.00
Brokenshire, Mr Robert	2,253.20		1,008.00		3,261.20
Brown, Hon. Dean	1,821.90		420.00		2,241.90
Buckby, Hon. Malcolm	0.00		0.00		0.00

## House of Assembly members annual travel report 1997-98

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Caudell, Mr C.	0.00		0.00		0.00
Ciccarello, Ms Vincenzina	1,292.50		356.00		1,648.50
Clarke, Mr Ralph	629.00		2,912.00		3,541.00
Condous, Mr Steve	1,030.10		1,906.00		2,936.10
Conlon, Mr Patrick	1,759.28	857.59	2,336.00	2,205.00	7,157.87
Cummins, Mr J.	941.20		0.00		941.20
DeLaine, Mr Murray	958.04		0.00		958.04
Evans, Hon. Iain	3,939.80		1,578.00	49.50	5,567.30
Foley, Mr Kevin	708.70		1,008.00		1,716.70
Geraghty, Ms Robyn	708.70	5,923.60	0.00	1,575.00	8,207.30
Grieg, Ms J.	0.00		0.00		0.00
Gunn, Hon. Graham	1,972.10		0.00		1,972.10
Hall, Hon. Joan	0.00		0.00		0.00
Hamilton-Smith, Mr Martin	2,553.84		784.00		3,337.84
Hanna, Mr Chris	909.40		542.00		1,451.40
Hill, Mr John	1,740.56		682.00		2,422.56
Hurley, Ms Annette	3,306.14		0.00		3,306.14
Ingerson, Hon. Graham	0.00	7,210.00	0.00		7,210.00
Kerin, Hon. Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Key, Ms Stephanie	1,429.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,429.34
Kotz, Hon. Dorothy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Koutsantonis, Mr Tom	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Leggett, Mr S.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lewis, Mr Peter	2,705.13	1,377.81	4,317.06	0.00	8,400.00
Matthew, Hon. Wayne	206.20	0.00	290.00	0.00	496.20
Maywald, Ms Karlene	1,576.02	0.00	138.50	0.00	1,714.52
McEwin, Mr Rory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Meier, Mr John	1,605.10	0.00	532.00	0.00	2,137.10
Olsen, Hon. John	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Oswald, Hon. John	2,187.76	0.00	1,906.00	0.00	4,093.76
Penfold, Mrs Liz	1,337.84	3,021.60	2,835.00	0.00	7,194.44
Quirke, Mr J.	2,835.51	400.00	756.00	0.00	3,991.51
Rankine, Ms Jennifer	455.50		1,260.00	0.00	1,715.50
Rann, Hon. Mike	3,684.15		0.00	0.00	3,684.15
Rosenberg, Ms L.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rossi, Mr J.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Scalzi, Mr Joe	797.12	0.00	860.00	0.00	1,657.12
Snelling, Mr John	894.40	761.62	1,626.00	160.00	3,442.02
Stevens, Ms Lea	418.30	0.00	140.00	0.00	558.30
Such, Hon. Bob	2,759.00	4,501.04	3,052.00	0.00	10,312.04
Thompson, Ms Mary	602.15	0.00	252.00	0.00	854.15
Venning, Mr Ivan	878.93	0.00	252.00	0.00	1,130.93
Wade, Mr D.	420.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	420.00
White, Ms Trish	1,209.00	0.00	756.00	0.00	1,965.00
Williams, Mr Michael	2,326.20	0.00	1,008.00	0.00	3,334.20
Wotton, Hon. David	1,764.76	0.00	1,173.60	4,422.35	7,360.71
Wright, Mr Michael	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	65,767.40	24,053.26	40,534.16	8,411.85	138,766.67
Grand Total					138,766.67

## House of Assembly members annual travel report 1998-99

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Armitage, Hon. Michael	9 190.62	0.00	280.00	0.00	9 470.62
Atkinson, Mr Michael	2 073.28	0.00	5 364.00	0.00	7 437.28
Bedford, Ms Frances	1 190.32	0.00	580.00	0.00	1 770.32
Breuer, Ms Lyn	1 567.74	0.00	2 036.00	0.00	3 603.74
Brindal, Hon. Mark	997.70	6 336.00	784.00	0.00	8 117.70
Brokenshire, Hon. Robert	0.00	2 509.36	280.00	5 040.00	7 829.36
Brown, Hon. Dean	2 394.44	0.00	280.00	0.00	2 674.44
Buckby, Hon. Malcolm	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ciccarello, Ms Vini	467.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	467.84
Clarke, Mr Ralph	116.00	0.00	2 240.00	0.00	2 356.00
Condous, Mr Steven	1 195.22	871.50	1 036.00	3 150.00	6 252.72
Conlon, Mr Patrick	1 143.76	0.00	2 344.00	0.00	3 487.76
DeLaine, Mr Murray	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Evans, Hon. Iain	1 747.43	0.00	933.50	0.00	2 680.93
Foley, Mr Kevin	1 223.71	6 374.37	1 512.00	7 875.00	16 985.08
Geraghty, Ms Robyn	666.90	0.00	504.00	0.00	1 170.90
Gunn, Hon. Graham	1 940.00	5 117.74	0.00	3 465.00	10 522.74
Hall, Hon. Joan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hamilton-Smith, Mr Martin	2 865.72	2 926.20	700.00	4 095.00	10 586.92
Hanna, Mr Kris	2 305.76	544.93	1 548.00	3 150.00	7 548.69
Hill, Mr. John	2 895.51	0.00	2 306.00	235.00	5 436.51
Hurley, Ms Annette	5 096.00	0.00	504.00	0.00	5 600.00
Ingerson, Hon. Graham	527.13	1 795.00	707.00	1 970.00	4 999.13
Kerin, Hon. Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Key, Ms Stephanie	659.30	12 361.36	870.00	10 080.00	23 970.66
Kotz, Hon. Dorothy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Koutsantonis, Mr Tom	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lewis, Mr Peter	3 140.64	0.00	1 008.00	0.00	4 148.64
Matthew, Hon. Wayne	0.00	0.00	140.00	0.00	140.00
Maywald, Mrs Karlene	1 001.04	5 340.00	0.00	5 670.00	12 011.04
McEwen, Mr Rory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Meier, Mr John	2 859.02	0.00	2 296.00	0.00	5 155.02
Olsen, Hon. John	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Oswald, Hon. John	3 683.88	0.00	2 212.00	0.00	5 895.88
Penfold, Mrs Elizabeth	381.80	0.00	420.00	0.00	801.80
Rankine, Ms Jennifer	2 925.15	0.00	3 072.00	0.00	5 997.15
Rann, Hon. Michael	3 408.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	3 408.74
Scalzi, Mr Joe	951.12	0.00	1 204.00	0.00	2 155.12
Snelling, Mr Jack	1 958.42	4 301.00	1 588.00	3 438.00	11 285.42
Stevens, Ms Lea	1 714.30	1 983.00	2 364.00	1 975.50	8 036.80
Such, Hon. Bob	2 092.13	0.00	2 912.00	315.00	5 319.13
Thompson, Ms Gay	1 739.69	0.00	1 108.50	0.00	2 848.19
Venning, Mr Ivan	671.80	5 328.94	0.00	5 670.00	11 670.74
White, Ms Trish	2 183.36	0.00	1 652.00	0.00	3 835.36
Williams, Mr Mitch	671.80	5 059.92	580.00	5 040.00	11 351.72
Wotton, Hon. David	516.80	0.00	866.50	0.00	1 383.30
Wright, Mr Michael	2 240.08	0.00	3 054.00	0.00	5 294.08
Totals	72 404.15	60 849.32	49 285.50	61 168.50	243 707.47

## House of Assembly members annual travel report 1999-2000

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Armitage, Hon. Michael	0.00	0.00	140.00	0.00	140.00
Atkinson, Mr Michael	1 018.50	0.00	4 315.00	0.00	5 333.90
Bedford, Ms Frances	483.64	0.00	1 284.00	0.00	1 767.64

## House of Assembly members annual travel report 1999-2000

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Breuer, Ms Lyn	2 353.80	0.00	2 311.00	0.00	4 664.80
Brindal, Hon. Mark	1 128.00	0.00	1 052.80	0.00	2 180.80
Brokenshire, Hon. Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Brown, Hon. Dean	1 184.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 184.06
Buckby, Hon. Malcolm	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ciccarello, Ms Vini	423.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	423.00
Clarke, Mr Ralph	825.31	2 141.75	2 251.00	4 275.00	9 493.06
Condous, Mr Steven	1 916.05	999.00	1 498.20	2 205.00	6 618.25
Conlon, Mr Patrick	5 516.23	0.00	7 214.00	0.00	12 730.23
DeLaine, Mr Murray	1 270.14	0.00	570.00	0.00	1 840.14
Evans, Hon. Iain	0.00	0.00	140.00	0.00	140.00
Foley, Mr Kevin	440.80	1 791.36	410.00	1 575.00	4 217.16
Geraghty, Ms Robyn	2 129.84	0.00	756.00	0.00	2 885.84
Gunn, Hon. Graham	1 126.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 126.85
Hall, Hon. Joan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hamilton-Smith, Mr Martin	4 029.05	0.00	995.00	0.00	5 024.05
Hanna, Mr Kris	4 177.84	0.00	3 334.00	0.00	7 511.84
Hill, Mr. John	1 068.97	5 441.48	2 851.00	4 987.50	14 348.95
Hurley, Ms Annette	6 853.64	0.00	728.00	0.00	7 581.64
Ingerson, Hon. Graham	359.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	359.00
Kerin, Hon. Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Key, Ms Stephanie	1 876.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 876.26
Kotz, Hon. Dorothy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Koutsantonis, Mr Tom	1 602.40	0.00	2 307.00	0.00	3 909.40
Lewis, Mr Peter	2 990.24	0.00	896.00	577.45	4 463.69
Matthew, Hon. Wayne	164.00	0.00	1 010.00	0.00	1 174.00
Maywald, Mrs Karlene	2 082.69	0.00	1 300.00	0.00	3 382.69
McEwen, Mr Rory	1 109.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 109.44
Meier, Mr John	4 007.28	0.00	1 565.00	0.00	5 572.28
Olsen, Hon. John	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Oswald, Hon. John	2 381.22	2 097.10	1 940.00	0.00	6 418.32
Penfold, Mrs Elizabeth	235.20	0.00	754.00	0.00	989.20
Rankine, Ms Jennifer	992.35	0.00	1 927.00	0.00	2 919.35
Rann, Hon. Michael	2 091.30	6 925.00	0.00	0.00	9 016.30
Scalzi, Mr Joe	763.78	0.00	2 255.00	0.00	3 018.78
Snelling, Mr Jack	2 703.78	0.00	5 839.00	0.00	8 542.78
Stevens, Ms Lea	645.90	5 368.19	730.00	4 410.00	11 154.09
Such, Hon. Bob	52.00	2 145.80	1 803.00	1 260.00	5 260.80
Thompson, Ms Gay	4 370.62	0.00	3 119.00	0.00	7 489.62
Venning, Mr Ivan	2 909.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	2 909.80
White, Ms Trish	1 392.84	1 554.11	2 344.00	2 493.75	7 784.70
Williams, Mr Mitch	933.28	0.00	504.00	0.00	1 437.28
Wotton, Hon. David	2 869.81	0.00	1 606.00	0.00	4 475.81
Wright, Mr Michael	863.98	7 602.67	1 639.00	4 275.00	14 380.65
Totals	73 343.29	36 066.46	61 388.00	26 058.70	196 856.45

## House of Assembly members annual travel report 2000-01

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Armitage, Hon. Michael	5 810.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	5 810.56
Atkinson, Mr Michael	1 520.92	0.00	3 419.00	0.00	4 939.92
Bedford, Ms Frances	2 331.13	0.00	3 520.00	0.00	5 851.13
Breuer, Ms Lyn	2 831.77	0.00	2 343.40	0.00	5 175.17
Brindal, Hon. Mark	1 104.08	7 704.40	855.00	0.00	9 663.48
Brokenshire, Hon. Robert	1 161.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 161.16

## House of Assembly members annual travel report 2000-01

Member	Travel costs		Daily allowance		Total \$
	Australia \$	Overseas \$	Australia \$	Overseas \$	
Brown, Hon. Dean	3 539.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	3 539.77
Buckby, Hon. Malcolm	0.00	6 415.10	0.00	0.00	6 415.10
Ciccarello, Ms Vini	1 114.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 114.30
Clarke, Mr Ralph	1 861.78	0.00	4 787.40	0.00	6 649.18
Condous, Mr Steven	0.00	10 039.00	0.00	6 613.00	16 652.00
Conlon, Mr Patrick	3 209.26	0.00	7 803.00	0.00	11 012.26
DeLaine, Mr Murray	4 414.80	0.00	2 099.00	0.00	6 513.80
Evans, Hon. Iain	1 713.20	0.00	797.00	0.00	2 510.20
Foley, Mr Kevin	0.00	10 775.20	1 013.00	7 481.25	19 269.45
Geraghty, Ms Robyn	2 032.19	0.00	2 799.00	0.00	4 831.19
Gunn, Hon. Graham	699.80	7 176.38	285.00	6 056.25	14 217.43
Hall, Hon. Joan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hamilton-Smith, Mr Martin	6 644.60	2 443.67	2 607.00	3 867.25	15 562.52
Hanna, Mr Kris	3 150.71	0.00	4 330.00	0.00	7 480.71
Hill, Mr. John	1 165.35	0.00	1 305.00	0.00	2 470.35
Hurley, Ms Annette	5 690.21	0.00	2 890.00	0.00	8 580.21
Ingerson, Hon. Graham	0.00	14 469.62	0.00	3 562.50	18 032.12
Kerin, Hon. Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Key, Ms Stephanie	1 133.77	0.00	2 920.00	0.00	4 053.77
Kotz, Hon. Dorothy	968.00	0.00	855.00	0.00	1 823.00
Koutsantonis, Mr Tom	2 853.49	0.00	2 591.00	0.00	5 444.49
Lewis, Mr Peter	4 976.20	2 750.00	2 617.00	4 688.00	15 011.20
Matthew, Hon. Wayne	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maywald, Mrs Karlene	546.54	0.00	622.00	0.00	1 168.54
McEwen, Mr Rory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Meier, Mr John	575.60	0.00	474.00	0.00	1 049.60
Olsen, Hon. John	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Oswald, Hon. John	2 197.16	9 011.04	2 981.00	1 567.50	15 756.70
Penfold, Mrs Elizabeth	3 261.80	0.00	346.80	0.00	3 608.60
Rankine, Ms Jennifer	3 390.85	0.00	4 786.00	0.00	8 176.85
Rann, Hon. Michael	3 365.98	0.00	1 140.00	0.00	4 505.98
Scalzi, Mr Joe	1 515.32	0.00	2 328.00	0.00	3 843.32
Snelling, Mr Jack	3 937.59	0.00	4 570.00	0.00	8 507.59
Stevens, Ms Lea	320.30	5 801.36	1 393.00	6 056.25	13 570.91
Such, Hon. Bob	201.07	0.00	2 420.00	0.00	2 621.07
Thompson, Ms Gay	3 247.93	0.00	4 293.50	0.00	7 541.43
Venning, Mr Ivan	2 395.37	1 488.00	0.00	0.00	3 883.37
White, Ms Trish	2 655.22	0.00	4 570.00	0.00	7 225.22
Williams, Mr Mitch	1 081.32	8 080.60	1 054.50	7 125.00	17 341.42
Wotton, Hon. David	3 090	0.00	1 928.00	0.00	5 018.12
Wright, Mr Michael	1 997.21	0.00	4 116.00	0.00	6 113.21
Totals	93 706.43	86 154.37	86 858.60	46 997.00	313 716.40

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It is interesting to look at who the real travellers are. It says that in 1999—Key, Stephanie, \$23 970—

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I ask that the member for Stuart refer to the member for Ashford by her electorate title.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The member for Stuart knows that in this place you refer to members by their electorate or by their title.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** As a point of order, I refer to standing order 127, Digression: personal reflections on members. Mr Deputy Speaker, this is an Address in Reply debate, and the member is attempting to attack a member of

this house and a minister of the Crown for her travel in a previous parliament.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. As I understand it, the member for Stuart is detailing information from parliamentary records.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Everyone in South Australia who reads *Hansard*—and we can circulate it—will know that the Treasurer spent, I think, \$19 000. He is one of the most frequent travellers. But everyone can see. The second scurrilous document that went out has a mock of a cheque and it is made out to me. It says, ‘On 9 February vote Labor,’ and it has a figure of \$1 337 971. It says, ‘Mr Gunn has racked up over \$1.3 million in superannuation.’ It is not true.

This document says: 'Source: Parliamentary Library'—and a member of parliament went to the Parliamentary Library and sought this information. The Parliamentary Library has no expertise in calculating superannuation benefits. They do not know which scheme I am in. They don't know. They got a calculation—which the library now admits is not correct—but they gave it authenticity by putting on it: 'Source: Parliamentary Library', and they tried to make out that I was getting some benefit which I was not entitled to. I say to the house: how much have I paid into the superannuation scheme in the time that I have been a member?

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If the member does not know, no wonder he makes those sorts of inane interjections. He just wants to think a bit. I have paid in well over \$450 000 into the scheme, but members opposite do not tell the community that. But this particular document is untrue and scurrilous, and the Parliamentary Library should not be permitted—and number one when I became aware of this document I sought from the Parliamentary Librarian the copy of the document which was made about me. He declined to give it to me. I asked him three times. The then Speaker asked him, and he declined to give it. In a democracy when this information is prepared at taxpayers' expense, when it is scurrilous and untrue, I believe if there was any fairness or any openness then I should be entitled to the information that was provided about me. It wasn't, and as far as I am concerned the Librarian has called into question the impartiality of the library, and the library should not be there to carry out and investigate the private activity of members of parliament. The Librarian should be ashamed of himself. He has downgraded the library, and I think it is a disgrace to get involved in politics in the—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** So, you want to hide it from the public?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart has the call.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I am hiding nothing from the public. If the member wishes, we will put some questions on notice and find out how much some of his people have been paid in superannuation. But he should not try to make out that I am the only one who is entitled to a reasonable superannuation scheme. That is a nonsense.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** The longer I stay here, the less computation I can take. The member ought to know that.

Time expired.

#### MEMBER FOR MAWSON

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Sir, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** During question time today, when reading out a question to the Minister for Emergency Services, I prefaced one of my questions by calling the member for Mawson a 'former disgraced minister'. I apologise and retract that statement unreservedly.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate resumed.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I acknowledge that we are on Kaurna land and I—

**An honourable member:** Not you, too.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Sorry, did the member say not me too? I will not name the member who said that, but I am sure he is very regretful and wished no offence. I congratulate our Speaker on his election and you, sir, on your election as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, and I welcome new members to this place. I wish everyone here an enjoyable time—although I do not know that we have had one to date. I know that, for all members in this place, it is a very hard-working existence, as new members will soon discover.

I would also like to thank the electors of Torrens. Indeed, they are a wonderful group of people, and I thank them for supporting my re-election for a third term. I would also like to thank the many people who have rung me—and who are still ringing—with words of congratulations, encouragement and support.

**The Hon. M.J. Wright:** No doubt about them; they're good judges.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, they certainly are. As the Minister for Industrial Affairs has said, they are good judges of character. I would also like to thank my subbranch members and the many volunteers for their support and hard work over the years and for the long hours that they have spent giving me a hand. I have apologised to a number of them for their aching backs and sore feet on a number of occasions, but I do not know whether some of them have yet forgiven me for sending them out into the very hilly suburb of Highbury to do some letterboxing. On the day on which the election was called, I asked them to letterbox some literature for me as soon as they could and, of course, as usual, they very willingly agreed. They went out that evening and were then so enthusiastic that they started again at 5 o'clock the following morning. When I saw them around lunch time, when I bounced in and asked, 'How did it go?'—

**An honourable member:** Did you give them a drink?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** No, I let them get their own. I bounced in and asked them, 'How did everything go?' and this little group of people just looked at me and looked at each other and then asked me if I was trying to send them to their graves. Even today they still have not stopped telling me—I think the words they used when they were going up the hills were that they 'crawled with their nose to the bitumen', and when they were going down they were 'walking at such an angle that they were almost lying on the road', and they had to do that to stop themselves from falling over. They complained to me about their feet hurting and their backs aching. In fact, some of them told me that they would never be the same again, but I have not noticed much change! I told them that I was very sorry and that I certainly would never ask them to do that again. However, I do not think that they believed me, because every time I mention the word 'letterboxing' they just look at me with a look that says, 'Do not even ask.'

To Irene, June, Viv, Rosemary, Ross, Alan and Steven I want to say that you are some of my best supporters, and I will certainly never again ask you to letterbox in Highbury.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** No, I have clarified that—I will not ask them to letterbox in Highbury. I will find them another suburb. There are many of these very wonderful people whom I need to thank. To Ron and Margaret, who are extraordinary friends and supporters, to Walter, Tony, Lisa and family, to Pat, Josie, Andrew, Tony, Kevin, Pat and Ross (very aged and very dear friends of mine, and also a couple that the member for Florey knows very well), and to Rose,

Hans, Brian and his trusty old pushbike, and Geof and Dave for their patience, I say, 'Thank you.'

To Sam, who came along and provided some wonderful Lebanese feasts for us—and I guess we are lucky that we do not eat them every day, because I would certainly be carrying a whole lot more weight than I do now, I also express my thanks. I tell Kay and Dennis that I appreciated their support. To Cheryl, Brian (another Brian), Dorothy, Pat, Bridgit, Irwin, Damion and family, Dianne, Denise, Robyn, Felicity, Henning, Ivan, Phemie (who, unfortunately, is in hospital at the moment and not terribly well), I also pass on my sincere thanks. There were just so many that I really cannot name them all.

However, I really should pay tribute to Ken and his wheelchair. Ken will just travel around anywhere in that wheelchair and do anything. He is a very wonderful man. As I have said, there are just so many of them and I do not mean to leave anyone out. I do appreciate their support and I must say that I was very lucky to have had them supporting me.

I also have to say a great thank you to my family. I have a very supportive family and I guess a tolerant one at that. My husband Bob and our two sons and the grandchildren mean everything to me, and they are wonderful supporters. Even the littlies—the grandchildren—will come out; I guess they are starting their career in letterboxing. I think they know that grandma will call on them quite often. Bob, as usual, was my campaign director, and he kept the wheels turning in the campaign in his very calm way. Not only did he do that but he also ran things on the home front, at which he is excellent. Most importantly, he is always there when I need him.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What was the swing?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I can't remember now. Regrettably, I—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** It was 16.6 last time, yes. I did go down this time, and I will certainly work on that. Of course, their staffs are very important to all members. Without their support we certainly would not be able to do the work that we are needed to do. Gerard and Nelleke were wonderful, and gave their all to ensure that every constituent matter was attended to, and their support was invaluable. Nelleke, my trainee, like all trainees, will be leaving us soon. I am sure that she will have a very bright future. I must say that, whilst her skills in assessing the nuts and bolts of a problem are still developing, she has already gained great astuteness beyond her years and shows a remarkable sense of compassion and understanding. She is always happy to learn and to take on a new challenge and a new experience, and I am very proud to have had some influence in helping her to develop those skills.

I also have to say thank you to friends of more years than I care to mention, although I guess that to do so would remind me how old I am getting.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** How very kind of members here to say that I do not look that old.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** When I have my 50th birthday party next I will invite the member. But I am not sure that we will be around.

**Mr Hanna:** Which 50th is this?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** That will be the second 50th, for sure! To Bob Donnelly I want to say thank you. Bob and his wife Robyn have been friends of Bob and me ever since the two Bobs commenced work together as apprentices at ETSA.

Over the years we have kept our friendship going—we are not in each other's pockets all the time but we are always there to give each other assistance.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** It does. Our children, Anthony and Jason, and Kate and Chad, were littlies together, and we have had some interesting camping experiences which I will not go into in this place. Sadly, Kate is no longer with us today. She is with the angels, but she is very lovingly remembered.

I also want to thank Noel Paul and Gerry Kandelaars of the CEPU postal and communications divisions. They are great friends and supporters, and I thank them for their valued assistance. I also thank Bob Johnston, who would have had to give up a golf game to help me, which was a great sacrifice, and only those of us who know him would appreciate that. I also want to thank Geoff Munro, who has had a great deal to contend with; he and Rose are always in our thoughts. I also say a big thanks to a great mate of mine, Wilf Deakin, who also works in the CEPU. He has been a stalwart—not just during campaign time but a great help in between. Tony Elkins is also a very special person, along with John Camillo and Paul McMahon, who is friend, a really good-hearted bloke and a caring man.

I also feel the need to mention that this is the first election I have been through without my much loved mother-in-law holding the fort at home for us, while leaving father at home to hold the fort for them. Unfortunately, time is catching up with mum, and I certainly missed her during this campaign—not only for the work she did such as the stuffing of envelopes and the sorts of things mums are wonderful for, or the great dinners she cooked, but particularly going home at night and having a chinwag with her about what happened during the day. I guess I will have to learn to miss that in the future. However, for over 35 years she has been my mum, and she has always been there for her family.

I also want to thank Russell and Dana Wortley, not last, but because now is the appropriate place to do that. These are the two people who had faith and who said the words that led to my being here on 7 May 1994. To them, I say, 'Thank you very much.' Whatever the future holds for me, I already have the best friends who have been the greatest influences on my life. I have a really wonderful family, and I have had some of the most interesting experiences being here. While they are unusual, I am grateful for all those experiences.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, bowls has been one of the best things that have happened to me since I have been here, and I have the member for Schubert to thank for that. That leads me to say how very pleasing it is to be in government and to know the support out there for our government. People are particularly proud to have a Mike Rann led Government. When we go out in our community it is very interesting to hear what people are saying. Since Labor formed government, there has been a general quiet yet excited consensus within the community that it is happy and supportive of this government. Clearly, our community—and I would say other members on this side of the house would concur—is indicating that it certainly was time for a change and that the change is good.

I am very pleased to be part of this government, a government that has already shown it will be open, honest and transparent in the management of government finances, to be accountable to the community and to the parliament. We will ensure that never again can governments hide the true state of our budgets. We have committed ourselves to



improve the health sector and to rebuild services. Under the leadership of Mike Rann, we will restore confidence in our health system, because we have a vision and the right priorities to make sure that the quality of care in our hospitals and the safety of patients are no longer neglected or at risk.

Our focus will also be on improving the quality of education that we provide for our young people and our youth. The Minister for Education and Children's Services has already introduced legislation to raise to 16 years the school leaving age. Our young people need to have a good education to be competitive in the job market or to go on to further studies, so this is a positive step forward and will, with other options that our government has outlined, provide pathways for our young people to engage in their education in a far greater way.

Many parents have been concerned for a long time that their children are leaving school too early and are ill-equipped to cope in society because they lack the necessary skills to be able to present themselves in the best possible light. This initiative will help overcome that problem and will help to reinstate the self-esteem that so many of our young people lack simply because they left school too early and without confidence in themselves or their abilities.

The previous government went down a path of privatisation, and that path cost our state dearly. It reduced services to our communities, and it caused home owners and families on low incomes and pensioners to pay more for essential services. Our government has made it clear that we will not go down this path, we will not continue the privatisation madness of the previous government, and this is very welcomed by people in our electorates. We have also commenced a process of going through all the contracts to which the previous government committed this state to make sure that the conditions in the outsourced and privatised contracts are upheld and adhered to.

Finally, there will be accountability by these operators. In the event that the contracts are not honoured, penalties will be enforced and this will mean that members of the public who were not happy that many of the services were outsourced or sold off will know that they will no longer be fobbed off or under serviced at an operator's whim. Many of my constituents have been treated poorly by some of these operators, and it has taken a great deal of intervention on my part or that of my staff to have their problems resolved. Most of those problems could have been resolved quite quickly, but there appeared to be an attitude on the part of some of the operators that the public do not particularly count because they are running a business. I believe now that many of those attitudes will change, and that is good for our community. So, I look forward to the government's progress in that regard.

I am also pleased to say that our government will strengthen the powers of the EPA, and I look forward to seeing the extent to which these powers will be strengthened. While this has not been the focus of the changes yet, I believe that it will have a great impact within our—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I look forward to reading that report; thank you. We have had very inappropriate behaviour in our communities by business operators and/or neighbours unfortunately. As progress is made in this area, when people lodge a complaint there will be more activity to resolve their problem. For a long time we have been told that the EPA can do little, and that has been a source of great frustration for a lot of people. Quite often people in the suburbs have felt marginalised when it comes to the activities of some busines-

ses. At present, noise coming from a household cannot be dealt with because the powers just are not there to resolve this issue. Obviously of importance is the EPA taking a lead role in controlling and ensuring the safety of radioactive waste stored in South Australia, and even more importantly the review of the environmental impact of the in situ leach mining practice.

On Tuesday last week the opposition sought to make an issue of two recent spills at the Beverley uranium mine, yet when they were in government they tried to delay notification of such spills to the public. They simply did not want us to know when these spills occurred and whether there had been any environmental damage. Most South Australians were appalled at this situation and are now pleased to know that there will be far greater monitoring and better notification procedures. I know people are very concerned about the leaks that have occurred at Beverley and the way in which the radioactive substances are handled: our government's investigation team will look at these issues and at the operating procedures, with environmental wellbeing and public safety the focus.

Last week the Minister for Environment and Conservation said in his press release, when speaking of these issues:

The ALP government shares those concerns and has established the investigation team as a matter of urgency.

He went on to say:

Last December the Labor Party also announced its commitment to conduct a full review of the environmental impacts of the in situ leach mining process used at both Beverley and Honeymoon uranium mines, with the results expected later this year.

When we made that announcement in December, many people in my electorate expressed their support and are now looking forward to the results of the review because they believe that all the facts will be available for us to make an educated decision without fear that any information is being withheld.

It is important that people are provided with the truth because the protection of our environment is a genuine issue within our communities. We need to know that what we are doing will not cause irreparable harm, and that where damage is being caused to the land steps are taken to cease these improper practices or any further damage and set a path of remediation where possible. People in South Australia, like those elsewhere, want to leave something for future generations, namely, a clean and safe environment and not one that has been destroyed beyond repair.

Our Premier Mike Rann has also announced that nothing will soften his resolve against South Australia's being used as a national dumping ground for low and medium level nuclear waste. He said in his press release last week:

The Howard federal government will set itself on a collision course with the South Australian government if it locates its proposed national low and medium level nuclear waste dumps in our state. Our government is ready to take on the fight against it.

He went on to say:

In his letter Prime Minister John Howard said that the preferred sites for a national low level nuclear waste dump announced last year by the federal government, all of which were in South Australia, were chosen in cooperation and consultation with the former Liberal state government. The Olsen government was well aware that the federal government was intending to collocate its national low level nuclear waste dump with the medium level waste dump. While this is confirmation of the Olsen government's cooperation with the Howard government on the nuclear waste dump, things are different now. The federal government will not receive any cooperation from a Rann Labor government.

Clearly, our Premier has said no. Our government will not be supporting the Prime Minister's intention to use our state as a dumping ground, and we have introduced legislation, as we promised during the campaign, to stop the Prime Minister using our state as a national waste repository. Other states must be responsible for their waste, as we will be for ours.

We will, should the Prime Minister go down this path as the Premier has announced, first, extend existing legislation to produce a national low level, as well as the higher level, nuclear waste repository in South Australia and, secondly, introduce new laws to trigger a referendum if the commonwealth ever moves to override state laws to establish a medium or high level nuclear dump in South Australia.

A number of years ago—and I did not have time to look this up (but given that the member for Waite has a great interest in this issue he may remember)—I raised the issue of waste being transported on South Australian roads and the dangers that that posed for other road users and for the lands through which the waste was transported. This is still an issue for us today and certainly is an issue that has been recognised by our government.

Premier Rann intends to deal with that by banning the transportation of radioactive waste through our state if it is to be sent to a national waste dump here in South Australia. These are very tough measures but are necessary if we want to protect our state and the people who live here, so the introduction of this legislation and these measures are a very welcome initiative. We do not want to be forced to take everybody else's nuclear waste, and we do not want to be known as the nuclear dumping ground state because we care about the people who live in South Australia, including our traditional owners, and we particularly care about our environment, which we hope to leave in a fairly decent state for our children and future generations.

There is a great deal to do to rejuvenate our economy, restore confidence in our state and put back faith in government. I most sincerely believe that a Rann Labor government will do those things. We will give people in the community a faith that has been lacking for a long time because we will be an open and accountable government and, above all, we will be moving forward with policies that put people first and lead the way and, most importantly, show a direction for the future of this state and the wellbeing of all South Australians.

I am pleased to be part of this government, to be here to see those changes and to participate in change, not just for the sake of it but because we need a new direction and need a real way forward. I congratulate all members on this side who have been elected, re-elected and newly elected and again congratulate members opposite.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to commend Her Excellency the Governor for her address to the parliament, to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and to reflect on the past five years. It is my fifth year in this place, and the occasion of this address has brought back to me my first Address in Reply debate contribution in December 1997. I went through it and noted the visions that one has when one arrives in this place. I spoke about reconciliation and the issue of whether Australia should become a republic, about our dreams for industry development and creating a better, more equitable and more wealthy community, about the need to promote education and personal advancement and the need for a grand vision for the development of the state—and, in particular, within that the

need for us to consider a population policy that involved growth, which is still very topical today.

I also followed that address with an initial foray into the media environment, with some statements about how it was my view, having had 23 years as an officer in the military, that, given the break-up and Balkanisation of Indonesia that seemed so evident at the time of the collapse of the Suharto regime, we might see a bumping up of the number of refugees travelling to the north of our shores as people filtered through or took advantage of the break-up of law and order in Indonesia to process illegal immigrants through that land to our own.

At the time, the media went into global orbit and accused me of all sorts of outrageous extremist views. I was accused of threatening that there would be an Asian invasion of our shores and I was to be regarded as some sort of a maverick with no idea of the realities of life. How could it ever come to pass? We certainly would not have a rapid influx of refugees and it was nothing but rhetoric.

I commend the opposition for not joining in that fracas because, lo and behold, within a few months the flow of refugees and illegal immigrants to our shores had bumped up. Within a few months, the federal government had stood up the first brigade in Darwin and brought them to a higher level of readiness. Within a few months, budget allocations were reflecting far greater attention to the issue of illegal immigration. Within a few months, the *Advertiser* was starting to backtrack and run articles along the very same lines of the comments I had expressed in January. By the end of 1998, all that I had predicted had happened and journalists were pulling me up in the corridor in Parliament House saying, 'How did you predict this? We had no idea it was coming.'

**Mr Hanna:** Tell us what's going to happen next year.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitchell can predict what will happen to himself if he keeps behaving in that way.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** It is very interesting to reflect on that occurrence. A week is a long time in politics. People can stand up here and hold to a particular view and be proven within a very short time to have been completely wrong, or right, depending on the falling of events and the circumstances which transpire. I have learned some valuable lessons in the last five years and I am sure that all members here would express a similar view.

I am going to take my time to talk, firstly, about some local issues in my electorate and then I am going to touch on the shadow portfolio areas for which I am responsible, and they are tourism, innovation, information economy and the arts. I will also make a few remarks about the start that I believe my corresponding minister has made, that is, the Minister for Tourism, Minister for Science, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, and a range of other things, and I might offer her a few words of advice. Then I will talk about what I think is the vision that is required for the state, and I am going to point to some failings of the ALP and say what I think holds for the future of liberalism in the 21st century.

In my electorate of Waite, I am blessed with some gifts. I am one of those rare things called a member of parliament who was born in, went to school in, grew up in and has lived in his electorate all his life, apart from the time that I was in the military. I doubt that there would be very many such members in the chamber, probably a few, but it is very much my home ground. During the four years of my first term, I was able to help the community protect the hills face zone

and particularly to save Brown Hill from desecration by untidy and unwanted developments involving hotels and the destruction of open space.

As a private member whilst in government, I introduced a bill, which was successfully passed, for an act to repeal the Netherby Kindergarten Act, which restituted the Waite bequest to the people of South Australia and took away from the education department any right to carve up the land and use it for development as a kindergarten, whilst at the same time negotiating with the government an outcome that saw a new kindergarten built just up the road at Netherby to the benefit of the local community.

We saw the introduction of plan amendment reports for Colonel Light Gardens and Mitcham which have uplifted the quality of life for people living in those suburbs. In addition, the previous government upgraded Portrush Road and Cross Road and commenced work on the Old Belair Road. Other roads are also being improved.

In regard to schools, I point out to the house that the precinct of Waite experienced nothing more than an investment boom by the previous government in developing schools within my electorate. The success of the former minister, the member for Light, and his predecessor in the upper house, the Hon. Rob Lucas, is nothing more than stunning. The list of projects includes: Unley High School, a major and significant multimillion dollar rebuild; Mitcham Girls High, substantially rebuilt; Westbourne Park Primary School, completely transformed; work under way to the tune of \$20 million at Urrbrae High School to make it probably the premier agricultural high school of its type in the world; further work planned at Colonel Light Gardens Primary School and Mitcham Primary School, with other planning work under way at Clapham Primary School; and work completed at Belair Primary School.

The reinvestment by the previous government in education in my electorate is simply stunning and the quality of the teachers and the outcomes in my electorate in the five years that I have been the member have been impressive, to say the least. If this government even touches the performance achieved by the previous government, I will be stunned, and it has a considerable challenge ahead of it.

In addition, two shopping centres have been rebuilt. At the Mitcham Shopping Centre, work is still in progress, and the Bi-Lo Shopping Centre on Goodwood Road has also been redeveloped. The Belair railway line has experienced substantial upgrades and there have been a number of new crossings and improvements to the stations and improvements to usage and, of course, whilst all that was going on, the previous government supported community groups, and I would like to mention a few of those.

I have done a round or two with my local Meals on Wheels group at Mitcham and visited them on numerous occasions. The efforts of these people, many of whom are not all that young themselves, who come in every morning and commit themselves to preparing meals and delivering them to those in need, is striking and to be admired by us all. I have visited most of the youth groups and sporting clubs in my electorate, ranging from the Mitcham Football Club to the Crescent Youth Club. All the clubs that I have visited, of every shape and size for people of all ages, that I have been able to give grant cheques to through the Active Clubs Scheme, or that I have simply been able to visit and support for their afternoon tea, end-of-year wrap-up, or the opening of the season—all of that has been an uplifting and quite

sobering experience for a local MP, and one that I have enjoyed enormously.

One of the great joys of being a local MP is attending citizenship ceremonies. It is something in which I take great pride and I always speak at those ceremonies. It warms the heart to see people who have come from another land, where they have suffered enormously, stand up proudly, swear their allegiance to this country and take out their citizenship. It is an experience that I look forward to and one of the great joys of being a local MP.

I mention now the various residents' associations in my electorate: Colonel Light Gardens, Mitcham, Melrose Park, the Friends of Carrick Hill (managed so capably by Alan Smith and his team of volunteers), the Friends of Urrbrae House and the Friends of Brownhill Creek. The friends groups of all shapes and sizes have simply been a joy to work with and, to the extent that I have been able to make myself of use to them, that has been beneficial to me and I hope to them in terms of getting results for our local community. It is a great community to be part of. I live smack-bang in the middle of it, along with other members of my family, and hope to do so for years to come.

I also had the benefit in my first term of chairing a Select Committee on a Heroin Rehabilitation Trial, which canvassed most exhaustively a range of issues to do with the terrible problem of drugs. I commend that report to the government, which has now decided to have another drugs summit. I commend that idea but I caution the government that you can talk all you like about drug law reform. However, at the end of the day, you have to put your money where your mouth is and invest in the children of South Australia and fix some problems.

That heroin rehabilitation trial resulted in a bill of \$33 million that needed to be provided for immediately and other funding needing to be provided for currently, and I commend that report to the government. Get on with the job of fixing the problems. As you tackle them you will find that this is an area full of vested interests and coveted dreams. You will find that lawyers, doctors, police, social workers and other people with a stake in the problem will all present very cogent arguments as to why they should have the money, and finding the right balance will be a challenge. I wish you well.

In regard to the tourism industry, I had the benefit of being the Minister for Tourism for a brief time. It was a great challenge and one which I enjoyed enormously. I commend former minister Hon. Joan Hall for the outstanding results she achieved. We had a policy for tourism in the lead-up to the election; the Labor Party had no policy on tourism. In fact, the Labor Party has downgraded the portfolio and given it to somebody who is clearly not coping and has far too much to do to pay the required attention to the challenges facing the industry.

There are a number of great attractions and a number of great reasons to come to South Australia. I refer to Kangaroo Island; the Outback; and the forthcoming railway which will be built because of the vision of former premier John Olsen and this Liberal government, assisted by the greatest Prime Minister this country has seen since World War II, John Howard, and agreed to, but not really championed by, the Labor Party at any time. Who would want to upset the maritime unions by building a railway to Darwin? There are a lot of great reasons to come to South Australia. It is the new Minister for Tourism's challenge to ensure that people come. It is a great industry, full of terrific small business people and

wonderful workers. They need government support. As shadow minister I will keep the minister to her obligations in that respect.

In regard to innovation and information economy, I commend former minister Hon. Michael Armitage for the outstanding job that he did in producing Information Economy 2002, which built on the excellent work done by former premier Dean Brown with IT 2000 in 1995. The previous government had a great vision for information economy and for innovation. I had the great honour of being the minister for innovation and I thank the Leader of the Opposition who, as premier, gave me the opportunity to step forward into that new portfolio. It was a great honour, and we were able to come up with a very cogent innovation policy prior to the election. The Labor Party had no innovation policy, and has none today.

There are some great initiatives which we commissioned and which are now being announced, such as the GRDC Grain Genomic Centre of Excellence at the Waite Campus that was announced last Friday by the Premier. Regrettably, I note that he was not gracious enough to acknowledge that it was us who provided the funding and the only decision they had to make was to not cut it. Nevertheless, I thank the Minister for Information Economy for at least having the grace to bring to the attention of the house in a ministerial statement that it was our \$12 million investment that enabled that bid to become a reality.

I have talked about the IT Centre of Excellence bid which is still under way, for which \$10 million was provided by this government. I championed it in cabinet and it was approved through the great vision of our government. I commend that bid to the new government and hope that it does not cut and slash it, as I understand was very nearly the case with the Grain Genomic Centre of Excellence. The Thebarton Bioscience Precinct is vital to the success of our biotech industries. It depends upon the quick acquisition of 4.8 hectares of land. Procrastination, delay and ineptitude will result in that land falling into other hands and the failure of the bioscience precinct. I urge the government to give it close attention.

The only way to rebuild this economy is to get our centres of excellence, universities, businesses and governments to work together to produce jobs and growth. We must stop seeing our universities and centres of excellence as places of education and research alone. We must start seeing them as economic engine rooms. The Labor Party does not get the point on that. They must learn it during the sobering experience of government.

In regard to the arts, I commend former minister Hon. Diana Laidlaw who, over eight years, did an absolutely amazing job assisting and helping that wonderful industry to grow and become all it can be. Under her guidance our arts industry has flourished. We have had a number of very successful festivals—and a few controversies, as has always been the case, but the industry today is as vibrant as it has ever been. We have the Lee Warren Dancers, the Australian Dance Theatre and the State Opera. Money is going to new groups such as Co-Opera, of which I have been a great supporter for many years; money is flowing through Country Arts SA to our regions; the Art Gallery and the Museum have been completely rebuilt.

The achievements of the government are simply stunning and I hope that the new government will come up with a better vision and a more substantial vision than its very shaky opening performance, which was to slash and burn the

Barossa Music Festival and now to announce a film festival which, while we cautiously support it, runs the risk of being a glitzy, fun event while not providing any substantial strategy or funding for our film industry in the future. We cautiously support it, but the government must come up with some meat on the bones as well for our wonderful film industry, not just a showcase. South Australian taxpayers have a right to expect a return on their investment.

To my opposite number, the minister for tourism, employment, science, further education and all the other bits and pieces that were not already promised to her colleagues, I say: good luck, and watch your back. You have jumped over a number of people in the Labor Party who did the hard yards to get here. The Premier could not possibly give you education or health or social inclusion where you perhaps would have been better placed. He had to give you, member for Adelaide, an odd-bod collection of portfolios in the hope that you will be given some prominence but with the reality that you will not be snatching any prizes or rewards from those who bitterly resent your arrival in the Labor Party and in the parliamentary party. No doubt the member for Port Adelaide and the member for Elder are looking over their shoulders and wondering whether the Premier will be looking to elevate the member for Adelaide a little bit closer. She is the star of the Labor Party, so that the first time the member for Port Adelaide and the member for Elder fall on their faces, she can zoom down there, jump over the member for Taylor and over the member for Elizabeth and position herself a little bit closer.

We all know that she is a shining star in the Labor Party. The other women—and men—in the Labor Party apparently are not good enough to get there. They are chairmen of committees so they are still driving around in nice cars and they have been given jobs to do—but to the member for Adelaide I say: good luck. Member for Adelaide, you have had a very poor start indeed. I have asked you a number of questions and I think you have answered one, you have refused to answer several and a couple you flicked to the Treasurer. You look not confident and shaky. You have had a very rocky start to your ministerial career. One of the interesting things that I have seen coming—

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I have a point of order. For a person who is talking about people not handling their new career very well, the member for Waite should not be referring to the member for Adelaide as 'you', as he has done for the last minute and a half.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The member for Waite should use the title or the electorate.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thank the member for Elder for raising that point. His new found interest in the rules of this place and high standards of behaviour is simply remarkable. I am extraordinarily shocked, given his behaviour over the last four years, which was absolutely reprehensible on a regular daily basis. But to the Minister for Tourism I say: I was disappointed that you did not attend the Australian Tourism Export Council conference, as I did, where all of the industry was gathered and where you were expected. We were hosting the event but you were not there. I was extremely disappointed. I understand that you went to a social event a day or two before, but it takes more than social events: it takes substance.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I rise on a point of order, sir. I think the member for Waite is straying a bit. He is inferring something against the minister that may not be true.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Waite was straying back into using the term 'you' rather than referring to the minister by title or electorate.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Very well, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will not waste any more time arguing the point. Thank you for your guidance. I was intrigued by an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* in the third week of March and which portrayed the member for Adelaide as working in the basement of the Education Department building with donated furniture in very austere conditions. I understand—and perhaps the member for Adelaide can correct me if I am wrong—that at the same time she is still holding my former office at 50 Grenfell Street on the 11th floor in fairly plush circumstances at thousands of dollars expense to the taxpayer, as well as her parliamentary office.

I do not know whether any other office spaces are held over for the member as she flits around from one portfolio to another. I did check with the *Sunday Mail* journalist, who indicated that that information had not been revealed to him and that he was given the impression that that was her only office. One needs to be cautious about these things before portraying oneself in a particular light without revealing all the facts to the journalist concerned because one can be misrepresented. That was certainly the impression I got from the article concerned.

The ALP is a bit of a lost soul at the moment. Its members are absolutely astonished at being in office. They did not win the election: they lost the popular vote. They are here as a consequence of the most remarkable sequence of events—but they are there. The Labor Party has a problem finding its identity. The Labor Party, that great party of the 1890s and the early 1900s, that party which produced so many great leaders before World War II, seems today to be a party without a rudder in the water. It seems today to be a party that is trying desperately to become a Liberal Party. It is desperately trying to emulate Tony Blair. It has lost its soul. It is no longer sure whether it wants to be a socialist party or a more conservative party. It does not know any more what it stands for. Its members do not seem to know whether it wants to sing the *Internationale* (as they used to do at meetings) and call each other 'comrade' (as Kim Beazley did after the 1987 election) or whether they want to be more collegiate and come here in blue suits to embrace the business community.

In fact, the way in which the party has engaged senior business people to form boards and to seek guidance and advice raises the question whether the government has confidence it can govern without deferring frequently to some of the many boards that have been created to govern, in effect, for the government. It is all a little confusing. I welcome some of the idealistic legislation that, I understand from the Governor's speech, we are to see in this place involving codes of conduct and budget honesty. Anything that leads to greater probity in government is worthwhile. I am sure that in due course the government will regret having set the benchmark so high.

I remind members opposite of Premier Nick Greiner's creation in New South Wales, the Independent Commission against Corruption, which ultimately resulted in his having to stand down. I can assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that we will engage in most spirited debate and we will be very vigilant to ensure that the government adheres to the standards it has set for itself during the remainder of its term.

Australia is changing and leaving the Labor Party behind. The Labor Party is desperately trying to catch up. There is a

swing back in this country to family values, more fundamental values, law and order, national and self respect, as the basis upon which to go forward. There is a movement away from the sort of political correctness and crazy idealism of earlier times to values that are more abrupt and substantial and more purposeful. This has left the Labor Party with nowhere to go. At a time when the community wants to see more individualism and independence, when small businesses are replacing larger businesses, when individual people are replacing organised labour, and small businesses are replacing many larger concerns as the backbone of the economy, the Labor Party and the union movement do not know where to turn.

Australia is changing so swiftly it seems that the course the Labor Party has set for itself is to try to become a Liberal Party as quickly as it can and, if you like, take away the middle ground. This leaves the Labor Party without much of an identity. I think that is evident from the course which this government has set and which, frankly, lacks vision. I can see no grand design for the next four years of government; rather, it is inward looking; it is looking at the processes of this place; it is looking backward to the days of Don Dunstan; and it is looking to the past and to others for inspiration. We have all sorts of people being dusted off and asked to show the Labor Party and the Labor government in this state some direction for the next four years.

We are reviewing the world at the moment and, after that, some grand recipe will be delivered. I wish the government well. I hope it has a good four years. I hope that it sets a course of which South Australians can be proud and that we achieve something. At the end of the four years, if there are still problems in health and education, if they have not delivered on the promises they have made then they will be judged accordingly. I wish members opposite well.

As a young political student I was told that the Labor Party was the party of initiation and the Liberal Party conservatives the party of resistance. It has all changed: the Liberal Party is now the reformist at state and national level and the Labor Party is the party of resistance. I see no grand reform plans in its agenda. If there are, enlighten us.

Time expired.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** Her Excellency the Governor laid out a range of measures that the government intends to take to improve and extend health services for South Australians. She announced that improving health and rebuilding our health services are top priorities. Her Excellency indicated that the government's tasks were to rebuild acute services and, at the same time, move the health system towards primary health care, prevention, health promotion, and safety and quality in health care.

I now wish to take some time to expand on how the government intends going about these tasks. Our first task, however, is to rebuild. It is with much sadness that I must report that on coming to this ministry my deep concerns about the state of the South Australian health system were confirmed. The Labor Party went to the electorate at the last election with health as one of its principal priorities. We did this because time and again both consumers and providers had told us that their health system was under extreme stress, if not in crisis. Members of my party and I listened and responded to the warnings to which the previous government neither listened nor responded.

On coming to government it was clear why the system had failed. Put simply, it was quite clear that health was not a

priority for the previous government. As I have previously informed the house, we know that during the term of the former government:

- Since 1994, South Australian public hospitals and community health services have been targeted for budget cuts, despite an increasing demand for services.
- Over 400 hospital beds were closed between 1993-94 and 1999-2000.
- Sick people were kept on trolleys all day because no beds were available.
- Major surgery was regularly cancelled, often after the patients had been prepared for surgery, because there were no beds.
- Ambulances were put on bypass because the system could not cope.
- Directors of emergency departments warned the then government of the risks of serious adverse events because of overloaded emergency departments.
- Hospitals in this state had the highest rates of hospital acquired infection in Australia.

All this, not to mention 94 000 people waiting for dental treatment, a mental health system in crisis, and a mental health reform process which had fallen behind other states. The previous government not only presided over a run down in services, but it also dropped the ball on financial management.

Again, as I have recently informed the house, it is important that South Australians are told the truth about the financial situation in our public health system inherited by this government. 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.

As I have previously stated, 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 this \$8 million is added to the budget overrun of \$10 million, this government will start the budget process for hospital services next year with an \$18 million black hole. These are the tangible results of eight years of neglect and mismanagement. There are other impacts as well that are not always counted but are no less damaging.

Before the February election, I had been shadow minister since 1994. As I have indicated, over that time I watched as the health and community services sectors were put under enormous strain through not only massive budget cuts but also, as a result of limited vision, inadequate leadership, poor planning and excessively slow processes of decision making. The impact on services to the public was profound and unconscionable. But another impact, which was perhaps not so obvious to the public, was on the staff in health units and the Department of Human Services itself. I know that this was not an easy time for many people, and that many talented people became disheartened and had even left the services and department.

It is very clear to me that, among the many reform measures that will mark my time as Minister for Health and Minister Assisting the Premier in Social Inclusion, one of the most significant tasks will be that of rebuilding: rebuilding capacity; rebuilding confidence; rebuilding courage and

commitment; and, above all, rebuilding the services themselves. However, the effort of rebuilding cannot occur all at once: the damage done has been too great. Clearly, it requires the restoration of a positive, inclusive culture of service provision and cooperation within the department, between health units, and across the private and non-government sectors.

It is always much easier to wreck something good than it is to build or rebuild it. The previous government wrecked much of what was good in the South Australian health system. I am determined to rebuild and extend the system for the good health of South Australians: there can be no more important task. The problems inherited by this government in health—as across all areas of government—cannot be solved overnight or in the first months or the first few years, but they will be solved. The government is taking the first steps to correct the situation left to us by our predecessors.

During the election campaign, the Premier announced the 'better hospitals guarantee' as well as a comprehensive raft of measures and reforms totalling some \$122.5 million over four years in health spending alone. They included:

- establishing 100 new hospital beds—both emergency extended care and acute beds;
- developing a cleaner hospital strategy;
- increasing elective surgery;
- providing additional funds to the Women's and Children's Hospital;
- providing support for the provision of MRI services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Services;

as well as a wide range of reforms and rebuilding initiatives, including:

- the establishment of a health and community services ombudsman;
- the extension of falls prevention programs;
- the rebuilding of rehabilitation services and early childhood intervention services;
- pushing forward with the mental health reform process and ensuring the development of greater community-based services;
- addressing the chronic problem of dental waiting lists; and
- committing to the completion of major capital works projects at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Services.

These initiatives are all seen as simply the start. The Premier and I are quite clear that these initiatives are down payments on our firm pledge to improve and extend health services for all South Australians.

There are two great roles which must be played by government in the development and delivery of health and health care services—stewardship and leadership. The concept of stewardship is one that the World Health Organisation has particularly promoted. In its annual report on world health in the year 2000, the World Health Organisation reported on the state of health systems around the world. It concluded that stewardship in health is the essence of good government.

Stewardship means the establishment of the best and fairest health system possible within the resources available. It was seen that the health of the public must always be a priority and that government responsibility for it must be continuous and permanent. In World Health Organisation terms, stewardship must encompass the tasks of defining the vision and direction of health policy and directing and encouraging the development of practices and strategies to

meet health goals. Stewardship means making sure that a health system works and works well for all of the people all of the time. Leadership means taking the health system forward so that it works even better and actually works to improve health.

This government is committed to both good stewardship and good leadership in health. We have articulated a clear vision, which can be summarised as follows: a health system that supports and assists you, your family and community to achieve your full health potential; a health system that is there when you need it, that is fair, and that you can trust; a health system that encourages you to have your say, listens to you, and ensures that your views are taken into account. In order to achieve this vision we have established five key strategic pillars which will underpin all our reform efforts. Those five pillars are:

- improving quality and safety;
- greater opportunities for inclusion and community participation;
- strengthening and reorienting services towards prevention and primary health care;
- developing service integration and cooperation; and
- adopting whole-of-government approaches to advance and improve health status.

To press forward with this vision and this reform process the government has commissioned a generational health review, which was announced last week. This will be the first major review of South Australia's health system for 30 years. It was a review chaired by the late Sir Charles Bright which reported in 1973 and which laid the foundations for the development of the modern South Australian health system. It is well past time that the system was reviewed, refreshed and refocussed on contemporary needs and contemporary conditions. This generational review will set a comprehensive plan for the state's health system over the next 20 years. The number one priority will be the consumer. It is about improving health services for all South Australians and ensuring that we can enjoy the highest standards of health and health care. It will look at how taxpayers' money can best be invested to enhance a focus on prevention and primary health care delivery, regional funding mechanisms and improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of health care.

As the Premier said in his campaign launch prior to the last election:

Over the next 12 months, the review will conduct a root and branch examination of everything our health system does and does not do, and most importantly, how we can do it better.

The review will do this by developing strategies to meet future demands and determine broad investments required to deliver health and wellbeing for all South Australians. The development of this plan will bring together the best talents of this state, headed by the highly accomplished John Menadue AO. John Menadue brings a wealth of experience in the public and private sectors to this new role as chair of the committee. Mr Menadue, a former South Australian, has had a distinguished career, with over 40 years' experience in senior government and business appointments and, most recently, completed a review into the New South Wales health system. I am delighted that South Australia will be able to directly benefit from the experience that he will bring to this new role. Mr Menadue will be assisted in this task by a team of highly respected individuals, whose names I outlined to this house in a ministerial statement yesterday. The review signals a bold new direction in the delivery of

health services in our state. I expect a final report from Mr Menadue within 12 months.

These initiatives in respecting and rebuilding the capacity of the health system and reshaping it to the contemporary needs of the new century are the clear expression of Labor's strong and determined stewardship and leadership. I take these roles seriously, and so does the public. The government owes members of the public nothing less than the best possible health system to respond to their health needs.

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** I rise to support the motion, and I thank the Governor for her speech. I welcome the new members and wish them well during their time here. I am taking this opportunity to ask the new Labor government to designate Eyre Peninsula as a special development region. A special effort is needed to fast-track approvals through government red tape and to assist with funding, particularly for infrastructure. The region needs infrastructure which other regions have had for years or do not require and without which Eyre Peninsula will not be able to fulfil its considerable potential. Because the region is conservative and remote, I am concerned that it is at risk of being ignored by the new Labor government in favour of city-based and union promoted issues and projects.

Eyre Peninsula already contributes more than \$1 billion into the state's economy, with less than 3 per cent of the population. I believe that, with the continuation of the support it has received over the last eight years from the state Liberal government (despite the massive debt inherited from the former Labor government), with continuing federal government support, together with private capital expenditure for various billion dollar projects, including water and electricity, it could double that contribution in less than five years. However, alarmingly, at present, future development has stopped because of a lack of water and inadequate power supplies.

Due to increasing water usage, the prospect of a dry year and low recharge of our underground basins, SA Water has indicated that there will be no more new commercial, industrial or housing water allocations on Eyre Peninsula. This puts in jeopardy, in Port Lincoln alone, major proposals including the Peninsula Hotel, the Lukin development, the ETSA site housing development and the Marine Innovation Centre project. Towns across Eyre Peninsula have approximately 1 000 subdivisions and marina developments being planned that have been halted. These include Ceduna Keys and coastal development, over 500 blocks; Smoky Bay 70 blocks; Venus Bay 200 blocks; Elliston 55 blocks, Lincoln Lakes 200 blocks; and Coffin Bay 50 blocks.

Eyre Peninsula is not connected to the Murray River but has its own independent underground water systems. A water master plan for Eyre Peninsula currently being undertaken by SA Water and United Utilities is almost completed in readiness for public consultation. The solution to our water problems, I believe, will include the installation of reverse osmosis facilities to either desalinate the brackish water in the Todd Reservoir at Port Lincoln, or located closer to the coast but still connected to the Todd system to provide options for various water sources. Brackish water is cheaper to desalinate than sea water: however, water availability may not always be secure. Sea water desalination at Ceduna may also be required.

At least 10 megalitres per day capacity is needed. The estimated cost per kilolitre varies between 63¢ and \$1.33. In the long term, there is underground water at Lock that could

be desalinated while dewatering the proposed coal mine. Private enterprise investors are interested in providing the desalination plants needed and for a speedy resolution to this problem, the government must facilitate their involvement as quickly as possible or provide the desalination plants through SA Water.

Eyre Peninsula is one of the best wind power generation sites in the world. Potential output of over 1 000 megawatts, or nearly 20 per cent of the state's consumption, is planned. Developments in progress and those being planned on Eyre Peninsula, including desalination, need more power and greater reliability than the existing power line provides. Port Lincoln is currently serviced by a single, ageing 132 kilovolt line from Port Augusta, together with two 10 megawatt diesel turbines for backup which are also used as peak power facilities.

The development of wind farms along the West Coast of Eyre Peninsula depends upon the construction of a 275 kilovolt line providing access to the main grid at a reasonable cost. Unfortunately, the cost of this line is proving to be a major stumbling block. Ausker Energies has approval for a two stage 115 megawatt \$170 million wind farm project funded by the ANZ Bank. Hydro Tasmania's project is expected to be approved soon and will be followed by Wind Prospect, Pacific Hydro and Babcock and Brown over the next few years. To solve Eyre Peninsula's power problems, we need support for ElectraNet or a private provider to construct a 275 kV line, possibly from Cultana to Elliston via Wudinna, then from Elliston to the Port Lincoln substation. We need government support for the ACCC approval of this line as a regulated line, and we need support for ElectraNet to upgrade the existing 132 kV lines to 275 kV lines to provide reliability and double the power export routes again as regulated lines.

The guidelines for the federal government's remote areas power supply grant funding, provided through the state government, do not allow funding if the power supply is connected to the grid. If these guidelines are changed, this funding could be accessed to provide the line from Elliston to Port Lincoln and thereby replace the two back-up diesel generators with wind power. This would appear to be a reasonable request as the purpose for the grant, I have been led to believe, was to remove dirty diesel powered generators in remote locations. With this support, the surplus 'green power' can be exported into the grid.

The tyranny of distance has adverse effects on commerce and tourism on Eyre Peninsula. Port Lincoln is 650 kilometres from Adelaide, and Ceduna is 800 kilometres from Adelaide and 400 kilometres from Port Lincoln. However, Boston Bay is the largest natural deep water harbour in the Southern Hemisphere and is five times larger than Sydney Harbour. It is capable of taking panamax vessels and, with dredging, Cape Bulkers may be possible.

Flinders Ports are the new owners of ports across the state, and the South Australian Independent Industry Regulator predicts that Port Lincoln will be one of the cheapest ports to operate in the state due to its natural features. Heavy road transport access to the harbour from the north is a problem for road train access (70 tonne capacity) as all the 50-plus tonne trucks are forced to use the main street in Port Lincoln's central business district as the heavy transport route, conflicting with the retail sector. In excess of 1 million tonnes of grain is transported through the main shopping precinct. Transport SA's Port Lincoln freight access study report April 2002 states that that equates to approximately

125 heavy vehicles per day. The solution would be to build a heavy vehicle by-pass around Port Lincoln to allow access from the western approach road. The lowest cost estimate by Transport SA is \$13 million.

There is also a need to increase rail patronage by encouraging AusBulk to possibly place a strategic grain site at Ungarra rail siding to reduce the one at Tumby Bay serviced by road into Port Lincoln. This would have the additional benefit of reducing the maintenance on our road system. While the main arterial roads on Eyre Peninsula are either fully or partly sealed, only 5 per cent of all roads are sealed. The Lincoln Highway to Whyalla has very poor surfaces near Cowell. Continuation of the program for the construction of sealed roads, especially arterial roads and those of economic importance, is essential, together with the upgrade of the Lincoln Highway over its full length.

Port Lincoln used to have a ferry service to Adelaide. A service has been proposed between Cowell and Wallaroo, and the proponents claim it is viable with only a small amount of government assistance towards land infrastructure. There should be an assessment of the economics of alternative ferry operations and future viability to determine if either Cowell/Wallaroo or Adelaide/Port Lincoln ferries should be supported, taking into account the prospective growth and also the social justice that would be served by better access for Eyre Peninsula. Support for the necessary approvals and infrastructure would be required.

Port Lincoln is the busiest airport terminal outside Adelaide, with 100 000 regular passenger transports (RPTs) annually. It is also probably one of the most expensive nationally per nautical mile, with full fares now over \$350 return. Ceduna is well serviced by Kendell. However, at present no passenger services are available from Adelaide to Cleve and Wudinna. Air freight is essential for moving locally produced fresh seafood overseas. It is mainly used for crayfish. Tuna is usually road freighted to Sydney for freighting overseas. With the Ansett demise, air freight capacity has been severely restricted. A solution must be found to ensure that there is adequate competition by a low-cost carrier buying Kendell. The reintroduction of air services to central Eyre Peninsula, with a subsidy if necessary similar to Adelaide's public transport system, must be a priority. Proactive assistance for the Lower Eyre Peninsula council to help with acquiring the land for runway extensions to take larger aircraft if needed should be undertaken now. Greater freight capacity and linkages to an overseas air operator with freight connections, as is apparently being developed by Virgin, would be beneficial.

The 1 100 kilometres narrow gauge railway system on Eyre Peninsula is old with mainly wooden sleepers. Unless this system is maintained, it will have a limited life. It stops about 70 kilometres from the narrow gauge One Steel lines connecting to Whyalla, and even further from the standard gauge interstate system. Rail is used extensively to move grain to Port Lincoln (925 000 tonnes per year) and gypsum to Thevenard (217 204 tonnes per year). Proceeds from the sale of the rail business and property should be used to provide funding assistance to upgrade the current track and, if one of the mines is developed, to connect the rail to enable transport of the products to and from Whyalla or Port Lincoln. A long-term goal needs to be set by the government to standardise the Eyre Peninsula line, thereby directly connecting our wonderful port and products to the Adelaide to Darwin line.



The Gawler Craton mineralisation which covers Eyre Peninsula includes diamonds, coal, gold, copper, uranium, tungsten, major hematite and world-class magnetite iron ore, lead, gypsum, graphite, kaolin, clay, jade, granite, marble and porphyry. In addition, there is potential offshore oil and gas with a drilling program of \$90 million being currently undertaken. I am concerned that the attitude of the parks and wildlife department and the new Labor government to mining in parks and conservation areas of the state makes reasonable exploration and mining development very difficult. The evaluation of the potential mine in the Yumbarra Conservation Park near Ceduna, for instance, is subject to constant delay by the parks and wildlife department through the multiple approval process, with separate permits required for each stage. The latest demand is for \$30 000 to remove rabbits and weeds, presumably resulting from the limited work done. The rabbits would have been there for 100 years. It has taken two years, and I understand that the company still does not have deep drilling approval.

Governments need to recognise that the state is best able to maintain the environment and look after its people if it has adequate funds. Sensible control, not petty restrictions, should apply to potential mining projects. The institution of one or two stage approvals and the remove of the constant permit system required for each stage would help considerably. With the vast area set aside for parks and conservation areas (many of them arbitrarily determined) small areas used to create wealth would be a rational use of our assets while assisting to maintain the environment and the quality of life of the people of our state. Other benefits of mining include jobs in regional areas. It would also assist small local councils and volunteers in maintaining park access, and weed and fire control in these parts.

The waters surrounding Eyre Peninsula have the greatest diversity of temperate marine species in the Southern Hemisphere. I am told that the species diversity is greater than that of the Great Barrier Reef. Eyre Peninsula has a longer coastline than Tasmania. Fishing and aquaculture income in South Australia has just passed that of Tasmania, most of it coming from Eyre Peninsula. Tuna income last year was \$264 million, and it is expected to be \$302 million this year. The last tuna cannery in Australia, based in Port Lincoln, has nearly doubled in size recently and employs 370 people. Crayfish, abalone, yellowtail kingfish, oysters, prawns, pilchards and other fin fish are major industries on the peninsula.

For further development of fishing and aquaculture, support is needed for improved onshore facilities; examples include the Tumbly Bay marina and the Farm Beach boat ramp. Better balance in approvals to acknowledge the benefit to local communities and the state versus the environment is needed, particularly at the Arno Bay marina where I understand a small area of seagrass has been preventing the expansion of an industry and increased jobs in the area.

The Port Lincoln Marine Science Centre was developed in part by over \$1 million in donations from the local community. As there is apparently no comparable facility concentrating on the southern coastline on this latitude, it has the potential to develop into the southern temperate region marine science centre. The Marine Innovation South Australia (MISA) project, to be primarily located in Port Lincoln, I understand has been signed off by the state universities, SARDI and the South Australian Museum for an estimated \$30 million. This involves the development of a major marine research and education facility in Port Lincoln. Support for

the marine innovation project, through the construction of a new greenfield research and tertiary education facility on the BHP site, now owned by the Lukin family, is required. The initial expansion could employ up to 50 people from the current 25 and provide ample land for future expansion in the decades ahead. This would provide a world-class temperate marine centre. The current Marine Science Centre facility could be used to house TAFE, the high school and virtual marine secondary education centre for the state.

The Minnipa Research Centre has been a major contributor to world dry land farming research and for extension work throughout South Australia. The centre is developing new farming techniques and fertiliser applications that will make substantial improvements to productivity on some of the poorer high calcium base soils found across Australia and indeed the world. These new developments have already enabled substantial productivity increases on Eyre Peninsula, which produces 40 per cent of the state's grain worth approximately \$350 million. Support for the development and promotion of Minnipa Research Centre as a major dry land farming research and tertiary education centre, with both Australian and overseas students and farmers living on site and backed up by the Sims Farm-Cleve Area School program, is essential.

Good soils, including extensive terra rossa soils, are found over considerable areas of Eyre Peninsula. There are now three vineyards near Port Lincoln and the gold medals are rolling in. Southcorp has a major interest and recognises the potential of Eyre Peninsula through its current contact with one of these vineyards. The Port Lincoln water reuse scheme has the potential to provide adequate water for 2 000 hectares of viticulture on the lower Eyre Peninsula.

Substantial olive groves have been planted using drip systems and are already producing. Support for the development of desalination plants on the Peninsula, using existing pipes and pumping infrastructure to allow expansion of horticulture across the region, will enable substantial increases in populating the small towns. Cleve council has lost 700 people from its heyday and has excellent soils within its boundaries. Eyre Peninsula boasts beautiful scenery, coastal and offshore islands, and tourism is booming. Coastal councils have over 1 000 marina and building sites planned. A new 7 storey, five star hotel is planned for Port Lincoln by Sime Sarin, estimated at \$25 million. More than 10 per cent of South Australia's national parks are based on Eyre Peninsula. Eco-tourism in national parks has proven particularly difficult due to the resistance of parks and wildlife to allow any form of commercial use.

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

**Mrs PENFOLD:** One application lodged in 1991 for vehicle and homestead use in a national park was not answered for three years and still only verbal approval has been given. The management plans for the Yumbarra and Yellabina national parks started two years ago and have not reached the public comment stage yet. The Gawler Range National Park agreement for freeholding the two homesteads and allowing four camp sites to be established has yet to be implemented. These parks are a burden on the local councils, volunteers and taxpayers and they must start helping to pay their way.

Introduction of a rational policy for the limited commercial use of the parks for ecotourism is urgently required. It is also my belief that councils should be paid rates for the parks

in their areas by the government as these areas are set aside for all South Australians and should not be a burden on one small group of ratepayers and volunteers.

Implementation of a safe harbor concept for siting moorings around the coast of South Australia for yachties to tour the gulfs is needed with locations of where they can seek refuge in unfavourable weather conditions and use them as nightly stopover points, possibly categorised in the same way as motels, according to their facilities, for example, one star, four star, and so on.

According to a recent report, some 70 trades and professional positions are unfilled on southern Eyre Peninsula. Doctors and allied health professionals are needed for Eyre Peninsula's hospitals and if these positions are vacant for any period there is a risk of closure and consequent devastating effects on the district. Bringing qualified people from South Africa or similar countries, where the people are happy to live in regions and fit in well, is a sensible solution. We currently have several South African doctors on Eyre Peninsula. Previously there was discrimination against such immigration. Positive encouragement should be provided for the people to go to rural regional areas. I see no reason why these should not be a condition of permanent residence and work visas.

A state issue I strongly pushed with the previous government was support for the establishment of the square kilometre array (SKA) telescope to be sited in South Australia. The SKA is an advanced international radio telescope planned for construction in about eight years. It will be funded internationally at a cost of approximately \$1 billion, and South Australia has a very good case for its being sited in the north of our state. The federal government has allocated \$23.5 million to research into Australia's astronomy future through its major national research facilities program. This preliminary work is essential in supporting Australia's bid.

The state government has promised \$400 000 towards the site selection, which is now being undertaken, and I urge the new Labor government not to neglect this wonderful opportunity. Competitors for the SKA site are Western Australia, the Northern Territory and New South Wales. The United States of America is also a competitor, although there is a possibility of too much radio interference and the facility would be sited in the wrong hemisphere to collect information on the southern skies. South America is also competing for this facility, but it has political instability, and South Africa, another competitor, has the same problem. This project must continue to be supported if South Australia's leading position (in the view of some CSIRO scientists) is to be maintained for the future.

Eyre Peninsula has 10 local councils, a local government association, a regional development board and one state member covering 45 000 square kilometres. The federal member is based in Whyalla and has responsibility for 92 per cent of the state. There are no legislative councillors or senators based on Eyre Peninsula. The fragmentation resulting from having 10 councils that are large in area but small in population, the difficulty of providing adequate state and federal representation caused by these huge distances and small populations, plus the many unusual and diverse issues resulting from these small populations and their isolation, make influencing policy and getting city-based departments and political leaders to understand our different needs and huge potential very difficult.

I cannot emphasise enough the uniqueness of this region's strengths and weaknesses. These weaknesses would best be overcome by giving special development regional status for Eyre Peninsula at both state and federal level. With this recognition and support, Eyre Peninsula would be able to fulfil its potential for the benefit of South Australia for all South Australians.

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** I commence my speech tonight by offering my congratulations to you, sir, on your appointment as Deputy Speaker. I also congratulate our new Speaker. I know that you will both do your best always to extend goodwill and guidance to members of this house, both new and old. In relation to the Speaker, there is no-one in this place who holds more dear to his heart the practices, principles and conventions of this place than he. After four years in this chamber, I know that I still have much to learn, and I have no doubt that there will be times when our lack of knowledge will cause all of us some difficulty as we endeavour not just to speak about lifting the standards under which we operate but also to work by the standards we so easily espouse; that is, not just to talk the talk, but to walk the walk, and with your help, guidance and patience, sir.

I extend my congratulations also to those new members elected to the South Australian parliament, both in this house and the other place. There is no need to say, I guess, what an honour it is to be elected and to have so many people place their faith in you. I welcome the new members opposite and wish them good fortune in dealing with their electorate and in coping with the steep learning curve that this special place insists we all undergo.

I most particularly welcome my colleagues the members for Adelaide, Cheltenham, Colton, Napier and Enfield. In the other place, the Labor team has been strengthened by the inclusion of the Hon. Gail Gago and the Hon. John Gazzola, and these are all members of great passion, commitment and experience. South Australians are the real winners, having these people part of their new Rann Labor government.

I also congratulate my Labor colleagues from the last parliament who were also re-elected. I have no illusions that this was a tough campaign resulting in what can only be described as an extraordinary outcome which has delivered to all South Australians a dynamic, enthusiastic and competent government, a government that wants to get on and do the job, a job that has at its core the desire to lift our community, not to put it down; to encourage, not to cast aside; to be inventive, not to put up obstacles; and to aim to be the best in Australia, not set our sights on being the Australian average.

I extend my congratulations to our recently elected ministers, who are already making their mark on our community and, last but by no means least, my sincere congratulations go to our new Premier. My enthusiasm for our Labor team and our new Labor Premier is shared very much by our community. They have seen for the first time in a very long time a Premier who is prepared to lead and a Premier who is prepared to act with confidence, conviction, commitment and dedication to his community. I am extremely proud and honoured to be a part of what I know will be an exciting time in our history.

In saying that, let me say how honoured and humbled I am that the people of Wright have again extended their faith and trust in me to represent them in this place. On 19 February 1998, I made my inaugural address to the parliament. I pledged at that time to do my best to honour the faith that the

people of Wright put in me. I can say that I absolutely did my very best in that regard, and today I reiterate that pledge.

I serve a very diverse, interesting and complex community—a community facing many challenges. We have found that, by working together, we have been able to face those challenges and, in so many instances, not only overcome them but also achieve successful outcomes. The reality is, however, that in these battles one does not always win. I guess that largely depends on one's definition of winning. For me, winning is when we have worked together for what we believe is right. Winning is supporting one another, knowing it is not just about a personal gain or a gain for one's particular club or organisation, but understanding that what is important is our whole community. It is about all our children, not just mine. It is about all our clubs, not just one. It is about valuing all our residents, the young and the not so young. My community has excelled in these areas, and I will be doing my best to ensure that the care and support we have developed for one another continues. To the people of Wright, I register my sincere thanks and, as I said, I reiterate my commitment to them.

In her speech, Her Excellency the Governor outlined the Rann government's vision for South Australia, a new concept which we have not experienced for some considerable time in this state. I refer to the fact that the government actually has a vision for the future. If you need any proof of that, you need only look over some of the contributions made in this place by members opposite over the past week and a half. Not only have some been outstanding in their obvious astonishment—and I think it is not unfair to say petulance—at not retaining government but also their focus is totally in the past.

One contribution, which was obviously delivered to appease those who own that member, focused so far back in our state's history that it could only equate to the back to the future style of John Howard. It was also an indication of what drives these Liberals: it is not vision, but hatred. It is not about getting on with the job, but rather about getting even. Let me tell them that they have missed the boat and it will not be pulling into their harbour for some time to come.

In making reference to boats and harbours, I must speak of the circumstances facing those Australian workers from the CSL *Yarra* who, with the support of the federal Liberal government, have been threatened with the dispossession of their jobs. If ever we needed a clear example of where Howard's Liberals want to take industrial relations in this country—as if we needed it after the infamous waterfront dispute—and if ever we needed a clear example of how little the federal Liberals value Australian workers, their families and their jobs, this is it.

The Howard government does not want to reform industrial relations. That is a joke in the extreme. It is not that they want to take industrial relations back to the last century: they want to set industrial relations back two centuries. In 1890 the maritime union came under attack in order to break the back of the union movement. Does that sound a little familiar? At that time unemployed workers were brought in to break the strikes. The only difference is that this time our unemployed are not even getting the benefit of the jobs. The Liberals are allowing foreign crews to be brought in to take over Australian jobs working in Australian waters. It may be a little flippant of me to say so, but perhaps those fleeing for their lives and seeking refuge in Australia should instead apply for a job on the *Yarra*.

I made brief reference during my grievance speech the other day to the community of Port Pirie who have so

steadfastly supported the crew of the *Yarra*. I had the absolute pleasure of living in Port Pirie for eight-plus years. It is a wonderful community steeped in pride, and justifiably so. Port Pirie is a community that supports its own. When someone is down the people are there to lift them up—no ifs, no buts, no fuss: it just happens. During my time there I saw many examples of their generosity of spirit and kindness.

Port Pirie is also a community that openly welcomes strangers, and I experienced that personally when I moved there many years ago with a very young family. We were, again without fuss, simply picked up by strangers and made to feel more than welcome among them. That is what these people have done for the workers aboard the *Yarra*. The people of Port Pirie know only too well the tenuous state of employment and they have once again extended their support and kindness to strangers. I remain, as always, very proud to have once been a part of this community. I commend them for their support of Australian workers and condemn John Howard and his cronies for their treachery. Of course, there is more that I could say about that—about their treachery and about their disregard for our aged, sick and disabled, but I will leave that for another day and for closer examination as the dust settles on their deplorable budget.

I would like to address some of the issues raised by the Governor in her opening address to the Fiftieth Parliament of this state and, in doing so, offer her my congratulations on her appointment, which was so warmly welcomed by the South Australian community. Her investiture at Government House was a delightful event enjoyed by all those who attended. I know that the Premier holds Her Excellency in the highest regard and his deep affection and respect for her were reflected in the words he shared with us at the time. He did not send the easy message of, 'It's great to have you as Governor, Marj, because you are a great runner and raise lots of money for charity.' No: the Premier talked of the values that have driven Her Excellency to excel in all avenues of her life—the values and determination she applied in her young days to athletics; the values and determination she applied when coming to terms with great tragedy in her life; and her ability to turn adversity into a benefit for the community and a personal passion for herself.

The Premier, as is his hallmark, was also gracious enough at the very outset of his speech to commend the then very recently resigned Premier (the Hon. John Olsen) for Her Excellency's appointment. His own side of politics did not have the good grace to make this acknowledgment but, in their defence, perhaps they were still smarting from the fact that for the first time in our history a Premier was forced to resign because he was found to be dishonest. Perhaps they were showing their normal level of loyalty and trying to distance themselves from him as much as possible. Nevertheless, I know that all South Australians will enjoy Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson's term as Governor of South Australia.

As I have already stated, the newly elected Rann Labor government is a government with a vision—a real vision for the future. The Premier's policy of social inclusion and the establishment of a social inclusion unit with a cross-government approach is a great initiative and is welcomed by all South Australians. Issues that have dogged our community will at last be treated with real concern and commitment—issues such as homelessness, the school drop-out rate, youth suicide and the use of illicit drugs. These are issues that affect every family in one way or another and come at a great cost to our community. We can no longer allow our young people

to be lost to society, whether it is by not fulfilling their potential, through suicide or through drug taking. These are things that every parent's nightmares are made of and things that this government is prepared to talk about with the community and to tackle in a practical way.

This government is committed to outcomes; committed to including, not excluding. We hear so often that our young people are our future. We must recognise that they are part of the here and now and, if we do not act and live up to our responsibilities, they will have no future. I attended the community drug forum held at the Tea Tree Gully Civic Centre on Monday evening. This was one of the many community forums being organised to give each and every member of the community the opportunity to have their say and to provide input prior to the formal drug summit to be held in June. There was a great turnout of local MPs—three state MPs, in fact, and all Labor MPs, all listening intently to what residents had to say. I was impressed by the openness of so many people and their willingness to share their stories, many of which were quite heartbreaking. It was interesting to hear at first hand from parents of children who had been involved in drug taking and from a former drug taker (now parent) about what it is they believe entices our young ones into drug taking and what they believe will be the outcome or possible consequences of their drug use.

It was very clear to me that the overwhelming view of this particular group of people is that people become involved in drugs primarily to fill a hole in their lives and to compensate for a lack of self-esteem and confidence. It was also very clear that the majority of people who so openly discuss this issue believe very strongly that drug addiction is an illness and should be treated as such. That does not mean putting up easy options or going soft, but there needs to be a far greater understanding of the causes if we are to make a difference. Drug addiction devastates lives. It breaks up families and its impacts are catastrophic. Parents and young people all spoke of the need for positive role models and to seek ways to actively involve young people in our community so that they have an opportunity to develop self-esteem and we as a community can show them that they are important to us and they do matter.

Prevention is the cure. There are many ways that this can be done and we have seen recent articles about the effects on students, for example, who have been involved in our Rock and Roll Eisteddfod. Young people who are involved, active, have positive self-images and are positively engaged have no need for drugs. Indeed, in raising my sons I always worked on the premise that if I kept them busy they would be too tired to get themselves into too much trouble. I am sure that there was the odd escapade that they got up to that their mother did not know about, but I am extremely grateful that my efforts, bordering on exhaustion at times, were in some ways successful.

There will be a number of very important issues in the future in my electorate (and I will address them at another time) in relation to the involvement and/or lack of involvement of young people—issues that really need to be addressed. Community safety is also a priority for this government and I know many people in my electorate have been extremely pleased with the decisions that this government has already made in this area.

I look forward to my new role as parliamentary secretary to the Premier and I am delighted to assist him with his very important portfolio area of volunteers. I spoke briefly of this earlier this week and I truly believe that volunteers are the

heart and soul of our community. The Premier told the house today that he will make a significant announcement on Volunteers Day in relation to volunteers. I have a bit of an inkling what it is about and am very much looking forward to lifting the recognition of the contribution of volunteers in our community and working with those peak volunteer bodies in our state which have done, and are continuing to do, such a magnificent job.

I will also be assisting the Minister for Health, and I know that all South Australians were as pleased as I was with her announcement of a generational review into health service provision in this state. Again, the area of quality health provision is one that has been a passion both professionally and personally for me over a number of years. The people of this state deserve nothing less than to feel safe when accessing their health services.

This government is also committed to the establishment of a health and community services ombudsman—an initiative that is long overdue. I had an example last year that I brought to this house of a man whose wife died in a private hospital and who could not access any of the medical records of that hospital or the hospital she attended previously unless a court order was issued. That is a disgraceful situation and one that needs to be remedied. Things are about to change and change for the better. These will be positive changes for health services and for patients, and that can only engender confidence in both the health services and the community.

I conclude with some personal thank you's. I want to thank a range of our South Australian unions that were generous in their assistance and support of me, in particular, the CFMEU, the Miscellaneous Workers Union, the Finance Sector Union and the Clothing, Textile and Footwear Union. I am deeply indebted to those unions for their great support over a long time.

I thank my sub-branch members who worked so diligently to ensure my re-election. I thank Lyn Byrne, my personal assistant who put in many hours of her time and, basically, set aside her life for four weeks.

**Mr Brindal:** Would you like to name some of your sub-branch members to give them due credit?

**Ms RANKINE:** Well, there are so many of them I do not think you need to know who they are. Let me make the point about the vindictiveness of the previous government. One local resident in my area had a photograph taken with me and his family and was persecuted by his government employer in relation to having that photograph taken. That is an indication of what you lot do when you know someone is supporting us. I am not likely to give you the list of my sub-branch members, let me tell you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** If you like, we can swap lists.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** Yes, or interstate.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** We know where your lists come from. I also thank Paul Bodisco very much for his creative interest and humorous efforts in my campaign. He travelled from interstate and it was an absolute delight to have him as part of my campaign team. I also thank my campaign manager, Dennis Crisp, who is a very long-time dear friend—I would not have got through that period without his support—and the women of Emily's List who were, once again, absolutely magnificent in their support of me and a number of other

candidates within South Australia. We stand proud to be members of that organisation.

I also thank all those non-ALP members in my community who backed me so steadfastly during the campaign. Last, but not least, I thank my family who are always there, in particular, my wonderful sons Matthew and Brett and my daughter-in-law who spent many hours day and night working to ensure that their mother was re-elected. I think part of that was the threat that perhaps mum would be moving in if she did not win! Their love and support was unwavering, and for that I will always be grateful.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I, too, support this motion and congratulate Her Excellency on her speech at the opening of this new parliament. Like many members, I agree that we are very fortunate to have Her Excellency as the Governor of this state. I also welcome the new members—the members for Bragg, Heysen, Morphett and Kavel; the members for Adelaide, Colton, Enfield, Napier and Cheltenham; and the members in another place.

It is an honour and privilege to be a member of parliament. I believe that, regardless of which side of the house we sit on or the political philosophy we hold, we all travel down the same road: we just walk on different footpaths. I happen to believe that my footpath and that of my colleagues is a much better footpath to ensure that the community is served.

I thank the electors of Hartley who, once again, after a tough election, have honoured me by electing me to be their member for the next four years. I refer to the comment made by many other members about acknowledging our being on Kaurua land. I believe it is important to acknowledge the full history of our state and our nation, but in so doing we must acknowledge the contributions that all groups of Australians have made.

I was looking at the proclamation of 1836, and it is important to note that Governor Hindmarsh, the first Governor of this state, in his proclamation said:

It is also at this time especially my duty to apprise the colonists of my resolution to take every lawful means for extending the same protection to the native population as the rest of His Majesty's subjects and of my firm determination to punish with exemplary severity all acts of violence or injustice which may in any manner be practised or attempted against the natives who are to be considered as much under the safeguard of the law as the colonists themselves and equally entitled to the privileges of British subjects.

It is important to note that in that proclamation we were different from the other states. South Australia was not terra nullius and we did acknowledge the indigenous inhabitants. However, although we have not always lived up to those expectations, the founders of this state have much of which to be proud. In 1857, when the first parliament was formed, in theory the indigenous male population could vote and stand for parliament. That was three years before the American Civil War over slavery in the United States. It is also important to note that in 1838 we had the first influx of non-English speaking migrants to Klemzig and Felixstow in my electorate, and they have certainly made a great contribution to the state.

Sometimes we forget our achievements as a state and, whilst we have not been perfect, we have certainly a lot of which to be proud. In 1894 we were the first place in the world to give women the right not only to vote but also to stand for parliament. Britain did not give women the right to vote until 1926. Italy, the country in which I was born, did not do so until after the Second World War; and Switzerland, the place where a lot of people revere citizens initiated

referenda, did not give women the right to vote until 1960s. All that glitters is not gold when we give examples of democracies. So, as I have said, South Australia has much of which to be proud.

Indeed, whilst acknowledging some of the shortcomings of the past, we should always acknowledge our achievements. However, if we look at the representation of the indigenous population in this place, the two major parties have a lot of work to do before we can be proud. Historically, there has not been any indigenous representation in this place, yet we are a state that started with such high ideals.

In the federal parliament, Senator Neville Bonner from Queensland, who served from 1971 to 1983, was the first indigenous member of parliament in the senate. He was a member of the Liberal Party, and I am proud to be a member of the party that saw fit to preselect him as a member of parliament. I would like to congratulate the Australian Democrats for preselecting Aden Ridgeway as their senator. This place must truly reflect the diversity and composition of the general population. When I made my maiden speech in 1994, there was only one female representative on the Labor side of the chamber—the former deputy leader, Annette Hurley. The Labor Party has certainly come a long way—

*The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** In 1994.

*The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** Yes, there was. The Minister for Education came into the chamber after the by-election for the electorate—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** That is correct, the member for Taylor; and the government Whip, the member for Torrens, came into this place after the sudden death of Joe Tiernan. So, indeed, the Labor Party had only one female member at the time. It is not so long ago that the Labor side of this place did not have the representation of women that it proudly boasts of today.

When I look back on the 1993 election—and I have just won my third election—for two or three years, I had to put up with members opposite saying, 'Enjoy the last term, Joe. Where would you like to teach—Oodnadatta, Port Augusta?' or whatever. I took it on the chin, because I knew that, if I continued to work hard, the electors of Hartley—the seat where I was brought up—would re-elect me. They have done so, and I thank them.

I went to the 1993 election as a sole parent with three children. My children—Cassandra, Luca and Joel—helped me to achieve that win. Today, I am proud to say that Cassandra is married and will graduate as a lawyer at the end of the year; my 25-year-old son Luca is doing well working in business with my brother; and my 20-year-old son Joel has just returned from the United States on a part tennis scholarship and represented South Australia in the Lincoln Cup. My children have done well.

In the tough 1997 election campaign, Labor threw everything at me, but I succeeded with a majority of 184 votes. My wife, Julia, whom I had met nine months prior to that election, was a great support, especially in the two weeks during which I was waiting for the result. She has also been a great support in ensuring that I succeeded in the difficult election of 2002. I thank my wife Julia, my children and two step-children, Anastasia and Maria, who have been a great support.

I want to thank my campaign team, especially Andrew McEwin, who for 18 months undertook the very demanding job of campaign manager in the most marginal

seat; I could not have succeeded without his support. I also thank Max Arthur, who was campaign manager for the two previous elections, because I stood in 1989 as well. I thank Kevin Ekendahl, who helped during the four weeks of the recent campaign. I sincerely thank all my supporters and those who voted for me; I know there were many Labor supporters amongst them. I thank them all for supporting me as the local member.

I know how the ALP candidate for Hartley feels, because I have mixed feelings too. You can imagine how he feels because, if Hartley had been won by the Labor Party, it would have governed in its own right. The Labor candidate worked hard for seven years to try to achieve a win; I had to work hard to ensure that he did not achieve it. So, I have a respect for my opponent in that regard and acknowledge the difficulty facing members in marginal seats. The member for Spence often came up to me and said, 'Joe, enjoy the last six months.' I would remind him of the reality of someone who has a 20 to 25 per cent margin, a margin such as the one he enjoyed, and say, 'Mick, if my dog Sheila got your placard and went for a walk around your electorate, it would win the seat for you. You'll never have the joy of winning a marginal seat.' A flea on a drover's dog on a windy day could win Spence for the Labor Party, although I do not believe that 9 February was particularly windy! I remember one of the Labor greats—Bill Hayden—first saying something to that effect: I have merely added a little onto it. So, I do my homework.

The election count was confusing. At one stage on the Saturday night, I was told that I had won. I was then told that I had not won. I visited my electorate office on Sunday morning, and on my answering machine I had messages such as, 'Congratulations, Joe' and I knew that I was 120 votes behind. It was a strange and mixed feeling. I am sure that the member for Adelaide knows what I am talking about.

The campaign in Hartley was long but it was not fair. There was confusion about the different levels of responsibility—local, state and federal government—all mixed together. My opponent got himself into a little trouble when he mentioned that the Gums and Kensington Gardens were threatened. In reality, those gums are a local government responsibility and they were not under threat. There was also the mischief concerning Lochiel Park, where the Labor Party stated throughout the campaign that it supported 100 per cent retention for open space. The Labor Party said that also at the meeting of 340 people on the Monday night. However, now the government is silent. Where is the 100 per cent left for open space? I am waiting.

**Mrs Geraghty:** How much did you say?

**Mr SCALZI:** I was honest and I said that we retained 20 per cent. The normal development is 12½ per cent, and I fought hard to get 20 per cent. But I am not in the business of making promises that I cannot keep. I think that this will bite the government, because it made promises in the last week of the campaign that it did not have any intention of keeping. If it had, as it did at the meeting on the Monday night, it would have met with the stakeholders, and they have written to me. They are disappointed; they believe they have been conned. Where is the 100 per cent commitment to Lochiel Park? We are waiting.

Similarly, the civic centre was supposed to be the other thing that would be the end of me. The reality is that the local council, on 3 October, voted 11 to three to go ahead and declassify the land to allow the development of JP Morgan on that site. I did not have a vote, and it was a very difficult

issue for me, because one of my brothers is on the council and we did not always agree on what should happen. It was a very difficult issue in many ways, but I am pleased to say that my three brothers, my sister and the whole family were there on election day, regardless of our disagreements, to hand out how-to-vote cards. I thank them for being committed to my re-election as well.

I think that the way in which the law and order issue was campaigned was most despicable. For example: 86 year old woman robbed by eight year old at Campbelltown; syringes found at Hectorville; stabbing at Hectorville; and murder victim found in front of Payneham Police Station. I did not believe that I would see that sort of campaigning from the Labor Party. I did not believe that it would stoop so low to scare the hell out of the elderly in my electorate. To use law and order in that way is wrong, because the elderly fear naturally, and to compound that fear for short-term political gain I think is wrong. And the more enlightened members opposite know that that is wrong.

We will not solve all the law and problems by locking people up and throwing away the key. We have to look at a more creative means of dealing with the problems. There is a strong correlation between unemployment and the incidence of crime, and we must look at it in a comprehensive way. I am pleased that the government is looking at the drug problem, because that has a lot to do with the crime rate. But you would not have thought that the same government would be responsible for those pamphlets in Hartley during the last election. It is incongruent: their rhetoric does not match their actions. I think it is important that this be pointed out tonight. It is important that we should be honest in campaigning.

I would now like to talk about independence—because, believe it or not, some members of the community wanted me to be independent over the issue of the Payneham Civic Centre. Mr Speaker, you would be aware that at some of those rallies I was asked to be independent and stand up to the government with regard to the Payneham Civic Centre. But we should be realistic: we are here by the grace of God, the electors and the support of our parties. No matter how good someone is, they will not get more than five, six, seven per cent of their personal votes on a good day. At the end of the day, I am privileged to have been re-elected and to have represented the party that has given me the opportunity to be in this place. I would not have won Hartley as an Independent, and I will not delude myself into thinking that I would have done so.

**Ms Rankine:** Which makes the Speaker's achievement more outstanding.

**Mr SCALZI:** The members opposite have brought in the election. It is important to note that I am fortunate to have received 43 per cent of the primary vote and I note that, statewide for the House of Assembly, the Labor Party, which is in power now, received only 36 per cent of the primary vote. We have a government that, in a preferential system, received only 36 per cent, and just over 32 per cent in another place—in the Legislative Council. That should really put a little perspective into how the Labor Party got on the other side—32 per cent in the Legislative Council: nine members for the Liberal Party, seven members for the Labor Party and, of course, there are Independents, such as the Independent from Family First, which received 4 per cent of the vote. Both parties should ask themselves the question: if we are honestly addressing the issues that are facing families, why did a party standing on the platform of Family First succeed, with Pastor Andrew Evans, in having a member of parliament in the

Legislative Council? Let us look at the victory in its proper context.

Members opposite pride themselves in their philosophy, as I pride myself in the philosophy that we hold. But fundamentally it appears that the government is behaving like the 'cuckoo party'. I say that because it is a little like the cuckoo bird. The cuckoo bird does not have its own nest and lays its eggs in another bird's nest, then claims that the nest as its own. I think of that when I hear from members opposite daily: 'We are a bipartisan party.' I could not believe what I heard when I went to the Wine Centre. The Deputy Premier gave a very good speech, I must say. He said that economic development is a bipartisan goal. He talked about the importance of promoting the state in a bipartisan way. He talked about the importance of the exports that this government has achieved—and it has made some decisions in putting some well experienced ex-Liberals on boards, and so on, and I commend them. I said to one of the members, 'Am I hearing right? Who was the Liberal staffer who wrote the Deputy Premier's speech?' because it sounded very much like a Liberal speech. That is what I mean about the cuckoo party—because it adopts someone else's nest.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** Well, put it this way, if you look after it: we have the best unemployment figures in over 10 years; we have had excellent exports to \$9 billion; we have had excellent developments—

**Ms Rankine:** How much a month is the Wine Centre costing us?

**Mr SCALZI:** Yes, the Wine Centre, and the Entertainment Centre—and we can even mention the soccer stadium. They will all be judged in the future as being good developments. I do not run away from that, and members opposite will own them one day. Just be careful! Government members talk about the black holes with which we left them. I believe many of them are imaginary, self-constructed black holes. Members will recall that with Labor we had \$9.6 billion of debt, which amounts to \$6 593 per capita. When we left members opposite our economic nest, it was only \$3.27 billion. Unemployment reached a peak of 12 per cent in 1992; we left members opposite with 7.1 per cent unemployment, and I have already mentioned how far exports have gone.

Members opposite introduced the 10 marijuana plant rule. We took a further step. I give members opposite credit for the upcoming drug summit, as a result of which things might change. With regard to health, since 1992-93 the Liberal government has spent more than \$700 million on upgrading hospitals and equipment, and has committed a further \$200 million. The total health budget now is \$2.2 billion per annum, an increase of 35 per cent.

With regard to the schools in my electorate, the East Torrens Primary School has received an extra \$270 000 on top of the \$500 000 for the new gymnasium. We have committed a lot to South Australia, and I hate to think what the economic nest was in 1993. It was in shreds. However, luckily we could put all the twigs together, and we did that. Obviously, members opposite have forgotten the past. They should remember that those who are ignorant of the past are condemned to live in it. They should make sure that they learn from their past mistakes just as we, too, have to learn from our past mistakes.

Imagine if Ralph Clarke and Murray De Laine had won their seats (because we have 51 per cent of the two party preferred vote); I am sure members opposite would have said,

'Those two members are from the Labor side. You can see their history; they have been on the Labor side since they were in short pants.' Therefore, it is reasonable and fair that the party that gets over 50 per cent plus one should govern. That is all we said. However, the government has a Napoleonic approach in that Napoleon put the crown on his own head. Let us not forget that the government did so having obtained 36 per cent of the primary votes in the House of Assembly and 32 per cent thereof in the Legislative Council.

I congratulate the new ministers, and I will respect those who have gained office in this place. Let us put it in perspective and understand that the major parties have a lot to learn. We must address a lot of issues. I am honoured and privileged to be here, and I look forward to facing from opposition the challenges that lie ahead of us. To get ahead you need a government and a responsible alternative government, and we have to work together to ensure that South Australia continues to go ahead with its exports and its confidence in the motor vehicle manufacturing and all the component industries that go with them. The train is going to Darwin. Let us make sure that members opposite now as the custodians do not derail the state after so much work has taken place before they came into power.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** In speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I take the opportunity to thank the Governor of South Australia Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson for her speech. It is certainly great to have her as our Governor. I am delighted that she has already visited my electorate twice since she became Governor. Certainly, with her personality and her outgoing nature, she is coming across so well and is an excellent person to be Governor of South Australia.

I take this opportunity to congratulate and welcome all new members into the house, in particular, the members for Morphet, Heysen, Bragg and Kavel on this side of the house, and the members for Napier, Enfield, Colton, Cheltenham and Adelaide on the government side, in the latter two cases the member for Cheltenham becoming the Minister for Urban Development and Planning, and the member for Adelaide becoming the Minister for Tourism. I congratulate them on their elevation to the cabinet with such short experience in the house.

I am sure that all members would be very pleased with their successes. I know members on this side have every reason to be pleased with their performance. They have worked hard. They would appreciate that it is not easy to get into parliament, and I know that they will represent their electorates very well.

I would like to start where the member for Hartley left off, namely, with the fact that it is rather ironic that the Liberal party is not in government even though it gained 40 per cent of the primary vote compared to Labor's 36.3 per cent of the primary vote in the House of Assembly. If you convert that into the two-party preferred vote, which is the one that counts, 50.9 per cent of the vote was for Liberal compared to 49.1 per cent for Labor, yet the Liberal Party is not in office. It is one of the ironies of this situation that the former member for MacKillop was instrumental in bringing about a redistribution in this house such that he and many members believe that whichever party gained 50.1 per cent of the vote should be able to form government. However, that did not occur in this case, so the government is in power having actually achieved a minority of the overall vote.

This applies not only in the House of Assembly but also in the Legislative Council, where the Liberal party gained 40.1 per cent of the primary vote compared to the ALP's 32.9 per cent. So, it is very clear that the Liberal party did gain a majority in both houses and won the election but still it does not govern. It is something that hopefully the electoral boundaries commissioners will take into consideration in their redistribution which is presently under way.

There is no doubt that South Australia is the great state. It is the state that is leading the way in Australia, and we can be thankful for eight years of Liberal government rule because it has brought South Australia out of the doldrums and into a leading position. I was very heartened to read in today's *Advertiser* a special business report by Rex Jory. Amongst other things, that report states:

South Australia's export record in the past three years has been one of the success stories of the national economy. The state's exports grew by 30 per cent to \$8.9 billion in 2001. Across Australia exports increased by 11 per cent.

**Mr Williams:** Three times as much!

**Mr MEIER:** As the Member for MacKillop says, three times as much. Whereas over the last three years Australia has experienced an 11 per cent increase in exports, South Australia's increase has been 30 per cent. We are storming ahead. We have a magnificent economy here. I am proud to have been part of the Liberal government which brought South Australia's economy to the point where it is now. What a lucky government we have that has taken office opposite, because this steamroller effect will continue for the next six, 12 or 24 months. It would not matter what the present government did. It could go back to the disastrous days of the early 1990s, and the economy would still keep rolling on. I just hope that members opposite will not go back to those disastrous days. However, we have already heard some very discomfiting comments; for example, 'We are going to turn the economy around.' I say, 'Help us!' We have worked tirelessly for eight years to get the economy where it is to turn it around from where it was in office in 1993.

The first thing the Labor Party says is, 'No, we're going to turn it around.' Really! I just hope it has been a slip of the tongue by the members who have said that, because, as I have said, we are leading the nation. Please, I beg the government, do not drag us back to the early 1990s. We have seen successes in so many areas, and certainly the wine exports have been spectacular. As Rex Jory highlights, in 1998-99 South Australia exported wine valued at just under \$660 million. By 1999-2000 this rose to \$861 million and in 2000-01 it topped \$1 billion in exports—a fantastic achievement—and there is more to come. By the end of this financial year it is anticipated—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the member for MacKillop that that is not normally home for him.

**Mr MEIER:** I thank you for your protection, sir, and I look forward to the contribution of the member for MacKillop tomorrow. By the end of this financial year, according to Mr Jory, wine exports will have hit \$1.8 billion—nearly three times as much as it was well after we took over. That is no accident, because our Food for the Future program was one of the real catalysts there, as were the efforts of the Department of Industry and Trade and our regional development boards, particularly those in the wine-growing areas. What do we see from the new Labor government? It will do a review of the regional development boards because it does not like the way they are going. Of this

fantastic success in tripling the wine exports members opposite say, 'We don't like it—we reckon it went too fast; we don't like too much economic activity.' That is what I assume they are saying. Or are they reviewing these boards because they think that they could have obtained a figure four times rather than three times as much? I will wait to see. I hope, whatever the case, that under no circumstances will they dispense with the regional development boards.

We can also refer to car exports—again a huge increase—or to our fish or uranium exports. Remember the mirage in the desert back in the 1979-82 period? That mirage in the desert has taken refined copper exports from South Australia from \$124.5 million in 1998-99 up to \$587 million in 2000-01: what a spectacular increase. We would not have had one cent of that had a Labor government had its way. I acknowledge the contribution of the upper house member, Mr Normie Foster, a fellow who was expelled from the Labor Party because he could see the future employment and future export growth involving Roxby Downs.

Our success stories are reflected in so many areas. We have heard from the member for Hartley, and I repeat, that South Australia's unemployment rate has now dropped to 6.6 per cent, the lowest level in almost 12 years. What did we inherit when we took office some eight years ago? Just before we took office the unemployment rate was 12 per cent, so we have halved that rate in the time we have been in government. What does the Labor Party want to do? It wants to turn around the economy and go backwards and take it up to 12 per cent again, I assume. It is a tragedy to hear that it does not care about the economic strength of this state. Indeed, it is a real worry.

We could look at tourism. It was wonderful to see in January of this year that South Australia was enjoying a bumper holiday season, with some visitor numbers up by as much as 20 per cent. Those things do not occur by accident and I pay particular tribute to the former minister for tourism (Joan Hall), who did so much for tourism in her time as minister. Certainly she worked tirelessly to turn tourism to the advantage of all South Australia. We have far more tourists than most other states have, as we should. The electorate of Goyder, which includes Yorke Peninsula, has benefited enormously from tourism growth. I again thank the member for Morialta, the former minister for tourism, for all she did in that regard. We had a huge amount of extra money coming into Goyder, not only in tourism infrastructure but also in new roads, a water study and a variety of other areas. It was many millions of dollars, and certainly I look forward to working with the new Minister for Tourism and welcome her to the job. I know that the former minister, the member for Morialta, spent many days in the district of Goyder and I will extend the same invitation to the present minister. I do not know how well she knows Yorke Peninsula, but I assure her that it is a wonderful place.

**The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith:** Intimately.

**Mr MEIER:** It is great to hear that she knows it intimately. A lot of work is to be done in future and I am pleased to hear her positive reaction across the chamber.

We have heard a lot about health in the past few days and I am certainly concerned about the new Minister for Health. I seriously question whether she will achieve what she seems to be suggesting. If we hark back to January of this year, we recall an article in the *Advertiser* of 31 January, headed, 'State tops health spending'. It states:



South Australian hospitals have more staff and shorter waiting lists for elective surgery than any other state, a federal government report says.

So, in health we are leading the nation, but what have we heard from the Minister for Health over the past few days? She has been knocking health and saying she needs a review on it. Why do you need a review of a health system that is performing the best in the country? Again, she will be wasting money on the review and not doing things when she should be doing things, and that really worries me. That report goes on:

Compared with other states in Australia, we [South Australia] spend more on hospitals and more doctors and more nurses than any state. We also have the lowest infant mortality rate and the highest life expectancy.

I repeat: we have the lowest mortality rate and the highest life expectancy rate in Australia. What are hospitals there for? I hope they are there to bring new arrivals into the world and to keep people living for as long as they can. The situation in South Australia as of January this year is that we are the best in the country, yet the Minister for Health says that that needs to be reviewed. Does she want to take us backwards like the Labor Party wants to take the economy backwards? I am really worried about its priorities. I will quote further from the *Advertiser*:

The annual review of government services in Australia found 1999 Australia spent \$778.90 per person on public hospitals in 1999-2000—the highest in Australia. Nationally the average was \$729.

Again, we are spending more per public patient than any other state. So, we are at the top in one category after another. My final quote from the article is as follows:

The proportion of patients suffering extended waits for elective surgery was 15.9 per cent—half the rate of Victoria's 32.9 per cent.

**An honourable member:** How long has Bracks been there?

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, how long has Bracks been there?

**Mr Brokenshire:** Too long.

**Mr MEIER:** I think it is more than two years, and what has happened to Victoria's health system? Down, down down. Our rate of patients enduring extended waits for elective surgery is now down to half that in Victoria. But what has this government already said in its first few weeks—we want a review of this situation—a review of the best system in Australia? Well, I am very worried for the future.

It is most appropriate to remember that, just over eight years ago, South Australia was a basket case. Remember, as I mentioned a little earlier, that we had an unemployment rate of 12 per cent and, in fact, 36 000 jobs were lost in the two years that the now Premier Mike Rann was minister for employment. I am very worried at the way in which the new Premier is carrying on and at some of his comments. For example, yesterday, when the Leader of the Opposition added a couple of words at the end of the explanation of his question, the Premier indicated that he felt that was not the right example to set.

I am currently having research done on all the former leader of the opposition's questions, because, if my memory serves me correctly, I think every question he asked in this place had a barb at the end, and he never once apologised. And he kept doing it, having been pulled up by the Speaker at the time. Now, however, he is a holier-than-thou person trying to correct the leader on the one occasion that he did it. I cannot believe the hypocrisy! It is quite unbelievable. When

I look at some of the members on that side, I see that they are shaking their head, too, in question time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I take a point of order. The honourable member has reflected on the Premier, suggesting that he is a hypocrite. I ask him to withdraw that reflection on the Premier.

**Mr MEIER:** My exact words related to the hypocrisy of the Premier in seeking to correct the leader for having added a comment to an explanation when he did it after every single question, from memory, but I am having that checked.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Rankine):** I suggest that the member for Goyder be mindful of his language and also be mindful that he does not reflect on the chair in the comments that he is making.

**Mr MEIER:** I thank you very much, Madam Acting Speaker. I take those points on board. Let us remember that eight years ago we had the worst per capita debt in Australia at something like \$9.5 billion and, in fact, we had a budget overrun of \$300 million per year. Now, eight years later, the Treasurer in this house is trying to bleat and carry on about a budget deficit that he says supposedly exists, and I think he has gone up something like \$100 million. If we remember back over the last eight budgets, but I stand to be corrected, every time he said, 'You are going to come in with a budget overrun.'

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Are you quoting him directly?

**Mr MEIER:** I have got some quotes here. In 2001, I think, quoting from *Hansard*, he said:

Since John Olsen was elected Premier we have seen a government that has continually delivered to the parliament budgets that have ultimately had a string of deficits.

I have checked with the people who know and they said, 'Wrong, we didn't run deficit budgets.' I do not know where the current Treasurer got that information from, or this statement, which again is from *Hansard*. Mr Foley said:

In 1998-99, there was supposed to be a \$4 million surplus from this government. It turned into a \$65 million deficit. In 1999-2000, a \$1 million surplus somehow became a \$39 million deficit, and I will say a little more about that later. In this budget there is supposed to be a minor \$2 million surplus. . . all the Olsen Liberal budgets since the election of 1997 have been deficit budgets, but even the wafer thin surpluses have been achieved only by illegitimately. . .

He suddenly acknowledges that there have been wafer thin surpluses. He is saying there have always been budget deficits but then he says that there have been wafer thin surpluses. We have learnt not to believe what the current Treasurer says. In 1998, quoting from *Hansard*, he said:

The \$20 million will only be paid for in a couple of ways: by a further blow-out in the budget deficit, or by cuts elsewhere in the budget or further taxes or charges, increases or fines, in the next couple of budgets.

Importantly, he also said:

But on top of that, of course, we already have a \$100 million black hole in this budget because, if members recall, in this budget cycle that we are in, this 12-month period, the government had forecast \$100 million from its ETSA tax, which has now gone. But that will leave the \$100 million black hole.

We know that never occurred and another balanced budget came in. Thankfully, the former treasurer has identified exactly what the Treasurer and the Premier have been up to in a memo entitled 'Rann and Foley's fictional black hole'. He says in that memo that these claims by the Treasurer and the Premier are fictional and dishonest, and I think that is a real reflection on this new government—a government that is outwardly saying it wants honesty in government but, when it comes to the point, boom, they are identifying untruths.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** On a point of order, I am trying to listen to my learned colleague's valuable contribution and I cannot hear for the bleating opposite.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will attempt to contain himself.

**Mr MEIER:** Thank you very much for your protection, Madam Acting Speaker; it is greatly appreciated. The former treasurer says in this memo:

These memos make it clear that as at January 15 and 16 [this year] Treasury advised:

- Estimated underlying surplus of \$96 million for this year's budget primarily due to strong boom in stamp duty receipts;
- Estimated underlying surplus of \$60 million for this year's budget even if all Treasury advice on budget problems in health and education was agreed to;
- the former government had put aside another \$170 million in the forward estimates for cost pressures and new initiatives such as the teachers' wage case—note Treasury memo 13 March 2002 confirms there is actually \$451 million in the forward estimates to meet cost pressures and new initiatives including capital works. This \$451 million has not yet been allocated to any specific spending decisions;

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I rise on a point of order. I seek your advice, sir. The member for Goyder said that he was quoting a Treasury memo, claiming that there was—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Unless he was not quoting a Treasury memo. If he is quoting a Treasury memo, that is the property of the state government and either it should be tabled or returned immediately.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the member for Goyder quoting from a Treasury memo?

**Mr MEIER:** Definitely not. I was quoting from a memo from the former treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, which was issued on 10 May.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The member for Goyder.

**Mr MEIER:** The former treasurer has made it very clear that the moneys were provided, and I just wonder how the government members are finding it when their Treasurer is putting out figures which, if not false, come from information that he does not understand. I am worried therefore for the state of South Australia if in these early days the Treasurer does not seem to understand how the budget works, and I know that the Hon. Robert Lucas was very upset at some of the comments made under parliamentary privilege by the Treasurer, and we must see that this is not perpetrated any further in this house.

**Mr Brindal:** We wouldn't trust him to run the West Beach Caravan Park.

**Mr MEIER:** The member for Unley mentions the West Beach Caravan Park: we are well aware that the mistakes of the former Labor government were gigantic. We could mention the West Beach Caravan Park, Marineland, Scrimber and also the Remm Centre. And, of course, I think there was another little one: the State Bank, wasn't it? \$3.4 billion! It just goes on and on. billions of dollars was wasted and they had the audacity to try to pin something on this government in relation to some very minor cost blowouts, I guess you could say, of totally insignificant proportions. But, then again, they are very good at playing the political game and I guess that is for us to take up as we see fit.

**Mr Brindal:** You had better be careful; they are bringing in the heavy guns. The Attorney has just come in. They must be worried.

**Mr MEIER:** With due respect to the Attorney-General, I appreciate his decision in seeking to have that film banned recently; I give him full credit for at least seeking to do what he could. In fact, I think there will probably be quite a few issues that he brings forward on which he will have my support.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I hope you're allowed to vote for my propositions.

**Mr MEIER:** We will certainly weigh them up and consider them.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, I must admit he has some conservative views that reflect entirely my own views, but we will see how things go. I hope that pressure is not brought to bear on the Attorney-General by members of his government which do not allow him to bring forward laws that will be in the best interests of this state.

Time seems to be getting away from me, Mr Speaker, but I want to highlight another positive thing in South Australia—and the way South Australia has been performing over the last few years has been all positive. I just hope that this positivism will not become negativism under this government. As I said, while the positives we initiated will keep flowing, perhaps even for another 24 months, may the government stop doing what it has been doing so far. It is interesting that the Premier said that they were ready to hit the ground running. Unfortunately, he was two-thirds right: they hit the ground but, unfortunately, nothing further has happened.

Another really positive aspect for South Australia was highlighted recently in the *Advertiser* and that is the glowing IT sector. The *Advertiser* stated:

More than 10 000 jobs have been created in South Australia's information technology sector in the past seven years, with the state government pumping more than \$120 million into the industry.

I say, 'Hear, hear!'—10 000 jobs is phenomenal. The *Advertiser* also stated that the state's IT sector is growing at an annual rate of about 9 per cent. I would like to know what industries are growing at 9 per cent other than the IT sector: not too many, probably.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Aquaculture, yes; and also, of course, the car industry. The wine industry has probably grown at a rate of more than 9 per cent. Did someone say tourism? So, actually, there are many industries growing at 9 per cent or more.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** It is. There are more examples than I thought. Anyway, the IT sector has grown at 9 per cent, with more than 100 companies established in recent years and better than half the state's population connected with it. In 1994 there were fewer than 8 000 IT jobs in South Australia. The most recent figure is more than 18 000 specialist jobs with a further 26 200 non-IT employees in the sector.

So, it has been success after success for South Australia. It was a pleasure to be part of the government that brought about that success but I am very concerned about some of the statements I have heard from the new government in the first week and a half of parliament's sitting.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### EAST TIMOR

The Legislative Council passed the following resolution to which it desired the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That this Council congratulates the people of East Timor on achieving full independence.

### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** In reply to a question in this house about whether the Rann-Lewis Labor government would commit to building a new deep sea port at Outer Harbor, the Premier said—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that standing orders state that members of this house should be referred to by their electorates or ministerial titles, not by their surnames.

**The SPEAKER:** Certainly they must be. The member for Schubert.

**Mr VENNING:** Thank you, sir. I am guided by your ruling. Yesterday, in reply to a question in this house about whether the Labor government would commit to building a new deep-sea port at Outer Harbor, the Premier said:

We will be making a major statement on that at a future date.

As I have done on all previous occasions in discussions on this topic, I declare my interest as a shareholder and a member of AusBulk, the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board—not that any of them has any direct involvement with this decision because this is mainly a decision involving Flinders Ports, in which I do not have any interest at all. I was appalled by the Premier's answer. Is there some doubt that the decision made and the contract signed between the previous government and Flinders Ports to build a new deep-sea port at Outer Harbor will not stand? All after the work, after all the debate in this chamber and after all the industry involvement and support by all the parties, we still have a stalemate.

This issue has been unresolved for over 25 years and I thought, when Premier Olsen announced it, that we finally had procured a deep-sea port for South Australia, the only one on this side of the gulf. But, alas, we now have a Labor government and, surely, this issue will not be reversed or changed. The decision by the Olsen Liberal government to build the port was one of the most important decisions for the economic development of South Australia in three decades. Back in 1955 we had a modern and efficient grain storage, freight and shipping system. Apart from Port Lincoln and Port Giles on the other side of the gulf, there have been no major upgrades of the ports since. For 25 years we have been going to address it, but for 25 years governments have procrastinated. We now see much of the world grain and wine trade carried in ships that cannot fit into our old shallow ports or, at least, they cannot be fully loaded there.

Small ships carry less, and associated costs are much higher. It now costs approximately \$6 to \$8 extra per tonne to pay for this inefficiency, and the high costs, of course, reduce the returns to the growers and affect their profitability. Losses to the industry and to the state amount to approximately \$25 million to \$30 million per year, and that is an absolute disgrace. As legislators we have let this state down.

Playford did the right thing back in 1955 in establishing the most modern bulk handling system in the world at that time. We have done nothing since, and every year we produce more grain than in the year before. We must get into the real world. We heard yesterday that the United States government will subsidise American farmers—and they are our competitors, I remind the house—to the tune of \$75 billion over the next 10 years.

How can we sell our produce against that amount of price core subsidy and still remain profitable and viable? We all know what the answer is: it is to provide our industry with the most efficient infrastructure available so it maximises the return to the growers and is not wasted along the current most inefficient grain paths. We have the most efficient farmers in the world, not just as grain producers but also as wine, wool and meat producers.

The past two harvests have produced record crops for South Australian grain producers with huge increases in crop production. The 2001-02 harvest was a record-breaker with 9.43 million tonnes of grain received, eclipsing last year's record harvest by 24 per cent—a whopping 24 per cent over the previous year. But there is more. There was a 20 per cent increase on the year before that, so in two years we have seen a 44 per cent increase over the previous record in the previous harvest. These are staggering figures, and it is amazing how successful our farmers have been in the past two years.

So in two years our farmers have increased production by more than a staggering 44 per cent. That equates to an injection of over \$1 billion per annum. What that means to a small state such as South Australia is obvious. We have outperformed other states for two consecutive years. All this but, alas, we cart it off to the market in a horse and cart, so to speak. There are over 10 million tonnes of grain to be sold and shipped out but, even if we have a record marketing and shipping program, we could not get it all out before harvest.

We cannot load the big panamax ships which are now common because we do not have ports deep enough near the grain. This inefficiency will cost the state over \$400 million over the next 25 years. It is a total waste and lost to inefficiencies that can and should be avoided. There is only one option, that is, a deep seaport centrally located with both road and rail connections. We have argued long and hard for this.

I heard a week ago that the Inner Harbor option was being reconsidered by the Labor government. We know that the preferred option of the member for Hart is the Inner Harbor, a view which he expressed quite strongly last year during the debate in relation to the PortsCorp sale. His preference is, quite strongly, for the Inner Harbor. I think his reasons are purely political because he is the local member. Apart from being Treasurer, he is the local member and he opposed the sale last year in this house. I have heard that more soil tests are being taken from the bottom of the Port River. Yet again, what for? We have done that before.

We have got to get this into our heads, once and for all: the Inner Harbor is not a feasible option; it has no future and it should be phased out. It is 10 kilometres up a narrow river—too narrow to swing large ships—and the older berth is too short and the loaders too low. But someone always knows better. Berth 8 is right alongside the container berth and it is the only—and best—option. We know that the new owner, Flinders Ports, will ensure that the channel is dredged to 12 metres at the container terminal berth, and it requires a pocket of 14 metres which will be deep enough for the panamax ships and even the super large cape ships. That is 12 metres and 14 metres under the loaders.

Berth 8 is right alongside this berth and will require only an extra small triangular shaped piece to be dredged to provide large vessels with the room to turn around in front of the container terminal and back into berth 8. It is plain commonsense and the grain storage should be nearby, not on vacant land two kilometres away, such as I have seen on some plans. A distance of 200 metres or 300 metres is more appropriate and by putting a loop railway line behind it and connecting road we have an opportunity to give our state's export industries efficiencies that will last for the next 20 to 30 years.

These delays, which are also causing plenty of anxiety elsewhere, allow competitors and other states to target us. You know, Mr Speaker, that a new port site in the north of the state has been purchased by farmers; it has been transferred and now purchased by the Australian Wheat Board, with a \$120 million facility being considered. Why is this? It is because our industry leaders and farmers despair at the situation and believe that nothing will ever happen in Adelaide.

So, the industry says, 'Well, if they will not do it, we will do it ourselves; hang the government; hang the port of

Adelaide. We will be better served by a new superport with up to 20 metres of water at Mypony Point and the grain south of Adelaide will go out through Portland in Victoria.' Is that what we want? What will that do to Port Adelaide and its industries? Adelaide will become another shipping backwater bypassed by the shipping industry. Mypony Point is the best spot in our state for a deep seaport with five kilometres of open coastline, 20 metres of water not far out, poor quality land—and no-one lives near it. We are not being fair to our new port buyer, Flinders Ports. How viable will Flinders Ports be if a new superport is built in the north and they want action at Outer Harbor as soon as possible. I visited Flinders Ports last week with colleagues and they were as frustrated as we are. Mr Rann, the previous government made the right decision for the long-term economic success of South Australia. All I can say is: make the announcement now, and get on with it!

Motion carried.

At 9.10 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 16 May at 10.30 a.m.